

Distributed Prescribed-Time Convex Optimization: Cascade Design and Time-Varying Gain Approach

Gewei Zuo, Lijun Zhu, Yujuan Wang and Zhiyong Chen

Abstract—In this paper, we address the distributed prescribed-time convex optimization (DPTCO) problem for a class of nonlinear multi-agent systems (MASs) under undirected connected graph. A cascade design framework is proposed such that the DPTCO implementation is divided into two parts: distributed optimal trajectory generator design and local reference trajectory tracking controller design. The DPTCO problem is then transformed into the prescribed-time stabilization problem of a cascaded system. Changing Lyapunov function method and time-varying state transformation method together with the sufficient conditions are proposed to prove the prescribed-time stabilization of the cascaded system as well as the uniform boundedness of internal signals in the closed-loop systems. The proposed framework is then utilized to solve robust DPTCO problem for a class of chain-integrator MASs with external disturbances by constructing a novel variables and exploiting the property of time-varying gains. The proposed framework is further utilized to solve the adaptive DPTCO problem for a class of strict-feedback MASs with parameter uncertainty, in which backstepping method with prescribed-time dynamic filter is adopted. The descending power state transformation is introduced to compensate the growth of increasing rate induced by the derivative of time-varying gains in recursive steps and the high-order derivative of local reference trajectory is not required. Finally, theoretical results are verified by two numerical examples.

Index Terms—Distributed convex optimization, Stabilization of cascaded systems, Prescribed-time control, Time-varying gain.

I. INTRODUCTION

The distributed convex optimization (DCO) has attracted significant attention and brings many applications for multi-agent systems (MASs), for example, reliable communications in wireless networks [1], collision avoidance among multiple robots [2], economic dispatch in power systems [3], [4], distributed optimal power flow [5], traffic management for large-scale railway networks [6], traffic metering in urban street networks [7]. In a DCO problem, each agent has a local cost function only known to itself and there is a global cost function takes the sum of local cost functions. The objective is

to design distributed controllers with limited local information such that the output or state of each agent converges to the optimum of global cost function. The earliest work on DCO can be tracked back to [8], and it attracts increasing interests in the last decade after the pioneer works in [9], [10].

The focus of DCO research is on four aspects: generalizing the type of cost functions [11]–[16] and systems [17]–[24], faster convergent rate [23], [25]–[29], and disturbance rejection [20], [22], [24], [30], [31]. The optimization control algorithms for time-independent cost function [11], time-varying cost function [12] and cost function with constraints [13], [14] have been proposed. In [15], [16], the convexity of local cost function and strong convexity of global cost function are respectively removed. Some works aim to achieve DCO for more general systems, such as single-integrator system in [17], linear system in [18], [19], Euler-Lagrange system in [20] and strict-feedback system in [21], [22]. Using sliding-mode control and backstepping method, the DCO controller can handle systems that are high-order and nonlinear [24]. A common approach to solving the DCO for high-order systems is the cascade design where the solution to the DCO problem is divided into two parts. The first one is distributed optimum seeking, which by utilizing the local information interaction generates local optimal reference for each agent that asymptotically converges to the optimal solution of the global cost function. The second one is to design local tracking controller to make the output or state asymptotically converge to the local optimal references.

The convergence rate and the disturbance rejection are two concerns of DCO. In [23], [29], the finite-time convergence of DCO is considered where all agents reach a consensus within a finite time interval while minimizing the global cost function. The finite-time DCO for chain integrator MASs with mismatched disturbances is achieved in [31], while fixed-time convergence is shown in [25], [27], [28], where the finite settling time is independent of initial values. In [26], the predefined-time DCO is achieved by designing a class of time-based functions, where the solution converges to a neighborhood of the optimum within a given time and to the optimum as time approaches infinity. But it cannot be extended to handle disturbances and high-order systems.

In this paper, we address the distributed prescribed-time convex optimization (DPTCO) for high-order nonlinear MASs with uncertainties for which the solution converges to the optimum within any prescribed time. The prescribed-time control is proposed to ensure that the settling time does not depend on the initial values and control parameters [32], [33]. The main contribution of this paper is summarized as follows.

G. Zuo and L. Zhu are with School of Artificial Intelligence and Automation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430072, China. L. Zhu is also with Key Laboratory of Imaging Processing and Intelligence Control, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China (Emails: gwzuo@hust.edu.cn; ljzhu@hust.edu.cn).

Y. Wang is with the State Key Laboratory of Power Transmission Equipment & System Security and New Technology, and School of Automation, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 400044, China (Email: yjwang66@cqu.edu.cn).

Z. Chen is with School of Engineering, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia (Email: chen@newcastle.edu.cn).

First, a DFTCO framework for a class of nonlinear MASs with disturbances is proposed. By embedding a cascade design, the DFTCO implementation is divided into two parts, namely, distributed optimal trajectory generator design and local reference trajectory tracking controller design. The DPTCO problem is then transformed into the prescribed-time stabilization problem of two cascaded subsystems where the first one is for the error of the distributed estimation towards the global optimum and the second one is for local tracking errors. Changing Lyapunov function method and time-varying state method together with some sufficient conditions are proposed to prove the prescribed-time stabilization of the cascaded system as well as the uniform boundedness of internal signals in the closed-loop system. A specific distributed optimal trajectory generator is constructed to show that the distributed estimation errors converges towards zero within a prescribed time.

Second, under the DPTCO framework, we propose a robust DPTCO algorithm for a class of nonlinear chain-integrator MASs with external disturbance. We design a novel variable and introduce a new time-varying state transformation, which converts the prescribed-time stabilization problem of local tracking error and other states unrelated to the output into the boundedness of the new variable. Different from traditional sliding-mode control in [34] and the prescribed-time work in [32], our approach does not need the high-order derivative of the reference trajectory for tracking. Moreover, our proposed algorithm is robust for any bounded external disturbances.

Third, we consider adaptive DPTCO for a class of strict-feedback MASs with parameter uncertainty. We introduce time-varying state transformation of a descending power to compensate the growth of increasing rate induced by derivative of time-varying gains in recursive steps. The backstepping method with prescribed-time dynamic filter is adopted to avoid the utilization of high-order derivative of reference trajectory, and an adaptive law is designed to compensate parameter uncertainty.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II gives the notation and problem formulation. Section III presents the DPTCO framework for a type of nonlinear systems, for which Section IV elaborates the optimal trajectory generator design. Given the DPTCO framework and optimal trajectory generator, robust DPTCO for chain-integrator MASs and adaptive DPTCO for strict-feedback MASs are considered in Section V, VI, respectively. The numerical simulation is conducted in Section VII and the paper is concluded in Section VIII.

II. NOTATIONS AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Notations

\mathbb{R} , $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and \mathbb{R}^n denote the set of real numbers, the set of non-negative real numbers, and the n -dimensional Euclidean space, respectively. t_0 denotes the initial time, T the prescribed-time scale, and $\mathcal{T}_p := \{t : t_0 \leq t < T + t_0\}$ the corresponding time interval. Define functions $x_1(s) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $x_2(c, s) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $x_1(s) = \mathcal{S}[x_2(c, s)]$ means that $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} [x_1(s)/x_2(c, s)] < \infty$ for any $c < \infty$.

The symbol $1_N \in \mathbb{R}^N$ (or $0_N \in \mathbb{R}^N$) denotes an N -dimensional column vector whose elements are all 1 (or 0). For $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$, $(\alpha(s))^{-1} = 1/\alpha(s)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}/0$, while $\alpha^{-1}(s)$ be the inverse function of $\alpha(s)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

An undirected graph is denoted as $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ is the node set and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the edge set. The existence of an edge $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ means that nodes i, j can communicate with each other. Denote by $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ the weighted adjacency matrix, where $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E} \Leftrightarrow a_{ij} > 0$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. A self edge is not allowed, i.e., $a_{ii} = 0$. The Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L} of graph \mathcal{G} is denoted as $\mathcal{L} = [l_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, where $l_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}$, $l_{ij} = -a_{ij}$ with $i \neq j$. If \mathcal{G} is connected, then the null space of \mathcal{L} is spanned by 1_N , and all the other $N - 1$ eigenvalues of \mathcal{L} are strictly positive.

B. Problem Formulation

Consider the nonlinear MASs

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}^i &= g_x^i(x^i, y^i, u^i, d^i(t)), \\ \dot{y}^i &= g_y^i(x^i, y^i, u^i, d^i(t)), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $x^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y^i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $u^i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ are system state, output and control input of i th agent, respectively. $d^i : [t_0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ denotes the system's uncertainties or external disturbances where \mathbb{D} is a compact set belonging to \mathbb{R}^{n_d} and it is possibly time-varying. $g_x^i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{D} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, $g_y^i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{D} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^m$ are smooth functions of their arguments satisfying $g_x^i(0, y^i, 0, d^i) = 0$ and $g_y^i(0, y^i, 0, d^i) = 0$ for any $y^i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $d^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$. The output feedback system (1) contains various specific types [35], i.e., chain-integrator system [32], strict-feedback system [36] and feedforward system [37].

The objective of the distributed prescribed-time optimal agreement is, for any prescribe-time $T > 0$, to design a distributed controller u^i such that the agent's output y^i converges to the optimum z^* of the convex optimization problem

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^m} f(z) = \sum_{i=1}^N f^i(z), \quad (2)$$

where $f^i(z)$ is the local scalar cost function for i th agent, $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T+t_0} \|y^i(t) - z^*\| = 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (3)$$

irrespective of system initial value and any other control parameters besides T . Moreover, the state x^i , the output y^i and control input u^i must be bounded, i.e.,

$$\|[(x^i(t))^T, (y^i(t))^T, (u^i(t))^T]^T\| < \infty$$

holds for $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$. The optimization problem (2) can be recasted as the output consensus of agents towards the optimum of the team cost function, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_y \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N f^i(y^i), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & y^i = y^j, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $y = [y_1^T, \dots, y_N^T]^T$.

In order to solve the prescribed-time optimal agreement, the function

$$\mu(t) = 1/(T + t_0 - t) \quad (5)$$

is used throughout the paper as the time-varying gain. The function $\mu(t)$ increases to infinity as t approaches the prescribed-time $T+t_0$ and is commonly used in the prescribed-time control. For $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$, one has $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p := [1/T, \infty)$. We simplify $\mu(t)$ as μ throughout this paper if no confusion occur. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ and $\iota \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\kappa(\iota\alpha(\mu)) = \exp\left(\iota \int_{t_0}^t \alpha(\mu(\tau)) d\tau\right), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_p, \quad (6)$$

where we note $\kappa(\iota\alpha(\mu))$ converges to zero as $t \rightarrow T+t_0$ for any $\iota < 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. We study the problem under these two common assumptions.

Assumption 2.1: The undirected graph \mathcal{G} is connected. ■

Assumption 2.2: For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, the function f^i is first-order differentiable, and f^i as well as its gradient ∇f^i are only known to i th agent. Moreover, it is ρ_c -strongly convex and has ϱ_c -Lipschitz gradients, i.e., for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla f^i(x) - \nabla f^i(y))^T(x - y) &\geq \rho_c \|x - y\|^2, \\ \|\nabla f^i(x) - \nabla f^i(y)\| &\leq \varrho_c \|x - y\|, \end{aligned}$$

where ρ_c and ϱ_c are some known positive constants. ■

Under Assumption 2.2, f is strictly convex as f^i is for $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Therefore, if the optimization problem (2) (or problem (4)) is solvable, the optimum is unique. We need the following assumption for the optimization problem to be sensible.

Assumption 2.3: The optimal value of cost function (2), denoted as f^* , is finite and the optimum set $Z_{\text{opt}} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \sum_{i=1}^N f^i(z) = f^*\}$ is nonempty and compact [38]. ■

Some definitions are given as follows and will be used later.

Definition 2.1: A function $\alpha : [0, \infty) \mapsto [a, \infty)$ is said to belong to class \mathcal{K}_∞^e , it is strictly increasing and $\alpha(0) = a \geq 0$. ■

Definition 2.2: A continuous function $\beta : [0, c) \times [0, T) \mapsto [0, \infty)$ is said to belong to class \mathcal{KL}_T^e if, for each fixed s , the mapping $\beta(r, s)$ belongs to class \mathcal{K}_∞^e with respect to r and, for each fixed r , the mapping $\beta(r, s)$ is decreasing with respect to s and satisfies $\beta(r, s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow T$. The function β is said to belong to class \mathcal{KL}_T if β belongs to class \mathcal{KL}_T^e and for each fixed s , the mapping $\beta(r, s)$ belongs to class \mathcal{K}_∞ with respect to r . ■

Definition 2.3: [39] Consider the system $\dot{\chi} = g(t, \chi, d(t))$ where $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state and $d(t) : [t_0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ is the external input. For any given $T > 0$, the χ -dynamics is said to be prescribed-time stable if there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}_T^e$ such that for $\chi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$, $\|\chi(t)\| \leq \beta(\|\chi_0\|, t - t_0)$ holds for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$ where $\chi_0 = \chi(t_0)$. ■

Definition 2.4: The continuously differentiable function $V(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called the prescribed-time stable Lyapunov function for the system $\dot{x} = f(x, \mu)$, if $V(x)$ and its derivative along the trajectory of the system satisfy, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$,

$$\underline{\alpha}(\|x\|) \leq V(x) \leq \bar{\alpha}(\|x\|), \quad \dot{V} \leq -\tilde{\alpha}(\mu)V, \quad (7)$$

where $\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \tilde{\alpha}$ are \mathcal{K}_∞ functions and μ is denoted in (5). $\tilde{\alpha}(\mu)$ is called prescribed-time convergent gain. The inequalities in (7) are simplified as $V(x) \sim \{\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \tilde{\alpha} \mid \dot{x} = f(x, \mu)\}$. The continuously differentiable function $V(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called the prescribed-time input-to-state stable (ISS) Lyapunov

function for the system $\dot{x} = f(x, d, \mu)$ with $d \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ being the external input, if $V(x)$ and its derivative along the trajectory of the system satisfy, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}(\|x\|) &\leq V(x) \leq \bar{\alpha}(\|x\|), \\ \dot{V} &\leq -\tilde{\alpha}(\mu)V + \tilde{\sigma}(\mu)\sigma(\|d\|) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\sigma} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^e$. $\tilde{\alpha}(\mu), \tilde{\sigma}(\mu)$ and $\sigma(\|d\|)$ are called prescribed-time convergent, prescribed-time ISS gain and (normal) ISS gain, respectively. The inequalities in (8) are simplified as $V(x) \sim \{\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \tilde{\alpha}, [\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}] \mid \dot{x} = f(x, d, \mu)\}$. When d contains multiple inputs as $d = [d_1^T, \dots, d_n^T]^T$ where $d_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, the second inequality of (8) becomes $\dot{V} \leq -\tilde{\alpha}(\mu)V + \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mu)\sigma_i(\|d_i\|)$, and the inequalities are simplified as $V(x) \sim \{\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \tilde{\alpha}, [\sigma_1, \tilde{\sigma}_1], \dots, [\sigma_n, \tilde{\sigma}_n] \mid \dot{x} = f(x, d, \mu)\}$. ■

Remark 2.1: Note that the ISS gain σ in a typical ISS-Lyapunov function belongs to \mathcal{K}_∞ , and it goes to zero when the external input d vanishes. In prescribed-time control, we allow $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^e$ such that the term does not vanish even when the external input d vanishes. ■

III. A CASCADE DESIGN APPROACH

The cascade design approach has been used for the distributed convex optimization problem in [20], [21], [24]. Following the cascade design principle, the optimal agreement can be decomposed into two subproblems, namely the distributed optimum seeking and local reference trajectory tracking. To this end, we propose the controller in the general form of

$$\dot{\zeta}^i = h_\zeta^i(\zeta^i, \chi^i, \mu), \quad (9)$$

$$\dot{\zeta}^i = h_\zeta^i(\zeta^i, \zeta^i, \xi^i, \mu), \quad (10)$$

$$u^i = h_u^i(\zeta^i, \zeta^i, \xi^i, \mu), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (11)$$

where $\chi^i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}(\zeta^j - \zeta^i)$ is the relative information received by i th agent from its neighbors and $\xi^i = [(x^i)^T, (y^i)^T]^T$. ζ^i -dynamics is designed to estimate the optimum z^* of the cost function (2). The state of ζ^i can be decomposed as $\zeta^i = [(\varpi^i)^T, (p^i)^T]^T$ where p^i -dynamics can be designed to adaptively find the gradient of the local cost function $\nabla f^i(z^*)$. ζ^i -dynamics is similar to a PI controller and designed to admit the equilibrium point $\zeta^i = \zeta^{*,i} := [(z^*)^T, (p_0^i(z^*))^T]^T$ with some known function p_0^i . $\zeta^i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_\zeta}$ is the local controller state used to construct the actual control input u^i for the tracking.

A. Coordinate Transformation and Cascaded Error System

For $i \in \mathcal{V}$, define the error states

$$\begin{aligned} e_\varpi^i &= \varpi^i - z^*, \quad e_p^i = p^i - p_0^i(z^*), \quad e^i = y - z^*, \\ e_y^i &= y^i - \varpi^i, \quad e_s^i = [(x^i)^T, (e_y^i)^T, (\zeta^i)^T]^T. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Note that e_ϖ^i and e_p^i are the error from the distributed optimal value seeking, e^i is the optimal tracking error and e_y^i is the local tracking error towards the local estimated optimal value ϖ^i . Define the lumped vectors $e_\varpi = [(e_\varpi^1)^T, \dots, (e_\varpi^N)^T]^T$, $e_p = [(e_p^1)^T, \dots, (e_p^N)^T]^T$, $e_r^i = [(e_\varpi^i)^T, (e_p^i)^T]^T$ and $e_r = [(e_\varpi^1)^T, (e_p^1)^T, \dots, (e_\varpi^N)^T, (e_p^N)^T]^T$. Note that $\xi^i = [(x^i)^T, (y^i)^T]^T = [0, (z^*)^T]^T +$




Figure 1. Cascaded system $\Sigma = [\Sigma_1^T, \Sigma_2^T]^T$ with $d = [(d^1)^T, \dots, (d^N)^T]^T$.

$[(x^i)^T, (e_y^i)^T]^T + [0, (e_\infty^i)^T]^T$ and $\zeta^i = \zeta^{*,i} + e_r^i$. Then closed-loop system composed of (1), (9), and (11) can be casted into the error dynamics as follows

$$\dot{e}_r = \tilde{h}_\zeta(e_r, \mu), \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{e}_s^i = g_c^i(e_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu), \quad (14)$$

$$e^i = [0, I, 0]e_s^i + [I, 0]e_r^i, \quad (15)$$

$$u^i = \tilde{h}_u^i(e_s^i, e_r, \mu), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (16)$$

where \tilde{h}_ζ and g_c^i in (13)-(14) can be derived from the definition and

$$g_c^i(e_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{g}_x^i(e_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu) \\ \tilde{g}_y^i(e_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu) \\ \tilde{h}_\zeta^i(e_s^i, e_r, \mu) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

As illustrated in Fig. 1, the error system is in a cascaded form. With the decomposition of e^i in (15), in order to show (3), it suffices to prove the prescribed-time stability of e_r - and e_s^i -dynamics, i.e., there exist \mathcal{KL}_T^e functions β_r, β_s^i such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_r(t)\| &\leq \beta_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|, t - t_0), \\ \|e_s^i(t)\| &\leq \beta_s^i(\|e_s^i(t_0)\|, t - t_0), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

B. Prescribed-time Stabilization of Cascaded System

1) *Changing Lyapunov Function Method:* We propose three conditions sufficient for prescribed-time stabilization of the cascaded system (13)-(15).

C₁: e_r -dynamics in (13) admits a prescribed-time Lyapunov function $V_r(e_r) : \mathbb{R}^{m^N} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$V_r(e_r) \sim \{\underline{\alpha}_r, \bar{\alpha}_r, \tilde{\alpha}_r | \dot{e}_r = \tilde{h}_\zeta(e_r, \mu)\} \quad (19)$$

holds;

C₂: e_s^i -dynamics in (14) admits a prescribed-time ISS Lyapunov function $V_s^i(e_s^i) : \mathbb{R}^s \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} V_s^i(e_s^i) &\sim \{\underline{\alpha}_s^i, \bar{\alpha}_s^i, \tilde{\alpha}_s^i, [\sigma_r^i, \tilde{\sigma}_r^i], [\sigma_d^i, \tilde{\sigma}_d^i] \\ &|\dot{e}_s^i = g_c^i(e_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu)\}, \quad i \in \mathcal{V} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

holds for some $\sigma_d^i \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^e$ and $\sigma_r^i \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$;

C₃: \tilde{h}_ζ in (13) satisfies

$$\|\tilde{h}_\zeta(e_r, \mu)\| \leq \gamma_\zeta(\mu)\|e_r\|, \quad (21)$$

for some $\gamma_\zeta \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$; \tilde{h}_ζ^i in (17) and \tilde{h}_u^i in (16) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{h}_\zeta^i(e_s^i, e_r, \mu)\| &\leq \gamma_\zeta^i(\mu)\|[(e_s^i)^T, e_r^T]\|, \\ \|\tilde{h}_u^i(e_s^i, e_r, \mu)\| &\leq \gamma_u^i(\mu)\|[(e_s^i)^T, e_r^T]\|, \quad i \in \mathcal{V} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

for some $\gamma_\zeta^i, \gamma_u^i \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

Note that condition **C₁** implies that $\dot{V}_r \leq -\tilde{\alpha}(\mu)V_r$. Invoking comparison lemma leads to $V_r(e_r(t)) \leq V_r(e_r(t_0))\kappa(-\tilde{\alpha}_r(\mu))$ where $\kappa(-\tilde{\alpha}(\mu))$ is denoted in (6). Due to $V_r(e_r) \geq \underline{\alpha}_r(\|e_r\|)$, it gives

$$\|e_r(t)\| \leq \underline{\alpha}_r^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|))\kappa(-\tilde{\alpha}_r(\mu)), \quad (23)$$

showing that the state of the first subsystem goes to zero at prescribed-time $t_0 + T$ and the first inequality in (18) is achieved. In order to investigate how the e_r -dynamics affects the convergence of e_s^i -dynamics, we introduce the change of the Lyapunov function for the e_s^i -dynamics as

$$W^i(\mu, e_s^i) = \sigma_s^i(\mu)V_s^i(e_s^i), \quad (24)$$

with $\sigma_s^i \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Then, the convergence result for the whole system is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1: Consider the system composed of (1), (9), (10) and (11). Suppose the closed-loop system (13)-(15) after the state transformation satisfies conditions **C₁**-**C₃**. Define functions $\varrho_r(c, s) = \underline{\alpha}_r^{-1}(c \exp(-\int_0^s \tau^{-2} \tilde{\alpha}_r(\tau) d\tau))$ and $\varrho_s^i(c, s) = (\underline{\alpha}_s^i)^{-1}(\gamma_s^{e,i}(c)/(\sigma_s^i(s)))$ with some $\gamma_s^{e,i} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^e$ and $c \geq 0$. Suppose

$$\max\{\gamma_\zeta^i(s), \gamma_\zeta^i(s), \gamma_u^i(\mu)\} = \mathcal{S}[1/(\varrho_r(c, s))] \quad (25)$$

and there exists a \mathcal{K}_∞ function σ_s^i for (24) such that

$$\frac{d\sigma_s^i(s)}{ds} \leq s^{-2}\sigma_s^i(s)\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s)/2, \quad (26)$$

$$\max\{\gamma_\zeta^i(s), \gamma_u^i(s)\} = \mathcal{S}[1/(\varrho_s^i(c, s))], \quad (27)$$

$$\sigma_s^i(s)\tilde{\sigma}_d^i(s) = \mathcal{S}[\exp(c)\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s)], \quad (28)$$

$$\sigma_s^i(s)\tilde{\sigma}_r^i(s) = \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s)/\sigma_r^i(\varrho_r(c, s))] \quad (29)$$

hold. Then, the problem of the distributed prescribed-time optimal agreement is solved for any bounded initial condition. ■

Proof: Due to (20), one has $\dot{V}_s^i(e_s^i) \leq -\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)V_s^i(e_s^i) + \tilde{\sigma}_d^i(\mu)\sigma_d^i(\|d^i\|) + \tilde{\sigma}_r^i(\mu)\sigma_r^i(\|e_r\|)$. Taking time derivative of $W^i(\mu, e_s^i)$ in (24) and using (26) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W}^i &\leq \frac{d\sigma_s^i(\mu)}{d\mu}\mu^2V_s^i + \sigma_s^i(\mu)(-\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)V_s^i \\ &+ \tilde{\sigma}_d^i(\mu)\sigma_d^i(\|d^i\|) + \tilde{\sigma}_r^i(\mu)\sigma_r^i(\|e_r\|)) \\ &\leq -\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)W^i/2 + \tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu)\sigma_d^i(\|d^i\|) + \tilde{\gamma}_r^i(\mu)\sigma_r^i(\|e_r\|), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu) = \sigma_s^i(\mu)\tilde{\sigma}_d^i(\mu)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_r^i(\mu) = \sigma_s^i(\mu)\tilde{\sigma}_r^i(\mu)$. Invoking comparison lemma yields

$$\begin{aligned} W^i(t) &\leq W^i(t_0)\kappa\left(-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)\right) \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\int_\tau^t \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s))ds\right) \tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu(\tau))\sigma_d^i(\|d^i(\tau)\|)d\tau \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\int_\tau^t \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s))ds\right) \tilde{\gamma}_r^i(\mu(\tau))\sigma_r^i(\|e_r(\tau)\|)d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Denote the bound of $\|d^i\|$ as \bar{d}^i . Given (28) with $c = 0$, one has $\sup_{\mu \in R_p}(\tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu)/\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)) < \infty$. As a result, the second term on the right-hand of (30) can be calculated as

$$\int_{t_0}^t \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\int_\tau^t \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s))ds\right) \tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu(\tau))\sigma_d^i(\|d^i(\tau)\|)d\tau$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sigma_d^i(\bar{d}^i) \kappa \left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) \right) \\
&\quad \times \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu(\tau))}{\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(\tau))} d \left(\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) \\
&= \sigma_d^i(\bar{d}^i) \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p} \left(\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) / \tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu) \right) \kappa \left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) \right) \\
&\quad \times \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) d \left(\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) \\
&\leq \epsilon_d^i \left(1 - \kappa \left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) \right) \right), \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_d^i = 2\sigma_d^i(\bar{d}^i) \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p} (\tilde{\gamma}_d^i(\mu) / \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu))$ is a finite constant. By (23), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_r(t)\| &\leq \underline{\alpha}_r^{-1} \left(\bar{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|) \exp \left(-\int_{\mu(t_0)}^{\mu(t)} \tau^{-2} \tilde{\alpha}_r(\tau) d\tau \right) \right) \\
&= \underline{\alpha}_r^{-1} \left(\epsilon \bar{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|) \exp \left(-\int_0^{\mu(t)} \tau^{-2} \tilde{\alpha}_r(\tau) d\tau \right) \right) \\
&= \varrho_r(\epsilon \bar{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|), \mu(t)), \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon = \exp \left(\int_0^{\mu(t_0)} \tau^{-2} \tilde{\alpha}_r(\tau) d\tau \right)$. Similar to (31), due to (29) and (32), the third term on the right-hand of (30) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{t_0}^t \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) \tilde{\gamma}_r^i(\mu(\tau)) \sigma_r^i(\|e_r(\tau)\|) d\tau \\
&\leq \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) \tilde{\gamma}_r^i(\mu(\tau)) \\
&\quad \times \sigma_r^i(\varrho_r(\epsilon \bar{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|), \mu(\tau))) d\tau \\
&= \kappa \left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) \right) \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) \\
&\quad \times \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_r^i(\mu(\tau)) \sigma_r^i(\varrho_r(\epsilon \bar{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|), \mu(\tau)))}{\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(\tau))} d \left(\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s)) ds \right) \\
&\leq \epsilon_r^i \left(1 - \kappa \left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) \right) \right), \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_r^i = 2 \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p} (\tilde{\gamma}_r^i(\mu) \sigma_r^i(\varrho_r(\epsilon \bar{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|), \mu)) / \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu))$ is a finite constant. Substituting (31), (33) into (30) yields $W^i(t) \leq W^i(t_0) \kappa \left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) \right) + (\epsilon_d^i + \epsilon_r^i) \left(1 - \kappa \left(-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu) \right) \right) \leq W^i(t_0) + \epsilon_d^i + \epsilon_r^i$. Then according to (24), e_s^i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_s^i(t)\| &\leq (\underline{\alpha}_s^i)^{-1} (\gamma_s^{e,i}(\|e_s^i(t_0)\|) / \sigma_s^i(\mu)) \\
&= \varrho_s^i(\|e_s^i(t_0)\|, \mu), \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_s^{e,i}(\|e_s^i(t_0)\|) = \sigma_s^i(\mu(t_0)) \bar{\alpha}_s^i(\|e_s^i(t_0)\|) + \epsilon_d^i + \epsilon_r^i$ and $(\underline{\alpha}_s^i)^{-1}$ denotes the inverse function of $\underline{\alpha}_s^i$. (34) means the second equation in (18) is achieved. As a result, the DPTCO is achieved.

Next, we prove the boundedness of h_ζ^i , h_ζ^i , h_u^i . By (23), (25), (27) and (34), $\max\{\gamma_\zeta^i(\mu), \gamma_\zeta^i(\mu), \gamma_u^i(\mu)\} \|e_r\| \leq \varepsilon_r$, $\max\{\gamma_\zeta^i(\mu), \gamma_u^i(\mu)\} \|e_s\| \leq \varepsilon_s$ hold for some finite constants ε_r , ε_s , and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p$. Since \tilde{h}_ζ^i , \tilde{h}_ζ^i , \tilde{h}_u^i satisfy (21), (22), these inequalities imply that h_ζ^i , h_ζ^i , h_u^i are bounded for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$. This completes the proof. ■

Remark 3.1: When $\underline{\alpha}_r(s) = \underline{c}_r s^2$, $\bar{\alpha}_r(s) = \bar{c}_r s^2$, $\tilde{\alpha}_r(s) = c_r s$, $\underline{\alpha}_s^i(s) = \underline{c}_s^i s^2$, $\bar{\alpha}_s^i(s) = \bar{c}_s^i s^2$, $\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s) = c_s^i s^m$, $\tilde{\sigma}_d^i(\mu) = s$, $\sigma_d^i(s) = s^2$, $\tilde{\sigma}_r^i(s) = s^2$, $\sigma_r^i(s) = s^2$ and $\gamma_\zeta^i(s) = \gamma_\zeta^i(s) = \gamma_u^i(s) = c_\gamma s^n$ with $m, n > 1$, (25)-(29) in Theorem 3.1 are

satisfied with $\sigma_s^i(s) = s^{m-1}$ for $m \geq 2n + 1$, $c_s^i \geq 2(m-1)T^{m-1}$, $c_r \geq m + 1$. ■

Remark 3.2: Different from the asymptotic stabilization [40] and finite-time stabilization [41], the prescribed-time stabilization of a cascaded system does not only require the prescribed-time stabilization of the autonomous subsystem (in this case e_r -dynamics), but also condition on the effect of its prescribed-time convergent gain on the e_s^i -dynamics. Suppose the prescribed-time ISS Lyapunov function for e_s^i -dynamics admits $\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s) = ks^2$, $\tilde{\sigma}_d^i(s) = c_1 s$, $\tilde{\sigma}_r^i(s) = c_2 s^m$, $\sigma_d^i(s) = s$, $\sigma_r^i(s) = s^2$, where $m > 2$ is some positive integer, the upper and lower bounds of $V_r(e_r)$ in condition **C1** are $\underline{\alpha}_r(s) = \nu_1 s^2$, $\bar{\alpha}_r(s) = \nu_2 s^2$ with $0 < \nu_1 \leq \nu_2$ and $\sigma_s^i(s) = s$. In order to meet the condition (29), $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}^+} \frac{c_2}{k} \left(\frac{c}{\nu_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} s^{m-1} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^s \tau^{-2} \tilde{\alpha}_r(\tau) d\tau \right) d\tau < \infty$ must hold, requiring the prescribed-time convergent gain in (19) to satisfy $\tilde{\alpha}_r(s) \geq 2(m-1)s$. ■

2) *Time-varying State Transformation*: A common practice in the literature of prescribed-time control [32], [33] is the time-varying state transformation technique. When **C2** is not feasible, we can seek a time-varying state transformation

$$\tilde{e}_s^i = h_s^i(e_s^i, \mu), \tag{35}$$

where $h_s^i: \mathbb{R}^{n+m+m_s} \times \mathbb{R}_p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^s$ is a differentiable function. Generally, the mapping from e_s^i to \tilde{e}_s^i is nonlinear. The \tilde{e}_s^i -dynamics becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\tilde{e}}_s^i &= \tilde{h}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu) \\
&= \frac{\partial h_s^i}{\partial e_s^i} g_c^i(e_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu) + \frac{\partial h_s^i}{\partial \mu} \mu^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\dot{\mu} = \mu^2$. Due to the nonlinearity of $h_s^i(\cdot)$, $\tilde{e}_s^i = 0$ may not guarantee $\dot{\tilde{e}}_s^i = 0$. With the time-varying state transformation, the closed-loop system composed of (1), (9), and (11) can be casted into the error dynamics as follows

$$\dot{e}_r = \tilde{h}_\zeta^i(e_r, \mu), \tag{36}$$

$$\dot{\tilde{e}}_s^i = \tilde{h}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \tag{37}$$

and ζ^i -dynamics and u^i in (10), (11) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{\zeta}^i = \tilde{h}_\zeta^i(\tilde{e}_s^i, e_r, \mu), \tag{38}$$

$$u^i = \tilde{h}_u^i(\tilde{e}_s^i, e_r, \mu) \tag{39}$$

with some functions \tilde{h}_ζ^i and \tilde{h}_u^i derived from (10), (11) and (35). Similarly, $\tilde{e}_s^i = 0$ may not guarantee $\dot{\tilde{h}}_\zeta^i = 0$ and $\dot{\tilde{h}}_u^i = 0$. We modify conditions **C2**, **C3** to **C2'**, **C3'** as follows.

C2': There exists a time-varying state transformation (35) such that \tilde{e}_s^i -dynamics in (37) admits a prescribed-time ISS Lyapunov function $\tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i): \mathbb{R}^s \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i) &\sim \{\underline{\alpha}_s^i, \bar{\alpha}_s^i, \tilde{\alpha}_s^i, [\sigma_r^i, \tilde{\sigma}_r^i], [\sigma_d^i, \tilde{\sigma}_d^i]\} \\
|\dot{\tilde{e}}_s^i &= \tilde{h}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i, e_r, d^i, \mu)\}, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

holds for some $\sigma_r^i \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ and $\sigma_d^i \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Moreover, the boundedness of \tilde{e}_s^i implies prescribed-time convergence of e_s^i .

C3': \tilde{h}_ζ^i in (38) and \tilde{h}_u^i in (39) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{h}_\zeta^i(\tilde{e}_s^i, e_r, \mu)\| &\leq \gamma_\zeta^i(\|\tilde{e}_s^i\|) + \tilde{\gamma}_\zeta^i(\mu) \|e_r\|, \\
\|\tilde{h}_u^i(\tilde{e}_s^i, e_r, \mu)\| &\leq \tilde{\gamma}_u^i(\|\tilde{e}_s^i\|) + \tilde{\gamma}_u^i(\mu) \|e_r\|, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p$ where $\|\tilde{e}_s^i\|_{\mathcal{T}} = \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_p} \|\tilde{e}_s^i(t)\|$, $\gamma_s^i, \tilde{\gamma}_s^i \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}^e$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_u^i, \tilde{\gamma}_c^i \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$.

Theorem 3.2: Consider the system composed of (1), (9), (10) and (11). Suppose the closed-loop system (15), (36) and (37) after the state transformation satisfies conditions \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{C}'_2 , \mathbf{C}'_3 with

$$\max\{\gamma_c(s), \tilde{\gamma}_c^i(s), \tilde{\gamma}_u^i(s)\} = \mathcal{S}[1/(\varrho_r(c, s))], \quad (42)$$

where $\varrho_r(c, s)$ is defined in Theorem 3.1, and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_d^i(s) = \mathcal{S}[\exp(c)\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s)], \quad (43)$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}_r^i(s) = \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s)/(\sigma_r^i(\varrho_r(c, s)))] \quad (44)$$

hold. Then, the problem of the distributed prescribed-time optimal agreement is solved for any bounded initial condition.

Proof: Due to (40), one has $\tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i) \leq -\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)\tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i) + \tilde{\sigma}_d^i(\mu)\sigma_d^i(\|d^i\|) + \tilde{\sigma}_r^i(\mu)\sigma_r^i(\|e_r\|)$. Invoking comparison lemma yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i(t)) &\leq \tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i(t_0))\kappa(-\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)) \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left(-\int_{\tau}^t \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s))ds\right) \tilde{\sigma}_d^i(\mu(\tau))\sigma_d^i(\|d^i(\tau)\|)d\tau \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left(-\int_{\tau}^t \tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu(s))ds\right) \tilde{\sigma}_r^i(\mu(\tau))\sigma_r^i(\|e_r(\tau)\|)d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the deviations in (31) and (33), by (43) and (44), the bound of \tilde{V}_s^i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i(t)) &\leq \tilde{V}_s^i(\tilde{e}_s^i(t_0))\kappa(-\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)) \\ &+ (\tilde{e}_d^i + \tilde{e}_r^i)(1 - \kappa(-\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu))), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{e}_d^i &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p} (\tilde{\sigma}_d^i(\mu)/\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(\mu)) \sigma_d^i(\bar{d}^i) < \infty, \\ \tilde{e}_r^i &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_p} (\tilde{\sigma}_r^i(\mu)\sigma_r^i(\varrho_r(\epsilon\tilde{\alpha}_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|), \mu))/\tilde{\alpha}_s^i(s)) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (45) implies that \tilde{e}_s^i is bounded. Since the boundedness of \tilde{e}_s^i implies the prescribed-time convergence of e_s^i by condition \mathbf{C}'_2 , the second equation in (18) is achieved and outputs of the agents converge to the optimal solution within prescribed time. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1, by (42), we have $\max\{\gamma_c(\mu), \tilde{\gamma}_c^i(\mu), \tilde{\gamma}_u^i(\mu)\}\|e_r\| < \infty$, and then the boundedness of all signals is guaranteed. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

IV. PRESCRIBED-TIME OPTIMAL SOLUTION SEEKING

In this section, we elaborate the design of ζ^i -dynamics. The two subsystems of ζ^i -dynamics, namely ϖ^i - and p^i -dynamics, are designed as,

$$\dot{\varpi}^i = -\alpha(\mu) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}^i} (\varpi^i - \varpi^j) + \nabla f^i(\varpi^i) + p^i \right), \quad (46)$$

$$\dot{p}^i = \alpha(\mu) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}^i} (\varpi^i - \varpi^j), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (47)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$ is a differentiable function to be designed.

Let $r = 1_N/\sqrt{N} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (N-1)}$ be such that $r^T R = 0$, $R^T R = I_{N-1}$. Therefore, $RR^T = \Pi_N = I_N - \frac{1}{N}1_N1_N^T$ and $[r, R]$ is an orthogonal matrix. Define $\mathcal{L}_R = R^T \mathcal{L} R$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L} \otimes I_m$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_R = \mathcal{L}_R \otimes I_m$, $\tilde{R} = R \otimes I_m$ and

$\bar{r} = r \otimes I_m$. For a connected graph, \mathcal{L}_R is a positive matrix and $\lambda_2 I_{N-1} \leq \mathcal{L}_R \leq \lambda_N I_{N-1}$ where λ_2 and λ_N are the second smallest and largest eigenvalues of \mathcal{L} , respectively. Let $\varpi = [(\varpi^1)^T, \dots, (\varpi^N)^T]^T$ and $p = [(p^1)^T, \dots, (p^N)^T]^T$. The dynamics (46) and (47) for the group of agents can be written compactly as

$$\dot{\varpi} = -\alpha(\mu)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varpi - \alpha(\mu)\nabla F(\varpi) - \alpha(\mu)p, \quad (48)$$

$$\dot{p} = \alpha(\mu)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}p, \quad (49)$$

where $\nabla F(\varpi) = [\nabla f^1(\varpi^1); \dots; \nabla f^N(\varpi^N)]$. Note that the system (48) and (49) is in the form of (9).

Proposition 4.1: Consider (48) and (49) under Assumption 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. Let z^* be the optimal solution to the optimization problem (2) and thus $1_N \otimes z^*$ be the optimal solution to the optimization problem (4). For initial value of $p^i(t_0)$ satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^N p^i(t_0) = 0$, then

$$\varpi^* = 1_N \otimes z^*, \quad (50)$$

$$p^* = -\nabla F(1_N \otimes z^*) \quad (51)$$

is the solution of

$$0 = -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varpi - \nabla F(\varpi) - p, \quad 0 = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}p. \quad (52)$$

Proof: From (52), the solution satisfies

$$\varpi^* \in \text{span}\{1_N \otimes v\}, \quad p^* = -\nabla F(\varpi^*) \quad (53)$$

for any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Since \mathcal{G} is undirected and connected, the Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L} is symmetric and its null space is spanned by 1_N , then $1_N^T \mathcal{L} = 0$. By $\sum_{i=1}^N p^i(t_0) = 0$, left multiplying (49) by $1_N^T \otimes I_m$ yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \dot{p}^i(t) = 0 \implies \sum_{i=1}^N p^i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N p^i(t_0) = 0, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Then left multiplying the first equation in (52) by $1_N^T \otimes I_m$ yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \nabla f^i(v) = 0.$$

For the optimization problem (2), the necessary and sufficient condition for a point z^* to be the unique optimal solution is $\nabla f(z^*) = \sum_{i=1}^N f^i(z^*) = 0$, and thus we have $v = z^*$ and (50). Substituting (50) into the second equation of (53) leads to (51). \blacksquare

As introduced in Section III, we use the coordinate transformation $e_{\varpi} = \varpi - 1_N \otimes z^*$, $e_p = p + \nabla F(1_N \otimes z^*)$ with e_{ϖ} and e_p being the error variables for distributed optimal value seeking problem. From Proposition 4.1, (48) and (49), e_r -dynamics can be obtained, with $e_r = [e_{\varpi}^T, e_p^T]^T$, as

$$\dot{e}_{\varpi} = -\alpha(\mu)(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}e_{\varpi} + \nabla \tilde{F}(e_{\varpi}) + e_p), \quad (54)$$

$$\dot{e}_p = \alpha(\mu)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}e_{\varpi}, \quad (55)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \tilde{F}(e_{\varpi}) &= [(\nabla f^1(\varpi^1) - \nabla f^1(z^*))^T, \\ &\dots, (\nabla f^N(\varpi^N) - \nabla f^N(z^*))^T]^T. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.1: Consider ζ^i -dynamics in (46) and (47) under Assumption 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. Define

$$c_1 = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_2}, \frac{1 + 2\varrho_c^2}{2\rho_c} \right\}, \quad c_2 = \frac{c_1}{2} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\lambda_N} \right\}, \quad (56)$$

$$c_3 = c_1 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\lambda_2} \right\} + 1, \quad c^* = \frac{1}{4c_3}, \quad (57)$$

where ρ_c and ϱ_c are given in Assumption 2.2. If $\sum_{i=1}^N p^i(t_0) = 0$ and

$$\frac{d\alpha(s)}{ds} \leq \frac{1}{2} c^* s^{-2} (\alpha(s))^2 \quad (58)$$

holds for $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, then e_r -dynamics satisfies condition \mathbf{C}_1 with

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}_r(s) &= c_2 s^2, & \bar{\alpha}_r(s) &= c_3 s^2, \\ \tilde{\alpha}_r(s) &= 2c^* \alpha(s), & \gamma_\zeta(s) &= \max\{2\lambda_N + \varrho_c, 1\} \alpha(s). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Moreover, the bounds of e_r and \dot{e}_r satisfy

$$\|e_r\| \leq \gamma_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|) \kappa(-c^* \alpha(\mu)), \quad (60)$$

$$\|\dot{e}_r\| \leq \gamma_e(\|e_r(t_0)\|) \kappa\left(-\frac{c^*}{2} \alpha(\mu)\right) \quad (61)$$

for some $\gamma_r, \gamma_e \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

Proof: Let us introduce the state transformations as

$$\varphi := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\varphi} \\ \tilde{\varphi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{r}^\top \\ \bar{R}^\top \end{bmatrix} e_\varpi, \quad \phi := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\phi} \\ \tilde{\phi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{r}^\top \\ \bar{R}^\top \end{bmatrix} e_p, \quad (62)$$

where $\bar{\varphi}, \tilde{\varphi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\bar{\phi}, \tilde{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1)m}$. As a result, the system composed of (54) and (55) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{\varphi}} &= -\alpha(\mu) \bar{r}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi), \\ \dot{\tilde{\varphi}} &= -\alpha(\mu) (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_R \tilde{\varphi} + \bar{R}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) + \tilde{\phi}), \\ \dot{\bar{\phi}} &= 0, & \dot{\tilde{\phi}} &= \alpha(\mu) \bar{\mathcal{L}}_R \tilde{\phi}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where we used $\bar{r}^\top \mathcal{L} = 0$ and $\bar{r}^\top e_p = 0$. Let the Lyapunov function candidate be $V(\varphi, \phi) = \frac{c_1}{2} (\varphi^\top \varphi + \phi^\top \bar{\mathcal{L}}_R^{-1} \phi) + \frac{1}{2} (\varphi + \phi)^\top (\varphi + \phi)$ where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_R = \text{diag}\{I_m, \bar{\mathcal{L}}_R\}$. Then the time derivative of $V(\varphi, \phi)$ along (63) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(\varphi, \phi) &= c_1 \alpha(\mu) \left(-\bar{\varphi}^\top \bar{\mathcal{L}}_R \tilde{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}^\top \bar{r}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) - \tilde{\varphi}^\top \bar{R}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) \right) \\ &+ \alpha(\mu) \left(-\bar{\varphi}^\top \bar{r}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) - \tilde{\varphi}^\top \bar{R}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) - \bar{\phi}^\top \tilde{\phi} \right. \\ &\left. - \tilde{\phi}^\top \bar{\mathcal{L}}_R \tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{\phi}^\top \bar{R}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where we used $\phi^\top \dot{\phi} = \tilde{\phi}^\top \dot{\tilde{\phi}} + \bar{\phi}^\top \dot{\bar{\phi}}$ and $\bar{\phi}^\top \dot{\bar{\phi}} = 0$. Due to Assumption 2.2 and (62), one has

$$\begin{aligned} -\bar{\varphi}^\top \bar{r}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) - \tilde{\varphi}^\top \bar{R}^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) &= -e_\varpi^\top \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^N (\varpi^j - z^*)^\top (\nabla f^j(\varpi^j) - \nabla f^j(z^*)) \\ &\leq -\rho_c \|e_\varpi\|^2 = -\rho_c \|\varphi\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

A few facts are $\bar{\phi}^\top \tilde{\phi} = 0$, $-(\bar{\phi}^\top \bar{r}^\top + \tilde{\phi}^\top \bar{R}^\top) \nabla \tilde{F}(e_\varpi) \leq \|\phi\|^2/4 + \varrho_c^2 \|\varphi\|^2$ and $-\bar{\phi}^\top \tilde{\phi} \leq \|\tilde{\phi}\|^2 + \|\bar{\phi}\|^2/4$. Substituting (65) and the above inequalities into (64) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(\varphi, \phi) &\leq -\alpha(\mu) (c_1 \rho_c + \rho_c - \varrho_c^2) \|\varphi\|^2 \\ &- \alpha(\mu) (c_1 \lambda_2 - 1) \|\tilde{\varphi}\|^2 - \alpha(\mu) \|\phi\|^2/2. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

By (56) and (57), we have $c_1 \lambda_2 \geq 1$ and $c_1 \rho_c + \rho_c - \varrho_c^2 \geq 1/2$. Then, by (66), one has

$$\dot{V}(\varphi, \phi) \leq -\alpha(\mu) \|\text{col}[\varphi, \phi]\|^2/2.$$

Note that $V(\varphi, \phi)$ can be written as a function of e_r , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} V(e_r) &= V(\varphi, \phi) \\ &= c_1 (\varphi^\top \varphi + \phi^\top \bar{\mathcal{L}}_R^{-1} \phi)/2 + (\varphi + \phi)^\top (\varphi + \phi)/2 \\ &= c_1 \left(\|e_\varpi\|^2 + e_p^\top [r, R] \bar{\mathcal{L}}_R^{-1} [r, R]^\top e_p \right) / 2 + \|e_\varpi + e_p\|^2/2 \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 \|e_r\|^2 &\leq V(e_r) \leq c_3 \|e_r\|^2, \\ \dot{V}(e_r) &\leq -\alpha(\mu) \|e_r\|^2/2 \leq -2c^* \alpha(\mu) V(e_r), \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where c^* is given in (57). Thus, the first part of condition \mathbf{C}_1 is satisfied. From (54)-(55), one has

$$\|\dot{e}_r\| = \|\tilde{h}_\zeta(e_r, \mu)\| \leq \gamma_\zeta(\mu) \|e_r\|, \quad (68)$$

where $\gamma_\zeta(\mu) = \max\{2\lambda_N + \varrho_c, 1\} \alpha(\mu)$. Invoking comparison lemma for (67) leads to (60) with $\gamma_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|) = \sqrt{c_3/c_2} \|e_r(t_0)\|$. By (58), one has

$$\alpha(\mu) \kappa(-c^* \alpha(\mu)) \leq \alpha(\mu(t_0)) \kappa\left(-\frac{c^*}{2} \alpha(\mu)\right) \quad (69)$$

and then substituting (60) into (68) and utilizing (69) leads to (61) with $\gamma_e(\|e_r(t_0)\|) = \max\{2\lambda_N + \varrho_c, 1\} \alpha(\mu(t_0)) \gamma_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|)$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Remark 4.1: According to the proof, (58) is used to guarantee the prescribed-time convergence of \dot{e}_r . When we select $\alpha(s) = ks$ with $k \geq 2/c^*$, $\alpha(s) = ks \ln(s+2)$ with $k \geq 1/(c^* \ln 2)$, or $\alpha(s) = k_1 s \exp(k_2 s)$ with $k_1 \geq 2/c^*$, $k_2 \geq 0$, $\gamma_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|) \kappa(-c^* \alpha(\mu))$ is a \mathcal{KL}_T^e function and the first inequality in (18) holds. Since the high-order derivative of ϖ^i may not exist, the prescribed-time convergence of \dot{e}_r will play a very important role in the design of the local prescribed-time tracking controller later. \blacksquare

V. ROBUST DPTCO FOR CHAIN-INTEGRATOR SYSTEMS

Consider the chain-integrator system with uncertainties as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_q &= x_{q+1}, \quad q = 1, \dots, m-1, \\ \dot{x}_m &= u + \varphi(x, d), \\ y &= x_1, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where $x = [x_1^\top, \dots, x_m^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ is the system state with $x_q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ control input, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ system output, and $d \in \mathbb{D}$ the uncertainties belonging to a compact set $\mathbb{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{na}$. The function $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{mn} \times \mathbb{D} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ is sufficiently smooth and for each fixed d it is bounded for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ [42]. Since we deal with the optimal tracking problem for each agent separately, we omit the superscript i for simplicity when no confusion is raised. According to [43, Lemma 11.1], the function φ satisfies

$$\|\varphi(x, d)\| \leq h(\|d\|) \psi(x), \quad (71)$$

where $h \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ is an unknown positive function and $\psi(x)$ is a known positive function and is bounded for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$. Note that (70) is in the form of (1).

We follow the framework developed in Section III to solve the DPTCO problem. First, define the error as in (12), i.e.,

$$e_s = \left[(x_1 - \varpi^1)^\top, (x_2)^\top, \dots, (x_m)^\top \right]^\top,$$

where ϖ^i is given in (46) and ς is omitted in this section. Due to (18) and Theorem 4.1, it suffices to design controller u such that the prescribed-time stabilization is achieved for e_s .

Let $K = [k_1, \dots, k_{m-1}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ such that

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m-2} & I_{m-2} \\ -k_1 & -k_2 \cdots -k_{m-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (72)$$

is Hurwitz, $L_j = j - 1$ for $j = 2, \dots, m$, $\tilde{K} = [K^\top, 1]^\top$ and $\Phi(\mu)$ is

$$\Phi(\mu) = \text{diag} \left\{ 1, (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-L_2}, \dots, (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-L_m} \right\}. \quad (73)$$

where $\alpha_x \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ is a first-order differentiable function to be designed. Since the system (70) is nonlinear and has the relative degree greater than one and the reference trajectory ϖ^i does not have the higher-order derivatives, the traditional sliding-mode based tracking control cannot be applied [34]. Instead, we construct a new variable \tilde{s} as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s} &= k_1^{-1} (\tilde{K}^\top \Phi(\mu) \otimes I_n) e_s \\ &= k_1^{-1} (K^\top \otimes I_n) r_1 + k_1^{-1} (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-L_m} x_m - \varpi^i \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

with

$$r_1 = [x_1^\top, (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-L_2} x_2^\top, \dots, (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-L_{m-1}} x_{m-1}^\top]^\top. \quad (75)$$

Then, we define the time-varying state transformation as

$$\tilde{e}_s = \alpha_s(\mu) \tilde{s}, \quad (76)$$

with a first-order differentiable $\alpha_s \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ to be designed. By doing so, we introduce the time-varying state transformation from e_s to \tilde{e}_s as

$$\tilde{e}_s = k_1^{-1} \alpha_s(\mu) (\tilde{K}^\top \Phi(\mu) \otimes I_n) e_s, \quad (77)$$

which coincides with the procedure in Section III.

Define functions

$$B(s) = k_1^{-1} (\alpha_x(s))^{-L_m}, \quad (78)$$

$\delta_s(s) = \frac{d\alpha_s(s)}{ds} s^2 (\alpha_s(s))^{-1}$ and $\delta_x(s) = \frac{d\alpha_x(s)}{ds} s^2 (\alpha_x(s))^{-1}$. By (70), (74), and (76), \tilde{e}_s -dynamics can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{e}}_s &= \alpha_s(\mu) (\dot{\tilde{s}} + \delta_s(\mu) \tilde{s}) \\ &= \alpha_s(\mu) (B(\mu) (u + \varphi(x, d) + \pi(x)) - \dot{\varpi}^i + \delta_s(\mu) \tilde{s}), \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

where $\pi(x) = \alpha_x(\mu)^{L_m} K^\top \dot{r}_1 - L_m \delta_x(\mu) x_m$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r}_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} x_2; (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-L_2} (x_3 - L_2 \delta_x(\mu) x_2); \\ \dots; (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-L_{m-1}} (x_m - L_{m-1} \delta_x(\mu) x_{m-1}) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Since Λ is Hurwitz, there exist positive matrices P, Q such that $P(\Lambda \otimes I_n) + (\Lambda^\top \otimes I_n)P = -Q$. Define two constants

$$v_1 = \lambda_{\min}(Q) \lambda_{\max}^{-1}(P), \quad v_2 = 2m \lambda_{\max}(P) \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(P). \quad (81)$$

Then, we propose the following design criteria (**DC**) for \mathcal{K}_∞ functions $\alpha_x(s)$ in (74) and $\alpha_s(s)$ in (77) such that the time-varying state transformation (77) and the \tilde{e}_s -dynamics satisfy **C**'₂ in Section III-B2.

DC₁: $\alpha_x(s)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d\alpha_x(s)}{ds} \leq \frac{v_1}{2v_2} s^{-2} (\alpha_x(s))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_x(s) \leq \frac{c^*}{v_1} \alpha(s) \quad (82)$$

where v_1, v_2 are given in (81) and c^* is given in (57);

DC₂: $\alpha_s(s)$ is chosen as

$$\alpha_s(s) = (\alpha_x(s))^m \exp\left(\frac{v_1}{2} \int_0^s \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau\right). \quad (83)$$

Lemma 5.1: Consider the system (70), ϖ^i -dynamics in (46) and p^i -dynamics in (47) with time-varying state transformation (77). If conditions in Theorem 4.1 and two design criteria **DC**₁-**DC**₂ hold, then the bound of e_s satisfies

$$\|e_s\| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_s^e (\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}) \kappa \left(-\frac{v_1}{4m} \alpha_x(\mu) \right) \quad (84)$$

for some \mathcal{K}_∞^e function $\tilde{\varepsilon}_s^e$ and $\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} = \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_p} \|\tilde{e}_s(t)\|$. ■

Given in the appendix, the proof of Lemma 5.1 implies that when \tilde{e}_s is bounded for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$, the prescribed-time convergence of e_s is achieved. Therefore, it suffices to design the controller u in (79) such that the closed-loop system for \tilde{e}_s admits a prescribed-time ISS Lyapunov function as in (40) and \tilde{e}_s is bounded for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$. Then, we design the controller u as

$$\begin{aligned} u &= -(v + \psi^2(x) + 1) \text{sign}(k_1 \tilde{e}_s - \pi(x)) \\ &\quad - (B(\mu))^{-1} \delta_s(\mu) \tilde{s} \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

with $v > 0$, and function ψ defined in (71).

For simplicity, we define

$$\alpha_b(s) = \alpha_s(s) |B(s)|, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_b(s) = \alpha_s(s) |B(s)|^{-1}, \quad (86)$$

where $B(s)$ is given in (78), and $\alpha_s(s)$ is introduced in (76). Note that α_b and $\tilde{\alpha}_b$ are \mathcal{K}_∞ functions.

Lemma 5.2: Consider the system (70) with the controller (85), ϖ^i -dynamics in (46) and p^i -dynamics in (47) with time-varying state transformation (77). If conditions in Theorem 4.1 and two design criteria **DC**₁-**DC**₂ hold, then \tilde{e}_s -dynamics satisfies condition **C**'₂. Moreover, it admits the prescribed-time ISS Lyapunov function in the form of (40) (omitting superscript i) with

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}_{\tilde{s}}(s) &= \bar{\alpha}_{\tilde{s}}(s) = s/2, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_{\tilde{s}}(s) = 2v \alpha_b(s), \\ \sigma_{\tilde{d}}(s) &= h^2(s), \quad \tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{d}}(s) = \alpha_b(s)/4, \\ \sigma_{\tilde{r}}(s) &= s^2, \quad \tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{r}}(s) = \tilde{\alpha}_b(s) (\gamma_\zeta(s))^2/4, \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

where $\gamma_\zeta(s) = \max\{2\lambda_N + \varrho_c, 1\} \alpha(s)$. And the controller u satisfies **C**'₃ with

$$\tilde{\gamma}_s(s) = \varepsilon'_1 + \varepsilon'_2 s, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_u(s) = \varepsilon'_3 (\alpha_x(s))^m \quad (88)$$

for some finite constants $\varepsilon'_1, \varepsilon'_2$ and ε'_3 . ■

Applying Theorem 3.2, 4.1 and Lemma 5.1, 5.2, we obtain the following results.

Theorem 5.1: Consider the system composed of (46), (47), (70), and (85). If conditions in Theorem 4.1 and two design criteria **DC**₁-**DC**₂ hold, the DPTCO problem for the chain integrator MASs (70) is solved. ■

VI. ADAPTIVE DPTCO FOR STRICT FEEDBACK SYSTEMS

Consider m -order strict feedback multi-agent systems with parameter uncertainty as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= x_2, \\ \dot{x}_q &= x_{q+1} + \theta \varphi_q(x_q), \quad q = 2, \dots, m-1, \\ \dot{x}_m &= u + \theta \varphi_m(x_m), \\ y &= x_1, \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

where $x = [x_1^\top, \dots, x_m^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ is the system state with $x_q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is output and $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is control input. $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown constant and $\varphi_q(x_q) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ is a known function with $\varphi_q(0) = 0$ for $q = 2, \dots, m$. For simplicity, we omit the superscript i when no confusion is raised.

Assumption 6.1: [44] For $q = 2, \dots, m$, φ_q is first-order differentiable and locally Lipschitz function. ■

Remark 6.1: Under Assumption 6.1, due to $\varphi_q(0) = 0$, by the mean value theorem, there exists continuous matrix-valued function $\psi_q(x_q) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$\varphi_q(x_q) = \psi_q(x_q)x_q, \quad (90)$$

where $\psi_q(x_q)$ and its first derivative with respect to t are continuous and bounded. Without losing generality, we assume $\|\psi_q(x_q)\| \leq \bar{\psi}_q$, $\|\frac{d\psi_q(x_q(t))}{dt}\| \leq \dot{\bar{\psi}}_q$ hold for $x_q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\bar{\psi}_q$ and $\dot{\bar{\psi}}_q$ are some positive finite constants. ■

Following the procedure in Section III, we define the error states according to (12) as

$$e_s = \left[(x_1 - \varpi^i)^\top, x_2^\top, \dots, x_m^\top, \varsigma^\top \right]^\top, \quad (91)$$

where ϖ^i is given in (46) and

$$\varsigma = [\hat{\theta}, \xi_f^\top]^\top$$

is the controller state where $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the estimator of unknown parameter θ and $\xi_f = [\xi_{2f}^\top, \dots, \xi_{mf}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n(m-1)}$ is the dynamic filter variable to be designed.

To facilitate the stability analysis and simplify the derivation, we introduce the coordinate transformation as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_1 &= x_1 - \varpi^i, \quad \xi_1 = -c_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu) \tilde{x}_1, \\ \tilde{x}_q &= x_q - \xi_{qf}, \quad \tilde{\xi}_q = \xi_{qf} - \xi_{q-1}, \\ \xi_q &= -c_q \alpha_\xi(\mu) \tilde{x}_q - \hat{\theta} \varphi_q(x_q) - v_q \alpha_\xi(\mu) \tilde{\xi}_q, \\ & \quad q = 2, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

where c_q for $q = 1, \dots, m$ is to be determined, $\alpha_\xi \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ to be designed, $\xi = [\xi_1^\top, \dots, \xi_m^\top]^\top$ is the virtual controller and ξ_{qf} and $\hat{\theta}$ -dynamics are designed as

$$\dot{\xi}_{qf} = v_q \alpha_\xi(\mu) (-\xi_{qf} + \xi_{q-1}), \quad q = 2, \dots, m, \quad (93)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}} = \tau - \sigma \alpha_\xi(\mu) \hat{\theta}, \quad (94)$$

with v_q for $q = 2, \dots, m$ and $\sigma > 0$ to be determined, and

$$\tau = \sum_{q=2}^m \tau_q, \quad \tau_q = (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_q} \tilde{x}_q^\top \varphi_q(x_q). \quad (95)$$

We further introduce the time-varying state transformation for (91) as

$$\tilde{e}_s = \left[\omega^\top, \eta^\top, \tilde{\theta} \right]^\top,$$

where $\omega = [\omega_1^\top, \dots, \omega_m^\top]^\top$, $\eta = [\eta_2^\top, \dots, \eta_m^\top]^\top$, $\tilde{\theta} = \theta - \hat{\theta}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_q &= (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_q} \tilde{x}_q, \quad q = 1, \dots, m, \\ \eta_q &= (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_q} \tilde{\xi}_q, \quad q = 2, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where $L_q = m + l + 1 - q$ with $l > 0$, $q = 1, \dots, m$. By doing so, we in fact introduce the time-varying state transformation from e_s to \tilde{e}_s as

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= (\Phi_1(\mu) \otimes I_n) \Lambda_1 e_s, \\ \eta &= (\Phi_2(\mu) \otimes I_n) (\Lambda_2 e_s - \Lambda_3 \xi(e_s)), \\ \tilde{\theta} &= \theta - \Lambda_4 e_s \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

with $\Phi_1(\mu) = \text{diag}\{(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_1}, \dots, (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_m}\}$, $\Phi_2(\mu) = \text{diag}\{(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_2}, \dots, (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_m}\}$, $\Lambda_2 = [0_{n(m-1) \times (nm+1)}, I_{n(m-1)}]$, $\Lambda_3 = [I_{n(m-1)}, 0_{n(m-1) \times n}]$, $\Lambda_4 = [0_{1 \times nm}, 1, 0_{1 \times n(m-1)}]$ and

$$\Lambda_1 = \left[I_{nm}, 0_{nm \times 1}, \begin{pmatrix} 0_{n \times n(m-1)} \\ I_{n(m-1)} \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

As a result, the \tilde{e}_s -dynamics can be expressed as $\dot{\tilde{e}}_s = \tilde{h}_s(\tilde{e}_s, e_r, u, \theta, \mu)$. We propose the design criterion for \mathcal{K}_∞ functions $\alpha(s)$ and $\alpha_\xi(s)$.

DC $_\xi$: $\alpha_\xi(s)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d\alpha_\xi(s)}{ds} \leq s^{-2} (\alpha_\xi(s))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_\xi(s) \leq \frac{c^* \alpha(s)}{2L_2} \quad (98)$$

for $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where c^* is denoted in (57).

Lemma 6.1: Consider the system (89), ϖ^i -dynamics in (46) and p^i -dynamics in (47) with time-varying state transformation (97). If conditions in Theorem 4.1 and the design criterion **DC $_\xi$** hold, then the bound of e_s satisfies

$$\|e_s\| \leq \varepsilon_s^e (\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-1} \quad (99)$$

for some \mathcal{K}_∞^e function ε_s^e and $\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} = \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_p} \|\tilde{e}_s(t)\|$. ■

The proof of Lemma 6.1 is given in the appendix. It implies that when \tilde{e}_s is bounded for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$, the prescribed-time convergence of e_s is achieved. Then, the controller u is designed as

$$u = \xi_m \quad (100)$$

where ξ_m is designed in (92).

Theorem 6.1: Consider the system (89) with the controller (100), ϖ^i -dynamics in (46) and p^i -dynamics in (47) with time-varying state transformation (97) under Assumption 6.1. Suppose conditions in Theorem 4.1 and the design criterion **DC $_\xi$** hold. Then, there always exists a set of parameters c_q for $q = 1, \dots, m$, v_q for $q = 2, \dots, m$ and h such that $\Omega(h)$ is an invariant set where $\Omega(h) = \{\tilde{e}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{2mn+1-n} \mid \|\tilde{e}_s\|^2 \leq h^2\}$ and the DPTCO problem for strict-feedback MASs (89) is solved. ■

VII. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we show two numerical examples to illustrate the theoretical results.

Example 7.1: (Robust DPTCO for Euler-Lagrange MASs) Consider the Euler-Lagrange MASs as follows

$$\dot{x}_1^i = x_2^i,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_2^i &= M(x_1^i)^{i,-1} (u^i - C^i(x_1^i, x_2^i) x_2^i - G^i(x_q^i)), \\ y^i &= x_1^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 6, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_1^i, x_2^i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $x_1^i = [x_{11}^i, x_{12}^i]^\top$, $x_2^i = [x_{21}^i, x_{22}^i]^\top$, and

$$\begin{aligned} M^i(x_1^i) &= \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1^i + \theta_2^i + 2\theta_3^i \cos(x_{12}^i) & \theta_2^i + \theta_3^i \cos(x_{12}^i) \\ \theta_2^i + \theta_3^i \cos(x_{12}^i) & \theta_4^i \end{bmatrix}, \\ C^i(x_1^i, x_2^i) &= \begin{bmatrix} -\theta_3^i \sin(x_{12}^i) x_{21}^i & -2\theta_3^i \sin(x_{12}^i) x_{22}^i \\ 0 & \theta_3^i \sin(x_{12}^i) x_{22}^i \end{bmatrix}, \\ G^i(x_q^i) &= \begin{bmatrix} \theta_5^i g \cos(x_{11}^i) + \theta_6^i g \cos(x_{11}^i + x_{12}^i) \\ \theta_6^i g \cos(x_{11}^i + x_{12}^i) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_1^i = 7$, $\theta_2^i = 0.96$, $\theta_3^i = 1.2$, $\theta_4^i = 5.96$, $\theta_5^i = 2$, $\theta_6^i = 1.2$ are unknown parameters for $i = 1, \dots, 6$, and $g = 9.8$. Note that the system is in the form of the chain-integrator systems in (70) and satisfies (71) due to the structural property of Euler-Lagrange systems. The communication topology among agents is given in Figure.2.




Figure 2. The information exchange topology

The six robots are located in a thermal radiation field, and the relationship between the intensity of thermal radiation P , temperature T_{em} and distance d can be roughly expressed as

$$P \propto \frac{T_{em}^4}{\|d - d^*\|^2},$$

where d^* denotes the two-dimensional coordinates of the heat source. Suppose each robot is capable of measuring the gradient information of the heat source with respect to distance. The objective is to design controller u^i such that the six robots approach the heat source in a formation, and reduce the total displacement of the six robots from their original location. Thus, the global objective function is designed as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \sum_{i=1}^6 \iota_1^i \|y^i - d^*\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^6 \iota_2^i \|y^i - y^i(t_0)\|^2, \\ \text{subject to } y^i - y^j = \omega^i - \omega^j, \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where $\omega^1 = [1, 0]^\top$, $\omega^2 = [1/2, \sqrt{3}/2]^\top$, $\omega^3 = [-1/2, \sqrt{3}/2]^\top$, $\omega^4 = [-1, 0]^\top$, $\omega^5 = [-1/2, -\sqrt{3}/2]^\top$, $\omega^6 = [1/2, -\sqrt{3}/2]^\top$ represent the formation shape, and ι_1^i and ι_2^i are objective weights.

By defining $\bar{y}^i = y^i - \omega^i$, the optimization problem (101) is transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} \min \sum_{i=1}^6 \iota_1^i \|\bar{y}^i + \omega^i - d^*\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^6 \iota_2^i \|\bar{y}^i + \omega^i - y^i(t_0)\|^2, \\ \text{subject to } \bar{y}^i = \bar{y}^j, \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

which is consistent with (4). For the optimization problem (102), we design ζ^i -dynamics as in the form of (46), (47) such that ϖ^i converges to the optimal solution within prescribed




Figure 3. The trajectories of $e_r(t)$ and $\dot{e}_r(t)$




Figure 4. Trajectories of positions x_1^i of the six robots for $0 \leq t < T$, where \bullet and \blacktriangle denote the initial and final position, \circ denotes the equipotential lines of P .

time. Then, the reference trajectory for each robot dynamics is changed as

$$\varpi^{i'} = \varpi^i + \omega^i.$$

Replacing ϖ^i in Section IV with $\varpi^{i'}$, we can design the controller following the procedures in Section V to solve the optimization problem (101). Let the initial condition to be $x_1^1(t_0) = [1, 1]^\top$, $x_1^2(t_0) = [2, 2]^\top$, $x_1^3(t_0) = [3, 3]^\top$, $x_1^4(t_0) = [-2, -3]^\top$, $x_1^5(t_0) = [-2, -2]^\top$, $x_1^6(t_0) = [-3, -3]^\top$, $x_2^i(t_0) = [1, 1]^\top$, $\varpi^i(t_0) = [1, 1]^\top$, $p^i(t_0) = [0, 0]^\top$ for $i = 1, \dots, 6$. The initial time t_0 is set as $t_0 = 0$, and the prescribed-time scale $T = 1$ s. The parameters and gain functions are chosen as $c = 6$, $l = 2$, $k_1 = 2$, $\alpha(\mu) = 10\mu$, $\alpha_x(\mu) = \mu$, $\alpha_s(\mu) = \exp(\mu)$. The weight coefficients ι_1^i and ι_2^i for cost function (101) are chosen as $\iota_1^i = 0.5$ and $\iota_2^i = 0.1$ for $i = 1, \dots, 6$. The coordinate of heat source is set as $d^* = [0, 0]^\top$.

The simulation results are shown in Figure. 3 and 4. In Figure. 3, $e_r(t)$ and $\dot{e}_r(t)$ converge to zero within T , and thus the validity of the optimal trajectory generator designed in Section IV is verified. In Figure. 4, the six robots approach the heat source in formation within the prescribed time.

Example 7.2: (Adaptive DPTCO for strict-feedback MASs) Consider the strict-feedback MASs in the presence of parameter uncertainties as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1^i &= x_2^i, \quad \dot{x}_2^i = x_3^i + \theta^i x_2^i, \\ \dot{x}_3^i &= u^i + \theta^i x_3^i, \quad y^i = x_1^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 6, \end{aligned}$$




Figure 5. The trajectories of tracking error between each agent's output and optimal solution




Figure 6. The trajectories of $\hat{\theta}^1(t)$, $\|x_2^1(t)\|$, $\|x_3^1(t)\|$.

where $\theta^i \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_1^i, x_2^i, x_3^i \in \mathbb{R}^2$. $\theta = [\theta^1, \dots, \theta^6] = [1, 2, -1, 3, -2, -3]$. The communication topology among agents is shown in Figure. 2, and the local cost function of each agent is

$$f^i(z) = \exp((z - z_{d2}^i)^T P^i (z - z_{d2}^i)) + (z - z_{d1}^i)^T Q^i (z - z_{d1}^i) + \delta^i,$$

where $z_{d1} = [z_{d1}^1, \dots, z_{d1}^6] = 1_{2 \times 6}$, $z_{d2} = [z_{d2}^1, \dots, z_{d2}^6] = 0.5_{2 \times 6}$, $Q^1 = [0.5, -0.2; -0.2, 0.3]$, $Q^2 = [0.1, 0; 0, 0.1]$, $Q^3 = [0.1, 0; 0, 0.2]$, $Q^4 = [0.4, 0.1; 0.1, 0.6]$, $Q^5 = [0.1, 0; 0, 0.5]$, $Q^6 = [0.2, -0.1; -0.1, 0.2]$, $P^1 = [0.1, 0; 0, 0.1]$, $P^2 = [0.1, 0; 0, 0.2]$, $P^3 = [0.2, 0; 0, 0.1]$, $P^4 = [0.2, 0; 0, 0.3]$, $P^5 = [0.4, 0.1; 0.1, 0.6]$, $P^6 = [0.1, 0.2; 0.2, 0.5]$, $\delta = [\delta^1, \dots, \delta^6] = 1_6$. Using Global Optimization Toolbox in MATLAB, the optimal solution z^* is

$$z^* = [0.7263, 0.7183]^T.$$

which is used for verification only. The parameters are chosen as $c_1^i = 10$, $c_2^i = 10$, $c_3^i = 10$, $v_2^i = 15$, $v_3^i = 20$, $\sigma^i = 10$, $i = 1, \dots, 6$, $l = 1$. $\alpha(\mu) = 10\mu^{3/2}$, $\alpha_\xi(\mu) = \mu^{3/2}$. The initial values are $x_1^1(t_0) = [1, 0]^T$, $x_2^1(t_0) = [2, -1]^T$, $x_3^1(t_0) = [3, -2]^T$, $x_4^1(t_0) = [-1, 3]^T$, $x_5^1 = [-2, 1]^T$, $x_6^1(t_0) = [-3, 2]^T$, $x_2^2(t_0) = [1, 1]^T$, $x_3^3(t_0) = [1, 1]^T$, $\hat{\theta}^i(t_0) = 1$, $i = 1, \dots, 6$, and $\varpi(t_0)$, $p(t_0)$ are the same as that in Example 1.

The simulation results are shown in Figure. 5 and 6. In Figure. 5, the tracking error between each agent's output and optimal solution is bounded and achieves prescribed-time convergence towards zero. For simplicity, we only provide the trajectories of $\hat{\theta}^1(t)$, $\|x_2^1(t)\|$, $\|x_3^1(t)\|$ in Figure. 6. These trajectories show that we achieve prescribed-time convergence towards zero for $\hat{\theta}^1(t)$, $\|x_2^1(t)\|$, $\|x_3^1(t)\|$.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a novel DPTCO algorithm for a class of high-order nonlinear MASSs. A DPTCO framework

is first constructed embedding the cascade design such that the DPTCO problem is divided into optimal solution seeking for the whole system and reference trajectory tracking problem for each agent. The DPTCO framework is then utilized to solve DPTCO problem for chain integrator MASSs and strict-feedback MASSs. The prescribed-time convergence lies in the time-varying gains which increase to infinity as time approaches the prescribed time. When solving the tracking problem for the two specific MASSs, high-order derivative of reference trajectory is not required. It would be very interesting to further consider the DPTCO where the local cost functions subject to bound, equality, and inequality constraints.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Chatzipanagiotis and M. M. Zavlanos, "Distributed scheduling of network connectivity using mobile access point robots," *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 1333–1346, 2016.
- [2] J. Alonso-Mora, P. Beardsley, and R. Siegwart, "Cooperative collision avoidance for nonholonomic robots," *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 404–420, 2018.
- [3] S. Yang, S. Tan, and J.-X. Xu, "Consensus based approach for economic dispatch problem in a smart grid," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 4416–4426, 2013.
- [4] P. Yi, Y. Hong, and F. Liu, "Initialization-free distributed algorithms for optimal resource allocation with feasibility constraints and application to economic dispatch of power systems," *Automatica*, vol. 74, pp. 259–269, 2016.
- [5] T. Erseghe, "Distributed optimal power flow using admn," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 2370–2380, 2014.
- [6] X. Luan, B. De Schutter, L. Meng, and F. Corman, "Decomposition and distributed optimization of real-time traffic management for large-scale railway networks," *Transp. Res. Pt. B-Methodol.*, vol. 141, pp. 72–97, 2020.
- [7] R. Mohebifard and A. Hajbabaie, "Distributed optimization and coordination algorithms for dynamic traffic metering in urban street networks," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 1930–1941, 2018.
- [8] J. Tsitsiklis, D. Bertsekas, and M. Athans, "Distributed asynchronous deterministic and stochastic gradient optimization algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 803–812, 1986.
- [9] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [10] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [11] S. S. Kia, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez, "Distributed convex optimization via continuous-time coordination algorithms with discrete-time communication," *Automatica*, vol. 55, pp. 254–264, 2015.
- [12] S. Rahili and W. Ren, "Distributed continuous-time convex optimization with time-varying cost functions," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1590–1605, 2016.
- [13] Q. Liu and J. Wang, "A second-order multi-agent network for bound-constrained distributed optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 3310–3315, 2015.
- [14] S. Yang, Q. Liu, and J. Wang, "A multi-agent system with a proportional-integral protocol for distributed constrained optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 3461–3467, 2016.
- [15] Z. Li, Z. Ding, J. Sun, and Z. Li, "Distributed adaptive convex optimization on directed graphs via continuous-time algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 1434–1441, 2017.

- [16] S. Liang, G. Yin, *et al.*, “Exponential convergence of distributed primal–dual convex optimization algorithm without strong convexity,” *Automatica*, vol. 105, pp. 298–306, 2019.
- [17] B. Ghahserifard and J. Cortés, “Distributed continuous-time convex optimization on weight-balanced digraphs,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 781–786, 2013.
- [18] Y. Zhao, Y. Liu, G. Wen, and G. Chen, “Distributed optimization for linear multiagent systems: Edge-and node-based adaptive designs,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 3602–3609, 2017.
- [19] L. Li, Y. Yu, X. Li, and L. Xie, “Exponential convergence of distributed optimization for heterogeneous linear multi-agent systems over unbalanced digraphs,” *Automatica*, vol. 141, p. 110259, 2022.
- [20] Y. Zhang, Z. Deng, and Y. Hong, “Distributed optimal coordination for multiple heterogeneous euler–lagrangian systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 79, pp. 207–213, 2017.
- [21] B. Huang, Y. Zou, Z. Meng, and W. Ren, “Distributed time-varying convex optimization for a class of nonlinear multiagent systems,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 801–808, 2019.
- [22] Z. Qin, T. Liu, and Z.-P. Jiang, “Adaptive backstepping for distributed optimization,” *Automatica*, vol. 141, p. 110304, 2022.
- [23] H. Liu, W. X. Zheng, and W. Yu, “Continuous-time algorithm based on finite-time consensus for distributed constrained convex optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2552–2559, 2021.
- [24] Y. Tang and X. Wang, “Optimal output consensus for nonlinear multiagent systems with both static and dynamic uncertainties,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 1733–1740, 2020.
- [25] B. Ning, Q.-L. Han, and Z. Zuo, “Distributed optimization for multiagent systems: An edge-based fixed-time consensus approach,” *IEEE T. Cybern.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 122–132, 2017.
- [26] Y. Liu, Z. Xia, and W. Gui, “Multi-objective distributed optimization via a predefined-time multi-agent approach,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2023.
- [27] G. Chen and Z. Li, “A fixed-time convergent algorithm for distributed convex optimization in multi-agent systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 95, pp. 539–543, 2018.
- [28] X. Wang, G. Wang, and S. Li, “A distributed fixed-time optimization algorithm for multi-agent systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 122, p. 109289, 2020.
- [29] P. Lin, W. Ren, and J. A. Farrell, “Distributed continuous-time optimization: nonuniform gradient gains, finite-time convergence, and convex constraint set,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2239–2253, 2016.
- [30] A. Pilloni, M. Franceschelli, A. Pisano, and E. Usai, “Sliding mode-based robustification of consensus and distributed optimization control protocols,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1207–1214, 2020.
- [31] X. Wang, G. Wang, and S. Li, “Distributed finite-time optimization for integrator chain multiagent systems with disturbances,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 5296–5311, 2020.
- [32] Y. Song, Y. Wang, J. Holloway, and M. Krstic, “Time-varying feedback for regulation of normal-form nonlinear systems in prescribed finite time,” *Automatica*, vol. 83, pp. 243–251, 2017.
- [33] G. Zuo and Y. Wang, “Adaptive prescribed finite time control for strict-feedback systems,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 5729–5736, 2022.
- [34] C. Edwards and S. Spurgeon, *Sliding mode control: theory and applications*. Crc Press, 1998.
- [35] Z. Chen and J. Huang, “Global robust output regulation for output feedback systems,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 117–121, 2005.
- [36] M. Krstić, I. Kanellakopoulos, and P. Kokotović, “Adaptive nonlinear control without overparametrization,” *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 177–185, 1992.
- [37] X. Ye, “Universal stabilization of feedforward nonlinear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 141–147, 2003.
- [38] 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.
- [39] J. Holloway and M. Krstic, “Prescribed-time observers for linear systems in observer canonical form,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 9, pp. 3905–3912, 2019.
- [40] E. Panteley and A. Loria, “Growth rate conditions for uniform asymptotic stability of cascaded time-varying systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 453–460, 2001.
- [41] S. Ding, S. Li, and W. X. Zheng, “Nonsmooth stabilization of a class of nonlinear cascaded systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 2597–2606, 2012.
- [42] Y. Song, X. Huang, and C. Wen, “Tracking control for a class of unknown nonsquare mimo nonaffine systems: A deep-rooted information based robust adaptive approach,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 3227–3233, 2015.
- [43] Z. Chen and J. Huang, “Stabilization and regulation of nonlinear systems,” *Cham, Switzerland: Springer*, 2015.
- [44] Y. Song, K. Zhao, and M. Krstic, “Adaptive control with exponential regulation in the absence of persistent excitation,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2589–2596, 2016.

APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 5.1: For $\alpha_s(s)$ in (83), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_s(\mu) &= (\alpha_x(\mu))^m \exp\left(\frac{v_1}{2} \int_0^\mu \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau\right) \\ &= (\alpha_x(\mu))^m \kappa \left(\frac{v_1}{2} \alpha_x(\mu)\right) \exp\left(\frac{v_1}{2} \int_0^{\mu(t_0)} \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau\right).\end{aligned}$$

By (76), for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{s}\| &\leq (\alpha_s(\mu))^{-1} \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon_s(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}) (\alpha_x(\mu))^{-m} \kappa \left(-\frac{v_1}{2} \alpha_x(\mu)\right).\end{aligned}\quad (103)$$

Note that $\varepsilon_s(s) = \exp\left(-\frac{v_1}{2} \int_0^{\mu(t_0)} \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau\right) s$ belongs to \mathcal{K}_∞ , since $\exp\left(-\frac{v_1}{2} \int_0^{\mu(t_0)} \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau\right)$ is a finite constant. Define

$$\tilde{r}_1 = r_1 - b' \otimes \varpi^i, \quad (104)$$

where $b' = [1, \dots, 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ and r_1 is defined in (75). Note that

$$e_s = \begin{bmatrix} (\Phi^{-1}(\mu) \otimes I_n) \tilde{r}_1 \\ x_m \end{bmatrix}, \quad (105)$$

where $\Phi(\mu)$ is given in (73). Taking time derivative of \tilde{r}_1 and using (80) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{r}}_1 &= \alpha_x(\mu)(\Lambda \otimes I_n) \tilde{r}_1 + \delta_x(\mu)(A \otimes I_n) \tilde{r}_1 \\ &\quad + \alpha_x(\mu) k_1 (b \otimes \tilde{s}) - b' \otimes \dot{\varpi}^i,\end{aligned}\quad (106)$$

where $b = [0, \dots, 1]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, Λ is denoted in (72), and

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0_{m-2}^T \\ 0_{m-2} & \text{diag}\{-L_2, \dots, -L_{m-2}\} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let the Lyapunov function candidate for \tilde{r}_1 -dynamics be $V_r(\tilde{r}_1) = \tilde{r}_1^T P \tilde{r}_1$. Then, its time derivative along (106) is

$$\dot{V}_r(\tilde{r}_1) = -\alpha_x(\mu) \tilde{r}_1^T Q \tilde{r}_1 + 2\delta_x(\mu) \tilde{r}_1^T (A^T \otimes I_n) P \tilde{r}_1$$

$$+ 2k_1\alpha_x(\mu)\tilde{r}_1^T P(b \otimes \tilde{s}) - 2\tilde{r}_1^T P(b' \otimes \dot{\tilde{c}}^i). \quad (107)$$

Due to (61), (103) and Young's inequality, the terms on the right-hand side of equality (107) satisfy $-\alpha_x(\mu)\tilde{r}_1^T Q\tilde{r}_1 \leq -v_1\alpha_x(\mu)V_r$, $2\delta_x(\mu)\tilde{r}_1^T(A^T \otimes I_n)P\tilde{r}_1 \leq v_3\delta_x(\mu)V_r$, $2k_1\alpha_x(\mu)\tilde{r}_1^T P(b \otimes \tilde{s}) \leq V_r + v_4(\varepsilon_s(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}))^2\kappa(-v_1\alpha_x(\mu))$, and $-2\tilde{r}_1^T P(b' \otimes \dot{\tilde{c}}^i) \leq V_r + v_5\kappa(-c^*\alpha(\mu))$, where v_1 and is given in (81), $v_3 = 2(m-3)\lambda_{\max}(P)\lambda_{\min}^{-1}(P)$, $v_4 = \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(P)\lambda_{\max}^2(P)|k_1|^2(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{-2m}$, $v_5 = \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(P)\lambda_{\max}^2(P)(\gamma_e(\|e_r(t_0)\|))^2$ and we used $\|b\| = \|b'\| = 1$ as well as $\|\dot{\tilde{c}}^i\| \leq \|\dot{e}_r\|$. Therefore, by (82) and the above inequalities, the bound of \dot{V}_r can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_r(\tilde{r}_1) &\leq (-v_1\alpha_x(\mu) + v_3\delta_x(\mu) + 2)V_r(\tilde{r}_1) \\ &\quad + (v_4(\varepsilon_s(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}))^2 + v_5)\kappa(-v_1\alpha_x(\mu)). \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

A few facts are

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp\left(\int_{\tau}^t \delta_x(\mu(s))ds\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\int_{\tau}^t \frac{d\alpha_x(c)}{dc}\bigg|_{c=\mu(s)} \mu^2(s)(\alpha_x(\mu(s)))^{-1}ds\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\ln(\alpha_x(\mu(s)))\bigg|_{\tau}^t\right) \\ &= \alpha_x(\mu(t))(\alpha_x(\mu(\tau)))^{-1}, \quad \forall \tau \leq t, \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

and

$$(\alpha_x(\mu))^{v_3}\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{2}\alpha_x(\mu)\right) \leq (\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{v_3} \quad (110)$$

due to (82). By (109) and (110), invoking comparison lemma for (108) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} V_r(t) &\leq \kappa(-v_1\alpha_x(\mu))\left(\frac{\alpha_x(\mu)}{\alpha_x(\mu(t_0))}\right)^{v_3} \exp(2(t-t_0))V_r(t_0) \\ &\quad + (v_4(\varepsilon_s(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}))^2 + v_5)\kappa(-v_1\alpha_x(\mu))(\alpha_x(\mu))^{v_3} \\ &\quad \times \exp(2(t-t_0))\int_{t_0}^t \frac{\exp(-2(\tau-t_0))}{(\alpha_x(\mu(\tau)))^{v_3}}d\tau \\ &\leq (\lambda_{\max}(P)\|\tilde{r}_1(t_0)\|^2 + v_4T(\varepsilon_s(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}))^2 + v_5T) \\ &\quad \times \exp(2T)\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{2}\alpha_x(\mu)\right). \end{aligned}$$

where we simply replace $V_r(\tilde{r}_1(t))$, $V_r(\tilde{r}_1(t_0))$ with $V_r(t)$, $V_r(t_0)$. Therefore, utilizing the property $(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|)^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p$ for $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ where $i = 1, \dots, n$, $0 < p \leq 1$, the bound of \tilde{r}_1 satisfies

$$\|\tilde{r}_1\| \leq \varepsilon_s^e(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}})\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{4}\alpha_x(\mu)\right), \quad (111)$$

where $\varepsilon_s^e \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}^e$ is $\varepsilon_s^e(s) = \exp(T)\lambda_{\min}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(P)[(v_4T)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon_s(s) + \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{1}{2}}(P)\|\tilde{r}_1(t_0)\| + (v_5T)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$ with $\varepsilon_s(s)$ denoted in (103). By (75), (104), and (111),

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\Phi^{-1}(\mu) \otimes I_n)\tilde{r}_1\| \\ &\leq \epsilon_e \varepsilon_s^e(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}})(\alpha_x(\mu))^{L_m}\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{4}\alpha_x(\mu)\right) \\ &\leq \epsilon_e \varepsilon_s^e(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}})(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{L_m}\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{4m}\alpha_x(\mu)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

where $\epsilon_e = \max\{1, (\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{-L_2}, \dots, (\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{-L_m}\}$. By (74) and (111), the bound of x_m satisfies

$$\|x_m\| \leq |k_1|(\alpha_x(\mu))^{L_m}\|\tilde{s}\| + (\alpha_x(\mu))^{L_m}\|K\|\|\tilde{r}_1\|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq |k_1|\varepsilon_s(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}})(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{-1}\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{2}\alpha_x(\mu)\right) \\ &\quad + \|K\|(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{L_m}\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{4m}\alpha_x(\mu)\right) \\ &\leq (|k_1|\varepsilon_s(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}})(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{-1} \\ &\quad + \|K\|(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{L_m})\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{4m}\alpha_x(\mu)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

Summarizing (112), (113) and (105), the bound of e_s satisfies (84) with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_s^e(s) \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}^e$ being $\tilde{\varepsilon}_s^e(s) = \epsilon_e \varepsilon_s^e(s)(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{L_m} + |k_1|\varepsilon_s(s)(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{-1} + \|K\|(\alpha_x(\mu(t_0)))^{L_m}$. This completes the proof. ■

Proof of Lemma 5.2: Let the Lyapunov function candidate for \tilde{e}_s -dynamics in (79) be

$$V_s(\tilde{e}_s) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{e}_s^T \tilde{e}_s. \quad (114)$$

According to Theorem 4.1, $\dot{\tilde{c}}^i$ satisfies $\|\dot{\tilde{c}}^i\| \leq \|\dot{\tilde{c}}\| \leq \|\dot{e}_r\| \leq \gamma_{\zeta}(\mu)\|e_r\|$ with $\gamma_{\zeta}(s)$ denoted in (59). Utilizing (71), (83), (86) and Young's inequality, we have $\tilde{e}_s^T \alpha_s(\mu)B(\mu)\varphi(x, d) \leq \alpha_b(\mu)(\psi^2(x)\|\tilde{e}_s\|^2 + h^2(\|d\|)/4)$ and $\tilde{e}_s^T \alpha_s(\mu)\dot{\tilde{c}}^i \leq \alpha_b(\mu)\|\tilde{e}_s\|^2 + \tilde{\alpha}_b(\mu)(\gamma_{\zeta}(\mu))^2\|e_r\|^2/4$. Then the time-derivative of $V_s(\tilde{e}_s)$ along \tilde{e}_s -dynamics (79) with the controller (85) is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_s(\tilde{e}_s) &= \tilde{e}_s^T \alpha_s(\mu)(B(\mu)(u + \varphi(x, d) + \pi) - \dot{\tilde{c}}^i + \delta_s(\mu)\tilde{s}) \\ &= -(v + (\psi(x))^2 + 1)\alpha_b(\mu)\|\tilde{e}_s\|^2 - \tilde{e}_s^T \alpha_s(\mu)\dot{\tilde{c}}^i \\ &\quad + \tilde{e}_s^T \alpha_s(\mu)B(\mu)\varphi(x, d) \\ &\leq -v\alpha_b(\mu)\|\tilde{e}_s\|^2 + \alpha_b(\mu)(h(\|d\|))^2/4 \\ &\quad + \tilde{\alpha}_b(\mu)(\gamma_{\zeta}(\mu))^2\|e_r\|^2/4. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

By (114) and (115), the closed-loop system of \tilde{e}_s admit a prescribed-time ISS Lyapunov function in the form of (20) with the prescribed-time convergent gain, prescribed-time ISS gain and ISS gain given as in (87).

What is left is to prove that control input u in (85) satisfies (41). By (106) and (111)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi\| &\leq \|K\|(\alpha_x(\mu))^m(\|\Lambda\|\|\tilde{r}_1\| + \|A\|\|\tilde{r}_1\| \\ &\quad + |k_1|\|\tilde{s}\| + \gamma_{\zeta}(\mu)\|e_r\|) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} + \varepsilon_3(\alpha_x(\mu))^m\|e_r\|, \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

where ε_1 , ε_2 and ε_3 are some finite constants. And

$$\begin{aligned} &\|B^{-1}(\mu)\delta_s(\mu)\tilde{s}\| \\ &\leq |k_1|\left(\frac{v_1}{2} + \frac{mv_1}{2v_2}\right)(\alpha_x(\mu))^{2m}\kappa\left(-\frac{v_1}{2}\alpha_x(\mu)\right)\|\tilde{e}_s\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon_4\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

for some finite constant ε_4 . Since $\psi(x)$ is bounded for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$, one has $-(v + \psi^2(x) + 1)\text{sign}(k_1)\tilde{e}_s \leq \varepsilon_5\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}$ for some positive finite constant ε_5 . Therefore, by (116) and (117), the controller u in (85) satisfies (41) with $\tilde{\gamma}_s(s)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_u$ in (88) by letting $\varepsilon'_1 = \varepsilon_1$, $\varepsilon'_2 = \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_4 + \varepsilon_5$ and $\varepsilon'_3 = \varepsilon_3$. This complete the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 5.1: In order to invoke Theorem 3.2, we must check the condition (43) and (44). Due to Lemma 5.2, $\tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{d}}(s) = \alpha_b(s)/4$. Therefore,

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} [\tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{d}}(s)/(\exp(c)\tilde{\alpha}_{\tilde{s}}(s))] = (8v \exp(c))^{-1} < \infty,$$

which means (43) is satisfied. By Theorem 4.1 and (82), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho_r(c, s) &= (2c/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-c^* \int_0^s \tau^{-2} \alpha(\tau) d\tau) \\ &= (2c/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-v_1 \int_0^s \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau),\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 , c_2 and c^* are denoted in (56), (57). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}& \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} [\tilde{\sigma}_r(s) / (\tilde{\alpha}_s(s) (\sigma_r(\varrho_r(c, s)))^{-1})] \\ &= \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} [\varepsilon(\alpha_x(s))^{2m} \exp(-2v_1 \int_0^s \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau)] \\ &\leq \varepsilon,\end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon = ck_1^2 v_1^2 (2\lambda_N + \varrho_c)^2 / (4vc_1(c^*)^2)$ and we used $m/v_2 \leq 1$, which means (44) is satisfied. By Theorem 3.2, \tilde{e}_s is bounded. In Theorem 4.1, we have proved $\gamma_\zeta(s) = S[\varrho_r(c, s)]$. And

$$\begin{aligned}& \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} [\tilde{\gamma}_u / (\varrho_r(c, s))^{-1}] \\ &= \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \varepsilon_3' (2c/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\alpha_x(s))^m \exp(-v_1 \int_0^s \tau^{-2} \alpha_x(\tau) d\tau) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_3' (2c/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.2 and 5.1, all conditions in Theorem 3.2 are satisfied. Invoking Theorem 3.2 completes the proof. ■

Proof of Lemma 6.1: Due to (92), one has

$$e_s = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 - \varpi^i \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_m \\ \hat{\theta} \\ \xi_f \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_1 \\ \tilde{x}_2 + \tilde{\xi}_2 + \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{x}_m + \tilde{\xi}_m + \xi_{m-1} \\ \hat{\theta} \\ \xi_f \end{bmatrix}.$$

By (96), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{x}_q\| &\leq \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 1, \dots, m, \\ \|\tilde{\xi}_q\| &\leq \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 2, \dots, m,\end{aligned}\tag{118}$$

where we used $\|\tilde{x}_q\| \leq \|\omega\| (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}$, $\|\tilde{\xi}_q\| \leq \|\eta\| (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}$, $\|\omega\| \leq \|\tilde{e}_s\| \leq \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\|\eta\| \leq \|\tilde{e}_s\| \leq \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}$. Due to (92), the bounds of ξ_1 and ξ_{2f} satisfy $\|\xi_1\| \leq c_1 \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} (\alpha_\mu(\mu))^{-L_2}$ and $\|\xi_{2f}\| \leq \|\tilde{\xi}_2\| + \|\xi_1\| \leq (1 + c_1) \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} (\alpha_\mu(\mu))^{-L_2}$. As a result, the bound of x_2 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_2\| &\leq \|\tilde{x}_2\| + \|\tilde{\xi}_{2f}\| + \|\xi_1\| \\ &\leq (2 + c_1) \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_2}.\end{aligned}\tag{119}$$

By Assumption 6.1, one has $\|\hat{\theta}\varphi_2(x_2)\| \leq |\hat{\theta}|\bar{\psi}_2\|x_2\| \leq \bar{\psi}_2(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} + |\hat{\theta}|)\|x_2\|$, where we used $|\hat{\theta}| \leq |\hat{\theta}| + |\theta|$ and $|\hat{\theta}| \leq \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}$. Then, the bound of ξ_2 and ξ_{3f} satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\|\xi_2\| &\leq (c_2 + \bar{\psi}_2|\hat{\theta}|(2 + c_1) + v_2) \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_3} \\ &\quad + \bar{\psi}_2(2 + c_1) \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}^2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_3}, \\ \|\xi_{3f}\| &\leq (c_2 + \bar{\psi}_2|\hat{\theta}|(2 + c_1) + v_2 + 1) \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_3} \\ &\quad + \bar{\psi}_2(2 + c_1) \|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}^2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_3}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_q\| &\leq \varepsilon_{xq} (\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 3, \dots, m, \\ \|\xi_q\| &\leq \varepsilon_{\xi q} (\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 3, \dots, m, \\ \|\xi_{qf}\| &\leq \varepsilon'_{\xi q} (\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 4, \dots, m,\end{aligned}\tag{120}$$

where ε_{xq} , $\varepsilon_{\xi q}$ and $\varepsilon'_{\xi q}$ are some \mathcal{K}_∞ functions.

By (90), (96), (119) and (120), τ in (95) satisfies

$$|\tau| \leq \sum_{j=2}^m \|\omega_j\| (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_j} \bar{\psi}_j \|x_j\| \leq \varepsilon_\tau (\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}),\tag{121}$$

where $\varepsilon_\tau \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Define the Lyapunov function candidate for $\hat{\theta}$ -dynamics as $U = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\theta}^2$. Its time-derivative along $\hat{\theta}$ -dynamics is

$$\dot{U} \leq -(2\sigma - 1)\alpha_\xi(\mu)U + (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-1}(\varepsilon_\tau(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}))^2/2.\tag{122}$$

Let $U_s = (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^2 U$ and

$$\sigma = (3 + \sigma')/2\tag{123}$$

with any $\sigma' > 0$. By (122) and (98), $\dot{U}_s \leq -\sigma'\alpha_\xi(\mu)U_s + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_\xi(\mu)(\varepsilon_\tau(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}))^2$. Invoking comparison lemma, one has $U_s(t) \leq \kappa(-\sigma'\alpha_\xi(\mu))U_s(t_0) + \frac{1}{2\sigma'}(\varepsilon_\tau(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}))^2$, then $\hat{\theta}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}|\hat{\theta}(t)| &\leq (\alpha_\xi(\mu(t_0))|\hat{\theta}(t_0)| + (2\sigma')^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon_\tau(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}})) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-1} \\ &\leq \varepsilon_\theta^e(\|\tilde{e}_s\|_{\mathcal{T}}) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

for $\varepsilon_\theta^e \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^e$. Therefore, (118)-(120) leads to (99). ■

Proof of Theorem 6.1: Let $V_i = \sum_{q=1}^i \frac{1}{2}(\omega_q^\top \omega_q + \eta_{q+1}^\top \eta_{q+1})$. We use the backstepping technique to prove

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_i &\leq -\sum_{j=1}^i \bar{c}_j \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\omega_j\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^i \bar{v}_{j+1} \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\eta_{i+1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\omega_{i+1}\|^2/2 + \bar{\theta} \sum_{j=2}^i \tau_j + \alpha_\xi(\mu) \sum_{j=1}^i \pi_j \\ &\quad + (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} \|\varpi^i\|^2/2\end{aligned}\tag{124}$$

holds for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$, where \bar{c}_j , \bar{v}_{j+1} are some positive finite constants, τ_j is denoted in (95) and π_j will be defined later.

Step 1: The derivative of $\omega_1^\top \omega_1$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1^\top \dot{\omega}_1 &= \omega_1^\top (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_1} (x_2 - \varpi^i + L_1 \delta_\xi(\mu) \tilde{x}_1) \\ &= \omega_1^\top (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_1} (\xi_1 + \tilde{x}_2 + \tilde{\xi}_2 - \varpi^i + L_1 \delta_\xi(\mu) \tilde{x}_1),\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_\xi(\mu) = \frac{d\alpha_\xi(\mu)}{d\mu} \mu^2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-1}$ and we used $x_2 = \tilde{x}_2 + \xi_{2f}$ and $\xi_{2f} = \xi_1 + \tilde{\xi}_2$. By Young's inequality and (98), we have $\omega_1^\top (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_1} L_1 \alpha_\xi'(\mu) \tilde{x}_1 \leq L_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\omega_1\|^2$, $\omega_1^\top (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_1} \tilde{x}_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \alpha_\xi(\mu) (\|\omega_1\|^2 + \|\omega_2\|^2)$, $\omega_1^\top (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_1} \xi_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \alpha_\xi(\mu) (\|\omega_1\|^2 + \|\eta_2\|^2)$ and $\omega_1^\top (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_1} \varpi^i \leq \frac{1}{2} \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\omega_1\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} \|\varpi^i\|^2$. Let $c_1 = \bar{c}_1 + L_1 + \frac{3}{2}$ with any $\bar{c}_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma$, where σ is denoted in (123). Substituting ξ_1 in (92) and the above inequalities into $\omega_1^\top \dot{\omega}_1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1^\top \dot{\omega}_1 &\leq -\bar{c}_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\omega_1\|^2 + \alpha_\xi(\mu) (\|\omega_2\|^2 + \|\eta_2\|^2)/2 \\ &\quad + (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} \|\varpi^i\|^2/2.\end{aligned}\tag{125}$$

Let $v_2 = \bar{v}_2 + L_2 + \rho_2 + \frac{1}{2}\sigma$ with $\bar{v}_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma$ and ρ_2 sufficiently large ρ_2 . The term $\eta_2^\top \dot{\eta}_2$ satisfies

$$\eta_2^\top \dot{\eta}_2 = \eta_2^\top (L_2 \delta_\xi(\mu) \eta_2 + (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_2} \dot{\xi}_2)$$

$$\leq -(\bar{v}_2 + 1/2)\alpha_\xi(\mu)\|\eta_2\|^2 + \alpha_\xi(\mu)\pi_1, \quad (126)$$

where

$$\pi_1 = \|(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_3} \dot{\xi}_1\|^2 / (2\rho_2). \quad (127)$$

Note that $\dot{\xi}_1$ exists for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$ and can be expressed as

$$\dot{\xi}_1 = -c_1\delta_\xi(\mu)\alpha_\xi(\mu)\tilde{x}_1 - c_1\alpha_\xi(\mu)(x_2 - \tilde{\omega}^i).$$

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate as $V_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\|\omega\|^2 + \|\eta_2\|^2)$. By (125) and (126), \dot{V}_1 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1 \leq & -\bar{c}_1\alpha_\xi(\mu)\|\omega_1\|^2 - \bar{v}_2\alpha_\xi(\mu)\|\eta_2\|^2 + \alpha_\xi(\mu)\|\omega_2\|^2/2 \\ & + (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1}\|\tilde{\omega}^i\|^2 + \alpha_\xi(\mu)\pi_1/2. \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

Step q: Suppose (124) holds for $i = q - 1$. Let $c_q = \bar{c}_q + L_q + 2$ with any $\bar{c}_q \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma$. Substituting ξ_q in (92) into $\omega_q^T\dot{\omega}_q$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_q^T\dot{\omega}_q &= \omega_q^T(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_q}(\tilde{x}_{q+1} + \tilde{\xi}_{q+1} + \xi_q + v_q\alpha_\xi(\mu)\tilde{\xi}_q \\ &\quad + \theta\varphi_q(x_q) + L_q\delta_\xi(\mu)\tilde{x}_q) \\ &\leq -(\bar{c}_q + 1/2)\alpha_\xi(\mu)\|\omega_q\|^2 + \tilde{\theta}\tau_q \\ &\quad + \alpha_\xi(\mu)(\|\omega_{q+1}\|^2 + \|\eta_{q+1}\|^2)/2. \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

Let $v_{q+1} = \bar{v}_{q+1} + L_{q+1} + \rho_{q+1} + \frac{1}{2}$ with $\bar{v}_{q+1} \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma$ and ρ_{q+1} sufficiently large. Then, $\eta_{q+1}^T\dot{\eta}_{q+1}$ satisfies

$$\eta_{q+1}^T\dot{\eta}_{q+1} \leq -(\bar{v}_{q+1} + 1/2)\alpha_\xi(\mu)\|\eta_{q+1}\|^2 + \alpha_\xi(\mu)\pi_q, \quad (130)$$

where

$$\pi_q = \|(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{L_{q+2}} \dot{\xi}_q\|^2 / (2\rho_{q+1}). \quad (131)$$

By Assumption 6.1, $\dot{\xi}_q$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}_q &= -c_q \frac{d\alpha_\xi(\mu)}{d\mu} \mu^2 \tilde{x}_q - c_q \alpha_\xi(\mu) \dot{\tilde{x}}_q - \hat{\theta} \psi_q(x_q) x_q \\ &\quad - \hat{\theta} \psi_q(x_q) \dot{x}_q - \hat{\theta} \frac{d\psi_q(x_q(t))}{dt} x_q - v_q \frac{d\alpha_\xi(\mu)}{d\mu} \mu^2 \tilde{\xi}_q \\ &\quad - v_q \alpha_\xi(\mu) \dot{\tilde{\xi}}_q. \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

Note that $V_q = V_{q-1} + \frac{1}{2}(\omega_q^T\omega_q + \eta_{q+1}^T\eta_{q+1})$. By (128), (129) and (130), \dot{V}_q can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_q \leq & -\sum_{j=1}^q \bar{c}_j \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\omega_j\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^q \bar{v}_{j+1} \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\eta_{j+1}\|^2 \\ & + \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\omega_{q+1}\|^2 / 2 + \tilde{\theta} \sum_{j=2}^q \tau_j + \alpha_\xi(\mu) \sum_{j=1}^q \pi_j \\ & + (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} \|\tilde{\omega}^i\|^2 / 2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the claim (124) holds for $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$.

Step m: Let Lyapunov function candidate be $V_m = V_{m-1} + \frac{1}{2}(\omega_m^T\omega_m + \tilde{\theta}^2)$. Substituting (100) and $\hat{\theta}$ in (94) into \dot{V}_m yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_m \leq & -\alpha_\xi(\mu) \sum_{j=1}^m \bar{c}_j \|\omega_j\|^2 - \alpha_\xi(\mu) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \bar{v}_{j+1} \|\eta_{j+1}\|^2 \\ & + \sigma \alpha_\xi(\mu) \tilde{\theta} \hat{\theta} + \alpha_\xi(\mu) \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \pi_j \\ & + (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} \|\tilde{\omega}^i\|^2 / 2 \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

where we used (95).

For a given $h > 0$, define $\Omega(h) = \{\tilde{e}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{2mn+1-n} \mid \|\tilde{e}_s\|^2 \leq h^2\}$. Within $\Omega(h)$, one has $\|\tilde{e}_s\| \leq h$, $\|\omega_j\| \leq h$, $\|\eta_j\| \leq h$ and $|\tilde{\theta}| \leq h$. Let constants c_j for $j = 1, \dots, m$ and v_j for $j = 2, \dots, m$ be defined in the proof of Lemma 6.1. Define constant vectors

$\tilde{c}_j = [c_1, \dots, c_j]^T$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, $\tilde{v}_j = [v_2, \dots, v_j]^T$ for $j = 2, \dots, m$ and

$$\tilde{c}_{s,j} = [\tilde{c}_j^T, \tilde{v}_{j+1}^T, \sigma, \theta, h]^T \quad (134)$$

for $j = 2, \dots, m$. Following the proof of Lemma 6.1, one has

$$\|\tilde{x}_1\| \leq \epsilon_1(h)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_1}, \quad (135)$$

$$\|x_2\| \leq \epsilon_2(\tilde{c}_1, h)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_2}, \quad (136)$$

$$\|x_q\| \leq \epsilon_q(\tilde{c}_{q-1}, \tilde{v}_{q-1}, h)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 3, \dots, m, \quad (137)$$

$$\|\xi_1\| \leq \bar{\xi}_1(\tilde{c}_1, h)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_1}, \quad (138)$$

$$\|\xi_q\| \leq \bar{\xi}_q(\tilde{c}_{q-1}, \tilde{v}_{q-1}, h, \theta)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 2, \dots, m, \quad (139)$$

$$\|\xi_{2f}\| \leq \bar{\xi}_{2f}(\tilde{c}_1, h)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_2}, \quad (140)$$

$$\|\xi_{qf}\| \leq \bar{\xi}_{qf}(\tilde{c}_{q-1}, \tilde{v}_{q-1}, h, \theta)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_q}, \quad q = 3, \dots, m, \quad (141)$$

$$|\hat{\theta}| \leq \Theta(\theta, \sigma, h)(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-1}, \quad (142)$$

with some functions ϵ_q for $q = 1, \dots, m$, $\bar{\xi}_q$, $\bar{\xi}_{qf}$ for $q = 2, \dots, m$ and Θ . From Theorem 4.1, one has

$$\|\dot{\tilde{\omega}}^i\| \leq \|\dot{e}_r\| \leq \gamma_\zeta(\mu)\|e_r\| \quad (143)$$

with $\gamma_\zeta(\mu) = (2\lambda_N + \rho_c)\alpha(\mu)$. According to (135), (136) and (143), ξ_1 satisfies $\|\dot{\xi}_1\| \leq c_1(\epsilon_1(h) + \epsilon_2(\tilde{c}_1, h))(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_3} + c_1\alpha_\xi(\mu)\gamma_\zeta(\mu)\|e_r\|$. Thus, π_1 in (127) satisfies

$$\pi_1 \leq \frac{\Xi_1(\tilde{c}_{s,1})}{2\rho_2} + \frac{\epsilon_{r,1}(\tilde{c}_{s,1})}{2\rho_2}(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2}(\alpha(\mu))^2\|e_r\|^2, \quad (144)$$

where $\Xi_1(\tilde{c}_{s,1}) = c_1^2 h^2 (3 + c_1)^2$ and $\epsilon_{r,1}(\tilde{c}_{s,1}) = c_1^2 (2\lambda_N + \rho_c)^2$. According to (136), (137), (138), (140) and Remark 6.1, the terms on the right hand side of $\dot{\xi}_2$ in (132) satisfy $-c_2 \frac{d\alpha_\xi(\mu)}{d\mu} \mu^2 \tilde{x}_2 \leq c_2 h (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_4}$, $-c_2 \alpha_\xi(\mu) \dot{\tilde{x}}_2 \leq c_2 (\epsilon_3 + |\theta| \bar{\psi}_2 \epsilon_2 \alpha_\xi(\mu(t_0)) + v_2 h) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_4}$, $-\hat{\theta} \psi_2(x_2) x_2 \leq (\epsilon_\tau(h) + \sigma \Theta) \bar{\psi}_2 \epsilon_2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_2}$, $-\hat{\theta} \psi_2(x_2) \dot{x}_2 \leq \Theta \bar{\psi}_2 (\epsilon_3 + \alpha_\xi(\mu(t_0)) |\theta| \bar{\psi}_2 \epsilon_2) (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_2}$, $-\hat{\theta} \frac{d\psi_2(x_2(t))}{dt} x_2 \leq \Theta \tilde{\psi}_2 \epsilon_2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_1}$, $-v_2 \frac{d\alpha_\xi(\mu)}{d\mu} \mu^2 \tilde{\xi}_2 \leq v_2 h (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_4}$ and $-v_2 \alpha_\xi(\mu) \dot{\tilde{\xi}}_2 \leq (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{-L_4} v_2^2 h + v_2 \alpha_\xi(\mu) \|\dot{\xi}_1\|$, where ϵ_τ is given in (121). As a result, upon utilizing the above inequalities and (144), π_2 in (131) satisfies

$$\pi_2 \leq \frac{\Xi_2(\tilde{c}_{s,2})}{\rho_3} + \frac{\epsilon_{r,2}(\tilde{c}_{s,2})}{\rho_3} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2} (\alpha(\mu))^2 \|e_r\|^2, \quad (145)$$

where $\tilde{c}_{s,2}$ is denoted in (134), $\Xi_2(\tilde{c}_{s,2})$ and $\epsilon_{r,2}(\tilde{c}_{s,2})$ are independent of v_3 . Similarly, by utilizing (135)-(142), (144) and (145), step by step, it can be derived that

$$\pi_j \leq \frac{\Xi_j(\tilde{c}_{s,j})}{\rho_{j+1}} + \frac{\epsilon_{r,j}(\tilde{c}_{s,j})}{\rho_{j+1}} (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2} (\alpha(\mu))^2 \|e_r\|^2 \quad (146)$$

for $j = 3, \dots, m - 1$, where $\Xi_j(\tilde{c}_{s,j})$ and $\epsilon_{r,j}(\tilde{c}_{s,j})$ are independent of v_{j+1} . By (143),

$$(\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} \|\dot{\tilde{\omega}}^i\|^2 / 2 \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_r (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} (\alpha(\mu))^2 \|e_r\|^2 \quad (147)$$

for some $0 < \tilde{\epsilon}_r < \infty$. Note that

$$V_m = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \omega_j^T \omega_j + \sum_{j=2}^m \eta_j^T \eta_j + \tilde{\theta}^2 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{e}_s^T \tilde{e}_s.$$

Using (144), (145), (146), and (147), the bound of \dot{V}_m in (133) satisfies

$$\dot{V}_m \leq -\iota_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu) V_m + \alpha_\xi(\mu) (\sigma\theta^2/2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \Xi_j / \rho_{j+1}) + \iota_2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu))^{2L_2+1} (\alpha(\mu))^2 \|e_r\|^2, \quad (148)$$

where $\iota_1 = \min\{2\bar{c}_1, \dots, 2\bar{c}_m, 2\bar{v}_2, \dots, 2\bar{v}_m, \sigma\}$ and $\iota_2 = \bar{\epsilon}_r + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \epsilon_{r,j}(\bar{c}_{s,j}) / \rho_{j+1}$.

By (58), (60) in Theorem 4.1 and (98), the bound of \dot{V}_m in (148) becomes

$$\dot{V}_m \leq -\iota_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu) V_m + \alpha_\xi(\mu) (\sigma\theta^2/2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \Xi_j / \rho_{j+1}) + \alpha_\xi(\mu) \iota_2 (\gamma_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|) \alpha(\mu(t_0)))^2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu(t_0)))^{2L_2}. \quad (149)$$

Let us choose any σ satisfies (123) and $\bar{c}_j \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, $\bar{v}_{j+1} \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma$ for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$. As a result, the parameter \bar{c}_m is fixed and it is always possible to find an h such that

$$\sigma\theta^2 / (2\iota_1) \leq h^2 / 8. \quad (150)$$

Since Ξ_j is independent of v_{j+1} for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$, it is independent of ρ_{j+1} . For any given h , it is always possible to choose sufficiently large ρ_2, \dots, ρ_m such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \Xi_j / (\rho_{j+1} \iota_1) \leq h^2 / 8. \quad (151)$$

Then, \bar{v}_m is fixed. For any bounded initial condition $e_r(t_0)$ and $\mu(t_0)$, it is always possible to find an h such that

$$(\iota_2 / \iota_1) (\gamma_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|))^2 (\alpha(\mu(t_0)))^2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu(t_0)))^{2L_2} \leq h^2 / 4.$$

By (150), (151) and the upper inequality, one has $h^2/2 \geq \bar{\epsilon}_d + \bar{\epsilon}_r$ where

$$\bar{\epsilon}_d = \sigma\theta^2 / (2\iota_1) + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \Xi_j / (\rho_{j+1} \iota_1),$$

$$\bar{\epsilon}_r = (\iota_2 / \iota_1) (\gamma_r(\|e_r(t_0)\|))^2 (\alpha(\mu(t_0)))^2 (\alpha_\xi(\mu(t_0)))^{2L_2}.$$

When $V_m(\bar{e}_s(t_0)) \leq h^2/2$, invoking comparison lemma for (149) yields


$$\begin{aligned} V_m(\bar{e}_s(t)) &\leq \kappa(-\iota_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu)) V_m(\bar{e}_s(t_0)) + (\bar{\epsilon}_d + \bar{\epsilon}_r) (1 - \kappa(-\iota_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu))) \\ &\leq h^2/2 + \kappa(-\iota_1 \alpha_\xi(\mu)) (V_m(\bar{e}_s(t_0)) - h^2/2) \leq h^2/2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\Omega(h)$ is an invariant set. It shows \bar{e}_s is bounded which implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0+T} e_s = 0$ by (99) in Lemma 6.1. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2, we can prove that the DPTCO problem is solved. ■



Gewei Zuo received the B.E. degree in automation from Xian University of Architecture and Technology, Xian, Shanxi, China, in 2019, and the M. E. Degree in control theory and engineering from Chongqing University, Chongqing, China, in 2022. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in control science and engineering with the school of Artificial Intelligence and Automation with Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan,

Hubei, China. His research interests include Nonlinear System Control Theory, Distributed Cooperative Control and Distributed Convex Optimization.



Lijun Zhu received the Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering from University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia, in 2013. He is now a Professor in the School of Artificial Intelligence and Automation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China. Prior to this, he was a post-doctoral Fellow at the University of Hong Kong and the University of Newcastle. His research interests include power systems, multi-agent systems and nonlinear systems analysis and control.



Yujuan Wang received the Ph.D. degree in the School of Automation, Chongqing University, Chongqing, China, in 2016. She is now a Professor in the School of Automation, Chongqing University, Chongqing, China. Prior to this, she was a post-doctoral Fellow at the University of Hong Kong and a Joint Ph.D. Student at University of Texas at Arlington. Her research interests include nonlinear system control, distributed control, cooperative adaptive control, fault-tolerant control.



Zhiyong Chen (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.E. degree in automation from the University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China, in 2000 and the M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees in mechanical and automation engineering from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, in 2002 and 2005, respectively. He was a Research Associate with the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA, from 2005 to 2006. In 2006, he joined the University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW, Australia, where he is currently a Professor. He was also a Changjiang Chair Professor with Central South University, Changsha, China. His research interests include nonlinear systems and control, biological systems, and reinforcement learning.

Dr. Chen is/was an Associate Editor for *Automatica*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, and *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*.