

# Distributed Nash Equilibrium Seeking in Aggregative Games over Jointly Connected and Weight-Balanced Networks

Zhaocong Liu, Jie Huang, *Life Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—The problem of the distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games has been studied over strongly connected and weight-balanced static networks and every time strongly connected and weight-balanced switching networks. In this paper, we further study the same problem over jointly connected and weight-balanced networks. The existing approaches critically rely on the connectedness of the network for constructing a Lyapunov function for their algorithms and these approaches fail if the network is not connected. To overcome this difficulty, we propose an approach to show the exponential convergence of the output of the closed-loop system to the unknown Nash equilibrium (NE) point under a set of mild conditions.

**Index Terms**—Aggregative games, exponential stability, converse Lyapunov theorem, jointly connected networks.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The distributed Nash equilibrium (NE) seeking problem is receiving an increasing attention from the control community [8] [9] [10] [21] [22], just to name a few. The problem for non-cooperative  $N$ -player game was studied in [22] over static, undirected and connected networks and in [21] over every time strongly connected networks. Reference [8] further considered the distributed Nash equilibrium seeking problem over static, undirected and connected networks via a passivity-based approach for games. In practice, the communication networks among the agents can be disconnected from time to time due to the changes of the environment or sensor/actuator failures. Thus, it is more interesting to consider switching communication networks which can be disconnected. In fact, references [9] and [10] studied the distributed Nash equilibrium seeking problem over jointly strongly connected switching networks which can be disconnected at every time instant.

Aggregative games are a subclass of non-cooperative  $N$ -player games whose cost functions depend on a so-called aggregate function. Aggregative games have been widely used to model the interaction between a group of self-interested players. The distributed NE seeking algorithms for aggregative games over static, undirected and connected communication networks were proposed in, for example, [1] [5] [7] [18] [20] [23]. The same problem was studied over static, strongly connected and weight-balanced networks in

[4], over strongly connected and weight-balanced or weight-unbalanced directed networks in [24], and over every time connected and undirected switching networks in [13]. Nevertheless, the approaches of the above mentioned papers do not apply to jointly connected switching networks because these approaches critically rely on the connectedness of the networks at every time.

In this paper, we will further consider the distributed NE seeking problem for aggregative games over jointly connected and weight-balanced switching networks. Compared with the existing literature, this paper offers the following features.

- (i) Our result applies to jointly connected and weight-balanced networks, which can be directed and disconnected at every time instant. In contrast, none of the existing methods mentioned above can handle disconnected networks.
- (ii) Even for the special case where the graph is static, connected and weight-balanced as studied in [4] [5], our main result also offers three significant improvements over the existing results in [4] [5] as elaborated in Remark 6.

To achieve the above advantages, we propose a different approach from the existing ones in that we make use of the converse Lyapunov function theory to construct the Lyapunov function candidate for our algorithm. For this purpose, we need to establish Lemma 1, which guarantees the exponential stability for a time-varying ancillary system.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II provides the preliminaries. Section III presents the main result. Section IV closes the paper with some remarks.

**Notation** Let  $\|\cdot\| : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  denote Euclidean norm and  $\|\cdot\| : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  denote the Euclidean-induced matrix norm. For column vectors  $a_i$ ,  $\text{col}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = [a_1^T, \dots, a_n^T]^T$ . For matrices  $A_i$ ,  $\text{blkdiag}(A_1, \dots, A_n)$  is the

block diagonal matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & A_n \end{bmatrix}$ .  $\otimes$  is the notation

of the Kronecker product.  $\mathbf{1}_p$  is the  $p$ -dimensional column vector with all 1's,  $\mathbf{0}_{p \times q}$  is the  $p \times q$ -dimensional matrix with all 0's, and  $I_p$  is the  $p$ -dimensional identity matrix.

This work was supported by the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region under grant No. 14201420.

The authors are with the Department of Mechanical and Automation Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Corresponding Author: Jie Huang (jhuang@mae.cuhk.edu.hk).

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Game theory

A non-cooperative game  $\Gamma$  is defined by a triplet as follows:

$$\Gamma \triangleq (\mathcal{V}, f_i, U_i) \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$  is the set of  $N$  players. For each player  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , the action of player  $i$  is denoted by  $x_i \in U_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  where  $U_i$  is called the action space of player  $i$ . Let  $U = U_1 \times U_2 \times \dots \times U_N \subset \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$  and  $\mathbf{x} = \text{col}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ , which are called the action space and the strategy vector of the game, respectively. Then,  $f_i : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the cost function for player  $i$ . Define  $\mathbf{x}_{-i} \triangleq (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N)$ , and  $U_{-i} \triangleq U_1 \times \dots \times U_{i-1} \times U_{i+1} \times \dots \times U_N$ . Then, the goal of each player  $i$  is, for all  $\mathbf{x}_{-i} \in U_{-i}$ , to minimize its cost function  $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})$  over  $x_i \in U_i$ , that is,

$$\text{minimize } f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) \quad \text{subject to } x_i \in U_i \quad (2)$$

Let  $\nabla_i f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) = [\frac{\partial f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})}{\partial x_i}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the partial derivative of  $f_i$  with respect to  $x_i$ . Then, we call

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \text{col}(\nabla_1 f_1(x_1, \mathbf{x}_{-1}), \dots, \nabla_N f_N(x_N, \mathbf{x}_{-N})) \quad (3)$$

the pseudo-gradient of the game  $\Gamma$ .

In this paper, we focus on aggregative games whose cost functions depend on a so-called aggregate function which is defined as follows:

$$\tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i(x_i) \quad (4)$$

where  $\phi_i(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$  is a continuously differentiable vector-valued function which represents the local contribution to the aggregated quantity. An aggregative game is a game whose cost functions  $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) = \bar{f}_i(x_i, \tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}))$  for some functions  $\bar{f}_i$ . A strategy vector  $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_i^*, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*) \in U$  is a Nash equilibrium of the aggregative game if it is such that

$$\bar{f}_i(x_i^*, \tilde{\sigma}(x_i^*, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*)) \leq \bar{f}_i(x_i, \tilde{\sigma}(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*)), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \forall x_i \in U_i. \quad (5)$$

To study the aggregative game, define the following functions:

$$J_i(x_i, s_i) \triangleq \nabla_y \bar{f}_i(y, s_i)|_{y=x_i} + \frac{1}{N} \nabla \phi_i(x_i) \nabla_y \bar{f}_i(x_i, y)|_{y=s_i} \quad (6)$$

where  $\nabla \phi_i(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is evaluated at  $x_i$  and equals the transpose of the Jacobian matrix of vector function  $\phi_i(x_i)$ , i.e.,  $\nabla \phi_i(x_i) = (\frac{\partial \phi_i(y)}{\partial y})|_{y=x_i}^T$ .

Let  $\mathbf{s} = \text{col}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ , and  $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \text{col}(\phi_1(x_1), \phi_2(x_2), \dots, \phi_N(x_N)) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ . Then the following operator

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) = \text{col}(J_1(x_1, s_1), \dots, J_N(x_N, s_N)) \quad (7)$$

is called the *extended pseudo-gradient* operator. Then the fact that  $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) = \bar{f}_i(x_i, \tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}))$ , and equations (3), (6) and (7) imply that  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) = F(\mathbf{x})$  if  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = (\frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}_N^T \otimes \mathbf{I}_n) \phi(\mathbf{x})$ .

Three standard assumptions are as follows [1] [4] [7].

### Assumption 1.

- 1) For all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $U_i$  is nonempty, closed and convex.
- 2) The cost function  $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})$  is convex and continuously differentiable in  $x_i$  for every fixed  $\mathbf{x}_{-i} \in U_{-i}$ .
- 3) The pseudo-gradient  $F$  is strongly monotone on  $U$ , that is, for some  $\mu > 0$ ,

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')^T (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}')) \geq \mu \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|^2, \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in U$$

**Assumption 2.** The pseudo-gradient  $F$  is Lipschitz continuous, i.e., for some  $\theta > 0$ ,

$$\|F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq \theta \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|, \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in U$$

**Assumption 3.** For all  $\mathbf{x} \in U$ ,

- 1) The extended pseudo-gradient  $\mathbf{F}$  is Lipschitz continuous in its second variable, that is, for some  $\hat{\theta} > 0$ ,  $\|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}')\| \leq \hat{\theta} \|\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}'\|, \forall \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}' \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ .
- 2) The Jacobian of  $\phi(\mathbf{x})$  is globally bounded, i.e.,  $\|\frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\| \leq l$  for some  $l > 0$ .

**Remark 1.** If Parts 1) and 2) of Assumption 1 hold, then by [6, Proposition 1.4.2], an NE  $\mathbf{x}^*$  exists which is such that the following variational inequality  $VI(U, F)$  holds:

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)^T F(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in U \quad (8)$$

Moreover, by [6, Theorem 2.3.3 (b)], Part 3) of Assumption 1 guarantees a unique NE  $\mathbf{x}^*$  exists. In what follows, we consider the global case, that is,  $U = \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ . For this case, (8) implies  $F(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1}$ .

Assumption 2 is weaker than the smoothness requirement in [13, Assumption 1] and [24, Assumption 1]. Part 2) of Assumption 3 includes average aggregate function  $\phi_i(x_i) = x_i$  and linear weighted aggregate function  $\phi_i(x_i) = A_i x_i$  with matrices  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  as special cases.

### B. Graph theory

The information exchange of all players of the game described in (1) can be described by a time-varying graph<sup>1</sup>  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)})$  with  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $\sigma(t)$  a piece-wise constant switching signal, and  $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . For any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)}$  contains an edge  $(j, i)$  if and only if the player  $i$  is able to use the information of player  $j$  at time  $t$ . We define the neighbor set of agent  $i$  at time  $t$  as  $\mathcal{N}_i(t) = \{j \in \mathcal{V} | (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)}\}$ . A graph  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)}$  is called weight-balanced at time  $t$  if  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij}(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ji}(t)$  holds for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . For any  $t \geq 0, s > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma([t, t+s])} = \cup_{t_i \in [t, t+s]} \mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t_i)}$ . We call  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma([t, t+s])}$  the *union graph* of  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)}$  over the time interval  $[t, t+s]$ .

We have the following assumption regarding the communication of the players.

### Assumption 4.

- 1) There exists a positive number  $T$  such that the graph  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma([t, t+T])}$  is connected for all  $t \geq 0$ .
- 2) The graph  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)}$  is weight-balanced for any  $t \geq 0$ .

**Remark 2.** A time-varying graph satisfying Part 1) of Assumption 4 is called *jointly connected*. Under Assumption 4,

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix for a summary of graph.

the graph can be directed and disconnected at every time instant. Therefore, none of the existing approaches in [1] [3] [4] [5] [7] [13] [18] [20] [23] [24] applies to this case. It is also interesting to note that Assumption 4 implies the graph  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma([t, t+T])}$  is strongly connected for all  $t \geq 0$  [19, Lemma 17].

### III. MAIN RESULT

Let us first propose our distributed NE seeking algorithm for player  $i$  as follows:

$$\dot{x}_i = -\delta J_i(x_i, s_i) \quad (9a)$$

$$\dot{s}_i = -\alpha(s_i - \phi_i(x_i)) - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (s_i - s_j) - \nu_i \quad (9b)$$

$$\dot{\nu}_i = \alpha\beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (s_i - s_j) \quad (9c)$$

where  $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \nu_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are two variables to ensure exact estimation of the aggregate value  $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ , and  $\delta, \alpha, \beta$  are three adjustable parameters to be specified later.

**Remark 3.** The algorithm (9) is motivated by [4], which is in turn inspired by the dynamic average consensus algorithm proposed in [12]. However, we have somehow simplified [4, Equation (11d)] by removing the term  $\nabla \phi_i(x_i)$  to obtain the current form of the equation (9b). In contrast to the original form in [12, Equation (4a)], we also remove  $\frac{d}{dt} \phi_i(x_i) = \frac{\partial \phi_i(x_i)}{\partial x_i} \dot{x}_i$  in (9b). This change simplifies the analysis below and reduces the calculation burden.

Let  $\mathbf{x} = \text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}, \mathbf{s} = \text{col}(s_1, \dots, s_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}, \boldsymbol{\nu} = \text{col}(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ . Then, the concatenated form of (9) is as follows:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\delta \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \quad (10a)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{s}} = -\alpha(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})) - \beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\nu} \quad (10b)$$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \alpha\beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \mathbf{s} \quad (10c)$$

Now we concentrate on the subsystem composed of (10b) and (10c). First, we define two projection matrices as follows:

$$P_n = \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n \quad (11a)$$

$$P_n^\perp = I_{Nn} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n \quad (11b)$$

In fact,  $P_n$  in (11a) denotes projection onto consensus subspace of dimension  $n$ , and  $P_n^\perp$  in (11b) represents projection onto disagreement subspace of dimension  $n$ .

Consider the following coordinate transformation:

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \check{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{s} - P_n \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (12a)$$

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \boldsymbol{\nu} - \alpha(I_{Nn} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n) \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\nu} - \alpha P_n^\perp \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (12b)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = \text{col}(\bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2, \dots, \bar{s}_N), \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \text{col}(\bar{\nu}_1, \bar{\nu}_2, \dots, \bar{\nu}_N)$ . Then, (10b)-(10c) is equivalent to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} &= -\alpha \bar{\mathbf{s}} + \alpha \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) - \beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} - P_n \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= -\alpha \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \delta P_n \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{s}} + P_n \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})) \end{aligned} \quad (13a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}}} &= \alpha\beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n)(\bar{\mathbf{s}} + \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \check{\sigma}(\mathbf{x})) - \alpha P_n^\perp \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \alpha\beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}} + \delta \alpha P_n^\perp \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{s}} + P_n \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})) \end{aligned} \quad (13b)$$

The Jacobian linearization of (13) at the origin is as follows:

$$\dot{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} = -\alpha \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \quad (14a)$$

$$\dot{\bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}}} = \alpha\beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}} \quad (14b)$$

Let  $r = \frac{\mathbf{1}_N}{\sqrt{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . Then, there exists  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (N-1)}$  such that  $R^T R = I_{N-1}$  and  $R^T r = \mathbf{0}_{(N-1) \times 1}$ . That is, the matrix  $\mathcal{Q} = [r \ R]$  is an orthogonal matrix. Let  $r_\otimes = r \otimes I_n, R_\otimes = R \otimes I_n, \mathcal{Q}_\otimes = \mathcal{Q} \otimes I_n$ . We further define the following coordinate transformation

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{Q}_\otimes^T \bar{\mathbf{s}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (15a)$$

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathcal{Q}_\otimes^T \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (15b)$$

with  $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{z}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn-n}$ . Suppose Part 2) of Assumption 4 is satisfied. Then, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{1}_N^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times N}$ , which implies  $r_\otimes^T (\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times (nN)}$ . Thus, system (14) is equivalent to the following

$$\dot{\mathbf{y}}_1 = -\alpha \mathbf{y}_1 - \beta r_\otimes^T (\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{z}_1 = -\alpha \mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{z}_1 \quad (16a)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{y}}_2 = -\alpha \mathbf{y}_2 - \beta((R^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} R) \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 - \mathbf{z}_2 \quad (16b)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{z}}_1 = \alpha\beta r_\otimes^T (\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \bar{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \quad (16c)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{z}}_2 = \alpha\beta((R^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} R) \otimes I_n) \mathbf{y}_2 \quad (16d)$$

To study the stability property of (16), consider the following ancillary system:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} = A(t) \boldsymbol{\zeta} \quad (17)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \text{col}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$  with  $\zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \zeta_2, \zeta_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn-n}$ , and

$$A(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha I_n & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\alpha I_{Nn-n} - \beta(R^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} R) \otimes I_n & -I_{Nn-n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \alpha\beta((R^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} R) \otimes I_n) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

We first establish the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** Under Part 1) of Assumption 4, the origin of the linear switched system (17) is exponentially stable.

*Proof.* Let  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} = \text{col}(\hat{\zeta}_1, \hat{\zeta}_2, \dots, \hat{\zeta}_N)$  with  $\hat{\zeta}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, N$ . Then, we first consider the following subsystem:

$$\dot{\hat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}} = -\beta(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_n) \hat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} \quad (19)$$

Under Part 1) of Assumption 4, by [2, Corollary 2.1], which in turn follows from [16, Theorem 1], all  $\hat{\zeta}_i$  converge to a

common vector  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  exponentially as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , that is,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\hat{\zeta}(t) - \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \xi) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1}$  exponentially.

Next, define coordinate transformation  $\tilde{\zeta} = \text{col}(\tilde{\zeta}_1, \tilde{\zeta}_2) = \begin{bmatrix} r_{\otimes}^T \\ R_{\otimes}^T \end{bmatrix} \hat{\zeta}$ . Then, using the property that  $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \mathbf{1}_N = \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1}$  for  $t \geq 0$ , (19) is transformed to the following form:

$$\dot{\tilde{\zeta}}_1 = -\beta((r^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} R) \otimes I_n) \tilde{\zeta}_2 \quad (20a)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{\zeta}}_2 = -\beta((R^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} R) \otimes I_n) \tilde{\zeta}_2 \quad (20b)$$

We now show the origin of (20b) is exponentially stable. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\zeta}_2(t) &= R_{\otimes}^T \hat{\zeta}(t) \\ &= R_{\otimes}^T (\hat{\zeta}(t) - \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \xi) + R_{\otimes}^T (\mathbf{1}_N \otimes \xi) \\ &= R_{\otimes}^T (\hat{\zeta}(t) - \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \xi) \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from  $R_{\otimes}^T (\mathbf{1}_N \otimes \xi) = (R^T \mathbf{1}_N) \otimes (I_n \xi) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1}$ .

Thus, for any initial condition  $\tilde{\zeta}_2(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn-n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{\zeta}_2(t) &= R_{\otimes}^T \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{\zeta}(t) \\ &= R_{\otimes}^T \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\hat{\zeta}(t) - \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \xi) \\ &= \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1} \end{aligned}$$

exponentially, which means  $\tilde{\zeta}_2$  tends to the origin exponentially as  $t$  goes to infinity.

We now show that the origin of the linear switched system (17) is exponentially stable. For this purpose, let  $w = \alpha \tilde{\zeta}_2 + \tilde{\zeta}_3$ . Then (17) is transformed to the following form:

$$\dot{\tilde{\zeta}}_1 = -\alpha \tilde{\zeta}_1 \quad (21a)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{\zeta}}_2 = -\beta((R^T \mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} R) \otimes I_n) \tilde{\zeta}_2 - w \quad (21b)$$

$$\dot{w} = -\alpha w \quad (21c)$$

Thus, both  $\tilde{\zeta}_1$  and  $w$  vanish exponentially. Since (21b) can be viewed as an exponentially stable linear system perturbed by an exponentially vanishing input  $w$ , by [2, Corollary 2.4] or [14, Lemma 1], we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{\zeta}_2(t) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1}$  exponentially. The proof is thus complete.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** It is interesting to compare Lemma 1 with [12, Lemma 4.4] where it was showed that  $\bar{s}_i$  in (14a) and  $\bar{v}_i$  in (14b) achieve consensus exponentially, respectively. First, in [12],  $\phi_i(x_i) = x_i$  with  $x_i$  a scalar while our Lemma 1 works for a more general  $\phi_i(x_i)$  with  $x_i$  a vector. Thus, Lemma 1 here has somehow extended [12, Lemma 4.4]. Moreover, we further showed that a reduced system governing only  $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2$  and  $\mathbf{z}_2$  is exponentially stable. This result is crucial for constructing the Lyapunov function (29) for the system (24) in the proof of Theorem 1 later.

Now we are ready to establish our main result which makes use of the converse Lyapunov theorem based on Lemma 1.

**Theorem 1.** Under Assumptions 1 - 4, there exists a constant  $\delta^* > 0$  such that, for any  $0 < \delta < \delta^*, \alpha, \beta > 0$ , any  $x_i(0) \in$

$\mathbb{R}^n, s_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^N \nu_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ , the solution of the system (10) is bounded over  $t \geq 0$  and satisfies:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}^* \quad (22a)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{s}(t) = P_n \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) = \left( \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n \right) \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \quad (22b)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \boldsymbol{\nu}(t) = \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) = \alpha \left( I_{Nn} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n \right) \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \quad (22c)$$

all exponentially.

*Proof.* Let  $\text{col}(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}})$  be governed by (10a), (13a), and (13b), respectively. Let

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{z}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times (Nn)} & r_{\otimes}^T \\ \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes}^T & \mathbf{0}_{Nn} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times (Nn)} & R_{\otimes}^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{s}} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (23)$$

Then, under Part 2) of Assumption 4, using (18) and the fact that  $R_{\otimes}^T P_n = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times (Nn)}$  and  $r_{\otimes}^T P_n^\perp = \mathbf{0}_{n \times (Nn)}$ , (10a), (13a), and (13b) are transformed to the following:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\delta \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes} \mathbf{y} + P_n \phi(\mathbf{x})) \quad (24a)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{z}}_1 = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \quad (24b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 \end{bmatrix} &= A(t) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} \delta r_{\otimes}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes} \mathbf{y} + P_n \phi(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1} \\ \delta \alpha R_{\otimes}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes} \mathbf{y} + P_n \phi(\mathbf{x})) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (24c)$$

Since  $\sum_{i=1}^N \nu_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{z}_1(0) = r_{\otimes}^T \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(0) = r_{\otimes}^T (\boldsymbol{\nu}(0) - \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}(0))) = r_{\otimes}^T \boldsymbol{\nu}(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \quad (25)$$

Thus, by (24b), we have  $\mathbf{z}_1(t) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . As a result, the linear part of the subsystem (24c) is given by (17), whose equilibrium at the origin is exponentially stable by Lemma 1. Let  $\Phi(\tau, t)$  be the state transition matrix of (17). Then there exist some positive constants  $\gamma$  and  $\lambda$  such that

$$\|\Phi(\tau, t)\| \leq \gamma e^{-\lambda(\tau-t)}, \forall \tau \geq t \quad (26)$$

Define  $P(t) = \int_t^\infty \Phi^T(\tau, t) Q \Phi(\tau, t) d\tau$  with  $Q$  being some constant positive definite matrix. Then, similar to [15, Lemma 3.1], one can verify that  $P(t)$  is continuous for all  $t \geq 0$ , and it is positive definite and decrescent in the sense that there exist constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that

$$c_1 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{v}^T P(t) \mathbf{v} \leq c_2 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \quad (27)$$

It implies that  $\|P(t)\| \leq p$  with some positive constant  $p$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Note that  $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)}$  is a piece-wise constant matrix with the range of  $\sigma(t)$  being a finite set  $\mathcal{P} = \{1, 2, \dots, n_0\}$ . Thus  $A(t)$  in (18) is bounded over  $[0, +\infty)$  and continuous on each time interval  $[t_j, t_{j+1})$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots$ . Therefore, for  $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}), j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , the following holds [11, Theorem 4.12]:

$$-\dot{P}(t) = A(t)^T P(t) + P(t) A(t) + Q \quad (28)$$



Let  $\bar{x} = x - x^*$ ,  $\xi = \text{col}(y, z_2)$ ,  $V_1(\bar{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\|x - x^*\|^2$ , and  $V_2(\xi, t) = \xi^T P(t) \xi$ . Then, we define a time-varying Lyapunov function candidate for system (24) as follows:

$$V(\bar{x}, \xi, t) = V_1(\bar{x}) + V_2(\xi, t) \quad (29)$$

The derivative of  $V_1$  along (24a) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1 &= (x - x^*)^T (-\delta F(x, Q_\otimes y + P_n \phi(x))) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} -\delta (x - x^*)^T (F(x, Q_\otimes y + P_n \phi(x)) - F(x, P_n \phi(x))) \\ &\quad - \delta (x - x^*)^T (F(x) - F(x^*)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \delta \hat{\theta} \|\bar{x}\| \|Q_\otimes y\| - \delta \mu \|\bar{x}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \delta \hat{\theta} \|\bar{x}\| \|\xi\| - \delta \mu \|\bar{x}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where equality (a) follows from  $F(x, P_n \phi(x)) = F(x, (\frac{1_{N \times 1}}{N} \otimes I_n) \phi(x)) = F(x)$  by (7) and  $F(x^*) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1}$  by Remark 1, inequality (b) follows from Part 3) of Assumption 1 and part 1) of Assumption 3, and inequality (c) follows from  $\|Q_\otimes y\| = \|y\| \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} y \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\|$ .

On the other hand, for any  $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , taking derivative of  $V_2$  with respect to (24c) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2 &= [y^T \quad z_2^T] (A(t)^T P(t) + P(t) A(t) + \dot{P}(t)) \begin{bmatrix} y \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + 2 [y^T \quad z_2^T] P(t) \begin{bmatrix} \delta r_\otimes^T \frac{\partial \phi(x)}{\partial x} F(x, Q_\otimes y + P_n \phi(x)) \\ \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1} \\ \delta \alpha R_\otimes^T \frac{\partial \phi(x)}{\partial x} F(x, Q_\otimes y + P_n \phi(x)) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} -\xi^T Q \xi + \\ &\quad 2\delta \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} \|\xi\| \|P(t)\| \|Q_\otimes^T \frac{\partial \phi(x)}{\partial x}\| \|F(x, Q_\otimes y + P_n \phi(x))\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\lambda_{\min}(Q) \|\xi\|^2 + 2pl\delta \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} \|\xi\| (\hat{\theta} \|y\| + \theta \|\bar{x}\|) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where inequality (a) follows from (28), and inequality (b) follows from following facts:  $\|Q_\otimes^T\| = 1$ ,  $\|F(x, Q_\otimes y + P_n \phi(x))\| \leq \|F(x, Q_\otimes y + P_n \phi(x)) - F(x, P_n \phi(x))\| + \|F(x, P_n \phi(x)) - F(x^*, P_n \phi(x^*))\| \leq \hat{\theta} \|y\| + \theta \|\bar{x}\|$  by Remark 1, Assumption 2 and Part 1) of Assumption 3,  $\|\frac{\partial \phi(x)}{\partial x}\| \leq l$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$  by Part 2) of Assumption 3, and  $\|P(t)\| \leq p$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

Define  $M = 2pl\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} > 0$ . Then (31) can be further simplified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2 &\leq -\lambda_{\min}(Q) \|\xi\|^2 + \delta M \hat{\theta} \|\xi\|^2 + \delta M \theta \|\xi\| \|\bar{x}\| \\ &\leq -(\lambda_{\min}(Q) - \delta M \hat{\theta}) \|\xi\|^2 + \delta M \theta \|\xi\| \|\bar{x}\| \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Substituting (30) and (32) into  $\dot{V} = \dot{V}_1 + \dot{V}_2$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \dot{V}_1 + \dot{V}_2 \\ &\leq -\delta \left[ \begin{bmatrix} \|\bar{x}\| \\ \|\xi\| \end{bmatrix} \right]^T \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mu & -\frac{(\hat{\theta} + M\theta)}{2} \\ -\frac{(\hat{\theta} + M\theta)}{2} & \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}{\delta} - M\hat{\theta} \end{bmatrix}}_{B(\delta)} \begin{bmatrix} \|\bar{x}\| \\ \|\xi\| \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Since  $\mu > 0$ , the matrix  $B(\delta)$  in (33) is positive definite if  $\mu(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}{\delta} - M\hat{\theta}) - \frac{(\hat{\theta} + M\theta)^2}{4} > 0$ . Therefore, we can select the positive constant  $\delta^*$  as

$$\delta^* = \frac{4\mu\lambda_{\min}(Q)}{(\hat{\theta} + M\theta)^2 + 4\mu M\hat{\theta}} \quad (34)$$

such that, for any  $0 < \delta < \delta^*$ ,  $\dot{V} \leq -\delta \lambda_{\min}(B(\delta)) \left[ \begin{bmatrix} \|\bar{x}\| \\ \|\xi\| \end{bmatrix} \right]^2$ . Since both  $V(\bar{x}, \xi, t)$  and  $-\dot{V}(\bar{x}, \xi, t)$  are positive definite quadratic functions in  $\text{col}(\bar{x}, \xi)$ , we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{x}(t) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1}$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} y(t) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1}$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} z_2(t) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1}$  all exponentially. Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} x(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\bar{x}(t) + x^*) = x^* \quad (35)$$

exponentially, which means the strategy vector  $x$  tends to the NE exponentially as  $t$  goes to infinity. Since  $z_1(t)$  is identically zero for all  $t \geq 0$ , using (12), (15) and (35), we can further obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} s(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (Q_\otimes y(t) + P_n \phi(x(t))) = P_n \phi(x^*) \quad (36a)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \nu(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (Q_\otimes z(t) + \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(x(t))) = \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(x^*) \quad (36b)$$

both exponentially.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** Reference [17] studied general multi-cluster game problem over switching networks. For comparison, let  $m_i = 1$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  in [17], that is, there is only one player in each cluster. Then the first line of [17, Equation (21)] can be put as follows:

$$\dot{\hat{q}} = -\delta \text{diag}\{c_{ij}\} ((\mathcal{L}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes I_N + A_0) \hat{q} + r_0) \quad (37)$$

where  $\hat{q} = \text{col}(\hat{q}_{11}, \dots, \hat{q}_{1N}, \dots, \hat{q}_{NN})$  with  $\hat{q}_{ij}$  being player  $i$ 's estimate of action of player  $j$ ,  $c_{ij} > 0$  are the gains, and  $r_0 = -\text{col}(a_{11}^{\sigma(t)} q_1, a_{12}^{\sigma(t)} q_2, \dots, a_{1N}^{\sigma(t)} q_N, \dots, a_{NN}^{\sigma(t)} q_N)$ . One immediately realizes that it is the same as the second equation of [21, Equation (9)]. Thus, by [9, Remark 3.4], the approach in [17] only applies to every time strongly connected networks.

**Remark 6.** Our result also applies to the special case where the networks are static, connected and weight-balanced as studied in, for example, [4] and [5]. Even for this special case, our result offers a few advantages as follows:

- 1) Our algorithm relaxes the restrictive initial condition  $\nu_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} (i \in \mathcal{V})$  in [4, Equation (11e), (13e)] and [5, Equation (7e), (24e)] to merely  $\sum_{i=1}^N \nu_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ , which significantly enlarges the feasible set of initial conditions.
- 2) The validity of [4, Lemma 1] or [5, Lemma 1] relies on a crucial assumption that  $\phi_i(x_i)$  in (9b) are either constants or exponentially converge to some constants, which may not be verifiable since  $x$  dynamics and  $s - \nu$  dynamics are coupled in (10). In contrast, we do not need such an assumption.
- 3) We gave an explicit upper bound  $\delta^*$  in (34) for the design parameter  $\delta$  while [4] [5] only assumed the existence of the upper bound  $\delta^*$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the problem of the distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games over jointly connected and weight-balanced switching networks. The existing approaches critically rely on the connectedness of the graph for constructing a Lyapunov function for their algorithms and these approaches fail if the network is not connected. To overcome this difficulty, we have first established the exponential stability for a time-varying ancillary system. Then, by the converse Lyapunov theorem, we obtain a time-varying quadratic Lyapunov function for the ancillary system, which in turn leads to the construction of a suitable Lyapunov function for the closed-loop system, thus leading to the solution of the problem.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bianchi and S. Grammatico, "Continuous-time fully distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking for multi-integrator agents," *Automatica*, vol. 129, p. 109660, 2021.
- [2] H. Cai, Y. Su, and J. Huang, *Cooperative control of multi-agent systems: Distributed-observer and distributed-internal-model approaches*. Springer Nature, Switzerland AG, 2022.
- [3] C. De Persis and S. Grammatico, "Continuous-time integral dynamics for a class of aggregative games with coupling constraints," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2171–2176, 2019.
- [4] Z. Deng and X. Nian, "Distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking algorithm design for aggregative games over weight-balanced digraphs," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 695–706, 2018.
- [5] Z. Deng, "Distributed algorithm design for aggregative games of Euler–Lagrange systems and its application to smart grids," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 8315–8325, 2021.
- [6] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang, *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2003.
- [7] D. Gadjov and L. Pavel, "Single-timescale distributed GNE seeking for aggregative games over networks via forward–backward operator splitting," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 7, pp. 3259–3266, 2020.
- [8] D. Gadjov and L. Pavel, "A passivity-based approach to Nash equilibrium seeking over networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1077–1092, 2018.
- [9] X. He and J. Huang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking over strongly connected switching networks," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 533, pp. 206–213, 2023.
- [10] X. He and J. Huang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking with dynamics subject to disturbance of unknown frequencies over jointly strongly connected switching networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 606–613, 2024.
- [11] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. New York, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [12] S. S. Kia, J. Cortes, and S. Martinez, "Dynamic average consensus under limited control authority and privacy requirements," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 25, no. 13, pp. 1941–1966, 2015.
- [13] S. Liang, P. Yi, and Y. Hong, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games with coupled constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 85, pp. 179–185, 2017.
- [14] T. Liu and J. Huang, "Leader-following attitude consensus of multiple rigid body systems subject to jointly connected switching networks," *Automatica*, vol. 92, pp. 63–71, 2018.
- [15] W. Liu and J. Huang, "Adaptive leader-following consensus for a class of higher-order nonlinear multi-agent systems with directed switching networks," *Automatica*, vol. 79, pp. 84–92, 2017.
- [16] L. Moreau, "Stability of continuous-time distributed consensus algorithms," in *Proc. 43rd IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*, 2004, pp. 3998–4003.
- [17] X. Nian, F. Niu, and Z. Yang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for multicenter game under switching communication topologies," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern., Syst.*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 4105–4116, 2021.
- [18] M. Shakarami, C. De Persis, and N. Monshizadeh, "Distributed dynamics for aggregative games: Robustness and privacy guarantees," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 5048–5069, 2022.

- [19] C. W. Wu, "Algebraic connectivity of directed graphs," *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 203–223, 2005.
- [20] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Game design and analysis for price-based demand response: An aggregate game approach," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 720–730, 2016.
- [21] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking in multi-agent games under switching communication topologies," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 3208–3217, 2017.
- [22] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking by a consensus based approach," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 4811–4818, 2017.
- [23] Y. Zhang, S. Liang, X. Wang, and H. Ji, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games with nonlinear dynamics under external disturbances," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 4876–4885, 2019.
- [24] Y. Zhu, W. Yu, G. Wen, and G. Chen, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking in an aggregative game on a directed graph," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2746–2753, 2020.

#### APPENDIX

A time-varying graph is denoted by  $\mathcal{G}(t) = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}(t))$ , where  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$  is the node set, and  $\mathcal{E}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  is the edge set. If there is an edge from node  $j$  to node  $i$ , then  $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}(t)$ , and we say  $j$  is a neighbor of  $i$  at time  $t$ .

A subset of  $\mathcal{E}(t)$  of the form  $\{(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_{k-1}, i_k)\}$  is said to be a directed path from node  $i_1$  to node  $i_k$ , and in this case, we say node  $i_1$  can reach node  $i_k$  at time  $t$ . The graph  $\mathcal{G}(t)$  is said to be static if  $\mathcal{G}(t) = \mathcal{G}(0)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . A static graph is denoted by  $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ . A static graph is said to be *connected* if there is a node that can reach every other node, and is said to be *strongly connected* if there is a directed path between any two nodes. An edge  $(i, j)$  is called an undirected edge if  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \Leftrightarrow (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$ .  $\mathcal{G}$  is called an undirected graph if every edge in  $\mathcal{E}$  is undirected. The adjacency matrix of a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is a non-negative matrix  $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  where, for  $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $a_{ij} = 1$  if there is an edge from node  $j$  to node  $i$  and  $a_{ij} = 0$  if otherwise. Since, for  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , there is no such edge as  $(i, i)$ , we have  $a_{ii} = 0$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , let  $d_i^{\text{in}} = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ji}$  and  $d_i^{\text{out}} = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}$ , which are called the in-degree and out-degree of node  $i$ , respectively. Let  $D = \text{diag}(d_1^{\text{out}}, \dots, d_N^{\text{out}})$ , which is called the degree matrix of  $\mathcal{G}$ . The matrix  $\mathcal{L} = D - \mathcal{A}$  is called Laplacian of  $\mathcal{G}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

A time function  $\sigma : [0, +\infty) \mapsto \mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, n_0\}$  with  $n_0$  being some positive integer is said to be a piece-wise constant switching signal if there exists a sequence  $\{t_j : j = 0, 1, \dots\}$  satisfying  $t_0 = 0$  and  $t_{j+1} - t_j \geq \tau$  for some positive constant  $\tau$  such that, for all  $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ ,  $\sigma(t) = p$  for some  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ .  $\mathcal{P}$  is called the switching index set,  $t_j$  is called the switching instant, and  $\tau$  is called the dwell time.

Given a set of  $r$  graphs  $\{\mathcal{G}_i = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_i), i = 1, \dots, r\}$ , the graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  where  $\mathcal{E} = \cup_{i=1}^r \mathcal{E}_i$  is called the union of graphs  $\mathcal{G}_i$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{G} = \cup_{i=1}^r \mathcal{G}_i$ .

Given a piece-wise constant switching signal  $\sigma(t)$  and a set of  $n_0$  static graphs  $\mathcal{G}_i = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_i), i = 1, \dots, n_0$ , one can define a time-varying graph  $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)})$ , which is called a *switching graph*.