

Scalable second-order consensus of hierarchical groups^{*}

Jiamin Wang^a, Jian Liu^a, Feng Xiao^b, Ning Xi^c, Yuanshi Zheng^{a,*}

^a*Shaanxi Key Laboratory of Space Solar Power Station System, School of Mechano-electronic Engineering, Xidian University, Xi'an, 710071, China*

^b*School of Control and Computer Engineering, North China Electric Power University, Beijing, 102206, China*

^c*School of Cyber Engineering, Xidian University, Xi'an, 710071, China*

Abstract

Motivated by widespread dominance hierarchy, growth of group sizes, and feedback mechanisms in social species, we are devoted to exploring the scalable second-order consensus of hierarchical groups. More specifically, a hierarchical group consists of a collection of agents with double-integrator dynamics on a directed acyclic graph with additional reverse edges, which characterize feedback mechanisms across hierarchical layers. As the group size grows and the reverse edges appears, we investigate whether the absolute velocity protocol and the relative velocity protocol can preserve the system consensus property without tuning the control gains. It is rigorously proved that the absolute velocity protocol is able to achieve completely scalable second-order consensus but the relative velocity protocol cannot. This result theoretically reveals how the scalable coordination behavior in hierarchical groups is determined by local interaction rules. Moreover, we develop a hierarchical structure in order to achieve scalable second-order consensus for networks of any sizes and with any number of reverse edges.

Keywords: Dominance hierarchy, Directed acyclic graphs, Reverse edges, Group sizes, Scalable second-order consensus

1. Introduction

The dominance hierarchy is a pyramidal social relationship formed by ranking individuals according to some criteria such as the orders of motion, divisions of labor, body sizes, health conditions, and leadership, which is omnipresent in social species such as bird flocks [1], ant colonies [2], and primate groups [3] including human society. A mathematical model for characterizing such hierarchical relationships is directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) [1, 4, 5], in which all edges originate from lower-numbered to higher-numbered vertices and no directed cycles are included. It indicates that higher-ranked individuals exert greater authority to lead lower-ranked individuals. Interestingly, the hierarchy facilitates highly efficient coordination behavior. For example, in hierarchical pigeon flocks [1], a rapid consensus of the flight directions emerged. Thus, it has attracted substantial interest from researchers in the field of the distributed coordination of multi-agent systems. Based on multi-agent models, authors in [6, 7] theoretically proved that hierarchical networks described by DAGs indeed lead to optimal convergence rates of consensus.

Interestingly, we notice that feedback exists from low-ranked layers to high-ranked layers in hierarchical groups. Since low-ranked individuals usually undertake foraging and exploration tasks, they should report feedback information such as food resources, suitable habitats and dangerous predators to high-ranked individuals for better collective behavior decisions [8]. Moreover, the hierarchy of most gregarious animals is not strictly linear [4, 9], that is, the hierarchical relationship between a high-ranked individual and a low-ranked individual is temporarily reverse sometimes.

^{*}This work is funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62273267), the Natural Science Basic Research Program of Shaanxi, China (2022JC-46, 2023-JC-YB-525 and 2023-JC-QN-0766), the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, China (ZYTS23021), and the Major Research plan of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (92267204).

^{*}Corresponding author

Email addresses: wangjiamin21@outlook.com (Jiamin Wang), liujianzym@outlook.com (Jian Liu), fengxiao@ncepu.edu.cn (Feng Xiao), nxi@xidian.edu.cn (Ning Xi), zhengyuanshi2005@163.com (Yuanshi Zheng)

Such a feedback mechanism, which is opposite to the hierarchical relationship, can be viewed as additional directed edges in DAGs. These edges point from higher-numbered to lower-numbered vertices. Thereby, they are called the *reverse edges* that may create directed cycles and affect the consensus performance. Inspired by these phenomena, some researchers examined the influence of adding reverse edges to DAGs on the convergence rates of first-order consensus [10–13]. It should be noted that first-order consensus is always achieved no matter how many reverse edges are added to a DAG since the underlying interaction graphs always contain spanning trees. By contrast, second-order consensus is sensitive to the complex eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix [14, 15]. Additional reverse edges may bring complex eigenvalues and thus second-order consensus could fail without adjusting control gains. In order to recapture consensus, authors in [16, 17] suggested re-tuning control gains or modifying edge weights. Note that the above results were derived on particular regular DAGs and supposed no more than two reverse edges. However, hierarchical networks of large-scale groups are asymmetric, and feedback mechanisms emerge quite frequently that is far beyond the assumption of two reverse edges. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the second-order consensus problems of hierarchical groups on general DAGs in the presence of multiple reverse edges.

More interestingly, it is observed that when an incipient hierarchical group grows and matures by reproduction, the hierarchical network has to be re-ranked to accommodate the offspring [18]. Furthermore, feedback mechanisms emerge and vary more frequently as the group grows and the environment changes [2, 4]. In this case, in order to rebuild consensus under constantly changing network structure together with reverse edges, we have to re-tune control gains or edge weights as shown in [16, 17], which is not practical for a group with finite network resources. On the other hand, a recent work [19] focused on the growth of network sizes for multi-agent systems, which allowed more agents to join but the control gains are preset and cannot be re-tuned. Based on these observations, we study the *scalable second-order consensus* of hierarchical groups, that is, reaching consensus without re-tuning the control gains in the presence of reverse edges as the group size grows.

On the other hand, the authors in [19] showed that the consensus vanished for certain large-scale networks with local relative information feedback. Similarly, in aforementioned works [16, 17], the classic relative velocity protocol [20] was investigated to study the influence of reverse edges on second-order consensus, where each agent uses the relative velocity measurements with regard to its neighbors. In contrast with the relative velocity protocols, another types of second-order consensus protocols, known as the absolute velocity protocol [21], required each agent to use their own absolute velocity information as the local feedback. Then, based on the structures of above two state-of-the-art protocols, a large number of investigations of second-order consensus have been conducted [22–28]. Recently, the authors in [29] gave a concise graph condition to tell which one of the absolute and relative velocity protocols has a better anti-disturbance capability. Based on these observations, we believe that the underlying structures of protocols may determine the scalable second-order consensus of hierarchical groups. It is consistent with the phenomenon that ant colonies would change the local interaction rules for larger scale of coordinated foraging [8]. Therefore, in this article, we compare the absolute velocity protocol and the relative velocity protocol with respect to the scalable second-order consensus. As far as we known, no previous study has investigated this issue.

Motivated by the above works, we delve into the scalable second-order consensus of hierarchical groups, which is composed of a group of agents with double-integrator dynamics on DAGs. We investigate which one of the absolute velocity protocols and the relative velocity protocols can achieve scalable second-order consensus. The considered problem is challenging. Because the existing methods in aforementioned references [10–13, 16, 17, 19] depended on precise Laplacian eigenvalues or specific topological structures, it is difficult to derive the sufficient conditions for scalable second-order consensus on general DAGs with multiple reverse edges. The main contributions are in three aspects:

- Different from existing works that studied symmetric DAGs with two or less reverse edges, we consider the general DAGs with multiple reverse edges;
- We prove that under a certain assumption, the absolute velocity protocols can obtain scalable second-order consensus no matter how the hierarchical network and the reverse edges change but the relative velocity protocols cannot. This result reveals the pivotal role of underlying structures of protocols on the scalable consensus of hierarchical groups. It is beneficial to explain why the local interaction rules for coordination behaviors are changed when a small hierarchical group grows to a large-scale group [8];
- We propose a hierarchical structure, i.e., directed star graphs, on which the scalable second-order consensus can

be guaranteed under reverse edges of any number and any weight. This finding facilitates deploying large-scale scalable multi-agent systems without re-tuning the controller parameters and edge weights.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminaries in graph theory. We formulate the problem in Section 3. The analysis of scalable consensus for the absolute and the relative velocity protocols are shown in Section 4. We conclude our work in Section 5.

Notations: Throughout this article, \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{C}^n are the n -dimensional real column vector space and complex column vector space, respectively. $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the $m \times n$ real matrix space. Let $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$, respectively, be the all-one and all-zero matrices with appropriate dimensions. Specially, $\mathbf{1}_n$ and $\mathbf{0}_n$ denote the $n \times 1$ all ones and all zeros column vectors, respectively. Denote I_n by the n -dimensional identity matrix. Define a set $\mathcal{I}_m = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. A complex number $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is denoted by $\lambda = \text{Re}(\lambda) + \mathbf{j}\text{Im}(\lambda)$, where $\text{Re}(\lambda)$ is the real part of λ , $\text{Im}(\lambda)$ is the imaginary part of λ , and \mathbf{j} is the imaginary unit. $|\cdot|$ refers to the cardinality of a set or the modulus of a complex number.

2. Preliminaries

Consider a group of $n > 2$ agents whose interaction network is represented as a weighted directed graph $\mathcal{G}_n = (\mathcal{V}_n, \mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{A}_n)$, where $\mathcal{V}_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is the set of vertices, $\mathcal{E}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}_n \times \mathcal{V}_n$ is the set of edges, and $\mathcal{A}_n = [a_{ij}]_{n \times n}$ is the weighted adjacency matrix with $a_{ij} \geq 0$. An edge of \mathcal{G}_n is denoted by $\varepsilon_{ij} = (i, j)$, where j is called the parent vertex of i and i is the child vertex of j . $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n \Leftrightarrow a_{ij} > 0 \Leftrightarrow$ agent i can receive information from agent j . Moreover, \mathcal{G}_n has no self-cycles, i.e., $a_{ii} = 0$. The degree matrix $\mathcal{D}_n = [d_{ii}]_{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix with $d_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}$. For convenience, let $d_{\max} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}_n} \{d_{ii}\}$. The Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L}_n = [l_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ associated with the graph \mathcal{G}_n is defined as $l_{ii} = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n a_{ij} = d_{ii}$ and $l_{ij} = -a_{ij}$, $j \neq i$, hence $\mathcal{L}_n \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{0}_n$ holds. Let λ_i , $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$ be the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_n .

The following definitions and assumption will be utilized to establish our main results.

Definition 1 ([5]) A DAG is a directed graph without directed cycles.

A DAG has a *linear extension ordering* which is a consecutive increasing numbering of the vertices as the order $1, 2, \dots, n$ such that all directed edges point from lower-numbered to higher-numbered vertices [5]. This property is used to characterize the relationships among members in hierarchical groups. Specifically, higher-ranked individuals in the hierarchy correspond to lower-numbered vertices in the linear extension ordering, and the directed edges mean that lower-ranked individuals are always led by higher-ranked individuals. In addition, the feedback from low-ranked layers to high-ranked layers in hierarchical groups is described by additional reverse edges in DAGs, which is defined as follows.

Definition 2 ([10]) For two vertices i and j ($i < j$) in a DAG \mathcal{G}_n that has a linear extension ordering, the additional edge (i, j) is called a reverse edge from j to i .

In other words, a reverse edge is an extra edge that is opposite to the linear extension ordering. Generally, suppose that there are multiple reverse edges and there is at most one reverse edge between two different vertices. Then, the DAG \mathcal{G}_n and additional reverse edges constitute a new directed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n = (\mathcal{V}_n, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_n)$ termed the *mixed graph*, where $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n = \mathcal{E}_n \cup \mathcal{E}_n^r$ is the set of edges, \mathcal{E}_n is the set of edges of the original DAG \mathcal{G}_n , \mathcal{E}_n^r is the set of additional reverse edges, and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_n = [\tilde{a}_{ij}]_{n \times n}$ is the weighted adjacency matrix whose elements are defined as $\tilde{a}_{ii} = 0$ and $\tilde{a}_{ij} > 0$ if $(i, j) \in \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n$ where $i \neq j$. It is obvious that $\tilde{a}_{ij} = a_{ij} > 0$, $\forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n$, where $i > j$, and $\tilde{a}_{ij} > 0$, $\forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n^r$, where $i < j$.

Definition 3 For a vertex i in a mixed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$, if there is another vertex j such that $i > j$ and $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n^r$, j is called a superior neighbor of i . If the vertex j satisfies $i < j$ and $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n$, j is said to be a inferior neighbor of i .

Specially, $\mathcal{N}_i^h = \{j | (i, j) \in \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n, j \in \mathcal{V}_n, i > j\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_i^l = \{j | (i, j) \in \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n, j \in \mathcal{V}_n, i < j\}$ denote the superior neighbor set and the inferior neighbor set of vertex i , respectively. Let $\theta = \min\{j | (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n^r\}$, $\varphi = \max\{j | (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n\}$ and $s = \varphi - \theta$. Then, the Laplacian matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n = [\tilde{l}_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of the mixed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ can be written as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} L_1 & & \\ * & \Theta & \\ * & * & L_2 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathcal{L}_n} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & & \\ & \Delta & \\ & & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_P, \quad (1)$$

where $L_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(\theta-1) \times (\theta-1)}$, $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times (s+1)}$, and $L_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-\varphi) \times (n-\varphi)}$ are all lower triangular matrices, $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times (s+1)}$ is an upper triangular matrix, \mathcal{L}_n is the Laplacian matrix of the original DAG \mathcal{G}_n with a linear extension ordering, and $P = [p_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ captures the additional reverse edges. Specifically, non-diagonal elements of P are given as $p_{ij} = -\bar{a}_{ij}$ if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}'_n$, otherwise $p_{ij} = 0$, and the diagonal elements of P is $p_{ii} = \sum_{j>i}^{s+1} \bar{a}_{ij}$. It is obvious that the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_n are $\lambda_i = d_{ii}$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}_n$. Furthermore, the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ are denoted by $\bar{\lambda}_i$, $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$.

The following assumption is made for the mixed graphs throughout this article unless otherwise stated.

Assumption 1 For any mixed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$, each agent has finite superior neighbors and inferior neighbors, i.e., $|\mathcal{N}_i^h| \leq \zeta$, $|\mathcal{N}_i^l| \leq \xi$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}_n$, and all edge weights are finite, i.e., $\bar{a}_{ij} \leq \bar{a}$, $\forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_n$ and $\bar{a}_{ij} \leq \bar{a}_r$, $\forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}'_n$.

Remark 1 Assumption 1 is reasonable in large-scale natural groups. For example, in fish schools and bird flocks, due to the limited spatial communication distance, each individual adjusts its direction based on the directions of its finite nearest neighbor, and the interaction strengths among individuals are finite and decay with the spatial distance [30, 31].

3. Problem statement

In this article, the hierarchical group consists of n agents on the DAG \mathcal{G}_n , which take the following double-integrator dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i(t) &= v_i(t), \\ \dot{v}_i(t) &= u_i(t), i \in \mathcal{V}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, $v_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, and $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ are the position-like, the velocity-like, and the control input of agent i , respectively, and \mathcal{G}_n has a spanning tree and a linear extension ordering. The hierarchical group (2) is said to reach second-order consensus if and only if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|v_i(t) - v_j(t)\| = 0$, $\forall i, j \in \mathcal{V}_n$. There are two common protocols for second-order consensus, the absolute velocity protocol

$$u_i(t) = \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} [x_j(t) - x_i(t)] - \beta v_i(t), \quad (3)$$

and the relative velocity protocol

$$u_i(t) = \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} [x_j(t) - x_i(t)] + \beta \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} [v_j(t) - v_i(t)], \quad (4)$$

where a_{ij} is the (i, j) th entry of the weighted adjacency matrix \mathcal{A}_n associated with the DAG \mathcal{G}_n , and the positive constants α and β are the state control gain and the velocity control gain, respectively. For both protocols, the necessary and sufficient conditions of reaching second-order consensus on directed graphs were investigated in [14, 15]. Specifically, hierarchical group (2)-(3) reaches second-order consensus if and only if \mathcal{G}_n has a spanning tree and

$$\frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} > \max_{\lambda_i \neq 0} \frac{\text{Im}^2(\lambda_i)}{\text{Re}(\lambda_i)}. \quad (5)$$

Similarly, hierarchical group (2)-(4) reaches second-order consensus if and only if \mathcal{G}_n has a spanning tree and

$$\frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} > \max_{\lambda_i \neq 0} \frac{\text{Im}^2(\lambda_i)}{\text{Re}(\lambda_i) |\lambda_i|^2}. \quad (6)$$

Since \mathcal{G}_n is a DAG, we have $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}_n$. Then, second-order consensus is easily achieved for both protocols under any positive control gains.

Remark 2 The consensus criterion (5) is not broadly known compared with (6). However, according to the proof of Lemma 2 in [14], it can be readily derived by using Hurwitz stability criteria to analyze the characteristic polynomial.

Different from existing works, we aim to investigate whether the absolute velocity protocol (3) and the relative velocity protocol (4) can achieve scalable second-order consensus for hierarchical group (2). Specifically, the scalability refers to two aspects. On the one hand, the scale of hierarchical group (2) gradually grows. As more agents join, communication graphs of different sizes constitute a family of DAGs $\{\mathcal{G}_n : n \geq n_0\}$ called the *hierarchical graph family*, in which n_0 is the incipient group size, the network size n is increasing and each DAG has a spanning tree and a linear extension ordering. On the other hand, as the group size grows, additional reverse edges constantly emerge. Then, we can obtain a new graph family $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n : n \geq n_0\}$ called the *mixed graph family*, in which each graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ is a mixed graph consisting of original DAG \mathcal{G}_n with additional reverse edges, and the associated Laplacian matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ takes the form in (1). For brevity, the hierarchical graph family and the mixed graph family are denoted by $\{\mathcal{G}_n\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n\}$, respectively. It should be stressed that control gains α and β of all agents are preset and cannot be re-tuned throughout $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n\}$, regardless of whether the absolute velocity protocol (3) or the relative velocity protocol (4) is employed. In addition, since hierarchical relations and topological structures reconstruct as the network size increases, $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{n-1}$ needs not be a subgraph of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$.

With the above configurations and Assumption 1, the scalable second-order consensus is defined as follows.

Definition 4 (Scalable second-order consensus) *For a given protocol, hierarchical group (2) is said to achieve scalable second-order consensus on a mixed graph family $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n\}$ if there exist fixed control gains α and β such that hierarchical group (2) achieves second-order consensus on any graph in $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n\}$. In particular, if hierarchical group (2) achieves scalable second-order consensus on any mixed graph family $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n\}$, it is called completely scalable second-order consensus.*

Remark 3 *Compared with \mathcal{G}_n , the mixed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ may be no longer a DAG, which brings complex Laplacian eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_i$. In this case, second-order consensus could fail without adjusting control gains. However, due to the difference between consensus conditions (5) and (6) resulting from different underlying structures of protocols, the influence of reverse edges on consensus may exhibit different trends as the network size increases. Therefore, we wonder whether the consensus can be preserved under constantly changing network structures together with reverse edges by selecting the underlying structures of protocols rather than re-tuning the control gains.*

4. Main results

In this section, we analyze the scalable second-order consensus of the hierarchical group (2) with the absolute velocity protocol (3) and the relative velocity protocol (4), respectively. Then, we propose a well-scalable hierarchical network for both protocols.

The following theorem is given for the hierarchical group (2) with the absolute velocity protocol (3).

Theorem 1 *Hierarchical group (2) can achieve completely scalable second-order consensus with the absolute velocity protocol (3) under Assumption 1.*

Proof. Note that each DAG \mathcal{G}_n in the hierarchical graph family $\{\mathcal{G}_n\}$ has a spanning tree and is a subgraph of the corresponding mixed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$. Thus, each mixed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ in the mixed graph family $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n\}$ must have a spanning tree, whose Laplacian matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ has a simple zero eigenvalue and all the other non-zero eigenvalues have positive real parts [32]. For convenience, let $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ assume the form $0 = \tilde{\lambda}_1 < \text{Re}(\tilde{\lambda}_2) \leq \dots \leq \text{Re}(\tilde{\lambda}_n)$. By inspecting (1), we find that $\tilde{l}_{ii} = \sum_{j \neq i} |\tilde{l}_{ij}| = d_{ii} + p_{ii}$. Thereby, the Geršgorin discs for rows of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ is $G(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - (d_{ii} + p_{ii})| \leq d_{ii} + p_{ii}\}$, which are in the complex right half plane and tangent to the imaginary axis. According to Geršgorin disc Theorem [33], all eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ lie inside $G(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n)$, i.e., $\tilde{\lambda}_i \in G(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n), \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_n$.

For convenience, let $G_{\sigma, \delta} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \sigma| \leq \delta, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}, \delta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be a disc with radius δ and center $(\sigma, 0)$ in the complex plane. For any mixed graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ subject to Assumption 1, there hold $d_{ii} \leq d_{\max} \leq \zeta \bar{a}$ and $p_{ii} \leq \xi \bar{a}_r$ for any $i \in \mathcal{V}_n$, which give rise to $G(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n) \subseteq G_{\mu, \mu}$, where $\mu = \zeta \bar{a} + \xi \bar{a}_r$.

Let $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \mu| = \mu\}$ be the boundary of the disc $G_{\mu, \mu}$. Since Ω is symmetric about the real axis, for any complex number $\omega \neq 0$ in $G_{\mu, \mu}$, there exist two conjugate complex numbers $c_1, c_2 \in \{z \in \Omega : \text{Re}(z) = \text{Re}(\omega)\}$ such that

$$\frac{\text{Im}(c_1)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} = \frac{\text{Im}(c_2)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} \geq \frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)},$$

which means that

$$\arg \sup_{\omega \in G_{\mu,\mu}} \frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} \in \Omega.$$

Therefore, we only need to focus on the complex number $\omega \neq 0$ on the boundary Ω .

If $\mu \leq \text{Re}(\omega) \leq 2\mu$, $\omega \in \Omega$, it follows that $\text{Im}(\omega)^2$ is decreasing with $\text{Re}(\omega)$. Then, we obtain

$$\sup_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega \\ \mu \leq \text{Re}(\omega) \leq 2\mu}} \frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} = \mu. \quad (7)$$

If $0 < \text{Re}(\omega) < \mu$, $\omega \in \Omega$, we draw two auxiliary lines in the complex plane, which are shown as the dash lines in Fig. 1. One of the lines connects $(\text{Re}(\omega), \text{Im}(\omega))$ and $(2\mu, 0)$. The other one is perpendicular to the real axis and passes




Figure 1: Diagram for the case $0 < \text{Re}(\omega) < \mu$.

through $(\text{Re}(\omega), \text{Im}(\omega))$. Obviously, it is observed that $\frac{\text{Re}(\omega)}{|\omega|} = \frac{|\omega|}{2\mu}$. Thus, we can get $\frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} = 2\mu - \text{Re}(\omega)$ which is decreasing with $\text{Re}(\omega)$. It follows that

$$\sup_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega \\ 0 < \text{Re}(\omega) < \mu}} \frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} = 2\mu. \quad (8)$$

Combining $G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_n) \subseteq G_{\mu,\mu}$, $\arg \sup_{\omega \in G_{\mu,\mu}} \frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} \in \Omega$, (7) and (8), we can obtain

$$\max_{\bar{\lambda}_i \neq 0} \frac{\text{Im}(\bar{\lambda}_i)^2}{\text{Re}(\bar{\lambda}_i)} \leq \sup_{\substack{\omega \neq 0 \\ \omega \in G_{\mu,\mu}}} \frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} \leq \sup_{\substack{\omega \neq 0 \\ \omega \in \Omega}} \frac{\text{Im}(\omega)^2}{\text{Re}(\omega)} = 2\mu.$$

Therefore, according to (5), if control gains are preset as $\frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} > 2(\zeta\bar{a} + \xi\bar{a}_r)$, hierarchical group (2)-(3) reaches second-order consensus for any mixed graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n$ in any mixed graph family $\{\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n\}$. That is, hierarchical group (2) can achieve completely scalable second-order consensus with the absolute velocity protocol (3).

By contrast, in the following theorem, we prove that the relative velocity protocol (4) fails to reach the completely scalable second-order consensus.

Theorem 2 Hierarchical group (2) cannot achieve completely scalable second-order consensus with the relative velocity protocol (4) under Assumption 1.

Proof. According to Definition 4, we just need to prove that there exists a class of mixed graph family such that hierarchical group (2)-(4) cannot achieve scalable second-order consensus on it.

Consider a family of hierarchical graphs $\{P_n\}$, in which each P_n is a directed path graph with a linear extension ordering and unit edge weights. In particular, the linear extension ordering of P_n is unique, which is the same as the order that the agents appear along the path. Suppose that there is only single reverse edge taking unit weight in each P_n , which points from agent m to agent q ($1 = q < m \leq n$), and the span of the reverse edge $s = m - q$ is increasing

with the network size n . Then, P_n and the above extra reverse edge constitute a mixed graph \bar{P}_n . The mixed graph family is represented as $\{\bar{P}_n\}$.

For each \bar{P}_n in $\{\bar{P}_n\}$, the reverse edge always includes the root node 1. Thus, the Laplacian matrix of \bar{P}_n in the form of (1) can be written as $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_n = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Theta} & \\ * & L_2 \end{bmatrix}$, where $L_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m) \times (n-m)}$ is a lower triangular matrix whose eigenvalues are all real, and $\bar{\Theta} = \Theta + \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{(s+1) \times (s+1)}$ is exactly the Laplacian matrix of a directed ring graph with $s+1$ vertices and unit edge weights, whose non-zero eigenvalues are $\gamma_i = 1 - \phi_i + \mathbf{j}\psi_i$, $i = 1, \dots, s$ [34], where $\phi_i = \cos(\frac{2\pi i}{s+1})$ and $\psi_i = \sin(\frac{2\pi i}{s+1})$. A simple calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Im}(\gamma_i)^2}{\text{Re}(\gamma_i)|\gamma_i|^2} &= \frac{\psi_i^2}{[1 - \phi_i] \cdot [(1 - \phi_i)^2 + \psi_i^2]} \\ &= \frac{1 + \phi_i}{2 \cdot [1 - \phi_i]} = \frac{1}{2} \cot^2\left(\frac{\pi i}{s+1}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It can be readily concluded that

$$\max_{\bar{\lambda}_i \neq 0} \frac{\text{Im}(\bar{\lambda}_i)^2}{\text{Re}(\bar{\lambda}_i)|\bar{\lambda}_i|^2} = \max_{i=1, \dots, s} \frac{\text{Im}(\gamma_i)^2}{\text{Re}(\gamma_i)|\gamma_i|^2} = \frac{1}{2} \cot^2\left(\frac{\pi}{s+1}\right).$$

Note that the span of the reverse edge s is increasing with the network size n . Therefore, combining with (6), there are no fixed control gains to preserve consensus as the network size grows. According to Definition 4, hierarchical group (2)-(4) cannot reach scalable second-order consensus on $\{\bar{P}_n\}$. Thereby, completely scalable second-order consensus is naturally failed.

Remark 4 *In fact, provided that the single reverse edge considered in the proof of Theorem 2 excludes the root node, i.e., $1 < q < m \leq n$, hierarchical group (2)-(4) still cannot achieve scalable second-order consensus on $\{\bar{P}_n\}$. In conclusion, as long as the span of the reverse edge is increasing with the network size, consensus could fail. This conclusion reveals the serious consequence that an individual bypasses its immediate leader and reports to a higher-level one.*

We are surprised that if the hierarchical group (2)-(4) deploys and expands in terms of a path structure, one reverse edge is enough to break the consensus. This is in sharp contrast with the hierarchical group (2) taking the absolute velocity protocol (4). As shown in the proof of Theorem 1, for the absolute velocity protocol (3), there always exist fixed control gains such that the hierarchical group (2) reaches consensus no matter how the topological structures and the reverse edges change. Our main results Theorem 1 and 2 reveal that the absolute velocity protocol (3) outperforms the relative velocity protocol (4) in terms of scalability of second-order consensus for hierarchical groups. In addition, this finding also theoretically tells that the local interaction rules among members affect the scalability of coordination behavior.

Besides $\{\bar{P}_n\}$, there certainly exist other mixed graph families such that the relative velocity protocol (4) fails to attain scalable second-order consensus. However, we are more interested in designing a common scalable hierarchical structure for both the absolute velocity protocol (3) and the relative velocity protocol(4).

Consider a hierarchical graph family $\{S_n\}$ consisting of a sequence of directed star graphs with increasing network size n . Each S_n has a linear extension ordering and n nodes including a hub node and $n-1$ fringe nodes. Every fringe node admits a directed edge with the same weight ρ pointing from the hub node to it. Here, the weights and the number of reverse edges are with no restrictions. Graph family $\{S_n\}$ with additional reverse edges is represented as the mixed graph family $\{\bar{S}_n\}$. Then, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3 *Hierarchical group (2) can achieve scalable second-order consensus on $\{\bar{S}_n\}$ with either the absolute velocity protocol (3) or the relative velocity protocol (4).*

Proof. For each \bar{S}_n in $\{\bar{S}_n\}$, the characteristic polynomial of the Laplacian matrix $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_n$ in the form (1) can be computed

as

$$|\lambda M_n - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n| = \begin{vmatrix} \lambda - p_{11} & \bar{a}_{12} & \bar{a}_{13} & \dots & \bar{a}_{1n} \\ \rho & \lambda - (\rho + p_{22}) & \bar{a}_{23} & \dots & \bar{a}_{2n} \\ \rho & 0 & \lambda - (\rho + p_{33}) & \dots & \bar{a}_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho & 0 & 0 & \dots & \lambda - \rho \end{vmatrix} \triangleq |\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0(\lambda)|,$$

where $\bar{a}_{ij} \geq 0$ ($i < j$) and $p_{ii} = \sum_{j=i+1}^n \bar{a}_{ij}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Recall that $\bar{a}_{ij} > 0$ implies a reverse edge with weight \bar{a}_{ij} from j to i , and $\bar{a}_{ij} = 0$ means no such reverse edge.

Then, we make a series of elementary row and column operations for $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0(\lambda)$. Firstly, starting with $j = 1$, adding each column after the j th column of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{j-1}(\lambda)$ to the j th column yields a new matrix $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_j(\lambda)$. Subsequently, repeating the above elementary column operations for $j = 2, \dots, n-1$ in turn, we can obtain a series of matrices $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0(\lambda), \dots, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-1}(\lambda)$, where

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-1}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & p_{11} & * & \dots & * & \bar{a}_{1n} \\ \lambda & \lambda - \rho & p_{22} & \dots & * & \bar{a}_{2n} \\ \lambda & \lambda - \rho & \lambda - \rho & \dots & * & \bar{a}_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda & \lambda - \rho & \lambda - \rho & \dots & \lambda - \rho & p_{(n-1)(n-1)} \\ \lambda & \lambda - \rho & \lambda - \rho & \dots & \lambda - \rho & \lambda - \rho \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally, every row of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-1}(\lambda)$ except the last row minus the last row which gives rise to the matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0(\lambda)| = |\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-1}(\lambda)| = |\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)| = \begin{vmatrix} 0 & \rho + p_{11} - \lambda & * & \dots & * \\ 0 & 0 & \rho + p_{22} - \lambda & \dots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \rho + p_{(n-1)(n-1)} - \lambda \\ \lambda & \lambda - \rho & \lambda - \rho & \dots & \lambda - \rho \end{vmatrix} = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} [\lambda - (\rho + p_{ii})].$$

It is obvious that all non-zero Laplacian eigenvalues are real for networks of any sizes with reverse edges of any number and any weight. Thus, according to (5) and (6), for any positive preset control gains, hierarchical group (2) is able to reach consensus with either the protocol (3) or protocol (4), that is, scalable second-order consensus can be achieved on $\{\bar{S}_n\}$ for either of the protocols.

Remark 5 Compared with the directed path graph, the directed star graph exhibits remarkable scalability under multiple reverse edges. This appears to imply a relation between the scalability and the height of the network which refers to the length of a longest path from the root node [5]. But it needs to be further verified by graph-theoretic analysis.

5. Conclusion

This study explored the scalable second-order consensus of hierarchical groups composed of a group of agents with double-integrator dynamics on DAGs. More specifically, as the network size increases and in the presence of reverse edges, we investigated which one of the absolute and the relative velocity protocols can preserve the system consensus property without tuning the control gains. It was proved that the absolute velocity protocol can reach completely scalable second-order consensus but the relative velocity protocol cannot. The scalable second-order consensus for the relative velocity protocol only happens on certain mixed graph families. This finding seems to explain the phenomenon that the local interaction rules are changed for larger scale of coordination behaviors [8]. Furthermore, we proposed a hierarchical architecture, i.e., the directed star graphs, on which second-order consensus can be reached for networks of any sizes with reverse edges of any number and any weight. We conjectured that the outstanding scalability of the structure may be related to height of the networks, which deserves to be further verified in future works.

References

- [1] M. Nagy, Z. Ákos, D. Biro, T. Vicsek, Hierarchical group dynamics in pigeon flocks, *Nature* 464 (2010) 890–893.
- [2] N. R. Franks, E. Scovell, Dominance and reproductive success among slave-making worker ants, *Nature* 304 (1983) 724–725.
- [3] R. M. Sapolsky, The influence of social hierarchy on primate health, *Science* 308 (5722) (2005) 648–652.
- [4] H. Shimoji, M. S. Abe, K. Tsuji, N. Masuda, Global network structure of dominance hierarchy of ant workers, *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 11 (99) (2014) 20140599.
- [5] J. L. Gross, P. Zhang, J. Yellen, *Handbook of graph theory*, CRC press, 2003.
- [6] J. Shao, J. Qin, A. N. Bishop, T.-Z. Huang, W. X. Zheng, A novel analysis on the efficiency of hierarchy among leader-following systems, *Automatica* 73 (2016) 215–222.
- [7] J. Shao, W. X. Zheng, T.-Z. Huang, A. N. Bishop, On leader–follower consensus with switching topologies: An analysis inspired by pigeon hierarchies, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 63 (10) (2018) 3588–3593.
- [8] C. Detrain, J.-L. Deneubourg, Self-organized structures in a superorganism: do ants “behave” like molecules?, *Physics of Life Reviews* 3 (3) (2006) 162–187.
- [9] P. H. Douglas, A.-C. N. Ngomo, G. Hohmann, A novel approach for dominance assessment in gregarious species: Adagio, *Animal Behaviour* 123 (2017) 21–32.
- [10] H.-T. Zhang, Z. Chen, X. Mo, Effect of adding edges to consensus networks with directed acyclic graphs, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 62 (9) (2017) 4891–4897.
- [11] X. Mo, Z. Chen, H.-T. Zhang, Effects of adding a reverse edge across a stem in a directed acyclic graph, *Automatica* 103 (2019) 254–260.
- [12] Y. Hao, Q. Wang, Z. Duan, G. Chen, The role of reverse edges on consensus performance of chain networks, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems* 51 (3) (2019) 1757–1765.
- [13] H.-T. Zhang, H. Cao, Z. Chen, A necessary and sufficient condition of an interfering reverse edge for a directed acyclic graph, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 67 (9) (2022) 4885–4891.
- [14] J. Zhu, Y.-P. Tian, J. Kuang, On the general consensus protocol of multi-agent systems with double-integrator dynamics, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 431 (5-7) (2009) 701–715.
- [15] W. Yu, G. Chen, M. Cao, Some necessary and sufficient conditions for second-order consensus in multi-agent dynamical systems, *Automatica* 46 (6) (2010) 1089–1095.
- [16] A. K. Dubey, D. Mukherjee, K. Arya, Consensus of double integrators over a chain with reverse edges, *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 55 (13) (2022) 19–24.
- [17] A. K. Dubey, D. Mukherjee, K. Arya, Consensus of double integrators in presence of a reverse edge in a chain: Analysis and design, in: *Proceedings of 2023 American Control Conference*, 2023, pp. 411–416.
- [18] I. R. Fischhoff, S. R. Sundaresan, J. Cordingley, H. M. Larkin, M.-J. Sellier, D. I. Rubenstein, Social relationships and reproductive state influence leadership roles in movements of plains zebra, *Animal Behaviour* 73 (5) (2007) 825–831.
- [19] E. Tegling, B. Bamieh, H. Sandberg, Scale fragilities in localized consensus dynamics, *Automatica* 153 (2023) 111046.
- [20] W. Ren, E. Atkins, Distributed multi-vehicle coordinated control via local information exchange, *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* 17 (10-11) (2007) 1002–1033.
- [21] G. Xie, L. Wang, Consensus control for a class of networks of dynamic agents, *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* 17 (10-11) (2007) 941–959.
- [22] Y. Zheng, Y. Zhu, L. Wang, Consensus of heterogeneous multi-agent systems, *IET Control Theory & Applications* 5 (16) (2011) 1881–1888.
- [23] H. Li, X. Liao, T. Huang, W. Zhu, Event-triggering sampling based leader-following consensus in second-order multi-agent systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 60 (7) (2015) 1998–2003.
- [24] W. Hou, M. Fu, H. Zhang, Z. Wu, Consensus conditions for general second-order multi-agent systems with communication delay, *Automatica* 75 (2017) 293–298.
- [25] Y. Zheng, Q. Zhao, J. Ma, L. Wang, Second-order consensus of hybrid multi-agent systems, *Systems & Control Letters* 125 (2019) 51–58.
- [26] Q. Zhao, Y. Zheng, Y. Zhu, Consensus of hybrid multi-agent systems with heterogeneous dynamics, *International Journal of Control* 93 (12) (2020) 2848–2858.
- [27] W. Xu, J. Kurths, G. Wen, X. Yu, Resilient event-triggered control strategies for second-order consensus, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 67 (8) (2022) 4226–4233.
- [28] L. Zhou, J. Liu, Y. Zheng, F. Xiao, J. Xi, Game-based consensus of hybrid multiagent systems, *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 53 (8) (2023) 5346–5357.
- [29] J. Wang, L. Zhou, D. Zhang, J. Liu, Y. Zheng, Protocol selection for second-order consensus against disturbance, *arXiv preprint: 2212.05240* (2022).
- [30] T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, O. Shochet, Novel type of phase transition in a system of self-driven particles, *Physical Review Letters* 75 (6) (1995) 1226–1229.
- [31] T. Mora, A. M. Walczak, L. Del Castello, F. Ginelli, S. Melillo, L. Parisi, M. Viale, A. Cavagna, I. Giardina, Local equilibrium in bird flocks, *Nature Physics* 12 (2016) 1153–1157.
- [32] W. Ren, R. W. Beard, Consensus seeking in multiagent systems under dynamically changing interaction topologies, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 50 (5) (2005) 655–661.
- [33] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [34] R. Agaev, P. Chebotarev, Which digraphs with ring structure are essentially cyclic?, *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 45 (2) (2010) 232–251.