

A Unifying System Theory Framework for Distributed Optimization and Games

Guido Carnevale, Nicola Mimmo, Giuseppe Notarstefano,

Abstract

This paper introduces a systematic methodological framework to design and analyze distributed algorithms for optimization and games over networks. Starting from a centralized method, we identify an aggregation function involving all the decision variables (e.g., a global cost gradient or constraint) and introduce a distributed consensus-oriented scheme to asymptotically approximate the unavailable information at each agent. Then, we delineate the proper methodology for intertwining the identified building blocks, i.e., the optimization-oriented method and the consensus-oriented one. The key intuition is to interpret the obtained interconnection as a singularly perturbed system. We rely on this interpretation to provide sufficient conditions for the building blocks to be successfully connected into a distributed scheme exhibiting the convergence guarantees of the centralized algorithm. Finally, we show the potential of our approach by developing a new distributed scheme for constraint-coupled problems with a linear convergence rate.

I. INTRODUCTION

Increasing attention has been devoted in the last years to turning centralized (or parallel) architectures into distributed ones, since distributed algorithms offer many benefits: e.g., preserve privacy and avoid a single point of failure, see Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Centralized (left) and distributed (right) architectures.

In *distributed optimization*, agents cooperate to minimize a common performance index, while, in the context of *games* over networks, they compete with each other to minimize individual costs. See the recent surveys on distributed optimization [1]–[8] and aggregative games [9]–[11] for a comprehensive overview of the existing frameworks, algorithms, and application scenarios. The use of tools from system theory in these settings is a recent successful trend [12]. The advantages of this approach have been already shown in the context of both distributed optimization [13]–[16] and games [17], [18]. The work [19] (see also [20]) proposes a control-theoretic approach to systematically decompose distributed optimization algorithms into a centralized optimization method and a second-order consensus estimator. Other systematic decompositions based on system theory are proposed in [21], [22], where also time-varying graphs are considered. A first attempt of a systematic design for distributed continuous-time optimization schemes is proposed in [23] by relying on nonlinear observation theory. Our key idea is to formalize an intuition of most distributed algorithms that try to mimic a centralized algorithm by combining an approximated optimization part with a consensus scheme to agree on global information. Specific distributed settings have been addressed under the lens of *singular perturbations* in both optimization [24]–[29] and game theory [30]–[34]. Singular perturbations (or timescale separation) are a powerful tool for analyzing systems characterized by the interconnection of a slow subsystem with a fast one [35], [36]. In order to deal with agreement on global information in our schemes, we resort to the formalism of α -consensus [37], [38], modeling problems in which N agents endowed with local quantities s_1, \dots, s_N aim to reach consensus at $\alpha(s_1, \dots, s_N)$.

The main contribution of this paper is a methodological framework for both the design and analysis of distributed algorithms for optimization and games over networks. We develop a procedure that (i) systematically prescribes how to get a distributed version of an inspiring centralized method and (ii) provides analytical guarantees that the resulting distributed scheme achieves the same convergence properties of the centralized one. Inspired by the mentioned successful examples using singular perturbations, we adopt them as a foundational tool to develop our systematic approach. Specifically, our procedure takes a centralized

algorithm and identifies a so-called *aggregation* function, i.e., a global quantity depending on all the network variables and, thus, requiring a central unit to be computed. Then, the global information is substituted by a local proxy that is updated according to a so-called consensus-oriented dynamics. Our framework formally establishes how to interlace the optimization- and the consensus-oriented parts leading to a distributed algorithm with suitable convergence guarantees. We interpret the obtained interconnected dynamics as a Singularly Perturbed (SP) system, usually decomposed into *fast* and *slow* subsystems derived from the optimization-oriented part and the consensus-oriented one, respectively. Based on this structure and by using tools from system theory, we provide convergence guarantees for the resulting distributed algorithm based on proper conditions on the optimization-oriented part and the consensus-oriented one separately considered. We consider general cases, possibly involving multiple solutions (e.g., nonconvex scenarios) and guarantee convergence in a LaSalle sense. When the solution is unique, we establish conditions for its exponential stability or, equivalently, for linear convergence. Our main result stands on a general theorem for SP systems with LaSalle-type properties (Theorem 3 in Appendix A) extending [26, Th. 1] and, thus, representing a contribution per se. Another side contribution is Proposition 1 (in Appendix B): it establishes sufficient conditions for designing distributed schemes solving dynamic average consensus problems with composite functions. Finally, we showcase the potential of the proposed approach with a concrete example. Specifically, we design a novel distributed algorithm for constraint-coupled optimization scenarios and, under mild problem assumptions, we prove its linear convergence properties. To the best of our knowledge, such a novel algorithm is the first distributed scheme exhibiting a linear convergence rate in solving optimization problems with coupling *inequality* constraints. This example highlights how novel distributed algorithms can be designed thanks to our framework by means of simple steps. Thus, it shows that our approach paves the way for systematically obtaining a wide variety of distributed algorithms (and their analysis) across several existing and potentially new scenarios. As for the existing attempts for systematic approaches (see the mentioned references [19]–[23]), we note that they all restrict to unconstrained convex consensus optimization and all but [23] focus only on the analysis neglecting the design phase. The work [23] offers also design arguments but it is restricted to gradient-flow continuous-time schemes. Let us then summarize the peculiarities of our methodology. First, it offers not only the analysis but also a systematic algorithm design. Second, thanks to the inherent generality of system theory, it provides a unified perspective across different viewpoints. Indeed, it allows us to encompass a wide range of scenarios (e.g., constraint-coupled optimization or aggregative games), algorithms (e.g., augmented primal-dual or projected gradient methods), and assumptions (e.g., nonconvex costs or unbounded feasible sets).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we formulate the problem and present the more popular frameworks arising in distributed optimization and games. Section III presents our systematic approach and the main result of the paper. Section IV provides an overview of optimization- and consensus-oriented algorithms matching the assumptions made in Section III. Finally, in Section V, we apply our approach to synthesize a novel distributed scheme and numerically test its effectiveness.

Notation: $\text{col}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ denotes the column stacking of the vectors x_1, \dots, x_N . In $\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, I_m and 0_m are the identity and zero matrices. The symbol $\mathbf{1}_N$ denotes the vector of N ones while $\mathbf{1}_{N,d} := \mathbf{1}_N \otimes I_d$, where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product. Dimensions are omitted when they are clear from the context. Given $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote as $[v]_i$ its i -th component. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we define $\|x\|_{\mathcal{S}} := \inf_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \|x - y\|$. Given $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define $\nabla_1 f(x, y) := \frac{\partial}{\partial s} f(s, y)|_{s=x}$ and $\nabla_2 f(x, y) := \frac{\partial}{\partial s} f(x, s)|_{s=y}$. \mathbb{R}_+^n is the positive orthant in \mathbb{R}^n .

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Our aim is to develop a comprehensive design and analysis approach for various scenarios in distributed optimization and games over networks. To achieve this unification, we begin by introducing the concept of Variational Inequality (VI), as it offers a unified view on both distributed optimization and games [39], [40]. In detail, given a subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a vector-valued function $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, a finite-dimensional VI problem $\text{VI}(X, F)$ consists in finding $x^* \in X$ such that

$$(x - x^*)^\top F(x^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (1)$$

A wide range of problems arising in optimization and games over networks can be modeled as particular instances of (1) referred to as *multi-agent* VI problem $\text{VI}(X, F)$. More in detail, in the multi-agent case, given $\mathcal{I} := \{1, \dots, N\}$, the decision variable x can be written as $x := \text{col}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N n_i = n$, while the feasible set reads as $X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_N$ with $X_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and F is

$$F(x) = [F_1(x)^\top \quad \dots \quad F_N(x)^\top]^\top,$$

where $F_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, a multi-agent VI reads as

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_N \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} x_1^* \\ \vdots \\ x_N^* \end{bmatrix} \right)^\top \begin{bmatrix} F_1(x^*) \\ \vdots \\ F_N(x^*) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in X, \quad (2)$$

where $x^* := \text{col}[x_1^*, \dots, x_N^*] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. We denote as $X^* \subseteq X$ the set containing all (possible) solutions to problem (2). In this paper, we focus on a comprehensive development of distributed strategies to address problem (2). Specifically, we focus on networks of N agents communicating according to a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{I} is the set of agents

and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}$ is the set of edges. The symbol \mathcal{N}_i denotes the in-neighbor set of agent i , namely $\mathcal{N}_i := \{j \in \mathcal{I} \mid (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Finally, the in-degree of agent i is the cardinality of \mathcal{N}_i and we use $\deg_i := |\mathcal{N}_i|$ to denote it.

In the next, we provide an overview of popular frameworks addressed in the context of optimization and games over networks and we cast them in the form of the VI (2).

Distributed Consensus Optimization: N agents aim at cooperatively minimizing the sum of functions all depending on a common variable. Formally, this kind of problem reads as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x), \quad (3)$$

where, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the cost function associated to agent i . We cast problem (3) in the form of (2) by setting

$$F(x) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \nabla f_i(x_1)^\top \quad \dots \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla f_i(x_N)^\top \right]^\top, \quad X = \mathbb{R}^{Nd}.$$

Distributed Constraint-Coupled Optimization: in this setup, the coupling among the agents' variables occurs in the constraints rather than in the objective functions. Indeed, it reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i) \\ \text{subj. to} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N A_i x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^N b_i, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where each $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the local cost function of agent i depending on the associated decision variable $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, while the elements $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_i}$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ model the feasible set. The whole decision variable is denoted as $x := \text{col}[x_1, \dots, x_N] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n := \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$. This problem structure does not necessarily impose consensus among the agents' estimates. However, as we will show also in Section IV, because of the coupling in the constraints, every single agent cannot independently solve a local problem with local information. We note that problem (4) can be cast in the form (2) with $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^N (A_i x_i - b_i) \leq 0\}$ and

$$F(x) = \left[\nabla f_1(x_1)^\top \quad \dots \quad \nabla f_N(x_N)^\top \right]^\top.$$

We recall that we want to satisfy the constraint formalized by the feasible set X in an asymptotic sense.

Distributed Aggregative Optimization: N agents still cooperate to minimize the sum of N functions, but now they also depend on a so-called *aggregative* variable. Formally, we have

$$\min_{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i, \sigma(x)), \quad (5)$$

in which $x := \text{col}[x_1, \dots, x_N] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the global decision vector, with each $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$. Each function $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents the local objective function of agent i , while the aggregative variable $\sigma(x)$ has the form

$$\sigma(x) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i(x_i), \quad (6)$$

where each $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the i -th contribution to $\sigma(x)$. We cast problem (5) in the form of (2) by setting $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and

$$F(x) = \left[\frac{\partial \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i, \sigma(x))}{\partial x_1} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\partial \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i, \sigma(x))}{\partial x_N} \right]^\top.$$

Aggregative Games over Networks with Linear Coupling Constraints: N agents compete with each other with the aim of minimizing their own costs depending on the strategies of all the other agents. Formally, agent i aims at solving

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}} \quad & J_i(x_i, \sigma(x)) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^N A_j x_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^N b_j, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the elements $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_i}$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ model the set of feasible strategies, while the cost function $J_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depends on the i -th individual strategy $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, as well as on the aggregative variable $\sigma(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ defined as in (6), with $x := \text{col}[x_1, \dots, x_N] \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n := \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$. We define the constraint functions $c_i(x_i) := A_i x_i - b_i$, $c_{-i}(x_{-i}) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{i\}} (A_j x_j - b_j)$, and $c(x) := c_i(x_i) + c_{-i}(x_{-i}) = Ax - b$, where $x_{-i} := \text{col}[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_i}$, $A := [A_1 \dots A_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$,

and $b := \sum_{i=1}^N b_i$. Then, the collective vector of strategies x must belong to the feasible set $\mathcal{C} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid c(x) \leq 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. We refer to any equilibrium solution to the set of inter-dependent optimization problems (7) as aggregative Generalized Nash Equilibrium (GNE) [41] (or simply GNE), which is formally defined as follows.

Definition 1 (GNE [41]). *A collective vector of strategies $x^* \in \mathcal{C}$ is a GNE of (7) if, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we have:*

$$J_i(x_i^*, \sigma(x^*)) \leq \min_{x_i \in \mathcal{C}_i(x_{-i}^*)} J_i(x_i, \frac{1}{N} \phi_i(x_i) + \sigma_{-i}(x_{-i}^*)),$$

with $\mathcal{C}_i(x_{-i}) := \{x_i \in X_i \mid A_i x_i \leq b_i - c_{-i}(x_{-i})\}$, $x_{-i}^* := \text{col}[x_1^*, \dots, x_{i-1}^*, x_{i+1}^*, \dots, x_N^*]$, and $\sigma_{-i}(x_{-i}^*) := \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \phi_j(x_j^*)$. ■

By addressing a VI in the form of (2) in which $X = \mathcal{C}$ and

$$F(x) = \left[\frac{\partial J_1(x_1, \sigma(x))}{\partial x_1} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\partial J_N(x_N, \sigma(x))}{\partial x_N} \right]^\top,$$

one finds a subset of the GNEs of problem (7) named *variational GNEs* (v-GNEs). As in the constraint-coupled setup, the constraint formalized by the feasible set X must be satisfied in an asymptotic sense.

Remark 1. *Many existing works focus on games in which each cost function J_i depends on all the single strategies x_j , namely each agent aims at minimizing $J_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ (see, e.g., [11], [42], [43]). However, we remark that the aggregative game (7) recovers this class of games by setting $\sigma(x) := x$, i.e., players need to access the whole vector of strategies.* ■

III. UNIFYING THEORY FOR DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHMS: SYSTEMATIC DESIGN AND FORMAL GUARANTEES

In this section, we provide a comprehensive approach to design an iterative distributed algorithm aimed at solving problem (2). In Section III-A, we start from a centralized algorithm (for optimization or games) run by N agents aided by a central unit named *aggregator* (or *master*). The aggregator collects/spreads data from/to all the agents of the network and performs computations involving all variables. Then, in Section III-B, we develop a naive version of a fully distributed algorithm in which we interlace the original optimization-oriented scheme with an inner, consensus-oriented one. Specifically, we introduce local proxies that asymptotically work as the aggregator. Finally, in Section III-C, we suitably modify this naive version to simultaneously run, in a distributed fashion, both the optimization- and consensus-oriented schemes.

A. Centralized Meta-Algorithm for Optimization and Games

We introduce a generic centralized method to address problem (2). This scheme serves as an inspiring algorithm that we aim to replicate in a distributed manner. It is intentionally kept generic and does not represent a specific methodology. Hence, we refer to it as the *centralized meta-algorithm*. In detail, given the iteration index $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_{\chi_i} \in \mathbb{N}$, each agent $i \in \mathcal{I}$, at iteration t , maintains a local algorithmic state $\chi_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\chi_i}}$ and a local output $x_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ representing the current estimate of the i -th block of a solution to problem (2). Although the variables χ_i^t and x_i^t are usually related, they do not necessarily coincide. Indeed, the algorithmic state χ_i^t may also contain, e.g., local multipliers λ_i^t to enforce local and/or global constraints (see, e.g., [31]), as well as local momentum terms m_i^t to improve the convergence features of the algorithm (see, e.g., [44]). Agent i iteratively updates (χ_i^t, x_i^t) according to a specific protocol implementable in a centralized manner. Posing $\chi^t := \text{col}[\chi_1^t, \dots, \chi_N^t] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi}$ with $n_\chi := \sum_{i=1}^N n_{\chi_i}$, we generally describe this centralized meta-algorithm as

$$\chi_i^{t+1} = g_i(\chi_i^t, \alpha(\chi^t)) \tag{8a}$$

$$x_i^t = \eta_i(\chi_i^t), \tag{8b}$$

where $g_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\chi_i}} \times \mathbb{R}^a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{\chi_i}}$ represents the local algorithm dynamics, $\eta_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\chi_i}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ represents the local output map, while $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^a$ is an *aggregation* function that couples all the local quantities χ_i^t . Specifically, $\alpha(\chi)$ represents a solution to a α -consensus problem, i.e., the problem of finding the collective information (e.g., the mean, the maximum, the minimum, etc...) encoded in α about the local quantities χ_1, \dots, χ_N . The specific form of g_i is motivated by the distributed paradigm we aim at aligning with. Indeed, we explicitly identified the dependency on the local (and available) information χ_i^t and the global (and unavailable) one encoded in $\alpha(\chi^t)$, which needs to be computed by the aggregator. In Section IV-A, for each setup presented in Section II, we provide a centralized algorithm that effectively solves the considered setup and we explicitly show that it matches the general form considered in (8). The column-stacked version of (8) reads as

$$\chi^{t+1} = g(\chi^t, \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi^t)) \tag{9a}$$

$$x^t = \eta(\chi^t), \tag{9b}$$

in which $x^t := \text{col}[x_1^t, \dots, x_N^t] \in \mathbb{R}^n$, while $g : \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \times \mathbb{R}^{Na} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi}$ and $\eta : \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ read as

$$g(\chi, v) := [g_1(\chi_1, v_1)^\top \quad \dots \quad g_N(\chi_N, v_N)^\top]^\top$$

$$\eta(\chi) := [\eta_1(\chi_1)^\top \quad \dots \quad \eta_N(\chi_N)^\top]^\top,$$

where $v := \text{col}[v_1, \dots, v_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{Na}$ with $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^a$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

B. Naive Double Loop Distributed Algorithm

In a network of peer-to-peer agents, the central aggregator is not available and, thus, the update (9a) cannot be implemented. To compensate for this lack of knowledge, we equip each agent i with an auxiliary variable $z_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ providing a local proxy $\hat{\alpha}_i(\chi_i^t, z_i^t) \in \mathbb{R}^a$ about the unavailable, aggregate quantity $\alpha(\chi)$. In other words, each z_i^t is the local state variable of a consensus-oriented mechanism that we need to embed in the overall algorithm to make its execution possible in a distributed fashion. We do that by modifying the local update (8a) as

$$\chi_i^{t+1} = g_i(\chi_i^t, \underbrace{\hat{\alpha}_i(\chi_i^t, z_i^t)}_{\text{proxy for } \alpha(\chi^t)}). \quad (10)$$

Next, we show a naive distributed algorithm, including an inner loop for the update of z_i^t , that helps to understand the rationale of the actual distributed algorithmic framework and the line of proof that we will present in the following sections. To this end, we introduce an inner iteration index $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we consider the double-loop algorithm

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for } t = 1, 2, \dots \\ &\quad \chi_i^{t+1} = g_i(\chi_i^t, \hat{\alpha}_i(\chi_i^t, z_i^{t,\infty})) \end{aligned} \quad (11a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\quad \text{for } \tau = 1, 2, \dots \\ &\quad \quad z_i^{t,\tau+1} = h_i(\chi_{\mathcal{N}_i}^t, z_{\mathcal{N}_i}^{t,\tau}), \end{aligned} \quad (11b)$$

where $z_i^{t,\infty} := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} z_i^{t,\tau}$, $h_i : \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} n_{x_j}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} p_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ is a generic description of the consensus-oriented dynamics, while $\chi_{\mathcal{N}_i}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} n_{x_j}}$ and $z_{\mathcal{N}_i}^{t,\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} p_j}$ collect the quantities maintained by the in-neighbors of agent i , namely

$$\chi_{\mathcal{N}_i}^t := \text{col} [\chi_j^t]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}, \quad z_{\mathcal{N}_i}^{t,\tau} := \text{col} [z_j^{t,\tau}]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i},$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. In Section IV-B, we will provide explicit examples of this consensus-oriented dynamics in the case in which the α -consensus problem reconstruction coincides with an average consensus problem, i.e., in the case in which $\alpha(\chi)$ represents the mean of local quantities (e.g., gradients, solution estimates, or constraints). To generalize, as it will be clear in the sequel, the inner update must be designed to asymptotically solve the α -consensus problem, i.e., the trajectories of (11b) must satisfy

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\alpha}_i(\chi_i^t, z_i^{t,\tau}) = \alpha(\chi^t),$$

for all $\chi^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}$. We conclude this part by providing the column-stacked version of (11b), namely

$$z^{t,\tau+1} = h(\chi^t, z^{t,\tau}), \quad (12)$$

where, given $p := \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$, we introduced $h(\chi, z) := [h_1(\chi_{\mathcal{N}_1}, z_{\mathcal{N}_1})^\top \dots h_N(\chi_{\mathcal{N}_N}, z_{\mathcal{N}_N})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$. We point out that algorithm (11) is not practically implementable since agents should run the inner loop forever or share a common iteration index to switch between the inner and outer loops.

C. Distributed Meta-Algorithm for Optimization and Games

We follow a key intuition based on singular perturbations to transform (11) in a fully distributed algorithm without an inner loop. To do that, we suitably modify (11a) and (11b) to create an interconnected system with a fast and a slow dynamics.

To this end, we introduce a parameter $\delta > 0$ allowing for an arbitrary tuning of the variations of χ^t , so that (10) becomes

$$\chi_i^{t+1} = \chi_i^t + \delta(g_i(\chi_i^t, \hat{\alpha}_i(\chi_i^t, z_i^t)) - \chi_i^t). \quad (13)$$

By simultaneously running (13) and a single step of (11b), we obtain our distributed meta-algorithm for optimization and games and we report it in Algorithm 1. We remark that (14) only uses variables locally available for agent i and, thus,

Algorithm 1 Distributed Meta-Algorithm (Agent i)

for $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

$$\chi_i^{t+1} = \chi_i^t + \delta(g_i(\chi_i^t, \hat{\alpha}_i(\chi_i^t, z_i^t)) - \chi_i^t) \quad (14a)$$

$$z_i^{t+1} = h_i(\chi_{\mathcal{N}_i}^t, z_{\mathcal{N}_i}^t) \quad (14b)$$

$$x_i^t = \eta_i(\chi_i^t) \quad (14c)$$

end for

can be implemented in a fully distributed manner. Although our primary objective is to provide a tool for developing and analyzing novel distributed methods, it is noteworthy that the general form of the generic distributed meta-algorithm reported in Algorithm 1 encompasses several existing methods. Just to name a few, we mention ADMM-Tracking Gradient [29] for




Fig. 2. Block diagram of (15).

consensus optimization (3), Distributed Aggregative Gradient Tracking [45] for aggregative optimization (5), and Primal TRADES [31] for aggregative games with local constraints (7).

By collecting all the local updates (14), the stacked-column description of our distributed meta-algorithm reads as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta(g(\chi^t, \hat{\alpha}(\chi^t, z^t)) - \chi^t) \quad (15a)$$

$$z^{t+1} = h(\chi^t, z^t) \quad (15b)$$

$$x^t = \eta(\chi^t), \quad (15c)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}(\chi, z) := [\hat{\alpha}_1(\chi_1, z_1)^\top \dots \hat{\alpha}_N(\chi_N, z_N)^\top]^\top$. The obtained distributed method interconnects the optimization-oriented subsystem (15a) and the consensus-oriented one (15b), see Fig. 2 for a schematic view. Intuitively, with a sufficiently small δ , the consensus-oriented scheme deals with a “quasi-static” χ^t , so that $\hat{\alpha}(\chi^t, z^t) \approx \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi^t)$. Then, the optimization-oriented scheme mimics a low-pass filter of the desired and centralized meta-algorithm (9). Based on this intuition, we formalize as follows the necessary properties of the centralized optimization meta-algorithm (9) and the consensus-oriented scheme (12) separately considered. We start from the required properties about the centralized method (9). Then, in Section IV-A, for each setup considered in Section II, we provide a centralized method that satisfies these assumptions.

Assumption 1 (Centralized method (9) equilibria). X^* is non-empty and there exist non-empty sets $\mathcal{X}^*, \mathcal{S}_\chi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi}$ such that

$$1) \mathcal{X}^* := \{\chi^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \mid \chi^* = g(\chi^*, \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi^*)), \eta(\chi^*) \in X^*\}.$$

$$2) \text{ The set } \mathcal{S}_\chi \supset \mathcal{X}^* \text{ is convex and, for all } (\chi, v) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathbb{R}^{N^a}, \text{ it holds } g(\chi, v) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi. \quad \blacksquare$$

Assumption 1 introduces the set \mathcal{X}^* containing the equilibria χ^* of the centralized method (9) whose output $x^* = \eta(\chi^*)$ is a solution to the variational inequality (2). As for the set \mathcal{S}_χ , we clarify its role as follows.

Remark 2. We introduced the forward-invariant set \mathcal{S}_χ to include optimization-oriented methods requiring a proper initialization (e.g., projection-based algorithms) and, thus, to enhance the class of setups and methods that can be captured by our framework. To further stress that this is not a limitation, we note that in the case of initialization-free methods (e.g., in unconstrained programs), since we do not require the boundedness of \mathcal{S}_χ , we can simply set $\mathcal{S}_\chi \equiv \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi}$. \blacksquare

The next assumption characterizes the convergence properties of the centralized method (9) by introducing a suitable descent-like function W . Such a function W may be, e.g., the overall cost function in the case of unconstrained programs (see [26]) or the so-called gap function (see [46]) in the case of games.

Assumption 2 (Convergence of centralized method (9)). There exist a radially unbounded, differentiable function $W : \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a function $D : \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, and $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\nabla W(\chi)^\top (g(\chi, \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi)) - \chi) \leq -c_1 D(\chi)^2 \quad (16a)$$

$$\|\nabla W(\chi)\| \leq c_2 D(\chi) \quad (16b)$$

$$\|\nabla W(\chi) - \nabla W(\chi')\| \leq c_3 \|\chi - \chi'\| \quad (16c)$$

$$\|g(\chi, \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi)) - \chi\| \leq c_4 D(\chi), \quad (16d)$$

for all $\chi, \chi' \in \mathcal{S}_\chi$. Moreover, $\chi^* \in \{\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \mid D(\chi) = 0\} \implies \chi^* \in \mathcal{X}^*$. Further, g and η are β_g - and β_η -Lipschitz continuous over $\mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathbb{R}^{N^a}$ and \mathcal{S}_χ , for some $\beta_g, \beta_\eta > 0$. \blacksquare

The next assumption focuses on variational inequalities (2) with a unique solution x^* and centralized methods (9) with exponential stability guarantees or, equivalently, a linear convergence rate. These stronger guarantees are commonly achieved in the case of strongly convex cost functions (optimization) or strongly monotone pseudo-gradients (game theory).

Assumption 3 (Exp. stability for centralized method (9)). Given $\chi^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times}$ such that $x^* = \eta(\chi^*) \in X^*$, it holds

$$\underline{c} \|\chi - \chi^*\|^2 \leq W(\chi) \leq \bar{c} \|\chi - \chi^*\|^2 \quad (17a)$$

$$D(\chi)^2 \geq c \|\chi - \chi^*\|^2, \quad (17b)$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_\chi$ and some $\underline{c}, \bar{c}, c > 0$. ■

Remark 3. The role of Assumptions 2 (resp. 3) is to frame convergence results of given centralized methods within a system theory interpretation based on LaSalle's Invariance Principle (resp. Lyapunov's stability theory). Indeed, we recall that our goal is to develop a systematic approach to designing and analyzing distributed versions of existing optimization-oriented methods. Hence, we require convergence results of these inspiring methods to be available. ■

Analogously, we will now formalize the necessary features of the consensus-oriented scheme (12). Section IV-B provides an overview of existing schemes satisfying these assumptions.

It is possible to decompose the most popular consensus-oriented dynamics (see the tutorial [47] about dynamic average consensus) into two suitable components, one of which has a forward-invariant set, while the other has a stable equilibrium parametrized in χ . In turn, α -consensus is achieved in configurations where the first part lies on the mentioned set and the other one in this equilibrium. To make these schemes eligible in our systematic procedure, we introduce a change of variables $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ that transforms z according to

$$z \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \bar{z} \\ z_\perp \end{bmatrix} := \mathcal{T}(z) := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{T}}(z) \\ \mathcal{T}_\perp(z) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

with $\bar{\mathcal{T}} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\perp : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp}$ with $\bar{p} + p_\perp = p$. The transformation \mathcal{T} allows us to rewrite system (15) as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta(g(\chi^t, \hat{\alpha}(\chi^t, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\text{col}[\bar{z}^t, z_\perp^t]))) - \chi^t) \quad (19a)$$

$$\bar{z}^{t+1} = \bar{\mathcal{T}}(h(\chi^t, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\text{col}[\bar{z}^t, z_\perp^t]))) \quad (19b)$$

$$z_\perp^{t+1} = \mathcal{T}_\perp(h(\chi^t, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\text{col}[\bar{z}^t, z_\perp^t]))) \quad (19c)$$

$$x^t = \eta(\chi^t). \quad (19d)$$

In these new coordinates, we suppose the following invariance and orthogonality conditions. We note that these conditions are common to the most widely used consensus-oriented schemes and, among others, to those presented later in Section IV-B, which serve as building blocks for our systematic methodology.

Assumption 4. (Invariance and orthogonality) There exists a forward-invariant set $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ for (19b). Moreover, there exist $\hat{\alpha}_\perp : \mathbb{R}^{n \times} \times \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_\alpha}$ and $h_\perp : \mathbb{R}^{n \times} \times \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp}$ such that

$$\hat{\alpha}(\chi, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\text{col}[\bar{z}, z_\perp])) = \hat{\alpha}_\perp(\chi, z_\perp) \quad (20a)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_\perp(h(\chi, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\text{col}[\bar{z}, z_\perp]))) = h_\perp(\chi, z_\perp), \quad (20b)$$

for all $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times}$, $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$, and $z_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp}$. Further, $\hat{\alpha}_\perp$ and h_\perp are Lipschitz continuous with constants $\beta_\alpha, \beta_h > 0$, respectively. ■

Now, we guarantee the existence of an equilibrium of (19c) parametrized in χ in which the α -consensus is solved.

Assumption 5. (Parametrized equilibrium) There exists $z_\perp^{eq} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp}$ such that, for all $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times}$, it holds

$$\hat{\alpha}_\perp(\chi, z_\perp^{eq}(\chi)) = \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi) \quad (21a)$$

$$z_\perp^{eq}(\chi) = h_\perp(\chi, z_\perp^{eq}(\chi)). \quad (21b)$$

Further, z_\perp^{eq} is Lipschitz continuous with constant $\beta_{eq} > 0$. ■

Conditions (20a) and (21a) ensure that if $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ and $z_\perp = z_\perp^{eq}(\chi)$, the α -consensus problem is solved. Since $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ is forward-invariant for (19b), the set $\mathcal{S}_z := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid \bar{\mathcal{T}}(z) \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}\}$ turns out to be forward-invariant for the whole consensus-oriented part (15b). Hence, by initializing system (15) with $z^0 \in \mathcal{S}_z$, one ensures $\bar{z}^t \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Thus, to assess the attractiveness of the entire α -consensus locus $\{(\bar{z}, z_\perp) \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}} \times \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp} \mid \bar{z} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}, z_\perp = z_\perp^{eq}(\chi)\}$, we now impose asymptotic stability properties for the equilibrium $z_\perp^{eq}(\chi)$.

Assumption 6 (Stability of consensus-oriented dynamics). There exist $U : \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 > 0$ such that

$$b_1 \|\bar{z}_\perp\|^2 \leq U(\bar{z}_\perp) \leq b_2 \|\bar{z}_\perp\|^2 \quad (22a)$$

$$U(h_\perp(\chi, \bar{z}_\perp + z_\perp^{eq}(\chi)) - z_\perp^{eq}(\chi)) - U(\bar{z}_\perp) \leq -b_3 \|\bar{z}_\perp\|^2 \quad (22b)$$

$$|U(\bar{z}_\perp) - U(\bar{z}'_\perp)| \leq b_4 \|\bar{z}_\perp - \bar{z}'_\perp\| (\|\bar{z}_\perp\| + \|\bar{z}'_\perp\|), \quad (22c)$$

for all $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times}$ and $\bar{z}_\perp, \bar{z}'_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{p_\perp}$. ■

Assumption 6 ensures that if $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ and χ were fixed, the point $z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi)$ would be a globally exponentially stable equilibrium uniformly in $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\chi}}$ of dynamics (19c). The following remark provides insights on $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ and the transformation (18).

Remark 4. *The purpose of $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ is to enlarge the class of schemes usable in our design procedure. Indeed, as we will see also later, some popular consensus-oriented schemes (see [47]) widely adopted in distributed optimization (see, e.g., [48]–[50]) require initialization in a subset $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$. We remark that this choice does not represent a limitation. Indeed, in the case of initialization-free protocols, since no boundedness of $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ has been required, one may simply set $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}} \implies \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$. Analogously, we also note that requiring stability properties only on a portion of the dynamics of z (see Assumption 6) is not restrictive: for schemes exhibiting these stability properties on their whole dynamics, one can set $\bar{p} = 0$ and $p_{\perp} = p$. ■*

Once these assumptions have been enforced, we are ready to provide the following theorem showing that the state of the distributed method (15) converges to a proper set associated to the solutions of the variational inequality (2). Moreover, under the additional Assumption 3, we also ensure exponential stability properties and, in turn, linear convergence of x^t toward the unique $x^* \in X^*$ solving the variational inequality (2).

Theorem 1. *Consider (15) and let Assumptions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 hold for a suitable \mathcal{T} as in (18). Then, there exists $\bar{\delta} \in (0, 1]$, such that, for all $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})$ and $(\chi^0, z^0) \in \mathcal{S}_{\chi} \times \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$, the trajectories of (15) satisfy*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\chi^t\|_{X^*} = 0 \quad (23a)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{T}_{\perp}(z^t) - z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\| = 0 \quad (23b)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x^t\|_{X^*} = 0. \quad (23c)$$

If further Assumption 3 holds true, then there exist $r_1, r_2, r_3 > 0$ such that, for all $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})$ and $(\chi^0, z^0) \in \mathcal{S}_{\chi} \times \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$, the trajectories of (15) satisfy

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \chi^t \\ \mathcal{T}_{\perp}(z^t) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \chi^* \\ z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi^*) \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq r_2 \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \chi^0 \\ \mathcal{T}_{\perp}(z^0) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \chi^* \\ z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi^*) \end{bmatrix} \right\| \exp(-r_1 t) \quad (24a)$$

$$\|x^t - x^*\| \leq r_3 \exp(-r_1 t), \quad (24b)$$

where $x^* = \eta(\chi^*)$.

Proof. First of all, since \mathcal{S}_{χ} and $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ are forward-invariant for (9) and (15b) (cf. Assumptions 1 and 4), \mathcal{S}_{χ} is convex (cf. Assumption 1), $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and $(\chi^0, z^0) \in \mathcal{S}_{\chi} \times \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$, we note that $\mathcal{S}_{\chi} \times \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ is forward-invariant for system (15). Now, we use the change of variables (18) and, thus, the equivalent formulation provided in (19). Since $z^0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$, it holds $\bar{z}^0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ by construction. Being $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ is forward-invariant for (19b) (cf. Assumption 4), it holds $\bar{z}^t \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, in light of the orthogonality condition (20) in Assumption 4, \bar{z}^t does not affect the other system states. Thus, we completely ignore it and use (20) to rewrite (19) as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta(g(\chi^t, \hat{\alpha}_{\perp}(\chi^t, z_{\perp}^t)) - \chi^t) \quad (25a)$$

$$z_{\perp}^{t+1} = h_{\perp}(\chi^t, z_{\perp}^t). \quad (25b)$$

After this preliminary phase, we analyze (25) by applying Theorem 3 (in Appendix A), i.e., we interpret it as an SP system, see their generic formulation provided in (52). In particular, χ^t and (25a) are the slow state and subsystem, while z_{\perp}^t and (25b) are the fast ones. We then proceed by checking that all the assumptions required by Theorem 3 are fulfilled. In light of (21b), we note that z_{\perp}^{eq} provides the equilibrium function of the fast part (25b) parametrized in χ^t . Then, the so-called boundary layer system associated to (25), i.e., the fast dynamics (25b) written using the error coordinates $\tilde{z}_{\perp}^t := z_{\perp}^t - z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)$ and an arbitrarily fixed $\chi^t = \chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\chi}}$, reads as

$$\tilde{z}_{\perp}^{t+1} = h_{\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{\perp}^t + z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi)) - z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi). \quad (26)$$

The Lyapunov function U (cf. Assumption 6) ensures that the origin is globally exponentially stable for (26) as required by Theorem 3 in (56). We proceed by studying the so-called reduced system associated to (25), i.e., the slow dynamics (25a) with $z_{\perp}^t = z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. This auxiliary system reads as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta(g(\chi^t, \hat{\alpha}_{\perp}(\chi^t, z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))) - \chi^t). \quad (27)$$

The reconstruction property (21a) ensures $\hat{\alpha}_{\perp}(\chi^t, z_{\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) = \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi^t)$. Hence, we introduce $g_{\alpha}(\chi) := g(\chi, \mathbf{1}\alpha(\chi))$ to lighten up the notation and equivalently rewrite system (27) as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta(g_{\alpha}(\chi^t) - \chi^t). \quad (28)$$

To apply Theorem 3, we need a function satisfying the LaSalle conditions encoded in (57). To this end, we pick the function W introduced in Assumption 2. Thus, in light of (16b), (16c), and (16d), the regularity conditions (57b), (57c), and (57d) are

guaranteed. As for the remaining condition (57a), we evaluate $\Delta W(\chi^t) := W(\chi^{t+1}) - W(\chi^t)$ along the trajectories of the reduced system (28), thus obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W(\chi^t) &= W(\chi^t + \delta(g_\alpha(\chi^t) - \chi^t)) - W(\chi^t) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} W(\chi^t) + \delta \nabla W(\chi^t)^\top (g_\alpha(\chi^t) - \chi^t) \\ &\quad + \delta^2 \frac{c_3}{2} \|g_\alpha(\chi^t) - \chi^t\|^2 - W(\chi^t) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\delta(c_1 - \delta \frac{c_3 c_4^2}{2}) D(\chi)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where in (a), in light of the Lipschitz continuity of ∇W (cf. (16c) in Assumption 2), we bound $W(\chi^t + \delta(g_\alpha(\chi^t) - \chi^t))$ via Descent Lemma [51, Prop. 6.1.2], while in (b) we use (16a) and (16d). Now, we arbitrarily set $\tilde{c}_1 \in (0, c_1)$. Let $\bar{\delta}_1 := \frac{2}{c_3 c_4^2}(c_1 - \tilde{c}_1)$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta}_1)$, we bound (29) as

$$\Delta W(\chi^t) \leq -\delta \tilde{c}_1 D(\chi)^2,$$

namely, W also satisfies (57a). Further, Assumptions 2 and 6 guarantee that the Lipschitz continuity of the dynamics of (25) and the function z_\perp^{eq} and the invariance conditions asked in (53) are achieved into \mathcal{S}_χ and \mathbb{R}^{p+} . Thus, we are in the position to apply Theorem 3. Namely, we use U and W to define $V : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in (59) and Theorem 3 guarantees there exist $\bar{\delta} \in (0, \bar{\delta}_1)$ and $\psi > 0$ such that, by evaluating $\Delta V(\chi^t, z_\perp^t - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) := V(\chi^{t+1}, z_\perp^{t+1} - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1})) - V(\chi^t, z_\perp^t - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))$ along the trajectories of system (25), for all $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})$, it holds

$$\Delta V(\chi^t, z_\perp^t - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) \leq -\psi(D(\chi^t)^2 + \|z_\perp^t - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\|^2), \quad (30)$$

for all $t \geq \mathbb{N}$. The inequality (30) ensures $\Delta V(\chi^t, z_\perp^t - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) \leq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. In detail, the right-hand side of (30) is null when $(\chi^t, z_\perp^t) \in E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x+p+}$, in which

$$E := \{(\chi, z_\perp) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{p+} \mid D(\chi) = 0, z_\perp = z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi)\}. \quad (31)$$

Thus, by LaSalle's invariance principle [52, Theorem 3.7], for all $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})$, the trajectories of system (25) satisfy

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{col}[\chi^t, z_\perp^t] - \xi\|_{\mathcal{M}} = 0, \quad (32)$$

for all $(\chi^0, z_\perp^0) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathbb{R}^{p+}$, where $\mathcal{M} \subseteq E$ denotes the largest invariant set for system (25) contained in E (cf. (31)). Since $\chi^* \in \{\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \mid D(\chi) = 0\} \implies \chi^* \in \mathcal{X}^*$ (cf. Assumption 2), we have $\mathcal{M} = \{(\chi, z_\perp) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{p+} \mid \chi \in \mathcal{X}^*, z_\perp = z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^*)\}$. In turn, $\chi^* \in \mathcal{X}^* \implies \eta(\chi^*) \in X^*$ by construction (cf. Assumption 1) and, thus, also (23) is achieved. As regards the additional results (24), we use (17b) to further bound (30) as

$$\Delta V(\chi^t, z_\perp^t - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) \leq -\psi(c \|\chi^t - \chi^*\|^2 + \|z_\perp^t - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\|^2). \quad (33)$$

By using the quadratic bounds (17a) and (22a), we get

$$\tilde{c} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \chi - \chi^* \\ z_\perp - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi) \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \leq V(\chi, z_\perp - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi)) \leq \tilde{c} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \chi - \chi^* \\ z_\perp - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi) \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2,$$

for all $(\chi^0, z_\perp^0) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathbb{R}^{p+}$, where $\tilde{c} := \min\{\underline{c}, b_1\}$ and $\tilde{c} := \max\{\bar{c}, b_2\}$. In light of these quadratic bounds and inequality (33), we invoke [53, Th. 13.2] to claim that $(\chi^*, z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^*))$ is exponentially stable for (25) and, thus, result (24a) is achieved (see the proof of [53, Th. 13.2] to quantify the constants r_1 and r_2 in (24a)). The proof of (24b) follows by recalling that $x^* = \eta(\chi^*)$ and setting $r_3 = \beta_\eta r_2 \|\text{col}[\chi^0 - \chi^*, z_\perp^0 - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^0)]\|$. \square

We note that the bound $\bar{\delta}$ on the parameter δ in Theorem 1 is uniform in $(\chi^0, z_\perp^0) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathcal{S}_z$ (see Remarks 2 and 4 to recall the purpose of these sets). Hence, using blocks having $\mathcal{S}_\chi \equiv \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $\mathcal{S}_z \equiv \mathbb{R}^p$, Theorem 1 provides global results.

IV. BUILDING BLOCKS FOR DISTRIBUTED OPTIMIZATION AND GAMES SETUPS

In this section, we provide implementations of the meta-algorithm (9) and consensus-oriented protocols (12) for the scenarios considered in Section II. This section, combined with the systematic design and analysis offered in Section III, paves the way for designing a large variety of distributed algorithms in the form (15) for optimization and games.

First, for each setup introduced in Section II, we provide a centralized method matching Assumptions 1 and 2 (and, some of them, the additional Assumption 3). The considered centralized methods involve aggregation functions that can be computed via dynamic average consensus. Thus, we then provide a set of dynamic average consensus schemes that satisfy Assumptions 4, 5, and 6.

A. Centralized Methods for Optimization and Games

For each setup considered in Section II, we now provide a centralized method satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2.

Consensus Optimization: we now present a centralized method for problems in the form (3).

First, we introduce an augmented cost function $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^{Nd} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\tilde{f}(x) := \frac{\nu}{2} x^\top \left(I - \frac{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top}{N} \right) x + N \sum_{i=1}^N f_i \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N x_j \right), \quad (34)$$

where $x := \text{col}[x_1, \dots, x_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{Nd}$ and $\nu > 0$ can be arbitrarily chosen. Such an augmented cost allows us to equivalently rewrite problem (3) as

$$\min_{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nd}} \tilde{f}(x), \quad (35)$$

namely, $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a stationary point of problem (3) if and only if $\mathbf{1}x^* \in \mathbb{R}^{Nd}$ is a stationary point of (35). Hence, by applying the gradient method to problem (35), each agent i , at iteration t , maintains an estimate $\chi_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ about the i -th block of a solution to (35) and explicitly updates it according to

$$\chi_i^{t+1} = \chi_i^t - \gamma \left(\nu \left(\chi_i^t - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_j^t \right) + \sum_{j=1}^N \nabla f_j \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \chi_k^t \right) \right), \quad (36)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the step size. Method (36) can be cast in the form of the meta-algorithm (8) by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_i(\chi_i) &:= \chi_i \\ \alpha(\chi) &:= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1(\chi) \\ \alpha_2(\chi) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \chi_i \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla f_i \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_j \right) \end{bmatrix} \\ g_i(\chi_i, \alpha(\chi)) &:= \chi_i - \gamma \left(\nu(\chi_i - \alpha_1(\chi)) + \alpha_2(\chi) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Given $\chi^t := \text{col}[\chi_1^t, \dots, \chi_N^t] \in \mathbb{R}^{Nd}$, we note that the stacking dynamics arising from the local one (36) compactly reads as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t - \gamma \nabla \tilde{f}(\chi^t). \quad (37)$$

Further, by assuming that $\sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x)$ is radially unbounded with Lipschitz continuous gradients, these properties apply to $\tilde{f}(x)$ too by construction (cf. (34)). Hence, by using the Descent Lemma [51, Prop. 6.1.2], algorithm (37) satisfies Assumptions 1 and 2 with sufficiently small γ and by setting

$$\mathcal{S}_\chi := \mathbb{R}^{Nd}, \quad W(\chi) := \tilde{f}(\chi).$$

In the case of strong convexity of $\sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x)$, given its unique minimizer x^* , it also satisfies the additional Assumption 3 with

$$W(\chi) := \tilde{f}(\chi) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{1}x^*).$$

Constraint-Coupled Optimization: we now focus on problems in the form (4). Let $A := [A_1 \ \dots \ A_N]$, $b := \sum_{i=1}^N b_i$, and $H_\rho : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$H_\rho([v]_\ell, [\lambda]_\ell) := \begin{cases} [v]_\ell [\lambda]_\ell + \frac{\rho}{2} ([v]_\ell)^2 & \text{if } \rho([v]_\ell) + [\lambda]_\ell \geq 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2\rho} [\lambda]_\ell^2 & \text{if } \rho([v]_\ell) + [\lambda]_\ell < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\rho > 0$, while $[v]_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the ℓ -th component of v . Then, let the function $\mathcal{H}_\rho : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$\mathcal{H}_\rho(v, \lambda) := \sum_{\ell=1}^m H_\rho([v]_\ell, [\lambda]_\ell). \quad (38)$$

By slightly adapting the approach in [54], we use \mathcal{H}_ρ to introduce an Augmented Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{Nm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated to problem (4) and defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(x, \lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i) + \mathcal{H}_\rho \left(Ax - b, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \right) - \frac{\nu}{2} \lambda^\top \left(I - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top \right) \lambda,$$

in which $\lambda := \text{col}[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{Nm}$ with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\nu > 0$ can be arbitrarily chosen. Finding saddle points of \mathcal{L} allows for solving problem (4) with linear rate [54]. Hence, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, agent i maintains a local solution estimate $x_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and a local multiplier $\lambda_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and updates them with a descent and an ascent step based on \mathcal{L} , namely

$$x_i^{t+1} = x_i^t - \gamma \nabla f_i(x_i^t) - \gamma A_i^\top \nabla_1 \mathcal{H}_\rho \left(Ax^t - b, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^t \right) \quad (39a)$$

$$\lambda_i^{t+1} = \lambda_i^t + \gamma \nu \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^t - \lambda_i^t \right) + \gamma \frac{1}{N} \nabla_2 \mathcal{H}_\rho \left(Ax^t - b, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^t \right), \quad (39b)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the step size. We cast method (39) in the meta-algorithm form (8) by setting

$$\chi_i := \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \lambda_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad \eta_i(\chi_i) := [I_{n_i} \quad 0_m] \chi_i \quad (40a)$$

$$\alpha(\chi) := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1(\chi) \\ \alpha_2(\chi) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^N (A_i x_i - b_i) \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \end{bmatrix} \quad (40b)$$

$$g_i(\chi_i, \alpha(\chi)) := \chi_i + \gamma \begin{bmatrix} -\nabla f_i(x_i) - A_i^\top \nabla_1 \mathcal{H}_\rho(\alpha_1(\chi), \alpha_2(\chi)) \\ \nu(\alpha_2(\chi) - \lambda_i) + \frac{1}{N} \nabla_2 \mathcal{H}_\rho(\alpha_1(\chi), \alpha_2(\chi)) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (40c)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. The local update (39) allows for a parallel implementation of the augmented primal-dual method proposed in [54] to deal with generic optimization problems with linear inequality constraints. Based on this observation, by assuming that A is full-row rank and $\sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i)$ is strongly convex with Lipschitz continuous gradients, for sufficiently small γ , the stacking dynamics arising from (39) satisfies Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 by adapting [54, Lemma 5] and setting

$$W(\chi) := \begin{bmatrix} x - x^* \\ \lambda - \mathbf{1}\lambda^* \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \kappa I & A^\top \mathbf{1}^\top \\ \mathbf{1}A & \kappa I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x - x^* \\ \lambda - \mathbf{1}\lambda^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_\chi := \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^{Nm},$$

where $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the unique solution to problem (4) and the corresponding multiplier, while $\kappa > 0$ needs to be sufficiently large [54, Th. 2]. In the case of nonlinear constraints, we refer to [55] to get semi-global exponential stability properties for the centralized algorithm (39).

Aggregative Optimization: we now report a centralized method tailored for problems in the form (5). Given a step size $\gamma > 0$, agent i , at iteration t , updates an estimate $\chi_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ about the i -th block of a problem solution via

$$\chi_i^{t+1} = \chi_i^t - \gamma \nabla_1 f_i(\chi_i^t, \sigma(\chi^t)) - \gamma \frac{\nabla \phi_i(\chi_i^t)}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \nabla_2 f_j(\chi_j^t, \sigma(\chi^t)). \quad (41)$$

We cast method (41) in the meta-algorithm (8) form by setting

$$\eta_i(\chi_i) := \chi_i$$

$$\alpha(\chi) := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1(\chi) \\ \alpha_2(\chi) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i(\chi_i) \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_2 f_i(\chi_i, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_j(\chi_j)) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$g_i(\chi_i, \alpha(\chi)) := \chi_i - \gamma (\nabla_1 f_i(\chi_i, \alpha_1(\chi)) + \nabla \phi(\chi) \alpha_2(\chi)),$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $f_\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $f_\sigma(x) := \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x_i, \sigma(x))$. Then, by computing the gradient of f_σ , we note that the stacking update of (41) reads as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t - \gamma \nabla f_\sigma(\chi^t). \quad (42)$$

Namely, system (42) corresponds to a parallel implementation of the gradient descent method applied to problem (5). Thus, if f_σ is radially unbounded with Lipschitz continuous gradients, for sufficiently small γ , system (42) satisfies Assumptions 1 and 2 via Descent Lemma [51, Prop. 6.1.2] and setting

$$\mathcal{S}_\chi := \mathbb{R}^n, \quad W(\chi) := f_\sigma(\chi).$$

In case of strong convexity of f_σ , given its unique minimizer x^* , Assumption 3 is satisfied too with $W(\chi) := f_\sigma(\chi) - f_\sigma(x^*)$.

Aggregative Games: we now provide an equilibrium-seeking scheme for games in the form (7). Inspired by [54], the local constrained problem of agent i can be treated by resorting to the Augmented Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{Nm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_i(x, \lambda) := J_i(x_i, \sigma(x)) + \mathcal{H}_\rho \left(Ax - b, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \right) - \frac{\nu}{2} \lambda^\top \left(I - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top \right) \lambda,$$

where \mathcal{H}_ρ is defined in (38) and $\nu > 0$ can be arbitrarily chosen. As already mentioned above, differently from standard Lagrangian functions, this choice allows for devising algorithms with linear rate [54]. In particular, at each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, agent i maintains an estimate $x_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ about the i -th block of a v-GNE of (7), a multiplier $\lambda_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and updates them via

$$x_i^{t+1} = x_i^t - \gamma G_i(x_i^t, \sigma(x^t)) - \gamma A_i^\top \nabla_1 \mathcal{H}_\rho \left(Ax^t - b, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^t \right) \quad (43a)$$

$$\lambda_i^{t+1} = \lambda_i^t + \gamma \nu \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^t - \lambda_i^t \right) + \gamma \frac{1}{N} \nabla_2 \mathcal{H}_\rho \left(Ax^t - b, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^t \right), \quad (43b)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the step size, while, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $G_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ reads as

$$G_i(x_i, z_i) := \nabla_1 J_i(x_i, z_i) + \frac{\nabla \phi_i(x_i)}{N} \nabla_2 J_i(x_i, z_i)$$

We cast method (43) in the meta-algorithm (8) form by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_i &:= \text{col}[x_i, \lambda_i], \quad \eta_i(\chi_i) := \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_i} & 0_m \end{bmatrix} \chi_i \\ \alpha(\chi) &:= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1(\chi) \\ \alpha_2(\chi) \\ \alpha_3(\chi) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i(x_i) \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \\ \sum_{i=1}^N (A_i x_i - b_i) \end{bmatrix} \\ g_i(\chi_i, \alpha(\chi)) &:= \chi_i + \gamma \begin{bmatrix} -G_i(x_i, \alpha_1(\chi)) - A_i^\top \nabla_1 \mathcal{H}_\rho(\alpha_3(\chi), \alpha_2(\chi)) \\ \nu(\alpha_2(\chi) - \lambda_i) + \frac{1}{N} \nabla_2 \mathcal{H}_\rho(\alpha_3(\chi), \alpha_2(\chi)) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

By adapting [54, Lemma 5], it can be shown that, for sufficiently small γ , dynamics (43) matches Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 by assuming that $\text{col}[G_1(x_1, \sigma(x)), \dots, G_N(x_N, \sigma(x))]$ is strongly monotone, the gradients of J_i and ϕ_i are Lipschitz continuous for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, A is full-row rank, and setting

$$\begin{aligned} W(\chi) &:= \begin{bmatrix} x - x^* \\ \lambda - \mathbf{1}\lambda^* \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \kappa I & A^\top \mathbf{1}^\top \\ \mathbf{1}A & \kappa I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x - x^* \\ \lambda - \mathbf{1}\lambda^* \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathcal{S}_\chi &:= \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^{Nm}, \end{aligned}$$

where $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the unique v-GNE and multiplier of (7), and $\kappa > 0$ must be large enough [54, Th. 2].

B. Dynamic Average Consensus

For the centralized algorithms (39) and (43), it holds

$$\alpha(\chi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(\chi_i), \quad (44)$$

where each $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_{x_i}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^a$ gives agent i contribution. Namely, $\alpha(\chi)$ is the solution to dynamic average consensus problems (see the tutorial [47]). In the centralized schemes (36) and (41), $\alpha(\chi)$ is the solution to dynamic average consensus problems with composite functions, namely

$$\alpha(\chi) := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_I(\chi) \\ \alpha_E(\chi, \mathbf{1}\alpha_I(\chi)) \end{bmatrix} := \frac{1}{N} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_{I,i}(\chi_i) \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_{E,i}(\chi_i, \alpha_I(\chi)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

In detail, we split α into $\alpha_I : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{a_I}$ and $\alpha_E : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{Na_I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{a_E}$ which, in turn, depend on the local contributions encoded in each $\varphi_{I,i} : \mathbb{R}^{n_{x_i}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{a_I}$ and $\varphi_{E,i} : \mathbb{R}^{n_{x_i}} \times \mathbb{R}^{a_I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{a_E}$. This ‘‘composite’’ structure makes a distinction between the ‘‘internal’’ aggregation function α_I (e.g., the mean of χ_1, \dots, χ_N) and the ‘‘external’’ one α_E (e.g., a global gradient computed at the mean α_I). In Appendix B, we formally show (cf. Proposition 1) that a cascade structure of suitable dynamic average consensus schemes constitutes a consensus-oriented dynamics satisfying Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 in the case of composite functions as in (45). For this reason, we now present a set of dynamic average consensus schemes satisfying Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 and, thus, representing possible candidates to constitute the consensus-oriented part (15b) of the overall distributed algorithm. Nonetheless, we recall that our approach is not limited to dynamic average consensus. As long as Assumptions 4, 5,

and 6 are verified, if required by the definition of the specific α , our approach may also include different consensus protocols, e.g., the leader-follower schemes widely used in game theory [30]. The schemes are presented by introducing $u_i := \varphi_i(\chi_i)$, $u_{\mathcal{N}_i} := \text{col}[u_j]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{\text{deg}_i a}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $u := \text{col}[u_1, \dots, u_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{N a}$, and a weighted adjacency matrix $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ whose entries w_{ij} match the sparsity of \mathcal{G} .

Perturbed Consensus Dynamics: this scheme [47], [56] has been extensively used in distributed optimization [45], [49], [57]–[59] and games [11], [31]. In the so-called *causal* form (see [26], [60]), agent i sets the approximation function as $\hat{\alpha}_i(u_i, z_i^t) = u_i + z_i^t$ with $z_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^a$ updated according to

$$z_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (z_j^t + u_j) - u_i. \quad (46)$$

System (46) matches Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 when \mathcal{G} is strongly connected and \mathcal{W} is doubly-stochastic [47, Th.5].

Proportional Integral Action for Dynamic Average Consensus: the distributed method (46) requires a specific initialization into $\{z \in \mathbb{R}^{N a} \mid \mathbf{1}^\top z = 0\}$ [47]. To overcome this limitation, one can discretize the continuous-time scheme in [61] obtaining

$$p_i^{t+1} = (1 - \gamma)p_i^t - k_P \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (p_i^t - p_j^t) + k_I \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (q_i^t - q_j^t) + \gamma u_i \quad (47a)$$

$$q_i^{t+1} = q_i^t + k_I \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (p_i^t - p_j^t), \quad (47b)$$

where $p_i^t, q_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^a$ and $\gamma, k_P, k_I > 0$ are tuning parameters. In this scheme, the approximation function is $\hat{\alpha}_i(u_i, \text{col}[p_i^t, q_i^t]) = p_i^t$. If \mathcal{G} is strongly connected and \mathcal{W} is doubly-stochastic, the result [61, Th. 5], adapted to discrete-time, ensures that (47) matches Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 with suitable k_P, k_I, γ .

R-ADMM for Dynamic Average Consensus: here, we report the distributed method proposed in [62] based on Alternating Dual Multiplier Method (ADMM). In [29], [63], [64], this method has been combined with a gradient-based policy to address consensus optimization. In detail, the original dynamic consensus problem is turned into the quadratic program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(s_1, \dots, s_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N a}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \|s_i - u_i\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.}: s_i = s_j, \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

If graph \mathcal{G} is connected, the (unique) optimal solution $s^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N a}$ to (48) reads as $s^* = \mathbf{1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N u_j$ [62]. From this observation, the dynamic average consensus is achieved by addressing (48) via Distributed R-ADMM [65]. Namely, agent i maintains a variable $z_{ij}^t \in \mathbb{R}^a$ for each neighbor $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and implements

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha}_i(u_i, z_i^t) = \underset{s_i \in \mathbb{R}^a}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|s_i - u_i\|^2 - s_i^\top \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_{ij}^t + \frac{\rho \text{deg}_i}{2} \|s_i\|^2 \right\} \\ z_{ij}^{t+1} = (1 - \beta) z_{ij}^t + \beta (-z_{ji}^t + 2\rho \hat{\alpha}_j(u_j, z_j^t)), \end{aligned}$$

with $\rho > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $z_i^t := \text{col}[z_{ij}^t]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$. Since the cost $\frac{1}{2} \|s_i - u_i\|^2$ is quadratic, the above update reduces to

$$\hat{\alpha}_i(u_i, z_i^t) = \frac{1}{1 + \rho \text{deg}_i} \left(u_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_{ij}^t \right) \quad (49a)$$

$$z_{ij}^{t+1} = (1 - \beta) z_{ij}^t + \beta (-z_{ji}^t + 2\rho \hat{\alpha}_j(u_j, z_j^t)). \quad (49b)$$

If graph \mathcal{G} is undirected and connected, system (49) matches Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 (see [62, Prop. 5] or [29, Lemma IV.3]).

V. NOVEL DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM FOR CONSTRAINT-COUPLED OPTIMIZATION

In this section, we show the potential of our systematic design by synthesizing a novel distributed algorithm for constraint-coupled problems (4). Then, we provide numerical simulations corroborating the theoretical results. With this example, we effectively demonstrate the potential of the proposed procedure as it immediately offers the design and analysis of a distributed algorithm able to recover the recent result in [54] about (centralized) optimization with inequality constraints.

A. Distributed Algorithm Design

As claimed in Section IV-A, the constraint-coupled setup (4) can be addressed via the centralized method (39). The execution of the considered centralized algorithm needs the aggregation function $\alpha(\chi)$ specified in (40). Once the centralized algorithm is chosen and its aggregation function has been identified, we follow the systematic design outlined in Section III to get its distributed counterpart. Specifically, for each agent $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we introduce the auxiliary variables $z_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ and choose the perturbed consensus dynamics in the causal form (46) to determine their evolution. Then, by decomposing each z_i^t according to $z_i^t := \text{col}[w_i^t, \zeta_i^t]$ with $w_i^t, \zeta_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the centralized method (39) gives rise to the distributed one

$$x_i^{t+1} = x_i^t - \delta\gamma\nabla f_i(x_i^t) - \delta\gamma A_i^\top \nabla_1 \mathcal{H}_\rho(N(A_i x_i^t - b_i) + \zeta_i^t, \lambda_i^t + w_i^t) \quad (50a)$$

$$\lambda_i^{t+1} = \lambda_i^t + \delta\gamma\nu w_i^t + \delta\gamma \frac{1}{N} \nabla_2 \mathcal{H}_\rho(N(A_i x_i^t - b_i) + \zeta_i^t, \lambda_i^t + w_i^t) \quad (50b)$$

$$w_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (w_j^t + \lambda_j^t) - \lambda_i^t \quad (50c)$$

$$\zeta_i^{t+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (\zeta_j^t + N(A_j x_j^t - b_j)) - N(A_i x_i^t - b_i). \quad (50d)$$

Next, we ensure that (50) solves problem (4) with a linear rate. As far as we know, existing distributed schemes (see, e.g., [66]) achieve this property only in the case of equality constraints and, thus, this is the first distributed scheme with a linear rate in problems with coupling inequality constraints.

Theorem 2. Consider (50). Assume that $\sum_{i=1}^N f_i$ is μ -strongly convex, ∇f_i is β -Lipschitz continuous for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $\kappa_1 I_m \leq AA^\top \leq \kappa_2 I_m$ for some $\mu, \beta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$. Assume that \mathcal{G} is strongly connected and \mathcal{W} doubly stochastic. Then, there exist $\bar{\delta}, \bar{\gamma}, a_1, a_2 > 0$ such that, for all $(x_i^0, \lambda_i^0, w_i^0, z_i^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$ with $w_i^0 = z_i^0 = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})$, and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma})$, it holds

$$\|x^t - x^*\| \leq a_1 \exp(-a_2 t), \quad (51)$$

where x^* is the unique solution to problem (4).

Proof. The proof directly uses Theorem 1. Indeed, under the enforced assumptions, there exists $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ such that, for all $\gamma \in \bar{\gamma}$, the inspiring centralized scheme (39) satisfies Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 by adapting [54, Lemma 5]. Further, the perturbed consensus dynamics (i.e., (46)) of $\text{col}[w_i^t, \zeta_i^t]$ matches Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 [47, Th. 5]. Thus, the requirements of Theorem 1 are met and (51) follows by (24b). \square

B. Numerical Simulations

We consider an instance of problem (4) with $N = 10$, $m = 2$, $n_i = 2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and quadratic costs $f_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$f_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2} x_i^\top Q_i x_i + r_i^\top x_i,$$

where $Q_i = Q_i^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we generate random matrices Q_i with eigenvalues in the set $(0, 1)$. We randomly select the components of r_i according to a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance 1 and the components of b_i extracting them from the interval $(0, 1)$ with a uniform probability distribution. Besides, we ensure that the matrices A_i guarantee the full-row rankness of $A = [A_1 \ \dots \ A_N]$. As for the inter-agent communication, we randomly generate an Erdős-Rényi graph with connectivity parameter 0.3. As for the algorithm parameters, we empirically tuned them as $\delta = 0.1$, $\gamma = 0.1$, $\rho = 0.9$, and $\nu = 1$. Fig. 3 shows the evolution of both $\|\chi^t - \chi^*\|$ and $\|\mathcal{T}_\perp(z^t) - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\|$, where $\chi^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n+Nm}$ contains both the unique problem solution x^* and the associated multiplier λ^* , the map $\mathcal{T}_\perp : \mathbb{R}^{2Nm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2(N-1)m}$ (see Assumption 4) reads as $\mathcal{T}_\perp(z) = T_\perp z$, where $T_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{2(N-1)m \times 2Nm}$ is a matrix whose columns span the subspace orthogonal to the span of $\mathbf{1}_{N,2m}/\sqrt{N}$, while $z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi) := -T_\perp \text{col}[\lambda_1, N(A_1 x_1 - b_1), \dots, \lambda_N, N(A_N x_N - b_N)] \in \mathbb{R}^{2(N-1)m}$. For further details about these elements, we point to the reference [47]. As predicted by Theorem 2, Fig. 3 confirms that (50) exhibits exponential convergence. Fig. 3 also graphically highlights the different convergence rates of the slow and fast parts of (50).

We now give insights on the role of the small parameter δ . We consider the same setting of the previous simulation and run the centralized method (39) with $\gamma = 0.1$, $\rho = 0.9$, and $\nu = 1$ as well as its distributed counterpart (50) with $\gamma = 0.1$, $\rho = 0.9$, $\nu = 1$, and different values of δ . Fig. 4 shows the evolution of the optimality error $\|x^t - x^*\|$ in the described cases. This simulation confirms the validity of our singular-perturbations-based interpretation, as it shows that the distributed scheme (50) regains effectiveness only with sufficiently small δ . We note that by running (50) with $\delta = 1$ and, thus, with the same step size γ making the centralized scheme (39) effective, we obtain an unstable behavior. Thus, this test suggests that the necessity to reduce the speed (i.e., to include a sufficiently small δ) is a fundamental limitation of the feedback interconnection architecture required to mimic a centralized scheme in a distributed setting.




Fig. 3. Algorithm (50): evolution over iterations t of the quantities $\|\chi^t - \chi^*\|$ and $\|\mathcal{T}_\perp(z^t) - z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\|$.




Fig. 4. Comparison between the centralized method (39) and its distributed counterpart with different values of δ .

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We developed a novel systematic approach for designing and analyzing distributed algorithms for optimization and games over networks. The proposed approach starts from a centralized optimization-oriented method, identifies an unavailable aggregation function $\alpha(\chi)$ needed for its execution, and selects a consensus-oriented dynamics to locally reconstruct it in a distributed way. By considering the optimization- and consensus-oriented parts as building blocks, our method prescribes how to interlace them and establishes a set of conditions regarding the two schemes separately considered. We have shown that these conditions allow for claiming the stability of the obtained distributed algorithm by leveraging on singular perturbations arguments. Finally, following the proposed approach, we developed a novel distributed scheme for constraint-coupled problems and proved its linear convergence properties.

APPENDIX

A. A LaSalle's Invariance Principle for SP Systems

Here, we provide a result for a special class of SP system in which the slow subsystem has LaSalle convergence properties. It slightly extends [26, Th. 1] by allowing assumptions to hold in generic sets \mathcal{S}_χ and \mathcal{S}_ζ instead in the entire \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m .

Theorem 3. Let $\chi^t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\zeta^t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and consider the system

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \zeta^t) \quad (52a)$$

$$\zeta^{t+1} = f(\zeta^t, \chi^t), \quad (52b)$$

with $s : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $f : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\delta > 0$. Assume that s and f are Lipschitz continuous with parameters $\beta_s, \beta_f > 0$, respectively. Assume there exist forward-invariant sets $\mathcal{S}_\chi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{S}_\zeta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ for (52a) and (52b), namely

$$\chi + \delta s(\chi, \zeta) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \quad \text{for all } \chi \in \mathcal{S}_\chi, \zeta \in \mathcal{S}_\zeta \quad (53a)$$

$$f(\zeta, \chi) \in \mathcal{S}_\zeta \quad \text{for all } \chi \in \mathcal{S}_\chi, \zeta \in \mathcal{S}_\zeta. \quad (53b)$$

Further, assume that there exists $\zeta^{eq} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\zeta$ such that $f(\zeta^{eq}(\chi), \chi) = \zeta^{eq}(\chi)$ for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_\chi$ and that ζ^{eq} is Lipschitz continuous with parameter $\beta_{eq} > 0$. Let

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t)) \quad (54)$$

be the reduced system and, given an arbitrary $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$\tilde{\zeta}^{t+1} = f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi), \chi) - \zeta^{eq}(\chi) \quad (55)$$

be the boundary layer system with $\tilde{\zeta}^t \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Assume there exist $U : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 > 0$ such that

$$b_1 \|\tilde{\zeta}\|^2 \leq U(\tilde{\zeta}) \leq b_2 \|\tilde{\zeta}\|^2 \quad (56a)$$

$$U(f(\tilde{\zeta} + \zeta^{eq}(\chi), \chi) - \zeta^{eq}(\chi)) - U(\tilde{\zeta}) \leq -b_3 \|\tilde{\zeta}\|^2 \quad (56b)$$

$$|U(\tilde{\zeta}) - U(\tilde{\zeta}')| \leq b_4 \|\tilde{\zeta} - \tilde{\zeta}'\| (\|\tilde{\zeta}\| + \|\tilde{\zeta}'\|), \quad (56c)$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_\chi$, $(\tilde{\zeta} + \zeta^{eq}(\chi)) \in \mathcal{S}_\zeta$, and $(\tilde{\zeta}' + \zeta^{eq}(\chi)) \in \mathcal{S}_\zeta$. Further, assume there exist $\bar{\delta}_1, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$, a radially unbounded, differentiable function $W : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and a function $D : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that, for all $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta}_1)$, it holds

$$W(\chi + \delta s(\chi, \zeta^{eq}(\chi))) - W(\chi) \leq -\delta c_1 D(\chi)^2 \quad (57a)$$

$$\|\nabla W(\chi)\| \leq c_2 D(\chi) \quad (57b)$$

$$\|\nabla W(\chi) - \nabla W(\chi')\| \leq c_3 \|\chi - \chi'\| \quad (57c)$$

$$\|s(\chi, \zeta^{eq}(\chi))\| \leq c_4 D(\chi), \quad (57d)$$

for all $\chi, \chi' \in \mathcal{S}_\chi$. Then, there exist $\bar{\delta} \in (0, \bar{\delta}_1)$, $\psi > 0$ such that, for any $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})$, the trajectories of (52) satisfy

$$V(\chi^{t+1}, \zeta^{t+1} - \zeta^{eq}(\chi^{t+1})) - V(\chi^t, \zeta^t - \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t)) \leq -\psi \left(D(\chi^t)^2 + \|\zeta^t - \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t)\|^2 \right), \quad (58)$$

for all $(\chi^0, \zeta^0) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathcal{S}_\zeta$, and $t \in \mathbb{N}$, where $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$V(\chi, \tilde{\zeta}) := U(\tilde{\zeta}) + W(\chi). \quad (59)$$

Proof. We note that $(\chi^0, \zeta^0) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathcal{S}_\zeta$ and, thus, in light of (53), it holds $(\chi^t, \zeta^t) \in \mathcal{S}_\chi \times \mathcal{S}_\zeta$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, we define $\tilde{\zeta}^t := \zeta^t - \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t)$, and rewrite (52) as

$$\chi^{t+1} = \chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t)) \quad (60a)$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}^{t+1} = f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{eq}(\chi^{t+1}). \quad (60b)$$

Pick the function W satisfying (57). Thus, by evaluating $\Delta W(\chi^t) := W(\chi^{t+1}) - W(\chi^t)$ along (60a), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W(\chi^t) &= W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))) - W(\chi^t) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))) - W(\chi^t) \\ &\quad + W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))) - W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\delta c_1 D(\chi^t)^2 + W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))) - W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where in (a) we add and subtract $W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t)))$ and in (b) we use (57a) to bound $W(\chi^t + \delta s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))) - W(\chi^t)$. In light of the Lipschitz continuity of W (cf. (57c)), Descent Lemma [51, Prop. 6.1.2] and the bound (57b) ensure that

$$W(\chi_1 + \chi_2) - W(\chi_1 + \chi_3) \leq c_2 D(\chi_1) \|\chi_2 - \chi_3\| + \frac{c_3}{2} (\|\chi_2\|^2 + \|\chi_3\|^2), \quad (62)$$

for all $\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3 \in \mathcal{S}_\chi$, which allows us to bound (61) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W(\chi^t) &\leq -\delta c_1 D(\chi^t)^2 + \delta c_2 D(\chi^t) \|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t)) - s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))\| \\ &\quad + \delta^2 \frac{c_3}{2} \left(\|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))\|^2 + \|s(\chi^t, \zeta^{eq}(\chi^t))\|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Now, we add and subtract $s(\chi^t, \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))$ into $\|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))\|^2$ and use the bound (57d) in (63) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W(\chi^t) &\leq -\delta(c_1 - \delta \frac{c_3 c_4^2}{2}) D(\chi^t)^2 + \delta c_2 D(\chi^t) \|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) - s(\chi^t, \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))\| \\ &\quad + \delta^2 \frac{c_3}{2} \|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) - s(\chi^t, \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) + s(\chi^t, \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} -\delta(c_1 - \delta c_3 c_4^2) D(\chi^t)^2 + \delta c_2 \beta_s D(\chi^t) \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\| + \delta^2 \frac{c_3}{2} \beta_s^2 \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|^2 + \delta^2 c_3 c_4 \beta_s \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\| D(\chi^t), \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where (a) exploits the square norm, the Lipschitz continuity of s , and (57d). Now, by evaluating $\Delta U(\tilde{\zeta}^t) := U(\tilde{\zeta}^{t+1}) - U(\tilde{\zeta}^t)$ along the trajectories (60b), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta U(\tilde{\zeta}^t) &= U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1})) - U(\tilde{\zeta}^t) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) - U(\tilde{\zeta}^t) \\ &\quad + U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1})) - U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -b_3 \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|^2 + \tilde{U}(\tilde{\zeta}^t, \chi^t), \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where in (a) we add and subtract the term $U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))$ and in (b) we bound $U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)) - U(\tilde{\zeta}^t)$ by using (56b) and introduce

$$\tilde{U}(\tilde{\zeta}^t, \chi^t) := U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1})) - U(f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)).$$

By using (56c), we bound the term $\tilde{U}(\tilde{\zeta}^t, \chi^t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}(\tilde{\zeta}^t, \chi^t) &\leq b_4 \|\zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1}) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\| \|f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1})\| \\ &\quad + b_4 \|\zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1}) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\| \|f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} b_4 \|\zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1}) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\|^2 + b_4 2 \|\zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^{t+1}) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\| \|f(\tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) - \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \delta^2 b_4 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 \|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))\|^2 + \delta b_4 2 \beta_{\text{eq}} \beta_f \|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))\| \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where in (a) we add within the second norm $\pm \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi)$ and use the triangle inequality, while in (b) we use $f(\zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t), \chi^t) = \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t)$ and exploit the Lipschitz continuity of ζ^{eq} and f . Now, add and subtract $s(\chi^t, \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))$ in $\|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))\|^2$ and $\|s(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t + \zeta^{\text{eq}}(\chi^t))\|$, use the triangle inequality, the Lipschitz property of s , and (57d) to bound (66) as

$$\tilde{U}(\tilde{\zeta}^t, \chi^t) \leq \delta^2 b_4 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 \beta_s^2 \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|^2 + \delta^2 c_4^2 b_4 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 D(\chi^t)^2 + \delta^2 b_4 c_4 2 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 \beta_s \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\| D(\chi^t) + \delta b_4 2 \beta_{\text{eq}} \beta_f \beta_s \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|^2 + \delta b_4 c_4 2 \beta_{\text{eq}} \beta_f D(\chi^t) \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|. \quad (67)$$

We then use (67) to further bound (65) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta U(\tilde{\zeta}^t) &\leq -b_3 \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|^2 + \delta^2 b_4 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 \beta_s^2 \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|^2 + \delta^2 c_4^2 b_4 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 D(\chi^t)^2 \\ &\quad + \delta^2 b_4 c_4 2 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 \beta_s \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\| D(\chi^t) + \delta b_4 2 \beta_{\text{eq}} \beta_f \beta_s \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|^2 + \delta b_4 c_4 2 \beta_{\text{eq}} \beta_f D(\chi^t) \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\|. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Now, let us consider V as defined in (59). Thus, by evaluating $\Delta V(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t) := V(\chi^{t+1}, \tilde{\zeta}^{t+1}) - V(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t) = \Delta W(\chi^t) + \Delta U(\tilde{\zeta}^t)$ along the trajectories of (60), we use (64) and (68) to write

$$\Delta V(\chi^t, \tilde{\zeta}^t) \leq - \begin{bmatrix} D(\chi^t) \\ \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\| \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi(\delta) \begin{bmatrix} D(\chi^t) \\ \|\tilde{\zeta}^t\| \end{bmatrix}, \quad (69)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\Psi(\delta) = \Psi(\delta)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ is defined as

$$\Psi(\delta) := \begin{bmatrix} \delta c_1 - \delta^2 k_1 & -\delta k_2 - \delta^2 k_3 \\ -\delta k_2 - \delta^2 k_3 & b_3 - \delta k_4 - \delta^2 k_5 \end{bmatrix},$$

in which the notation has been shortened through the constants

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &:= c_4^2 (b_4 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2 + c_3), \quad k_2 := \frac{c_4 (c_2 \beta_s + b_4 2 \beta_f \beta_{\text{eq}})}{2} \\ k_3 &:= \frac{c_3 \beta_s + b_4 c_4 2 \beta_s \beta_{\text{eq}}^2}{2} \\ k_4 &:= b_4 2 \beta_s \beta_f \beta_{\text{eq}}, \quad k_5 := \frac{c_3}{2} \beta_s^2 + b_4 \beta_s^2 \beta_{\text{eq}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Being $\Psi(\delta) = \Psi(\delta)^\top$, it holds $\Psi(\delta) > 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{cases} \delta c_1 > p_1(\delta) \\ \delta c_1 b_3 > p_2(\delta), \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

where we have introduced the polynomials $p_1(\delta) := \delta^2 k_1$ and

$$p_2(\delta) := \delta^2 c_1(k_4 + \delta k_5) + \delta^2 k_1(b_3 - \delta k_4 - \delta^2 k_5) + (\delta k_2 + \delta^2 k_3)^2.$$

Since $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_1(\delta)/\delta = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_2(\delta)/\delta = 0$, there exists $\bar{\delta} \in (0, \bar{\delta}_1)$ such that (70) is met for all $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})$. The proof of (58) follows by letting $\psi > 0$ be the smallest eigenvalue of $\Psi(\delta)$. \square

B. Composite Dynamic Average Consensus

In the case of α -consensus matching (45), the dynamics (11b) can be designed as the cascade between two distributed schemes able to solve standard dynamic average consensus problems. In detail, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, given the local aggregation rules $\varphi_{I,i}$ and $\varphi_{E,i}$ and the (fixed) variables χ_i , we consider the cascade

$$z_{I,i}^{t+1} = h_{I,i}(\varphi_{I,N_i}(\chi_{N_i}), z_{I,N_i}^t) \quad (71a)$$

$$z_{E,i}^{t+1} = h_{E,i}(\varphi_{E,N_i}(\chi_{N_i}, \hat{\alpha}_{I,N_i}(\varphi_{I,N_i}(\chi_{N_i}), z_{I,N_i}^t)), z_{E,i}^t), \quad (71b)$$

where $z_{I,i}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI,i}}$ and $z_{E,i}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE,i}}$ are the states, $h_{I,i} : \mathbb{R}^{\deg_i a_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} n_{zI,j}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI,i}}$ and $h_{E,i} : \mathbb{R}^{\deg_i a_E} \times \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} n_{zE,j}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE,i}}$ describe their dynamics. Finally, φ_{I,N_i} and φ_{E,N_i} collect the contributions $\varphi_{I,j}$ and $\varphi_{E,j}$ of the neighbors of agent i to α_I and α_E , while $\hat{\alpha}_{I,N_i}$ collects their estimates $\hat{\alpha}_{I,i} : \mathbb{R}^{a_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI,i}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{a_I}$ of α_I , namely

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{I,N_i}(\chi_{N_i}) &:= \text{col}[\varphi_{I,j}(\chi_j)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \\ \varphi_{E,N_i}(\chi_{N_i}, v_{N_i}) &:= \text{col}[\varphi_{E,j}(\chi_j, v_j)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \\ \hat{\alpha}_{I,N_i}(\chi_{N_i}, z_{N_i}) &:= \text{col}[\hat{\alpha}_{I,j}(\varphi_{I,j}(\chi_j), z_j)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}, \end{aligned}$$

with $v_j \in \mathbb{R}^{a_I}$ and $z_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI,j}}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$. We stress that agent i locally approximates $\alpha_I(\chi)$ using $\hat{\alpha}_{I,i}(\varphi_{I,i}(\chi_i), z_{I,i})$ into (71b). By collecting the local updates (71), we get

$$z_I^{t+1} = h_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I^t) \quad (72a)$$

$$z_E^{t+1} = h_E(\varphi_E(\chi, \hat{\alpha}_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I^t)), z_E^t), \quad (72b)$$

where $z_I := \text{col}[z_{I,1}, \dots, z_{I,N}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI}}$, $z_E := \text{col}[z_{E,1}, \dots, z_{E,N}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE}}$ with $n_{zI} := \sum_{i=1}^N n_{zI,i}$ and $n_{zE} := \sum_{i=1}^N n_{zE,i}$, while $\varphi_I : \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N a_I}$, $\hat{\alpha}_I : \mathbb{R}^{N a_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N a_I}$, and $\varphi_E : \mathbb{R}^{N a_E} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N a_E}$, $h_I : \mathbb{R}^{N a_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI}}$, and $h_E : \mathbb{R}^{N a_E} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE}}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_I(\chi) &:= \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{I,1}(\chi_1) \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_{I,N}(\chi_N) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\alpha}_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I) := \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\alpha}_{I,1}(\varphi_{I,1}(\chi_1), z_{I,1}) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\alpha}_{I,N}(\varphi_{I,N}(\chi_N), z_{I,N}) \end{bmatrix} \\ \varphi_E(\chi, \hat{\alpha}_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I)) &:= \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{E,1}(\chi_1, \hat{\alpha}_{I,1}(\varphi_{I,1}(\chi_1), z_{I,1})) \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_{E,N}(\chi_N, \hat{\alpha}_{I,N}(\varphi_{I,N}(\chi_N), z_{I,N})) \end{bmatrix} \\ h_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I) &:= \begin{bmatrix} h_{I,1}(\varphi_{I,1}(\chi_1), z_{I,1}) \\ \vdots \\ h_{I,N}(\varphi_{I,N}(\chi_N), z_{I,N}) \end{bmatrix} \\ h_E(\varphi_E, z_E) &:= \begin{bmatrix} h_{E,1}(\varphi_{E,1}, z_{E,1}) \\ \vdots \\ h_{E,N}(\varphi_{E,N}, z_{E,N}) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We also introduce $\hat{\alpha}_{E,i} : \mathbb{R}^{a_E} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE,i}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{a_E}$ that locally approximates α_E . Then, let $\hat{\alpha}_E : \mathbb{R}^{N a_E} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N a_E}$ be

$$\hat{\alpha}_E(v, w) := [\hat{\alpha}_{E,1}(v_1, w_1)^\top \quad \dots \quad \hat{\alpha}_{E,N}(v_N, w_N)^\top]^\top.$$

Given $u_I := \text{col}[u_{I,1}, \dots, u_{I,N}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N a_I}$ and $u_E := \text{col}[u_{E,1}, \dots, u_{E,N}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N a_E}$ with $u_{I,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{a_I}$ and $u_{E,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{a_E}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we consider the ‘‘internal’’ auxiliary system

$$z_I^{t+1} = h_I(u_I, z_I^t), \quad (73)$$

and the ‘‘external’’ one described by

$$z_E^{t+1} = h_E(u_E, z_E^t). \quad (74)$$

We now give the definition of Linearly Converging Dynamic Average Consensus (LCDAC) to formalize the requirements needed by the subsystems of (72) (separately considered) to make their cascade fit for the role of the consensus scheme (12). Given N vectors $u_1, \dots, u_N \in \mathbb{R}^a$, this definition uses $u := \text{col}[u_1, \dots, u_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{Na}$ and $u_{\mathcal{N}_i} := \text{col}[u_j]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{\text{deg}_i a}$.

Definition 2 (LCDAC). Let $z_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ and consider

$$z_i^{t+1} = h_i(u_{\mathcal{N}_i}, z_{\mathcal{N}_i}^t), \quad (75)$$

with $h_i : \mathbb{R}^{\text{deg}_i a} \times \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} p_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$, and the stacked form

$$z^{t+1} = h(u, z^t), \quad (76)$$

with $z^t := \text{col}[z_1^t, \dots, z_N^t] \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $h(u, z^t) := \text{col}[h_1(u_{\mathcal{N}_1}, z_{\mathcal{N}_1}^t), \dots, h_N(u_{\mathcal{N}_N}, z_{\mathcal{N}_N}^t)] \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $p := \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$. We say that system (76) is a *Linearly Converging Algorithm for Dynamic Average Consensus (LCDAC)* if it satisfies Assumptions 4, 5, and 6. ■

Proposition 1. Assume that φ_I and φ_E are Lipschitz continuous with constants $\beta_{\varphi_I}, \beta_{\varphi_E} > 0$, respectively. Assume that (73) and (74) are LCDAC with transformation maps $\mathcal{T}_I(z_I) := [\bar{\mathcal{T}}_I(z_I)^\top \quad \mathcal{T}_{I,\perp}(z_I)^\top]^\top$ and $\mathcal{T}_E(z_E) := [\bar{\mathcal{T}}_E(z_E)^\top \quad \mathcal{T}_{E,\perp}(z_E)^\top]^\top$, invariant sets $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}_I}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}_E}$, equilibrium functions $z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}$ and $z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}$, approximation functions $\hat{\alpha}_I$ and $\hat{\alpha}_E$, and Lyapunov functions U_I and U_E , respectively. Then, system (72) satisfies Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 with

$$z := \begin{bmatrix} z_I \\ z_E \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}} := \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}_I} \times \mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}_E} \quad (77a)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{T}}(z) := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{T}}_I(z_I) \\ \bar{\mathcal{T}}_E(z_E) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{T}_\perp(z) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{T}_{I,\perp}(z_I) \\ \mathcal{T}_{E,\perp}(z_E) \end{bmatrix} \quad (77b)$$

$$z_\perp^{\text{eq}}(\chi) := \begin{bmatrix} z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi) \\ z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi) \end{bmatrix} \quad (77c)$$

$$h(\chi, z) := \begin{bmatrix} h_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I) \\ h_E(\varphi_E(\chi, \hat{\alpha}_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I)), z_E) \end{bmatrix} \quad (77d)$$

$$\hat{\alpha}(\chi, z) := \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\alpha}_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I) \\ \hat{\alpha}_E(\varphi_E(\chi, \hat{\alpha}_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I)), z_E) \end{bmatrix} \quad (77e)$$

$$U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}) := U_I(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}) + \kappa U_E(\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}), \quad (77f)$$

for a sufficiently large $\kappa > 0$.

Proof. Given $\bar{p}_I, \bar{p}_E, p_{I,\perp}, p_{E,\perp} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n_{z_I} = \bar{p}_I + p_{I,\perp}$ and $n_{z_E} = \bar{p}_E + p_{E,\perp}$, let $\bar{z}_I \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}_I}$, $\bar{z}_E \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}_E}$, $z_{I,\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{I,\perp}}$, and $z_{E,\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{E,\perp}}$ be defined as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}_I \\ z_{I,\perp} \end{bmatrix} := \mathcal{T}_I(z_I), \quad \begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}_E \\ z_{E,\perp} \end{bmatrix} := \mathcal{T}_E(z_E), \quad (78)$$

where, by Definition 2, \mathcal{T}_I and \mathcal{T}_E comply with the generic properties in Assumption 4. In detail, in light of the invariance properties of $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}_I}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{z}_E}$ for (73) and (74), respectively, we exploit (20) in Assumption 4 to rewrite the cascade (72) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}_I^{t+1} \\ \bar{z}_E^{t+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{T}}_I(h_I(\varphi_I(\chi), z_I^t)) \\ \bar{\mathcal{T}}_E(h_E(\varphi_E(\chi, \hat{\alpha}_{I,\perp}(\chi, z_{I,\perp}^t)), z_E^t)) \end{bmatrix} \quad (79a)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_{I,\perp}^{t+1} \\ z_{E,\perp}^{t+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{I,\perp}(\varphi_I(\chi), z_{I,\perp}^t) \\ h_{E,\perp}(\varphi_E(\chi, \hat{\alpha}_{I,\perp}(\chi, z_{I,\perp}^t)), z_{E,\perp}^t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (79b)$$

for suitable functions $\hat{\alpha}_{I,\perp}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_{E,\perp}$ (see (20a)) and $h_{I,\perp}$ and $h_{E,\perp}$ (cf. (20b)). Further, by Definition 2, it holds (21b) (cf. Assumption 5), namely, there exist $z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}} : \mathbb{R}^{N a_I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_{I,\perp}}$ and $z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}} : \mathbb{R}^{N a_E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_{E,\perp}}$ such that, for all $u_I \in \mathbb{R}^{N a_I}$ and $u_E \in \mathbb{R}^{N a_E}$, we guarantee the equilibrium conditions

$$z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(u_I) = h_{I,\perp}(u_I, z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(u_I)) \quad (80a)$$

$$z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(u_E) = h_{E,\perp}(u_E, z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(u_E)). \quad (80b)$$

By Definition 2, also the reconstruction conditions (21a) (cf. Assumption 5) are verified, namely it holds

$$\hat{\alpha}_{I,\perp}(u_I, z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(u_I)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_{I,i} \quad (81a)$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_{E,\perp}(u_E, z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(u_E)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_{E,i}, \quad (81b)$$

for all $u_I \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{aI}}$ and $u_E \in \mathbb{R}^{a_E}$. By noting also the Lipschitz conditions ensured by Definition 2 and looking at (79), (80), and (81), we have that the cascade system (72) satisfies the orthogonality, reconstruction, equilibria, and Lipschitz conditions in Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 with the settings detailed in (77). Hence, to conclude the proof, we need to show that the Lyapunov function U (cf. (77f)) satisfies the conditions detailed in (22) (cf. Assumption 6) along the cascade system (72). Then, we neglect (79a) and focus on (79b) written in the coordinates $\tilde{z}_{I,\perp} := z_{I,\perp} - z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi)$ and $\tilde{z}_{E,\perp} := z_{E,\perp} - z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi)$, namely

$$\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^{t+1} = \tilde{h}_{I,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t) \quad (82a)$$

$$\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^{t+1} = \tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t), \quad (82b)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_{I,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}) &:= h_{I,\perp}(\varphi_I(\chi), \tilde{z}_{I,\perp} + z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi)) - z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi) \\ \tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}) &:= -z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi) + h_E(\varphi_E(\chi, \hat{\alpha}_{I,\perp}(\varphi_I(\chi), \tilde{z}_{I,\perp} + z_{I,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi))), \tilde{z}_{E,\perp} + z_{E,\perp}^{\text{eq}}(\chi)). \end{aligned}$$

The Lipschitz properties in Definition 2 and the ones of each $\varphi_{I,i}$ and $\varphi_{E,i}$ ensure there exist $\beta_{\tilde{h}_{I,\perp}}, \beta_{\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}} > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \tilde{h}_{I,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}) - \tilde{h}_{I,\perp}(\chi', \tilde{z}'_{I,\perp}) \right\| \leq \beta_{\tilde{h}_{I,\perp}} (\|\chi - \chi'\| + \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp} - \tilde{z}'_{I,\perp}\|) \quad (83a)$$

$$\left\| \tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}) - \tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi', \tilde{z}'_{I,\perp}, \tilde{z}'_{E,\perp}) \right\| \leq \beta_{\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}} (\|\chi - \chi'\| + \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp} - \tilde{z}'_{I,\perp}\| + \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp} - \tilde{z}'_{E,\perp}\|), \quad (83b)$$

for all $\chi, \chi' \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi}$, $\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}, \tilde{z}'_{I,\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{zI}}$, and $\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}, \tilde{z}'_{E,\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{zE}}$. By Definition 2, the two schemes separately considered satisfy Assumption 6. Thus, there exists $U_I: \mathbb{R}^{p_{I,\perp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$b_{I,1} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}\|^2 \leq U_I(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}) \leq b_{I,2} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}\|^2 \quad (84a)$$

$$U_I(\tilde{h}_{I,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp})) - U_I(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}) \leq -b_{I,3} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}\|^2 \quad (84b)$$

$$|U_I(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}) - U_I(\tilde{z}'_{I,\perp})| \leq b_4 \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp} - \tilde{z}'_{I,\perp}\| (\|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}\| + \|\tilde{z}'_{I,\perp}\|), \quad (84c)$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_\chi$, $\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}, \tilde{z}'_{I,\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{I,\perp}}$, and some $b_{I,1}, b_{I,2}, b_{I,3}, b_{I,4} > 0$. Analogously, there exists $U_E: \mathbb{R}^{p_{E,\perp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$b_{E,1} \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}\|^2 \leq U_E(\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}) \leq b_{E,2} \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}\|^2 \quad (85a)$$

$$U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp})) - U_E(\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}) \leq -b_{E,3} \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}\|^2 \quad (85b)$$

$$|U_E(\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}) - U_E(\tilde{z}'_{E,\perp})| \leq b_4 \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp} - \tilde{z}'_{E,\perp}\| (\|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}\| + \|\tilde{z}'_{E,\perp}\|), \quad (85c)$$

for all $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi}$, $\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}, \tilde{z}'_{E,\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{E,\perp}}$, and some $b_{E,1}, b_{E,2}, b_{E,3}, b_{E,4} > 0$. We highlight that the inequality (85b) is written by considering $\tilde{z}_{I,\perp} = 0$ into (82b). Now, let us focus on the Lyapunov function U (cf. (77f)), where κ will be suitably fixed in the next. By evaluating $\Delta U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t) := U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^{t+1}, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^{t+1}) - U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)$ along the trajectories of system (82), we get

$$\Delta U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t) = U_I(\tilde{h}_{I,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t)) - U_I(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t) + \kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)) - \kappa U_E(\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t).$$

We note that the first two terms of the right-hand side can be bounded by resorting to (84b), thus obtaining

$$\Delta U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t) \leq -b_{I,2} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\|^2 + \kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)) - \kappa U_E(\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t). \quad (86)$$

As for the second line, the bound (85b) cannot be used since it requires $\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}$ evaluated at $\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t = 0$. Thus, we add and subtract $\kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t))$ to the right-hand side of (86) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t) &\leq -b_{I,2} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\|^2 + \kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)) - \kappa U_E(\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t) + \kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)) - \kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} -b_{I,2} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\|^2 - \kappa b_{E,2} \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t\|^2 + \kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)) - \kappa U_E(\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -b_{I,2} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\|^2 - \kappa b_{E,2} \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t\|^2 \\ &\quad + \kappa b_{E,4} \|\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t) - \tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)\| (\|\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)\| + \|\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)\|) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} -b_{I,2} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\|^2 - \kappa b_{E,2} \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t\|^2 + \kappa b_{E,4} \beta_{\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\| \|\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)\| \\ &\quad + \kappa b_{E,4} \beta_{\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\| \|\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

where in (a) we apply (85b), while in (b) we use (85c), in (c) we use the Lipschitz continuity of $\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}$ (cf. (83b)). Now, we note that, in light of (80b), it holds $\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, 0) = 0$ for all $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\chi}$. Thus, we add $\pm \tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, 0, 0)$ into both the terms $\|\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)\|$ and $\|\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}(\chi, \tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t)\|$ of (87) and, by using the Lipschitz continuity of $\tilde{h}_{E,\perp}$ (cf. (83b)), we get

$$\Delta U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t) \leq - \begin{bmatrix} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\| \\ \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t\| \end{bmatrix}^\top \tilde{Q}(\kappa) \begin{bmatrix} \|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\| \\ \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t\| \end{bmatrix}, \quad (88)$$

where we introduced $\tilde{Q}(\kappa) = \tilde{Q}(\kappa)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ defined as

$$\tilde{Q}(\kappa) := \begin{bmatrix} b_{I,2} - \kappa b_{E,4} \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^2 & -\kappa b_{E,4} \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^2 \\ -\kappa b_{E,4} \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^2 & \kappa b_{E,2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We know that $\tilde{Q}(\kappa) = \tilde{Q}(\kappa)^\top > 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{cases} b_{I,2} > \kappa b_{E,4} \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^2 \\ \kappa b_{I,2} b_{E,2} > \kappa^2 \left(b_{E,4}^2 \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^4 + b_{E,2} b_{E,4} \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^2 \right). \end{cases}$$

Then, by setting $\kappa < \min \left\{ \frac{b_{I,2}}{b_{E,4} \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^2}, \frac{b_{I,2} b_{E,2}}{b_{E,4}^2 \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^4 + b_{E,2} b_{E,4} \beta_{h_{E,\perp}}^2} \right\}$ and denoting with $\tilde{q} > 0$ the smallest eigenvalue of $\tilde{Q}(\kappa)$, we bound the right-hand side of (88) as

$$\Delta U(\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^{t+1}, \tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^{t+1}) \leq -\tilde{q} (\|\tilde{z}_{I,\perp}^t\|^2 + \|\tilde{z}_{E,\perp}^t\|^2),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Testa, G. Carnevale, and G. Notarstefano, "A tutorial on distributed optimization for cooperative robotics: from setups and algorithms to toolboxes and research directions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04257*, 2023.
- [2] G. Notarstefano, I. Notarnicola, and A. Camisa, "Distributed optimization for smart cyber-physical networks," *Foundations and Trends® in Systems and Control*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 253–383, 2019.
- [3] P. Giselsson and A. Rantzer, *Large-scale and distributed optimization*, vol. 2227. Springer, 2018.
- [4] D. K. Molzahn, F. Dörfler, H. Sandberg, S. H. Low, S. Chakrabarti, R. Baldick, and J. Lavaei, "A survey of distributed optimization and control algorithms for electric power systems," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 2941–2962, 2017.
- [5] A. Nedić and J. Liu, "Distributed optimization for control," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 1, pp. 77–103, 2018.
- [6] T. Yang, X. Yi, J. Wu, Y. Yuan, D. Wu, Z. Meng, Y. Hong, H. Wang, Z. Lin, and K. H. Johansson, "A survey of distributed optimization," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 47, pp. 278–305, 2019.
- [7] R. R. Negenborn and J. M. Maestre, "Distributed model predictive control: An overview and roadmap of future research opportunities," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 87–97, 2014.
- [8] I. Necoara, V. Nedelcu, and I. Dumitrache, "Parallel and distributed optimization methods for estimation and control in networks," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 756–766, 2011.
- [9] M. K. Jensen, "Aggregative games and best-reply potentials," *Economic theory*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 45–66, 2010.
- [10] F. Parise and A. Ozdaglar, "Analysis and interventions in large network games," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 4, pp. 455–486, 2021.
- [11] G. Belgioioso, P. Yi, S. Grammatico, and L. Pavel, "Distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking: An operator-theoretic perspective," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 87–102, 2022.
- [12] F. Dörfler, Z. He, G. Belgioioso, S. Bolognani, J. Lygeros, and M. Muehlebach, "Towards a systems theory of algorithms," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2024.
- [13] J. Wang and N. Elia, "Control approach to distributed optimization," in *2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pp. 557–561, IEEE, 2010.
- [14] J. Wang and N. Elia, "A control perspective for centralized and distributed convex optimization," in *2011 50th IEEE conference on decision and control and European control conference*, pp. 3800–3805, IEEE, 2011.
- [15] T. Hatanaka, N. Chopra, T. Ishizaki, and N. Li, "Passivity-based distributed optimization with communication delays using pi consensus algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 4421–4428, 2018.
- [16] C.-Y. Chang, M. Colombino, J. Cortés, and E. Dall'Anese, "Saddle-flow dynamics for distributed feedback-based optimization," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 948–953, 2019.
- [17] D. Gadjev and L. Pavel, "Continuous-time distributed dynamics for nash equilibrium over networks via a passivity-based control approach," in *2017 IEEE 56th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 4600–4605, IEEE, 2017.
- [18] D. Gadjev and L. Pavel, "On the exact convergence to nash equilibrium in hypomonotone regimes under full and partial-decision information," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2022.
- [19] B. Van Scoy and L. Lessard, "A universal decomposition for distributed optimization algorithms," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 3044–3049, 2022.
- [20] B. Van Scoy and L. Lessard, "Systematic analysis of distributed optimization algorithms over jointly-connected networks," in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 3096–3101, IEEE, 2020.
- [21] A. Sundararajan, B. Van Scoy, and L. Lessard, "A canonical form for first-order distributed optimization algorithms," in *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 4075–4080, IEEE, 2019.
- [22] A. Sundararajan, B. Van Scoy, and L. Lessard, "Analysis and design of first-order distributed optimization algorithms over time-varying graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 1597–1608, 2020.
- [23] B. Touri and B. Ghahserifard, "A unified framework for continuous-time unconstrained distributed optimization," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 2004–2020, 2023.
- [24] F. Zanella, D. Varagnolo, A. Cenedese, G. Pillonetto, and L. Schenato, "Newton-raphson consensus for distributed convex optimization," in *2011 50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference*, pp. 5917–5922, IEEE, 2011.
- [25] D. Varagnolo, F. Zanella, A. Cenedese, G. Pillonetto, and L. Schenato, "Newton-Raphson consensus for distributed convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 994–1009, 2015.
- [26] G. Carnevale and G. Notarstefano, "Nonconvex distributed optimization via LaSalle and singular perturbations," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 301–306, 2022.
- [27] G. Carnevale, N. Mimmo, and G. Notarstefano, "Aggregative feedback optimization for distributed cooperative robotics," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 55, no. 13, pp. 7–12, 2022.
- [28] A. Maritan and L. Schenato, "Zo-jade: Zeroth-order curvature-aware distributed multi-agent convex optimization," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023.

- [29] G. Carnevale, N. Bastianello, G. Notarstefano, and R. Carli, “Admm-tracking gradient for distributed optimization over asynchronous and unreliable networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14142*, 2023.
- [30] D. Gadjov and L. Pavel, “A passivity-based approach to Nash equilibrium seeking over networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1077–1092, 2019.
- [31] G. Carnevale, F. Fabiani, F. Fele, K. Margellos, and G. Notarstefano, “Tracking-based distributed equilibrium seeking for aggregative games,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [32] S. Krilašević and S. Grammatico, “Stability of singularly perturbed hybrid systems with restricted systems evolving on boundary layer manifolds,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18238*, 2023.
- [33] S. Krilašević and S. Grammatico, “A discrete-time averaging theorem and its application to zeroth-order nash equilibrium seeking,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04854*, 2023.
- [34] D. E. Ochoa and J. I. Poveda, “Momentum-based nash set-seeking over networks via multi-time scale hybrid dynamic inclusions,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [35] P. V. Kokotovic, R. E. O’Malley Jr, and P. Sannuti, “Singular perturbations and order reduction in control theory—an overview,” *Automatica*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 123–132, 1976.
- [36] H. K. Khalil, “Nonlinear systems,” *Upper Saddle River*, 2002.
- [37] D. Bauso, L. Giaré, and R. Pesenti, “Non-linear protocols for optimal distributed consensus in networks of dynamic agents,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 918–928, 2006.
- [38] J. Cortés, “Distributed algorithms for reaching consensus on general functions,” *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 726–737, 2008.
- [39] G. Scutari, D. P. Palomar, F. Facchinei, and J.-S. Pang, “Convex optimization, game theory, and variational inequality theory,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 35–49, 2010.
- [40] G. Scutari, F. Facchinei, J.-S. Pang, and D. P. Palomar, “Real and complex monotone communication games,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 4197–4231, 2014.
- [41] F. Facchinei and C. Kanzow, “Generalized Nash equilibrium problems,” *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 175, no. 1, pp. 177–211, 2010.
- [42] C. Cenedese, G. Belgioioso, S. Grammatico, and M. Cao, “An asynchronous distributed and scalable generalized nash equilibrium seeking algorithm for strongly monotone games,” *European Journal of Control*, vol. 58, pp. 143–151, 2021.
- [43] M. Bianchi, G. Belgioioso, and S. Grammatico, “Fast generalized nash equilibrium seeking under partial-decision information,” *Automatica*, vol. 136, p. 110080, 2022.
- [44] G. Carnevale, F. Farina, I. Notarnicola, and G. Notarstefano, “Gtdam: Gradient tracking with adaptive momentum for distributed online optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2022.
- [45] X. Li, L. Xie, and Y. Hong, “Distributed aggregative optimization over multi-agent networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 3165–3171, 2021.
- [46] G. Mastroeni, “Gap functions for equilibrium problems,” *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 27, pp. 411–426, 2003.
- [47] S. S. Kia, B. Van Scoy, J. Cortes, R. A. Freeman, K. M. Lynch, and S. Martinez, “Tutorial on dynamic average consensus: The problem, its applications, and the algorithms,” *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 40–72, 2019.
- [48] W. Shi, Q. Ling, G. Wu, and W. Yin, “EXTRA: An exact first-order algorithm for decentralized consensus optimization,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 944–966, 2015.
- [49] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, and W. Shi, “Achieving geometric convergence for distributed optimization over time-varying graphs,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 2597–2633, 2017.
- [50] C. Xi, R. Xin, and U. A. Khan, “ADD-OPT: Accelerated distributed directed optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 1329–1339, 2017.
- [51] D. P. Bertsekas and A. Scientific, *Convex optimization algorithms*. Athena Scientific Belmont, 2015.
- [52] T. Ge, W. Lin, and J. Feng, “Invariance principles allowing of non-Lyapunov functions for estimating attractor of discrete dynamical systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 500–505, 2011.
- [53] V. Chellaboina and W. M. Haddad, *Nonlinear dynamical systems and control: A Lyapunov-based approach*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- [54] G. Qu and N. Li, “On the exponential stability of primal-dual gradient dynamics,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 43–48, 2018.
- [55] Y. Tang, G. Qu, and N. Li, “Semi-global exponential stability of augmented primal-dual gradient dynamics for constrained convex optimization,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 144, p. 104754, 2020.
- [56] M. Zhu and S. Martínez, “Discrete-time dynamic average consensus,” *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 322–329, 2010.
- [57] A. Daneshmand, G. Scutari, and V. Kungurtsev, “Second-order guarantees of distributed gradient algorithms,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 3029–3068, 2020.
- [58] X. Li, X. Yi, and L. Xie, “Distributed online convex optimization with an aggregative variable,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 438–449, 2021.
- [59] G. Carnevale, A. Camisa, and G. Notarstefano, “Distributed online aggregative optimization for dynamic multirobot coordination,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 3736–3743, 2022.
- [60] M. Bin, I. Notarnicola, L. Marconi, and G. Notarstefano, “A system theoretical perspective to gradient-tracking algorithms for distributed quadratic optimization,” in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 2994–2999, 2019.
- [61] R. A. Freeman, P. Yang, and K. M. Lynch, “Stability and convergence properties of dynamic average consensus estimators,” in *2006 45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 338–343, IEEE, 2006.
- [62] N. Bastianello and R. Carli, “Admm for dynamic average consensus over imperfect networks,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 55, no. 13, pp. 228–233, 2022.
- [63] G. Carnevale, N. Bastianello, R. Carli, and G. Notarstefano, “Distributed consensus optimization via admm-tracking gradient,” in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 290–295, IEEE, 2023.
- [64] E. Sebastián, M. Franceschelli, A. Gasparri, E. Montijano, and C. Sagüés, “Accelerated alternating direction method of multipliers gradient tracking for distributed optimization,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2024.
- [65] N. Bastianello, R. Carli, L. Schenato, and M. Todescato, “Asynchronous distributed optimization over lossy networks via relaxed admm: Stability and linear convergence,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2620–2635, 2020.
- [66] J. Li and H. Su, “Implicit tracking-based distributed constraint-coupled optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 479–490, 2022.