

Distributed Feedback-Feedforward Algorithms for Time-Varying Resource Allocation

Yiqiao Xu, *Member, IEEE*, Tengyang Gong, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Zhengtao Ding, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Alessandra Parisio, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we address distributed Time-Varying Resource Allocation (TVRA) problem, where the local cost functions, global equality constraint, and Local Feasibility Constraints (LFCs) vary with time. To track the optimal trajectories, algorithms that mimic the structure of feedback-feedforward control systems are proposed. We begin with their conceptual design in the absence of LFCs, developing a feedback-feedforward algorithm that is fixed-time convergent. For cases with LFCs, existing approaches predominantly rely on constructing a time-dependent barrier function, which may impede the design of fixed-time convergent algorithms. Therefore, by exploring the connection between projection and penalty functions, switched feedforward laws are tailored to handle LFCs, with projection used in conjunction. Based on this, we develop a projection-based feedback-feedforward algorithm, which converges to the exact optimal trajectories, possibly along with a number of switching instants, while exhibiting fixed-time convergence between consecutive switching instants. Numerical experiments verify the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms.

Index Terms—Distributed optimization, time-varying optimization, resource allocation.

I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY, there has been a notable surge in research on Time-Varying Optimization (TVO), which aims to predict and track the unknown optimal trajectories of engineering systems as they vary with time [1]. This growing interest spans across various applications, including power electronic converters [2], power distribution networks [3], vehicular systems [4], and quadrotors [5], [6]. A practically significant but challenging category of TVO problems is the Time-Varying Resource Allocation (TVRA) problem, which seeks to determine the optimal allocation of resources, often with limited availability, to activities characterized by time-varying cost functions and constraints.

In many cases, TVO requires real-time decision-making. The introduction of time-varying characteristics increases the problem's complexity, which is particularly pronounced in

TVRA due to more numerous and challenging constraints. Unlike time-invariant optimization algorithms that assume static conditions, solving TVO problems necessitates algorithms continuously adapting to current conditions so as to track the optimal trajectories. The complexity is further compounded in multiagent systems, where each agent has a limited view of the overall problem and requires information exchange for distributed problem-solving. While there is extensive literature on distributed time-invariant optimization, results on distributed TVO are scarce, and even more limited on distributed TVRA.

A. Related Work

The research of TVO can be traced back to some preliminary results [1], [7], where problems are sampled at discrete time steps. In this setting, each time step involves computations to correct the candidate solution with newly sampled data and to predict how the optimal trajectory will evolve at the next time step, hence referred to as the “prediction-correction method” [1]. Then, a continuous-time version of this method is proposed in [8], targeting the centralized TVRA problem with a time-varying cost function, inequality constraint, and affine equality constraint. However, applying the prediction-correction method to multiagent systems is hindered because both the prediction term and the correction term require global information, particularly the Hessian inverse, which is difficult to decompose [9]. Although a decentralized approximation of the Hessian inverse is achievable by truncating its Taylor expansion, this approach first requires augmented Lagrangian relaxation, which inevitably incurs an optimality gap between the relaxed and original problems [9].

Most research considers distributed TVO problems subject to state consensus constraints, under which the prediction and correction terms directly mirror the feedforward and feedback laws in control. Thus, alternatives to the prediction-correction method are investigated in [10], involving a class of continuous-time algorithms that utilize finite-time control techniques to track the optimal trajectories; the tracking errors are proven to be uniformly ultimately bounded, but they persist due to the absence of a feedforward law to predict the time variations. In [11], a fixed-time consensus protocol is developed to estimate the global information required by the feedback laws; despite being time-varying, the Hessians are assumed to be identical such that the feedforward laws can be locally computed by each agent. It has been generally

This work was partially supported by EPSRC projects: Supergrid Energy Networks Impact Hub (EP/Y016114/1), Multi-energy Control of Cyber-Physical Urban Energy Systems (EP/T021969/1), and Grid Scale Thermal and Thermo-Chemical Electricity Storage (EP/W027860/1).

Yiqiao Xu, Tengyang Gong, Zhengtao Ding, and Alessandra Parisio are with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, The University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL U.K. (e-mail: yiqiao.xu; tengyang.gong; zhengtao.ding; alessandra.parisio@manchester.ac.uk).

acknowledged that distributed estimators, introduced by a pioneering study in [12], play a crucial role in cases of non-identical Hessians, allowing the assumption of identical Hessians to be circumvented [13]–[16]. Specifically, [15] proposes a fixed-time distributed estimator to handle affine formation constraints defined by stress matrices, achieving exponential rate vanishing of tracking errors. In a similar way, algorithms for multi-objective distributed TVO problems over switching graphs are devised in [16], achieving fixed-time consensus followed by exponential convergence to the Pareto front.

However, distributed TVRA faces greater challenges, as constraints less tractable would be expected, such as global equality constraints, global inequality constraints, and Local Feasibility Constraints (LFCs). In recent years, a series of distributed algorithms for distributed TVRA have been proposed, assuming strongly convex local cost functions: 1) with time-invariant Hessians [17], 2) with identical time-varying Hessians [18], [19], and 3) with non-identical time-varying Hessians [5], [20]. Using an output regulation approach, the author of [21] shows that the desired feedforward laws can be estimated in a distributed way without using signum functions, yet this is restricted to periodic time variations. Hence, finite-time or fixed-time techniques are necessary, not only for dealing with aperiodic time variations but also for providing a convergence time guarantee. In [22] and [20], fixed-time and finite-time convergent algorithms are proposed for centralized and distributed TVRA, respectively.

Despite being prevalent in real-world problems, LFCs are often overlooked in related works on distributed TVRA. For example, [20] addresses the challenge of the Hessian inverse through a dual transformation, which becomes challenging in the presence of LFCs. The feedforward design in [21], and similarly in [5], [17], [19], [22], can only tackle equality constraints, and the presence of LFCs makes optimal trajectories increasingly difficult to estimate and track. In general, existing approaches to handle LFCs include using a smooth penalty function [18], logarithmic barrier function [6], [14], and projection [10], [23]. It is worth noting that only the latter two can retain the exact optimal solution. The idea behind [6], [14] is to incorporate a time-dependent barrier parameter and a time-dependent slack variable such that the barrier becomes closer to the indicator function as time approaches infinity, building upon the interior-point method in [8]. Due to the time dependence, achieving finite-time or fixed-time tracking of the optimal trajectories becomes challenging.

In this regard, directly projecting the primal variables onto the feasible region, as done in [10], [23], is promising. However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no existing projection-based algorithm achieves vanishing tracking errors: [10] demonstrates non-vanishing tracking errors, while [23] introduces a regularization term to enforce strong monotonicity in the saddle-point map, resulting in a regularized solution. Therefore, projection-based algorithms that converge to exact optimal trajectories with a convergence time guarantee remain to be explored. For this, existing results on time-invariant optimization [24], [25] can provide some insights.

B. Contribution Statement

This paper considers distributed TVRA problems defined by strongly convex local cost functions, LFCs, and a global equality constraint, all of which are time-varying. Additionally, the local cost functions may have non-identical time-varying Hessians. Inspired by [8], [21], two algorithms that mimic the structure of feedback-feedforward control systems are synthesized for distributed TVRA problems: one for cases without LFCs and one for cases with LFCs. Their conceptual design consists of two parts: a distributed estimator responsible for calculating the desired feedforward laws, and a distributed optimization algorithm that integrates feedback laws and feedforward laws for updating the candidate solution. Both the algorithms are fully distributed. The main contributions of this paper are four-fold:

- 1) A feedback-feedforward algorithm is proposed for cases without LFCs. The algorithm is fixed-time convergent under mild conditions, achieving fixed-time consensus of the local estimates and then fixed-time tracking of the optimal trajectories.
- 2) The presence of LFCs causes the optimal trajectories to evolve diversely for the interior and boundary of the feasible region. By exploring the connection between projection and penalty functions, switched feedforward laws are tailored to handle the LFCs along with the use of projection.
- 3) A projection-based feedback-feedforward algorithm is proposed for cases with LFCs. The switching of feedforward laws is commanded by a state-dependent switching signal, synchronized with the use of projection. The projection-based algorithm converges to the exact optimal trajectories, possibly along with a number of switching instants, while exhibiting fixed-time convergence between consecutive switching instants.
- 4) The projection-based algorithm is initialization-free, ensuring local feasibility once entering the feasible region by projecting the primal variables onto it. With some extensions, it applies to time-varying global inequality constraint as well.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces some preliminary concepts and mathematical background. Section III introduces the studied problems and the proposed algorithms. Section IV verifies the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms through numerical experiments. Section V concludes this paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

1) *Notations*: The following notations are used throughout this paper. \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+ , \mathbb{R}_{++} , and \mathbb{R}^n denote real numbers, non-negative real numbers, positive real numbers, and real column vectors of dimension n , respectively; $|\cdot|$, $\|\cdot\|_1$, $\|\cdot\|_2$, and $\|\cdot\|_p$ represent the absolute value, 1-norm, 2-norm, and p -norm of (\cdot) , respectively; $\text{sign}(\cdot)$ represents the signum function.

2) *Graph Theory*: The communication network among agents labeled from 1 to n is represented by a graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the vertex set and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ is the edge set. A vertex on graph \mathcal{G} represents an

agent and the existence of an edge (v_i, v_j) means agent i can receive certain information from agent j , but not necessarily vice versa. This connection is described by $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $a_{ij} = 1$ if $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. An edge is undirected if and only if $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$. Define the Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L} = [l_{ij}]_{n \times n}$ associated with the graph \mathcal{G} by $l_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}$ and $l_{ij} = -a_{ij}$ whenever $j \neq i$. The graph \mathcal{G} is said to be connected if, given any distinct agents, there is a spanning tree connecting them, and undirected if the adjacency matrix is symmetric. For an undirected graph, zero is a simple eigenvalue of \mathcal{L} if and only if it is connected. The smallest nonzero eigenvalue of \mathcal{L} is denoted by $\eta_2(\mathcal{L})$.

3) Convex Analysis:

Definition 1: A set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex if and only if, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$, the point $\theta x + (1 - \theta)y$ also belongs to \mathcal{X} .

Definition 2: A differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex over a convex set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, $\langle \nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0$. It is called strongly convex over \mathcal{X} if $\nabla^2 f(x) \succeq mI$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $m \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and I is the identity matrix.

Definition 3: Denote the projection of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}(x) = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \|y - x\|_2^2. \quad (1)$$

The normal cone of a point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}(x) = \{c \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}(x + c) = x\}. \quad (2)$$

4) Fixed-Time Stability:

Definition 4: Consider a multiagent system with state variables $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It is said to achieve fixed-time consensus if, for all agents $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\|_2 = 0, \quad (3a)$$

$$\|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\|_2 = 0, \quad \forall t \geq T, \quad (3b)$$

where $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is upper bounded by $T^{\max} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, independent of initial states.

Lemma 1 [26]: Given a differential equation

$$\dot{V} \leq -\gamma_1 V^{1-\frac{p}{q}} - \gamma_2 V^{1+\frac{p}{q}}, \quad (4)$$

where $V \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, p is an even integer, and q is an odd integer satisfying $p < q$. The origin is fixed-time stable for (4) and the settling time T satisfies

$$T \leq T^{\max} = \frac{\pi q}{2p\sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2}}. \quad (5)$$

III. MAIN RESULTS

Many problems in engineering systems can be formulated as convex optimization problems, which become TVO problems if there is an explicit time dependence in cost functions and/or constraints. In this section, we present our main results on distributed TVRA, starting with a case without LFCs.

TABLE I: List of key notations for each agent.

f_i	local cost function
g_i^m, g_i^M	local feasibility constraints
A_i, b_i	elements of the global equality constraint
x_i	primal variable
λ_i	dual variable
f_{ix}	partial derivative of f_i with respect to x_i
f_{ixx}, f_{ixt}	partial derivatives of f_{ix} with respect to x_i and t
g_{it}^m, g_{it}^M	partial derivatives of g_i^m and g_i^M with respect to t
b_{it}	partial derivative of b_i with respect to t
$F_{x,i}, F_{\lambda,i}$	feedback laws
$\alpha_{x,i}, \alpha_{\lambda,i}$	feedforward laws
y_i	local estimate of λ^*
ψ_i, ψ'_i	intermediate local estimates
e_i	error of stationarity condition
σ_i	state-dependent switching signal

A. Feedback-Feedforward Algorithm

Consider a distributed TVRA problem where both the cost functions and the global equality constraint explicitly vary with time. The goal is to find the optimal trajectories for each agent that minimize the total cost and allocate the resources to activities. Each agent holds a local cost function and partial information about the global equality constraint, which cannot be revealed to others. The problem is formulated as

$$x^*(t) = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i, t), \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(t). \quad (6b)$$

For agent i , $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the allocated resource, $x^*(t)$ denotes its optimal trajectory, $f_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the local cost function, $A_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an allocation coefficient, and $b_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents the activity.

Assumption 1: The local cost function $f_i(x_i, t)$ is strongly convex in x_i and continuously differentiable with respect to t for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Assumption 2: The communication graph \mathcal{G} is fixed, connected, and undirected.

Solving problem The optimal trajectories to track are unknown, but the time variations can be comprehended by examining the problem formulation. Let $z = \operatorname{col}(x, \lambda)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be the Lagrangian multiplier associated with (6b). The Lagrangian of problem (6) is given by

$$L(z, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i, t) + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t)). \quad (7)$$

Lemma 2 [8]: Denote $z^*(t)$ as the optimal trajectories for (7). Under Assumption 1, the time variations of $z^*(t)$ can be described by

$$\dot{z}^*(t) = -\nabla_{zz}^{-1} L(z^*(t), t) \nabla_{zt} L(z^*(t), t), \quad (8)$$

where $\nabla_{zz} L(z, t)$ and $\nabla_{zt} L(z, t)$ are Hessians of $L(z, t)$.

Based on [21], a distributed optimization algorithm for solving problem (6) can be synthesized as

$$\dot{z}_i = \operatorname{col}(0, -\mathcal{C}_i(\lambda)) - F_i(z_i, t) + \alpha_i(z_i, y_i, t), \quad (9)$$

where $z_i = \text{col}(x_i, \lambda_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ represents the primal-dual variable for each agent, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a local estimate that predicts the time variations, $F_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\alpha_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ summarize the feedback and feedforward laws, respectively, $\lambda = \text{col}(\lambda_i)$, and $\mathcal{C}_i(\cdot)$ represents a fixed-time consensus protocol to exchange information and reach agreement on (\cdot) :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_i(\lambda) &= \gamma_{\lambda,1} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \\ &\quad + \gamma_{\lambda,2} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^{1+\frac{p}{q}} \\ &\quad + \gamma_{\lambda,3} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \text{sign}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\gamma_{\lambda,1}, \gamma_{\lambda,2}, \gamma_{\lambda,3} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, p is an even integer, q is an odd integer satisfying $p < q$, and $\text{sign}(\cdot)$ is the signum function.

Given $\mathcal{C}_i(\lambda^*(t)) = 0$, the optimal trajectories satisfy

$$\dot{z}_i^*(t) = -F_i(z_i^*(t), t) + \alpha_i(z_i^*(t), y_i^*(t), t), \quad (11)$$

and hence we expect to see

$$\alpha_i(z_i^*(t), y_i^*(t), t) = \dot{z}_i^*(t), \quad (12a)$$

$$F_i(z_i^*(t), t) = \mathbf{0}_2, \quad (12b)$$

Achieving (12a) requires the feedforward laws to be able to predict and cancel the time variations, while (12b) indicates that the feedback laws must be designed in a way such that the KKT conditions are consistently satisfied. These lead to our design of the distributed estimator and the distributed optimization algorithm.

1) Distributed Estimator: In the following, we propose the distributed estimator based on [12], [21]. First, it produces a local estimate of $\dot{\lambda}^*(t)$ using:

$$y_i = \begin{cases} \psi_i^{-1} \psi'_i & \text{if } \psi_i \geq \epsilon, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (13a)$$

$$\dot{\theta}_i = -\mathcal{C}_i(\psi), \quad (13b)$$

$$\psi_i = \theta_i + \rho_i(x_i, t), \quad (13c)$$

$$\dot{\theta}'_i = -\mathcal{C}_i(\psi'), \quad (13d)$$

$$\psi'_i = \theta'_i - \phi_i(x_i, t), \quad (13e)$$

where $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a local estimate of $\dot{\lambda}^*(t)$; $\psi_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi'_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are local estimates of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t)$ and $-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i, t)$, respectively; $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is an appropriately small constant to avoid singularity issues; $\theta_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta'_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ are auxiliary variables; $\mathcal{C}_i(\psi)$ and $\mathcal{C}_i(\psi')$ follow the same design of $\mathcal{C}_i(\lambda)$ but may have different parameters; and $\rho_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are defined by

$$\rho_i(x_i, t) = A_i f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) A_i, \quad (13f)$$

$$\phi_i(x_i, t) = A_i f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) f_{ixt}(x_i, t) + b_{it}(t). \quad (13g)$$

Then, it outputs the feedforward laws according to:

$$\alpha_{x,i} = -f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) (A_i y_i + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)), \quad (13h)$$

$$\alpha_{\lambda,i} = y_i, \quad (13i)$$

where $\alpha_{x,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the feedforward law for x_i , $\alpha_{\lambda,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the feedforward law for λ_i , and $\text{col}(\alpha_{x,i}, \alpha_{\lambda,i}) = \alpha_i(z_i, y_i, t)$.

Remark 1: Due to the use of dynamical systems for estimation, ψ_i can be arbitrarily small or singular before converging to $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t)$. Thus, it is necessary to set y_i to 0 for $\mathcal{C}_i(\psi) \neq 0$, as done in (13c), to prevent singularity issues. Without this measure, performance degradation or even failure of the feedback-feedforward algorithms could occur.

2) Distributed Optimization Algorithm: The distributed optimization algorithm that employs the feedback and feedforward laws for updating the candidate solution is proposed as follows:

$$\dot{x}_i = -F_{x,i} + \alpha_{x,i}, \quad (14a)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}_i = -\mathcal{C}_i(\lambda) - F_{\lambda,i} + \alpha_{\lambda,i}, \quad (14b)$$

$$e_i = f_{ix}(x_i, t) + A_i \lambda_i, \quad (14c)$$

$$F_{x,i} = \kappa_x f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) (\gamma_{e,1} e_i^{1-\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,2} e_i^{1+\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,3} \text{sign}(e_i)), \quad (14d)$$

$$F_{\lambda,i} = \kappa_\lambda (b_i(t) - A_i x_i). \quad (14e)$$

Here is an illustration of (14): $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the primal variable; $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a local estimate of the Lagrangian multiplier; $F_{x,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $F_{\lambda,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ are the feedback laws; $\alpha_{x,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_{\lambda,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ are the feedforward laws defined by (13h)–(13i); $e_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an error term with respect to the stationarity condition, where $e_i = 0$ indicates that the stationarity condition is satisfied; $\mathcal{C}_i(\lambda)$ is defined by (10); and $\kappa_x, \kappa_\lambda, \gamma_{e,1}, \gamma_{e,2}, \gamma_{e,3} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ are control gains. Recall that, in addition to the feedforward laws, it is important to ensure that (12b) is consistently satisfied to enable tracking of the optimal trajectories. Regarding this, we implement fixed-time control in (14d) to restore e_i to the origin within a fixed time. In fact, the global equality constraint in (6b) can be concurrently met owing to fixed-time stability, and (12b) follows. Problem (6) is solved when both y_i and λ_i achieve consensus and $e_i = 0$ is restored for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

3) Convergence Analysis:

Assumption 3: There exist $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\|\dot{\rho}_i(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_1$ and $\|\dot{\phi}_i(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_2$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Lemma 3: Consider problem (6) with Assumptions 1-3. Let $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i(0) = 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta'_i(0) = 0$, $\gamma_{\psi,3} \geq 2nC_1$, and $\gamma_{\psi',3} \geq 2nC_2$, then (13a) reaches

$$y_i(t) \rightarrow - \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t) \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i, t) \quad (15)$$

within a fixed time. Furthermore, $\alpha_{x,i}(t) \rightarrow \dot{x}_i^*(t)$ and $\alpha_{\lambda,i}(t) \rightarrow \dot{\lambda}^*(t)$ as $x_i(t) \rightarrow x_i^*(t)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Proof: By summing (13c) over $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we find $\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i(0) + \int_0^t \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\theta}_i dt + \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t)$ if $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i(0) = 0$. Similarly, setting $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta'_i(0) = 0$ for (13e) leads to $\sum_{i=1}^n \psi'_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta'_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i, t) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i, t)$. We can obtain from the above that

$$\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi'_i = - \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t) \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i, t). \quad (16)$$

To obtain (15), it remains to show $\psi_i = \psi_j$ and $\psi'_i = \psi'_j$ at the convergent solution. Considering the similarity in analyzing ψ'_i , the subsequent analysis concentrates on ψ_i . Define the consensus error by $e_{\psi_i} = \psi_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_j$ and construct a Lyapunov candidate function $W_\psi = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_{\psi_i}\|_2^2$. The time derivative of W_ψ is given by $\dot{W}_\psi = \sum_{i=1}^n e_{\psi_i}^\top \left[\dot{\psi}_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{\psi}_j \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n e_{\psi_i}^\top \dot{\psi}_i$ due to $\sum_{i=1}^n e_{\psi_i} = 0$. Now we divide \dot{W}_ψ into three parts: $\dot{W}_{\psi,1}$, relating to $(\cdot)^{1-\frac{p}{q}}$; $\dot{W}_{\psi,2}$, relating to $(\cdot)^{1+\frac{p}{q}}$; $\dot{W}_{\psi,3}$, relating to the remaining terms. The first part can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W}_{\psi,1} &= -\frac{\gamma_{\psi,1}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} e_{\psi_i}^\top (e_{\psi_i} - e_{\psi_j})^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \\ &\quad - \frac{\gamma_{\psi,1}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ji} e_{\psi_j}^\top (e_{\psi_j} - e_{\psi_i})^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \\ &= -\frac{\gamma_{\psi,1}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \|e_{\psi_i} - e_{\psi_j}\|_{2-\frac{p}{q}}^{2-\frac{p}{q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Similarly, the second part can be obtained as

$$\dot{W}_{\psi,2} = -\frac{\gamma_{\psi,2}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \|e_{\psi_i} - e_{\psi_j}\|_{2+\frac{p}{q}}^{2+\frac{p}{q}}. \quad (18)$$

For the third part, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W}_{\psi,3} &= -\frac{\gamma_{\psi,3}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \|e_{\psi_i} - e_{\psi_j}\|_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n e_{\psi_i} \dot{\rho}_i(x_i, t) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} -\left(\frac{\gamma_{\psi,3}}{2} - nC_1\right) \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|e_{\psi_i} - e_{\psi_j}\|_1 \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

for $\gamma_{\psi,3} \geq 2nC_1$, where $\|e_i\|_2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|e_i - e_j\|_1$ and $\|\dot{\rho}_i(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_1$ have been used for deriving $\stackrel{(a)}{\leq}$. The combination of (17)–(19) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W}_\psi &\leq -\frac{\gamma_{\psi,1}}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \|e_{\psi_i} - e_{\psi_j}\|_2^{2-\frac{p}{q}} \right]^{1-\frac{p}{2q}} \\ &\quad - \frac{\gamma_{\psi,2}}{2n^{\frac{p}{q}}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \|e_{\psi_i} - e_{\psi_j}\|_2^{2+\frac{p}{q}} \right]^{1+\frac{p}{2q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

By Lemma 1 [26], we know e_{ψ_i} is fixed-time stable and ψ_i converges to $\bar{\psi}$ within a fixed time. The settling time $T_{\bar{\psi}}$ satisfies $T_{\bar{\psi}} \leq T_{\bar{\psi}}^{\max} = (\gamma_{\psi,1}\gamma_{\psi,2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_0$, where $T_0 = \pi q n^{\frac{p}{2q}} / (2p\eta_2(\mathcal{L}))$. Provided that $\|\dot{\phi}_i(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_2$ and $\gamma_{\psi',3} \geq 2nC_2$, ψ'_i converges to $\bar{\psi}'$ within a fixed time as well, and the settling time $T_{\bar{\psi}'}$ satisfies $T_{\bar{\psi}'} \leq T_{\bar{\psi}'}^{\max} = (\gamma_{\psi',1}\gamma_{\psi',2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_0$. Then we have $\psi_i = \psi_j$ and $\psi'_i = \psi'_j$, and hence $y_i = y_j$ for all $t \geq T_{\bar{y}}$ and $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, where

$$T_{\bar{y}} \leq T_{\bar{y}}^{\max} = \max\{(\gamma_{\psi,1}\gamma_{\psi,2})^{-\frac{1}{2}}, (\gamma_{\psi',1}\gamma_{\psi',2})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\} T_0. \quad (21)$$

Recall (16) and (13f)–(13g), we have (15).

In what follows, we show $\alpha_{x,i}(t) \rightarrow \dot{x}_i^*(t)$ and $\alpha_{\lambda,i}(t) \rightarrow \dot{\lambda}^*(t)$ as $x_i(t) \rightarrow x_i^*(t)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. According to convex

optimization theory, the KKT conditions are established at the optimal trajectories:

$$0 = f_{ix}(x_i^*(t), t) + A_i \lambda^*(t), \quad (22a)$$

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i^*(t) - b_i(t)). \quad (22b)$$

Thus, the time derivatives of (22) satisfy

$$0 = f_{ixx}(x_i^*(t), t) \dot{x}_i^*(t) + f_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t) + A_i \dot{\lambda}^*(t), \quad (23a)$$

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i \dot{x}_i^*(t) - \dot{b}_{it}(t)), \quad (23b)$$

which are referred to as the derivative optimality conditions in this paper. Since $f_i(x_i, t)$ is strongly convex, $f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t)$ is bounded, and it follows from (23a) that

$$\dot{x}_i^*(t) = -f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) (A_i \dot{\lambda}^*(t) + f_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t)). \quad (24a)$$

Substituting (24a) into (23b) returns

$$\dot{\lambda}^*(t) = - \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i^*(t), t) \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i^*(t), t), \quad (24b)$$

which is in accordance with (15) when $x_i(t) = x_i^*(t)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. The proof is complete. \blacksquare

Assumption 4: There exist $C_3, C_4 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\| -F_{\lambda,i} + \alpha_{\lambda,i} \|_2 \leq C_3$ and $\| -A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \|_2 \leq C_4$ hold for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Theorem 1: Consider problem (6) under Assumptions 1-4. The algorithm described by (13)–(14) converges to the optimal trajectories of problem (6) within a fixed time if $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i(0) = 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta'_i(0) = 0$, $\gamma_{\psi,3} \geq 2nC_1$, $\gamma_{\psi',3} \geq 2nC_2$, $\gamma_{\lambda,3} \geq 2nC_3$, and $\gamma_{e,3} \geq C_4$.

Proof: Sequential Lyapunov analysis will be employed for this proof, establishing fixed-time consensus and then fixed-time tracking of the optimal trajectories.

a) *Fixed-Time Consensus:* Using the similar steps as in the proof of Lemma 3, it can be inferred that consensus among λ_i can be attained within a fixed time, given that $\| -F_{\lambda,i} + \alpha_{\lambda,i} \|_2 \leq C_3$ and $\gamma_{\lambda,3} \geq 2nC_3$. The settling time $T_{\bar{\lambda}}$ is upper bounded as follows:

$$T_{\bar{\lambda}} \leq T_{\bar{\lambda}}^{\max} = (\gamma_{\lambda,1}\gamma_{\lambda,2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_0. \quad (25)$$

Now we have $\lambda_i = \bar{\lambda}$ and $y_i = \bar{y}$ for all $t \geq \max\{T_{\bar{y}}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}\}$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\bar{\lambda} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$ and $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$. For $t \geq \max\{T_{\bar{y}}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}\}$, a reduced representation for (14a)–(14b) is available:

$$\dot{x}_i = -F_{x,i} - f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) (A_i \bar{y} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)), \quad (26a)$$

$$\dot{\bar{\lambda}} = - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} + \bar{y}. \quad (26b)$$

b) *Fixed-Time Tracking:* For $t \geq \max\{T_{\bar{y}}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}\}$, we employ the following Lyapunov candidate function:

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_2^2 \quad (27)$$

where e_i is the error term defined by (14c). The time derivative of V along (26) can be obtained as below:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^\top \left[\dot{f}_{ix}(x_i, t) + A_i \dot{\lambda} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^\top \left[f_{ixx}(x_i, t) \dot{x}_i + f_{ixt}(x_i, t) + A_i \dot{\lambda} \right] \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^\top \left[f_{ixx}(x_i, t) F_{x,i} + A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\kappa_x \gamma_{e,1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_{2-\frac{p}{q}}^{2-\frac{p}{q}} - \kappa_x \gamma_{e,2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_{2+\frac{p}{q}}^{2+\frac{p}{q}} \quad (28)\end{aligned}$$

where $\| -A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \|_2 \leq C_4$ and $\gamma_{e,3} \geq C_4$ have been introduced for deriving $\leq^{(b)}$. Then we have

$$\dot{V} \leq -2^{1-\frac{p}{2q}} \kappa_x \gamma_{e,1} V^{1-\frac{p}{2q}} - 2^{1+\frac{p}{2q}} \kappa_x \gamma_{e,2} n^{-\frac{p}{q}} V^{1+\frac{p}{2q}}. \quad (29)$$

This indicates that V is fixed-time stable at the origin, and the settling time T_{sol} is given by

$$\begin{aligned}T_{sol} \leq T_{sol}^{\max} &= \max\{T_{\bar{y}}^{\max}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}^{\max}\} \\ &\quad + \eta_2(\mathcal{L})(2\kappa_x^2 \gamma_{e,1} \gamma_{e,2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_0.\end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

In fact, problem (6) is solved at T_{sol} , which is why we refer it to as the solving time. By fixed-time stability, we have

$$e_i = f_{ix}(x_i, t) + A_i \bar{\lambda} \equiv 0 \quad (31)$$

for all $t \geq T_{sol}$, which further implies

$$\dot{e}_i = -f_{ixx}(x_i, t) F_{x,i} - A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \equiv 0 \quad (32)$$

for all $t \geq T_{sol}$. Substituting $e_i = 0$ into (14d) leads to $F_{x,i} = 0$ and hence

$$- \sum_{i=1}^n F_{\lambda,i} = \kappa_\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t)) \equiv 0. \quad (33)$$

Noting that (31) and (33) exactly convey the KKT conditions, we have $x_i = x_i^*(t)$, $\lambda_i = \lambda^*(t)$, $\dot{x}_i = \alpha_{x,i}$, and $\dot{\lambda}_i = \alpha_{\lambda,i}$. It can be readily inferred by applying Lemma 3 that the derivative optimality conditions in (23) are met as well, i.e., $\alpha_{x,i}(t) = x_i^*(t)$ and $\alpha_{\lambda,i}(t) = \lambda^*(t)$ for all $t \geq T_{sol}$. The proof is complete as indicated in (12). ■

Remark 2: In digital implementations, the discontinuous signum function causes chattering [11], making $\text{sign}(e_i) \neq 0$ even when e_i is infinitesimal and $\dot{e}_i = 0$ for all $t \geq T_{sol}$ hardly achievable. In practice, the primal feasibility condition $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t))$ will be driven to the neighborhood of the origin, and we may observe a minor overshoot/undershoot at $t = T_{sol}$, which will then vanish at an exponential rate [8]. The readers can refer to the enlarged plot in Fig. 2(e) for a visual illustration.

B. Projection-based Feedback-Feedforward Algorithm

LFCs are prevalent in real-world examples but often omitted by related work. By considering the presence of LFCs for each agent, we have the following distributed TVRA problem:

$$x^*(t) = \underset{x \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i, t), \quad (34a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(t), \quad (34b)$$

$$g_i^m(t) \leq x_i \leq g_i^M(t), \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (34c)$$

where $g_i^m : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g_i^M : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Other notations follow the same definitions as for problem (6). The feasible region for each agent is defined by

$$x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(t) = \{x_i \mid g_i^m(t) \leq x_i \leq g_i^M(t)\}. \quad (35)$$

1) Algorithm Design: In this section, we extend the findings from Section III.A to handle LFCs. The presence of LFCs causes the optimal trajectories to evolve diversely within the interior or on the boundary of the feasible region. This implies that the optimal trajectories switch between different modes and are discontinuous at the switching instants.

However, for cases with LFCs, (22b) is no longer applicable and the stationarity condition now takes the following form:

$$-f_{ix}(x_i^*(t), t) - A_i \lambda^*(t) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}_i(t)}, \quad (36)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}_i(t)}$ denotes the normal cone of $\mathcal{X}_i(t)$. To tailor the feedforward laws, it is essential to comprehend the derivative optimality conditions, which are complicated by the need to compute the time derivative of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}_i(t)}$. In this regard, we demonstrate how this can be achieved by exploring the relationship between projection and penalty functions.

Lemma 4: Consider problem (34) under Assumptions 1-2 and the Slater's condition. Let $\sigma_i = -1$ if $x_i^*(t) = g_i^m(t)$, $\sigma_i = 1$ if $x_i^*(t) = g_i^M(t)$, and $\sigma_i = 0$ otherwise. Then the optimal trajectories can be described by following dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_i^*(t) &= -(1 - \sigma_i^2) f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) (A_i \lambda^*(t) + f_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t)) \\ &\quad - \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) + \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t),\end{aligned} \quad (37a)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}^*(t) = - \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i^*(t), t) \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i^*(t), t), \quad (37b)$$

where

$$\rho_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t) = A_i (1 - \sigma_i^2) f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) A_i, \quad (38a)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t) &= A_i (1 - \sigma_i^2) f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) f_{ixt}(x_i, t) + b_{it}(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{A_i \sigma_i}{2} (1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) - \frac{A_i \sigma_i}{2} (1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t).\end{aligned} \quad (38b)$$

Proof: Construct the quadratic penalty function

$$h_i(x_i, t) = \frac{\eta}{2} (\max\{0, g_i^m(t) - x_i, x_i - g_i^M(t)\})^2 \quad (39)$$

to penalize violations of the LFCs, where $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is the penalty coefficient. Then the local cost function becomes a

composite function given by $\hat{f}_i(x_i, t) = f_i(x_i, t) + h_i(x_i, t)$. Extending (24) to include the penalty function leads to

$$\dot{x}_i^*(t) = -\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t)(A_i \dot{\lambda}^*(t) + \hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t)), \quad (40a)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}^*(t) = - \left[\sum_{i=1}^n A_i \hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) A_i \right]^{-1} \times \left[\sum_{i=1}^n A_i \hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) \hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t) + \sum_{i=1}^n b_{it}(t) \right], \quad (40b)$$

where $\hat{f}_{ixx}(x_i, t) = f_{ixx}(x_i, t)$ and $\hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i, t) = f_{ixt}(x_i, t)$ if $g_i^m(t) \leq x_i \leq g_i^M(t)$, $\hat{f}_{ixx}(x_i, t) = f_{ixx}(x_i, t) + \eta$ and $\hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i, t) = f_{ixt}(x_i, t) - \eta g_{it}^m(t)$ if $x_i < g_i^m(t)$, and $\hat{f}_{ixx}(x_i, t) = f_{ixx}(x_i, t) + \eta$ and $\hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i, t) = f_{ixt}(x_i, t) - \eta g_{it}^M(t)$ if $x_i > g_i^M(t)$.

By setting $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$, the value of $h_i(x_i, t)$ increases to infinity as its argument approaches the boundary of the feasible region. As a result, we have $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) = 0$ and $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) \hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t) = -g_{it}^m(t)$ if $x_i^*(t) = g_i^m(t)$, $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) = 0$ and $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) \hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t) = -g_{it}^M(t)$ if $x_i^*(t) = g_i^M(t)$, and $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) = f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t)$ and $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) \hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t) = f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) f_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t)$ otherwise. Invoking σ_i as defined in Lemma 4, we have the following representation: $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) = (1 - \sigma_i^2) f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t)$ and $\hat{f}_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t) \hat{f}_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t) = \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) - \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t)$. This bridges the gap between projection and penalty functions, translating (40) into (37). The proof is complete. ■

Based on Lemma 4, the distributed estimator for calculating the switched feedforward laws is modified as follows:

$$\alpha_{x,i}^{\sigma_i} = -(1 - \sigma_i^2) f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) (A_i y_i^{\sigma_i} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)) - \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) + \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t), \quad (41a)$$

$$\alpha_{\lambda,i}^{\sigma_i} = y_i^{\sigma_i}, \quad (41b)$$

$$y_i^{\sigma_i} = \begin{cases} (\psi_i^{\sigma_i})^{-1} \psi_i^{\prime \sigma_i} & \text{if } \psi_i^{\sigma_i} \geq \epsilon, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (41c)$$

$$\dot{\theta}_i = -\mathcal{E}_i(\psi_i^{\sigma_i}), \quad (41d)$$

$$\psi_i^{\sigma_i} = \theta_i + \rho_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t), \quad (41e)$$

$$\dot{\theta}_i' = -\mathcal{E}_i(\psi_i^{\prime \sigma_i}), \quad (41f)$$

$$\psi_i^{\prime \sigma_i} = \theta_i' - \phi_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t), \quad (41g)$$

where $\rho_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t)$ and $\phi_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t)$ are defined by (38). The other notations are essentially identical to those in (13), except that $(\cdot)^{\sigma_i}$ represents variables that switch between different modes to account for the LFCs.

The distributed optimization algorithm for updating the candidate solution is designed as follows:

$$\dot{x}_i = -F_{x,i}' + \alpha_{x,i}^{\sigma_i}, \quad (42a)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}_i = -\mathcal{E}_i(\lambda) - F_{\lambda,i} + \alpha_{\lambda,i}^{\sigma_i}, \quad (42b)$$

$$e_i = x_i - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}_i(t)}(x_i - F_{x,i}), \quad (42c)$$

$$F_{x,i}' = f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i, t) (\gamma_{e,1} e_i^{1-\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,2} e_i^{1+\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,3} \text{sign}(e_i)), \quad (42d)$$

$$F_{x,i} = \kappa_x (f_{ix}(x_i, t) + A_i \lambda_i), \quad (42e)$$

$$F_{\lambda,i} = \kappa_\lambda (b_i(t) - A_i x_i), \quad (42f)$$

where $\alpha_{x,i}^{\sigma_i}$ and $\alpha_{\lambda,i}^{\sigma_i}$ are the switched feedforward laws defined by (41a)–(41b), and $x_i(0)$ can be arbitrary as (42) is initialization-free. To accommodate the use of projection, a state-dependent switching signal as follows is introduced to command the switching of feedforward laws:

$$\sigma_i = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x_i - F_{x,i} \leq g_i^m(t), \\ 1 & \text{if } x_i - F_{x,i} \geq g_i^M(t), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

When $x_i - F_{x,i} \leq g_i^m(t)$ or $x_i - F_{x,i} \geq g_i^M(t)$, it signifies the activation of projection, along with (42c) preventing violations of the LFCs.

Assumption 5: There exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that the statements $\|\dot{\rho}_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_1$, $\|\phi_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_2$, $\| -F_{\lambda,i} + \alpha_{\lambda,i}^{\sigma_i} \|_2 \leq C_3$, and $\| -(1 - \sigma_i^2)(A_i \bar{y} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)) - \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) + \frac{\sigma_i}{2} (1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t) - A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \|_2 \leq C_4$ are true for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Theorem 2: Consider problem (34) under Assumptions 1–2 and 5. Suppose that the Slater's condition holds, and within any bounded time interval, there is only a finite number of switching instants. The algorithm described by (41)–(43) converges to the optimal trajectories of problem (34) while exhibiting fixed-time convergence between consecutive switching instants if $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i(0) = 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i'(0) = 0$, $\gamma_{\psi,3} \geq 2nC_1$, $\gamma_{\psi',3} \geq 2nC_2$, $\gamma_{\lambda,3} \geq 2nC_3$, and $\gamma_{e,3} \geq C_4$.

2) Convergence Analysis:

Proof: We proceed with sequential Lyapunov analysis by first demonstrating fixed-time consensus of y_i and λ_i , followed by fixed-time tracking of a unique solution, which is subsequently shown to be time-varying optimal.

a) *Fixed-Time Consensus:* Given two consecutive switching instants at times τ_k and τ_{k+1} satisfying $\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k > 0$, it is trivially easy to show that

$$y_i^{\sigma_i} = \bar{y} = - \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t) \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t) \quad (44)$$

for all $t \in [\tau_k + T_{\bar{y}}, \tau_{k+1})$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$ if no switching occurs during $[\tau_k, \tau_k + T_{\bar{y}})$. Similarly, we can show that $\lambda_i = \bar{\lambda}$ for all $t \in [\tau_k + T_{\bar{\lambda}}, \tau_{k+1})$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$ if no switching occurs during $[\tau_k, \tau_k + T_{\bar{\lambda}})$, where $T_{\bar{y}}$ and $T_{\bar{\lambda}}$ are upper bounded as described in (21) and (25), respectively. Note that $\gamma_{\psi,3} \geq 2nC_1$, $\gamma_{\psi',3} \geq 2nC_2$, $\gamma_{\lambda,3} \geq 2nC_3$, $\|\dot{\rho}_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_1$, $\|\phi_i^{\sigma_i}(x_i, t)\|_2 \leq C_2$, and $\| -F_{\lambda,i} + \alpha_{\lambda,i}^{\sigma_i} \|_2 \leq C_3$ have been used.

b) *Fixed-Time Tracking:* Let $z = \text{col}(x, \bar{\lambda})$ with $\mathcal{Z}(t)$ being the feasible region for z . For all $t \in [\tau_k + \max\{T_{\bar{y}}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}\}, \tau_{k+1})$, (42a)–(42b) read compactly as $\dot{z} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Z}(t)}(z - F(z, t)) - z + \alpha^\sigma(z, \bar{y}, t)$. It is worth noting that the distributed time-invariant resource allocation problem in [24] is solved at $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Z}}(z^* - F(z^*)) - z^* = 0$, the equilibrium point of the dynamical system $\dot{z} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Z}}(z - F(z)) - z$. Referring back to problem (34), solving $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Z}(t)}(z^*(t) - F(z^*(t), t)) = z^*(t)$ is equivalent to finding $z^*(t) \in \mathcal{Z}(t)$ for the variational inequality: $\langle F(z^*(t), t), z - z^*(t) \rangle \geq 0, \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}(t)$ [27].

Leveraging variational inequality theory, we can construct a Lyapunov candidate function as follows:

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle F_{x,i}, e_i \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_2^2, \quad (45)$$

which is continuously differentiable for all $t \in [\tau_k + \max\{T_{\bar{y}}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}\}, \tau_{k+1})$. By enumeration, it is easy to check that $\langle F_{x,i}, e_i \rangle \geq 0$, as it equals to zero when $e_i = 0$, and $\text{sign}(F_{x,i}) = \text{sign}(e_i)$ otherwise. Then, V can be shown to hold a lower bound:

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle |F_{x,i}|, |e_i| \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_2^2 \stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_2^2. \quad (46)$$

where $\stackrel{(c)}{\geq}$ follows from the property that $|F_{x,i}| \geq |e_i|$.

According to [27, Theorem 3.2], V is equivalent to $V = -\min\{V'(z, t, x') \mid x' \in \mathcal{X}(t)\}$, where $z = \text{col}(x, \bar{\lambda})$ and $V'(z, t, x') = -\langle F_x(z, t), x - x' \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - x'\|_2^2$. As $F_x(z, t)$ is continuous and continuously differentiable with respect to z and t , it is readily verifiable that both $V'(z, t, x')$ and V maintain continuity and continuous differentiability for all $t \in [\tau_k, \tau_{k+1})$, and the minimum is uniquely attained at $x' = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}(t)(x - F_x(z, t))$. Since $\partial V'(z, t, x')/\partial x' = \mathbf{0}_{n+1}$, we have

$$\dot{V} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} V'(z, t, x') \dot{z} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V'(z, t, x'). \quad (47)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (47) decomposes into

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} V'(z, t, x') \dot{z} &= \underbrace{\left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial z} F_x(z, t) \dot{z}, x - x' \right\rangle}_{\dot{V}_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{F_x(z, t) \dot{x} - (x - x') \dot{x}}_{\dot{V}_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (47) is given by

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V'(z, t, x') = \underbrace{\left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t} F_x(z, t), x - x' \right\rangle}_{\dot{V}_3}. \quad (49)$$

For \dot{V}_1 , it is available that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1 &= -\kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle e_i, \gamma_{e,1} e_i^{1-\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,2} e_i^{1+\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,3} \text{sign}(e_i) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle e_i, f_{ixx}(x_i, t) \alpha_{x,i}^{\sigma_i} + A_i \alpha_{\lambda,i}^{\sigma_i} \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle e_i, A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Due to monotonicity in the saddle-point map, it holds true that $\langle F_{x,i} - e_i, \alpha_{x,i}^{\sigma_i} \rangle \leq 0$ for all $t \in [\tau_k + \max\{T_{\bar{y}}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}\}, \tau_{k+1})$. Then, acknowledging that $-\langle F_{x,i}, e_i^{\xi} \rangle = -\langle |F_{x,i}|, |e_i^{\xi}| \rangle \leq -\|e_i\|_{1+\xi}^{1+\xi}$ and $-\langle F_{x,i}, \text{sign}(e_i) \rangle \leq -\|e_i\|_1$, we can obtain an

upper bound for \dot{V}_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2 &= \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle e_i - F_{x,i}, \gamma_{e,1} e_i^{1-\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,2} e_i^{1+\frac{p}{q}} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \langle e_i - F_{x,i}, \gamma_{e,3} \text{sign}(e_i) \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \langle F_{x,i} - e_i, \alpha_{x,i}^{\sigma_i} \rangle \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Meanwhile, \dot{V}_3 is given by

$$\dot{V}_3 = \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \langle e_i, f_{ixt}(x_i, t) \rangle. \quad (52)$$

Based on the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= -\kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\gamma_{e,1} \|e_i\|_{2-\frac{p}{q}}^{2-\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,2} \|e_i\|_{2-\frac{p}{q}}^{2+\frac{p}{q}} + \gamma_{e,3} \|e_i\|_1 \right] \\ &\quad - \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \langle e_i, (1 - \sigma_i^2)(A_i \bar{y} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle e_i, \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) + \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle e_i, A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \right\rangle \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} -\kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{e,1} \|e_i\|_{2-\frac{p}{q}}^{2-\frac{p}{q}} - \kappa_x \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{e,2} \|e_i\|_{2-\frac{p}{q}}^{2+\frac{p}{q}}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where $\|-(1 - \sigma_i^2)(A_i \bar{y} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)) - \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) + \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t) - A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n}\|_2 \leq C_4$ and $\gamma_{e,3} \geq C_4$ have been used for deriving $\stackrel{(d)}{\leq}$. Recalling (46) that $V \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_2^2$, again we have $\dot{V} \leq -2^{1-\frac{p}{2q}} \kappa_x \gamma_{e,1} V^{1-\frac{p}{2q}} - 2^{1+\frac{p}{2q}} \kappa_x \gamma_{e,2} n^{-\frac{p}{q}} V^{1+\frac{p}{2q}}$. Thus, V is fixed-time stable at the origin if no switching occurs during $[\tau_k, \tau_k + T_{sol})$, and the solving time T_{sol} is given by (30). Along all switching instants, V is globally asymptotically stable at the origin, which can be derived using the multiple Lyapunov function approach [28].

Now that $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i\|_2^2 = 0$ for all $t \in [\tau_k + T_{sol}, \tau_{k+1})$, with $c_i \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}_i(t)}$ we have

$$e_i = F_{x,i} + c_i \equiv 0 \quad (54a)$$

$$\dot{e}_i = \dot{F}_{x,i} + \dot{c}_i \equiv 0 \quad (54b)$$

for all $t \in [\tau_k + T_{sol}, \tau_{k+1})$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Substituting (41)–(43) into (54b), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\equiv -(1 - \sigma_i^2)(A_i \bar{y} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)) - \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 - \sigma_i) g_{it}^m(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 + \sigma_i) g_{it}^M(t) - A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} + \dot{c}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

A solution to (55) could be found at

$$-A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda,i}}{n} \equiv 0, \quad (56)$$

because this, together with (54a), completes the optimality conditions. On the other hand, $(1 - \sigma_i)(A_i \bar{y} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)) +$

$(1 - \sigma_i)f_{ixx}(x_i, t)(g_{it}^m(t) - g_{it}^M(t)) + \dot{c}_i = 0$ and hence (54b) holds according to Lemma 4.

Between consecutive switching instants, \dot{x}_i is continuously differentiable and thus locally Lipschitz continuous. This property results in the uniqueness of the convergent solution for all $t \in [\tau_k + \max\{T_{\bar{y}}, T_{\bar{\lambda}}\}, \tau_{k+1})$, as per the Picard–Lindelöf theorem. Consequently, the solution yielded by (54a) and (56) represents the unique solution to (55) and the optimal solution to problem (34). To conclude, the projection-based algorithm converges to the optimal trajectories if no switching occurs during $[\tau_k, \tau_k + T_{sol}]$, i.e., $x_i = x_i^*(t)$, $\lambda_i = \lambda^*(t)$, $\dot{x}_i = \dot{x}_i^*(t)$, and $\lambda_i = \lambda^*(t)$ for all $t \in [\tau_k + T_{sol}, \tau_{k+1})$ and $i \in \mathcal{N}$. The proof is complete. \blacksquare

Remark 3: The design of switched feedforward laws represents a main feature of the presented work. It ensures that the distributed estimator consistently adjusts the estimation of $\dot{\lambda}^*(t)$ and $\dot{x}_i^*(t)$ while adhering to the LFCs. Comparing $\| -A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda, i}}{n} \|_2 \leq C_4$ in Assumption 4 with $\| -(1 - \sigma_i^2)(A_i \bar{y} + f_{ixt}(x_i, t)) - \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 - \sigma_i)g_{it}^m(t) + \frac{\sigma_i}{2}(1 + \sigma_i)g_{it}^M(t) - A_i \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_{\lambda, i}}{n} \|_2 \leq C_4$ in Assumption 5, it is evident that they are equivalent when $\sigma_i = 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Moreover, a comparison between (14) and (42) reveals that the feedback-feedforward algorithm and its projection-based counterpart coincide when the projection is inactive.

Remark 4: Equality-constrained distributed TVRA problems, e.g. problem (34), hold particular significance, as any inequality constraint, either global or local, time-varying or time-invariant, can be converted into a combination of an equality constraint and a time-invariant LFC by introducing a slack variable. Thus, with some modifications, the projection-based algorithm applies to time-varying global inequality constraints as well. Consider the following distributed TVRA problem, omitting the LFCs for demonstration purpose:

$$x^*(t) = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i, t) \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t)) \leq 0,$$

Introducing a non-negative slack variable s_i for each agent, the global inequality constraint can be replaced with $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t) + s_i) = 0$ and $s_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and, in terms of the feedforward design, a penalty function should be imposed on it. The Lagrangian can be formulated as $L(x, \lambda, s, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i, t) + \frac{\eta}{2}(\min\{0, s\})^2 + \lambda(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(t) + s)$, where $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. It follows that

$$0 = (1 - \sigma_i)\dot{s}_i^*(t) + \sigma_i \dot{\lambda}^*(t),$$

where $\sigma_i = 1$ if $s_i^*(t) \geq 0$ and $\sigma_i = 0$ otherwise. When $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$, we have $\dot{\lambda}^*(t) \equiv 0$ and $\sigma_i \equiv 1$. This converts $0 = f_{ixx}(x_i^*(t), t)\dot{x}_i^*(t) + f_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t) + A_i \dot{\lambda}^*(t)$ and $0 = \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i \dot{x}_i^*(t) - b_{it}(t) + \dot{s}_i^*(t))$ to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i^*(t) &= -f_{ixx}^{-1}(x_i^*(t), t)f_{ixt}(x_i^*(t), t), \\ \dot{s}_i^*(t) &= -\sigma_i(A_i \dot{x}_i^*(t) - b_{it}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Inheriting our methodology in Section III.B, feedforward laws for x_i and s_i can be designed, with a state-dependent switching signal taking values on $\{0, 1\}$. The switching rule will be similar to (43) but requires tailoring.

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, numerical experiments are conducted in MATLAB/SIMULINK. We begin with a case study without LFCs to illustrate the feedback-feedforward algorithm. Next, we consider a case study taking LFCs into account to demonstrate the effectiveness of the projection-based feedback-feedforward algorithm. Finally, a scalability test is performed, taking the energy management problem of an active distribution network as an example.

A. Case Study 1

In this case study, we consider problem (34) with a multi-agent system consisting of 6 agents. The feedback-feedforward algorithm introduced in Section III.A is employed. The communication network is connected and undirected, and fixed for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, as shown in Fig. 1. Each agent is assigned a





Fig. 1: Topology of the communication network.

time-varying local cost function $f_i(x_i, t) = (1 + 0.1i)x_i^2 + 0.2 \sin(0.1it)x_i^2$, which is strongly convex and has time-varying Hessians, and a time-varying activity $b_i(t) = 10i + 5 \sin(0.1it) + 0.1it$. The control parameters are set as: $p = 2$, $q = 3$, $\gamma_{\psi,1} = 10$, $\gamma_{\psi,2} = 10$, $\gamma_{\psi,3} = 1$, $\gamma_{\psi',1} = 10$, $\gamma_{\psi',2} = 10$, $\gamma_{\psi',3} = 1$, $\gamma_{\lambda,1} = 10$, $\gamma_{\lambda,2} = 10$, $\gamma_{\lambda,3} = 100$, $\gamma_{e,1} = 1$, $\gamma_{e,2} = 1$, $\gamma_{e,3} = 10$, $\kappa_x = 1$, $\kappa_\lambda = 5$, and $\epsilon = 0.1$. The initial states are set as: $x_i(0) = 0$, $\lambda_i(0) = 0$, $\theta_i(0) = 0$, and $\theta'_i(0) = 0$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$. The simulation results are provided in Fig. 2.


Fig. 2(a) depicts the local estimates provided by the distributed estimator. Both ψ_i and ψ'_i reach consensus and track the average of $\rho_i(x_i, t)$ and $\phi_i(x_i, t)$ over n agents, given by $\psi_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t)$ and $\psi'_i = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i, t)$. While $T_{\bar{y}}^{\max} = 0.14$ s, the desired value that $y_i = \psi_i^{-1} \psi'_i = [\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(x_i, t)]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x_i, t)$ is achieved at $t = T_{\bar{y}} = 0.03$ s. As shown in Figs. 2(b) and (d), x_i and λ_i vary significantly with time, while λ_i consistently maintain consensus. As illustrated in Fig. 2(c) and Fig. 2(e), the feedback-feedforward algorithm converges at $t = T_{sol} = 1.64$ s, while the upper bound on T_{sol} can be obtained as $T_{sol}^{\max} = 2.16$ s. However, due to digital implementations, $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t))$ is driven to the neighborhood of the origin within T_{sol} , with a minor undershoot of -0.52 observed $t = T_{sol}$ s, which then vanishes exponentially.

B. Case Study 2

This case study targets problem (34), focusing on the handling of LFCs. The projection-based feedback-feedforward algorithm introduced in Section III.B is employed. The problem




(a)



(b)

(c)




(d)

(e)


Fig. 2: Simulation results for Case Study 1. Evolution of: (a) local estimates y_i , ψ_i , and ψ_i^{σ} ; (b) primal variable x_i ; (c) error of stationarity condition e_i ; (d) dual variable λ_i ; and (e) violation of primal feasibility condition $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t))$.

settings and parameters are identical to those in Case Study 1, except for the inclusion of LFCs: $x_1 \leq 50$, $x_4 \leq 40$, $t \leq x_6 \leq 10 + 0.1t^2$. To demonstrate that the projection-based algorithm is initialization-free, we set $x(0) = [0; 0; 0; 0; 0; -10]$, where $x_6(0) = -10$ violates the LFC that $x_6 \geq 0$. The simulation results are presented in Figs. 3 and 4.

As shown in Fig. 3(a), all the local estimates are subject to switching commanded by the state-dependent switching signals in Fig. 4. The simulated span demonstrates a total of 159 switching instants for all the agents. Several ripples in ψ_i^{σ} and ψ_i^{σ} occur since $\rho_i^{\sigma}(x_i, t)$ and $\phi_i^{\sigma}(x_i, t)$ are discontinuous at the switching instants. The singularity issue is avoided despite ψ_i^{σ} exhibits zero crossing. The evolution of x_i is shown in Fig. 3(b), from which we can see x_i varies with time while respecting the LFCs. The projection-based algorithm is initialization-free, and once x_i enters its feasible region, violations of the LFCs are prevented. Also, we can see x_i sliding on the boundary of their LFCs, for example, $x_6 =$




(a)



(b)

(c)



(d)


(e)

Fig. 3: Simulation results for Case Study 2. Evolution of: (a) local estimates y_i^{σ} , ψ_i^{σ} , and ψ_i^{σ} ; (b) primal variable x_i ; (c) error of stationarity condition e_i ; (d) dual variable λ_i ; and (e) violation of primal feasibility condition $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t))$.

$10 + 0.1t^2$ roughly between $t = 2$ s and $t = 16$ s, and $x_6 = t$ roughly between $t = 44$ s and $t = 48$ s. As shown in Figs. 3(c)-(e), the evolution of the remaining variables is similar to those in Fig. 2. However, after a switching instant at $t = 0.94$ s, the problem is solved at $t = 2.20$ s, which yields $T_{sol} = 1.26$ s. To investigate the impact of switching after converging to the optimal trajectories, we highlight a switching instant at $t = 25.44$ s in Figs. 3(c) and (e). The enlarged plot shows that $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t))$ is disturbed to a very minimal extent and promptly restored to zero. In conclusion, the projection-based feedback-feedforward algorithm converges to the exact optimal trajectory while exhibiting fixed-time convergence between consecutive switching instants.

C. Scalability Test

Grid flexibility is crucial for modern power systems with high penetration of wind and solar energy, which are naturally time-varying. This flexibility can be provided by active

Fig. 4: State-dependent switching signal σ_i .

distribution networks via coordination of a large number of distributed generators, flexible loads, *etc.* A scalability test of the projection-based feedback-feedforward algorithm is performed on an active distribution network case, which entails 33 bus agents to absorb the deviated power when renewable generation deviates from forecasts, ensuring the power injection at the substation remains as scheduled.

The communication network follows the physical connections of the IEEE 33-bus system, as illustrated in Fig. 5. Denote the sets of flexible loads and distributed generators by \mathcal{N}_{FL} and \mathcal{N}_{DG} , respectively. Omitting distribution losses, it is required that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{FL}} (x_i - r_i(t)) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{DG}} (x_i - r_i(t)) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta P_{R,i}(t)$, where $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Here, $\Delta P_{R,i}(t)$ is the power deviation of renewables ($\Delta P_{R,i}(t) = 0$ if no renewable integration), and $r_i(t)$ is the scheduled power so that $x_i - r_i(t)$ corresponds to the power adjustment in kW for up/down-regulation. For each agent, the operational cost is given by $f_i(x_i, t) = \frac{1}{2} \varpi_i(t) (x_i - r_i(t))^2$, where $\varpi_i(t)$ is a time-varying cost coefficient for power adjustment. With $r_i(t)$ and $\Delta P_{R,i}(t)$ being superpositions of sinusoidal waves fitted from historical data, this energy management problem can be rewritten as problem (34). Fig. 6(a) illustrates the evolution of x_i over time, where the trajectories vary with time but are trimmed if necessary to meet the LFCs. In Fig. 6(b), we observe that the KKT conditions, *i.e.*, $e_i = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t)) = 0$, are promptly met and well maintained thereafter. These demonstrate the effectiveness and scalability of the projection-based algorithm.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have proposed two feedback-feedforward algorithms for distributed TVRA problems: one for cases without LFCs and another for case with LFCs. For generality, the local cost functions, global equality constraint, and LFCs considered are all time-varying. Each algorithm contains a distributed estimator for generating the desired feedforward laws and a distributed optimization algorithm for problem-solving. By studying the connection between projection and penalty functions, we have introduced an alternative to time-dependent barrier functions, *i.e.*, projection along with switched feedforward laws, to handle the LFCs. A state-dependent switching signal, synchronized with the use of projection, has been




Fig. 5: Studied active distribution network.

developed to ensure local feasibility. Based on these, we have developed a projection-based algorithm that converges to the exact optimal trajectory while exhibiting fixed-time convergence between consecutive switching instants. Under mild conditions, we have shown that the proposed algorithms achieves fixed-time consensus of the local estimates and then fixed-time tracking of the optimal trajectories. Finally, we have illustrated the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms through numerical experiments. Future directions include studying distributed TVRA problems with multiple global constraints, where singularity issues can be a major challenge.




Fig. 6: Simulation results for the scalability test. Evolution of: (a) primal variable x_i in kW; and (b) the KKT conditions: error of stationarity condition e_i and violation of primal feasibility condition $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_i x_i - b_i(t))$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Simonetto, A. Mokhtari, A. Koppel, G. Leus, and A. Ribeiro, "A class of prediction-correction methods for time-varying convex optimization,"

- IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 17, pp. 4576–4591, 2016.
- [2] J. Sun, J. Yang, W. X. Zheng, and S. Li, “GPIO-based robust control of nonlinear uncertain systems under time-varying disturbance with application to DC—DC converter,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 1074–1078, 2016.
- [3] S. M. Hosseini, R. Carli, and M. Dotoli, “Robust optimal energy management of a residential microgrid under uncertainties on demand and renewable power generation,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 618–637, 2021.
- [4] B. Gutjahr, L. Gröll, and M. Werling, “Lateral vehicle trajectory optimization using constrained linear time-varying mpc,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1586–1595, 2017.
- [5] B. Wang, S. Sun, and W. Ren, “Distributed time-varying quadratic optimal resource allocation subject to nonidentical time-varying Hessians with application to multiquadrotor hose transportation,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 6109–6119, 2022.
- [6] S. Sun, J. Xu, and W. Ren, “Distributed continuous-time algorithms for time-varying constrained convex optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 3931–3946, 2023.
- [7] A. Simonetto, “Dual prediction–correction methods for linearly constrained time-varying convex programs,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 3355–3361, 2019.
- [8] M. Fazlyab, S. Paternain, V. M. Preciado, and A. Ribeiro, “Prediction–correction interior-point method for time-varying convex optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 1973–1986, 2018.
- [9] A. Simonetto, A. Koppel, A. Mokhtari, G. Leus, and A. Ribeiro, “Decentralized prediction–correction methods for networked time-varying convex optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 5724–5738, 2017.
- [10] C. Sun, M. Ye, and G. Hu, “Distributed time-varying quadratic optimization for multiple agents under undirected graphs,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 3687–3694, 2017.
- [11] B. Ning, Q.-L. Han, and Z. Zuo, “Distributed optimization for multi-agent systems: An edge-based fixed-time consensus approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 122–132, 2019.
- [12] S. Rahili and W. Ren, “Distributed continuous-time convex optimization with time-varying cost functions,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1590–1605, 2017.
- [13] H. Hong, S. Baldi, W. Yu, and X. Yu, “Distributed time-varying optimization of second-order multiagent systems under limited interaction ranges,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 52, no. 12, pp. 13874–13886, 2022.
- [14] Y. Chen, T. Yu, Q. Meng, F. Niu, and H. Wang, “Time-varying distributed optimization problem with inequality constraints,” *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, vol. 360, no. 16, pp. 11314–11330, 2023.
- [15] C. Wu, H. Fang, X. Zeng, Q. Yang, Y. Wei, and J. Chen, “Distributed continuous-time algorithm for time-varying optimization with affine formation constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2615–2622, 2023.
- [16] Z. Li and Z. Ding, “Time-varying multi-objective optimisation over switching graphs via fixed-time consensus algorithms,” *Int. J. Syst. Sci.*, vol. 51, no. 15, pp. 2793–2806, 2020.
- [17] B. Wang, S. Sun, and W. Ren, “Distributed continuous-time algorithms for optimal resource allocation with time-varying quadratic cost functions,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 1974–1984, 2020.
- [18] L. Bai, C. Sun, Z. Feng, and G. Hu, “Distributed continuous-time resource allocation with time-varying resources under quadratic cost functions,” in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 823–828, 2018.
- [19] B. Wang, Q. Fei, and Q. Wu, “Distributed time-varying resource allocation optimization based on finite-time consensus approach,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 599–604, 2021.
- [20] X. Shi, G. Wen, and X. Yu, “Finite-time convergent algorithms for time-varying distributed optimization,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 3223–3228, 2023.
- [21] Z. Ding, “Distributed time-varying optimization—an output regulation approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, pp. 1–11, 2022.
- [22] H. Hong, W. Yu, G.-P. Jiang, and H. Wang, “Fixed-time algorithms for time-varying convex optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 616–620, 2023.
- [23] G. Bianchin, J. Cortés, J. I. Poveda, and E. Dall’Anese, “Time-varying optimization of lti systems via projected primal–dual gradient flows,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 474–486, 2022.
- [24] 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.
- [25] G. Chen and Z. Guo, “Initialization-free distributed fixed-time convergent algorithms for optimal resource allocation,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 845–854, 2022.
- [26] Z. Zuo and L. Tie, “A new class of finite-time nonlinear consensus protocols for multi-agent systems,” *International Journal of Control*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 363–370, 2014.
- [27] M. Fukushima, “Equivalent differentiable optimization problems and descent methods for asymmetric variational inequality problems,” *Mathematical programming*, vol. 53, pp. 99–110, 1992.
- [28] M. Branicky, “Multiple Lyapunov functions and other analysis tools for switched and hybrid systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 475–482, 1998.

Yiqiao Xu received the M.Sc. degree in Advanced Control and Systems Engineering in 2018 and the Ph.D. degree in Electrical and Electronic Engineering in 2023 from The University of Manchester, U.K. Since late 2022, he has been a postdoctoral research associate in the Power and Energy Division at the same institution. His research interests include distributed optimization, learning-based control, and their applications in power networks and multi-energy systems.

Tengyang Gong received the M.Sc. degree from the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering at The University of Manchester, U.K., in 2022. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in the same department. His research interests include the distributed optimization, control, and game theory of multi-agent systems, with applications in power and energy systems.

Zhengtao Ding received B.Eng. degree from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, and M.Sc. degree in systems and control, and the Ph.D. degree in control systems from The University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, Manchester, U.K. After working in Singapore for ten years, he joined The University of Manchester in 2003, where he is currently a Professor of Control Systems and the Head of Control, Robotics and Communication Division. His research interests include nonlinear and adaptive control theory and their applications, more recently network based control, distributed optimization and distributed machine learning, with applications to power systems and robotics. He is a member of IEEE Technical Committee on Nonlinear Systems and Control, IEEE Technical Committee on Intelligent Control, and IFAC Technical Committee on Adaptive and Learning Systems. He is a fellow of The Alan Turing Institute, the U.K. national institute for data science and artificial intelligence.

Alessandra Parisio is a Professor of Control of Sustainable Energy Networks, in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering at The University of Manchester, U.K. She is IEEE senior member, co-chair of the IEEE RAS Technical Committee on Smart Buildings and vice-Chair for Education of the IFAC Technical Committee 9.3. Control for Smart Cities. She is currently an Associate Editor of the IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems, European Journal of Control and Applied Energy. Her main research interests span the areas of control engineering, in particular Model Predictive Control, distributed optimisation and control, stochastic constrained control, and power systems, with energy management systems under uncertainty, optimisation and control of multi-energy networks and distributed flexibility.