

On output consensus of heterogeneous dynamical networks [★]

Yongkang Su ^{*} Lanlan Su ^{*} Sei Zhen Khong ^{**}

^{*} *Department of Automatic Control & Systems Engineering, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK (e-mail: ysu34@sheffield.ac.uk & lanlan.su@sheffield.ac.uk)*

^{**} *Department of Electrical Engineering, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung 80424, Taiwan (e-mail: szkhong@mail.nsysu.edu.tw)*

Abstract: This work is concerned with interconnected networks with non-identical subsystems. We investigate the output consensus of the network where the dynamics are subject to external disturbance and/or reference input. For a network of output-feedback passive subsystems, we first introduce an index that characterises the gap between a pair of adjacent subsystems by the difference of their input-output trajectories. The set of these indices quantifies the level of heterogeneity of the networks. We then provide a condition in terms of the level of heterogeneity and the connectivity of the networks for ensuring the output consensus of the interconnected network.

Keywords: Passivity, Heterogeneous networks, Diffusive coupling, Output consensus.

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, consensus control of interconnected networks has received a wide range of research interests and extensive applications in many areas, such as robot coordination (Qiao and Sipahi, 2015), power grid (Yang et al., 2013), and distributed sensor networks (Olfati-Saber and Shamma, 2005). In particular, passivity-based approaches have outstanding relevance in the consensus analysis for interconnected networks, and fruitful research results have been achieved, see, e.g., Chopra and Spong (2006); Bürger and De Persis (2015). For example, Chopra and Spong (2006) studied the output consensus of passive multi-agent systems over weight-balanced digraphs. In addition, by the internal model approach, the consensus problem for a network of incrementally passive systems over dynamic diffusive coupling was investigated in Bürger and De Persis (2015).

It should be noted that a common feature of the aforementioned literature is that the subsystems are expected to be passive. In the engineering practice, however, many systems are not inherently passive, (Kelkar and Joshi, 1998). Recently, there are fruitful results focusing on the consensus problem of interconnected networks with non-passive subsystems, see, e.g., Stan et al. (2007); Qu and Simaan (2014); Zhang and Lewis (2018); Li et al. (2019). For example, Stan et al. (2007) studied the consensus problem for networks of cyclic biochemical oscillators with identical incrementally output-feedback passive systems. Besides, the consensus problem of multi-agent systems with input feedforward passive agents over diffusive coupling was investigated in Li et al. (2019).

Moreover, in Scardovi et al. (2010), the consensus problem of interconnected networks with incrementally output-feedback passive systems and external inputs was studied from a purely input-output perspective. A condition of output with a high level of consensus is provided by combining the input-output properties of the subsystems with the connectivity of the network. However, it focused only on homogeneous networks, i.e., the dynamics of the subsystems in the interconnected networks are identical, which might be restrictive and impractical in many cases. In engineering practice, all physical systems of the interconnected systems are not exactly identical due to certain undesirable environmental factors and parametric uncertainties (Li et al., 2014). Therefore, this work attempts to generalise the research result to the case of heterogeneous networks.

The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows: 1) An index that characterises the gap between a pair of adjacent subsystems is introduced by the difference of their input-output trajectories, and the set of these indices quantifies the level of heterogeneity of the networks. 2) A non-conservative condition for obtaining this index between two adjacent linear time-invariant (LTI) subsystems is proposed. 3) A condition in relation to the output consensus of the heterogeneous network is proposed in terms of the level of heterogeneity and the connectivity of the networks.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Notation

Let \mathbb{R} be the set of real numbers. For a matrix A , denote by A^T its transpose, and $\text{rank}(A)$ its rank. Denote by I_m the $m \times m$ identity matrix. Let $\mathbf{1}_m := [1, \dots, 1]^T \in$

[★] This work was supported in part by the National Science and Technology Council of Taiwan under No. 113-2222E-110-002-MY3

\mathbb{R}^m . Given scalars a_1, \dots, a_m , let the column vector $\text{col}(a_1, \dots, a_m) := [a_1, \dots, a_m]^T$ and $\text{diag}\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ the diagonal matrix with its i th diagonal entry being a_i . Given a symmetric matrix $A = A^T$, we use $A \succ 0$ (resp., $A \succeq 0$) to denote that A is positive definite (resp., positive semi-definite). Define the signal space $\mathbf{L}_2 = \{x : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|x\|^2 := \int_0^\infty |x(t)|^2 dt < \infty\}$ where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. For any $x : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, define the truncation operator $(P_T x)(t) = x(t)$ for $t \leq T$ and $(P_T x)(t) = 0$ for $t > T$. Define \mathbf{L}_{2e} as $\mathbf{L}_{2e} = \{x : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \mid P_T x \in \mathbf{L}_2, \forall T \geq 0\}$. Given $x \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ and $T \geq 0$, $\|x\|_T := \left(\int_0^T |x(t)|^2 dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Given $x, y \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ and $T \geq 0$, $\langle x, y \rangle_T := \int_0^T x^T(t)y(t)dt$. An operator $H : \mathbf{L}_{2e} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ is said to be causal if $P_T H P_T = P_T H$, $\forall T \in \mathbb{R}$. All operators $H : \mathbf{L}_{2e} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ considered in this work are assumed to map 0 to 0.

2.2 Graph Theory

A graph is defined by $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the set of nodes and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ is the set of edges. The edge $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ denotes that node i can obtain information from node j . Let $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{N} \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ denote the set of neighbours of node i . The graph \mathcal{G} is said to be undirected if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ then $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$. \mathcal{G} is said to be strongly connected if there exists a sequence of edges between every pair of nodes. For a graph \mathcal{G} , its adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is defined as $a_{ij} = 1$ if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. It is assumed that there are no self-loop, that is $a_{ii} = 0, i = 1, \dots, n$. The Laplacian matrix $L = [l_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of \mathcal{G} is defined as:

$$l_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{q=1}^n a_{iq}, & i = j \\ -a_{ij}, & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

For an undirected graph \mathcal{G} , we may assign an orientation to \mathcal{G} by considering one of the two nodes of an edge to be the positive end and the other one to be the negative end. Denote by \mathcal{L}_i^+ (resp., \mathcal{L}_i^-) the set of edges for which node i is the positive (resp. negative) end. Let p be the cardinality \mathcal{E} , i.e., the total number of edges. Define the incidence matrix $D = [d_{ik}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ of an undirected graph \mathcal{G} as

$$d_{ik} = \begin{cases} +1, & k \in \mathcal{L}_i^+ \\ -1, & k \in \mathcal{L}_i^- \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For an undirected graph \mathcal{G} , it holds that $D^T \mathbf{1}_n = 0$ and $L = DD^T$ (Bai et al., 2011, Definition 1.2). A spanning tree in \mathcal{G} is an edge-subgraph of \mathcal{G} which has $n - 1$ edges and contains all nodes (Biggs, 1993, p29).

2.3 Passivity

In this work, we adopt the definitions of passivity from Definition 2.2.1 in Van der Schaft (2000) and incremental output-feedback passivity from Definition 2 in Scardovi et al. (2010) for system described by input-output maps.

Definition 1. A causal operator $H : \mathbf{L}_{2e} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ is said to be passive if

$$\langle Hu, u \rangle_T \geq 0, \forall u \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}, \forall T \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

Given $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, H is said to be γ -incrementally output-feedback passive (OFP) if

$$\langle Hu - Hv, u - v \rangle_T \geq \gamma \|Hu - Hv\|_T^2, \forall u, v \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}, \forall T \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

Problem Formulation

Consider n linear time-invariant systems $H_i : \mathbf{L}_{2e} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ described by

$$y_i = H_i u_i, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \quad (3)$$

where $u_i, y_i \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ denote respectively the input and output of the i -th system. Suppose H_i is real-rational proper transfer functions and the group of systems is interconnected by means of an undirected and connected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$. Specifically, the input u_i to the i -th system, is given by

$$u_i = w_i - v_i, i \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (4)$$

Here, $w_i \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ is the external disturbance and/or reference signals, and $v_i \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ depends on the relative outputs between the i -th system and its neighbours as given by

$$v_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \alpha_{ij} (y_i - y_j), \quad (5)$$

where the scalars $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ji} > 0$. Let $Y := \text{col}(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and the same notation is used to define the vectors V, W and U . Substituting (5) into (4) and recalling the definition of the incidence matrix D , it can be obtained that

$$U = W - V = W - D\Psi D^T Y \quad (6)$$

where $\Psi = \text{diag}\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p\}$ with $\alpha_k = \alpha_{ij}, k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ if $d_{ik} = 1$ and $d_{jk} = -1$.

The aim of this work is to derive conditions such that there exists a gain $\rho > 0$ such that

$$\|D^T Y\|_T \leq \rho \|D^T W\|_T, \forall W \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}, \forall T \geq 0. \quad (7)$$

Note that the external input W can be considered to be the sum $W = W_1 + W_2$ with $W_1 = w \mathbf{1}_n, w \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ being a reference signal and $W_2 \in \mathbf{L}_2$ being disturbance. Then, if (7) holds, it implies that $\|D^T Y\| \leq \rho \|D^T W_2\|$. As remarked in Scardovi et al. (2010), $\|D^T Y\|_T$ quantifies the synchrony of the outputs in the time interval $[0, T]$, and (7) implies that the interconnected network enjoy the property that external input with a high level of consensus produces output with the same property. More importantly, (7) can be extended to ensure synchronisation in systems described with a state space formalism (with arbitrary initial conditions) under the assumption of zero-state reachability.

3. MAIN RESULT

Given two systems H_i and H_j , suppose they are γ -incrementally output-feedback passive, i.e.,

$$\langle H_i u - H_i v, u - v \rangle_T \geq \gamma \|H_i u - H_i v\|_T^2$$

and

$$\langle H_j u - H_j v, u - v \rangle_T \geq \gamma \|H_j u - H_j v\|_T^2$$

for all $u, v \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ and $T \geq 0$. We introduce in the next assumption an index γ_{ij} to characterise the gap between H_i and H_j .

Assumption 2. For all $T \geq 0$, there exists $\gamma_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ such that the operators H_i and H_j satisfy

$$\langle H_i u - H_j v, u - v \rangle_T \geq \gamma_{ij} \|H_i u - H_j v\|_T^2, \forall u, v \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}. \quad (8)$$

Remark 3. When $H_i = H_j$, (8) reduces to H_i, H_j being γ_{ij} -incrementally output feedback passive. The deviation of γ_{ij} from γ capture the gap between H_i and H_j .

Given the LTI transfer function $H_i(s)$ and $H_j(s)$, define the following transfer function matrix:

$$\Omega_{ij}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{H_i(s)}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_i(s)} & \frac{-H_j(s)}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_j(s)} \\ \frac{-H_i(s)}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_i(s)} & \frac{H_j(s)}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_j(s)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

The following lemma states a necessary and sufficient condition that ensures (8) holds.

Lemma 4. Given the LTI transfer function $H_i(s)$ and $H_j(s)$ and suppose $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ is well-defined on \mathbf{L}_{2e} , (8) holds if and only if $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ is positive real, i.e., the following conditions hold:

- $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ is analytic in $\text{Re}[s] > 0$.
- $\Omega_{ij}(j\omega) + \Omega_{ij}^T(-j\omega) \geq 0$ for any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $j\omega$ is not a pole of $\Omega_{ij}(s)$.
- The pure imaginary poles of $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ are non-repeated, and the residue matrix at any pure imaginary pole s_0 , $\lim_{s \rightarrow s_0} (s - s_0) \Omega_{ij}(s)$, is Hermitian and positive semidefinite.

Proof. For all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, $u, v \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ and $T \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle H_i u - H_j v, u - v \rangle_T - \gamma_{ij} \|H_i u - H_j v\|_T^2 \\ &= \int_0^T (H_i u - H_j v)^T (u - v) dt \\ & \quad - \gamma_{ij} \int_0^T (H_i u - H_j v)^T (H_i u - H_j v) dt \\ &= \int_0^T \begin{bmatrix} u - \gamma_{ij} H_i u \\ v - \gamma_{ij} H_j v \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} H_i u - H_j v \\ H_j v - H_i u \end{bmatrix} dt \\ &= \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} u - \gamma_{ij} H_i u \\ v - \gamma_{ij} H_j v \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{H_i}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_i} & \frac{-H_j}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_j} \\ \frac{-H_i}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_i} & \frac{H_j}{1 - \gamma_{ij} H_j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u - \gamma_{ij} H_i u \\ v - \gamma_{ij} H_j v \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle_T. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

From Theorem 1 in Willems (1972), $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ is passive if and only if $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ is positive real, i.e., conditions a)-c) in Lemma 4 hold. Since $(1 - \gamma_{ij} H_i)u \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ if $u \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$, (8) holds if and only if $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ is passive, thus (8) holds if and only if $\Omega_{ij}(s)$ is positive real, i.e., conditions a)-c) in Lemma 4 hold. \square

Given an undirected and connected graph \mathcal{G} with an incidence matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, let \mathcal{G}_{ST} be any spanning tree of \mathcal{G} and let $D_{ST} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ be the incidence matrix of \mathcal{G}_{ST} . We present next two supporting lemmas.

Lemma 5. There exists a matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times p}$ such that $D = D_{ST}Q$ and $\text{rank}(Q) = n - 1$.

Proof. Since \mathcal{G} is an undirected and connected graph and \mathcal{G}_{ST} is a spanning tree of \mathcal{G} , $\text{rank}(L) = \text{rank}(D^T D) = \text{rank}(D) = \text{rank}(D_{ST}) = n - 1$ and there must exist a

matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times p}$ such that $D = D_{ST}Q$. Noting that $\text{rank}(AB) \leq \min\{\text{rank}(A), \text{rank}(B)\}$, one has $\text{rank}(Q) = n - 1$. \square

Lemma 6. Given $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times p}$ such that $D = D_{ST}Q$, $R = \text{diag}\{r_1, \dots, r_p\}$ with $r_i \geq r > 0$, $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. It holds that

$$M := Q(\gamma I_p R + R D^T D R) Q^T \succ 0$$

if $\gamma + r\lambda_2 > 0$ where λ_2 is the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix L .

Proof. Recall from Lemma 5 that $\text{rank}(Q) = n - 1$. By performing singular value decomposition (Dullerud and Paganini, 2013, Theorem 1.11), we can write $R^{\frac{1}{2}} D^T D R^{\frac{1}{2}} = V \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} V^T$, where $V \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is a unitary matrix, $\Sigma = \text{diag}\{\theta_1^2, \dots, \theta_{n-1}^2\}$ with $\theta_1 \geq \dots \geq \theta_{n-1} > 0$, and $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}$ are the nonzero singular values of $DR^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Since $D = D_{ST}Q$, we can obtain that $\begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} = V^T R^{\frac{1}{2}} D^T D R^{\frac{1}{2}} V = V^T R^{\frac{1}{2}} Q^T D_{ST}^T D_{ST} Q R^{\frac{1}{2}} V$. Noting $D_{ST} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$, it follows from $\text{rank}(D_{ST}^T D_{ST}) = \text{rank}(D_{ST}) = n - 1$ that $D_{ST}^T D_{ST} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$ is positive definite. By inspecting the equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} = V^T R^{\frac{1}{2}} Q^T D_{ST}^T D_{ST} Q R^{\frac{1}{2}} V,$$

it can be implied that $Q R^{\frac{1}{2}} V = [U \ 0]$ for some full-rank $U \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$ and $U^T D_{ST}^T D_{ST} U = \Sigma$. Now, we are ready to rewrite M into

$$\begin{aligned} M &:= Q(\gamma I_p R + R D^T D R) Q^T \\ &= Q R^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\gamma I_p + R^{\frac{1}{2}} D^T D R^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) R^{\frac{1}{2}} Q^T \\ &= Q R^{\frac{1}{2}} V \left(\gamma I_p + \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) V^T R^{\frac{1}{2}} Q^T \\ &= [U \ 0] \left(\gamma I_p + \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} U^T \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= U(\gamma I_{n-1} + \Sigma) U^T. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

It follows from (11) that $M \succ 0$ if $\gamma I_{n-1} + \Sigma \succ 0$. On the other hand, since $\text{rank}(D) = n - 1$, the nonzero singular values of D can be ordered in a nonincreasing manner as $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{n-1} > 0$. Noting that λ_2 is the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of $L = DD^T$, we have $\sigma_{n-1} = \sqrt{\lambda_2}$. According to the singular value inequalities in Loyka and Charalambous (2015), one has $s_i(AB) \geq s_i(A) s_{\min}(B)$, where $s_{\min}(B)$ is the smallest singular value of B , $s_i(A)$ and $s_i(AB)$ are the i th largest singular values of A and AB respectively. Therefore, we can obtain that $\theta_{n-1} = s_{n-1}(DR^{\frac{1}{2}}) \geq s_{n-1}(D) s_{\min}(R^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \sigma_{n-1} s_{\min}(R^{\frac{1}{2}}) \geq \sqrt{r\lambda_2} > 0$, where $s_{\min}(R^{\frac{1}{2}})$ is the smallest singular value of $R^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $s_{n-1}(D)$ and $s_{n-1}(DR^{\frac{1}{2}})$ are the $(n-1)$ th largest singular values (i.e., the smallest nonzero singular values) of D and $DR^{\frac{1}{2}}$ respectively, and the last inequality follows from $r_i \geq r > 0$. Accordingly, we can conclude that if $\gamma + r\lambda_2 > 0$, then $\gamma + \theta_{n-1}^2 > 0$ and thus $\gamma I_{n-1} + \Sigma \succ 0$, i.e., $M = Q(\gamma I_p R + R D^T D R) Q^T \succ 0$. \square

For a homogeneous network (i.e., all nodes share the same dynamics), suppose that the node dynamics are γ_c -

incremental OFP and the linear diffusive coupling gain is given by a constant α . It has been shown by Scardovi et al. (2010) that (7) holds if $\gamma_c + \alpha\lambda_2 > 0$. In the next theorem, we generalise this result to the case of heterogeneous networks.

Theorem 7. Consider the interconnected network (3)-(5) and suppose Assumption 2 holds. Let $\gamma_m = \min_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \gamma_{ij}$ and $\alpha = \min_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \alpha_{ij}$. Then, (7) holds if $\gamma_m + \alpha\lambda_2 > 0$.

Proof. According to Lemma 5, there exists a matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times p}$ such that $D = D_{ST}Q$. Consequently, for all $U \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi D^T Y, D^T U \rangle_T &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \alpha_{ij} \langle y_i - y_j, u_i - u_j \rangle_T \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \gamma_{ij} \alpha_{ij} \|y_i - y_j\|_T^2 \\ &\geq \langle D^T Y, \gamma_m I_p \Psi D^T Y \rangle_T \\ &= \langle D_{ST}^T Y, Q \gamma_m I_p \Psi Q^T D_{ST}^T Y \rangle_T \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Assumption 2, and Ψ is defined after (6). On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi D^T Y, D^T V \rangle_T &= \int_0^T Y^T D \Psi D^T D \Psi D^T Y dt \\ &= \int_0^T Y^T D_{ST} Q \Psi D^T D \Psi Q^T D_{ST}^T Y dt \\ &= \langle D_{ST}^T Y, Q \Psi D^T D \Psi Q^T D_{ST}^T Y \rangle_T. \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

Define $\tilde{M} := Q (\gamma_m I_p \Psi + \Psi D^T D \Psi) Q^T$. By hypothesis, $\gamma_m + \alpha\lambda_2 > 0$, and thus according to Lemma 6, $\tilde{M} \succ 0$, leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi D^T Y, D^T W \rangle_T &= \langle \Psi D^T Y, D^T U \rangle_T + \langle \Psi D^T Y, D^T V \rangle_T \\ &\geq \int_0^T Y^T D_{ST} \tilde{M} D_{ST}^T Y \geq \mu \|D_{ST}^T Y\|_T^2, \end{aligned}$$

where μ is the smallest eigenvalue of \tilde{M} . Noting that $\|\Psi D^T Y\|_T^2 \leq \bar{\alpha}^2 \|D^T Y\|_T^2$ and $\|D^T Y\|_T^2 \leq \kappa \|D_{ST}^T Y\|_T^2$, where $\bar{\alpha} = \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \alpha_{ij}$ and κ is the largest eigenvalue of

$Q Q^T$, and thus applying the Cauchy-Scharwz inequality yields

$$\|D^T Y\|_T \leq \rho \|D^T W\|_T, \quad \forall W \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}, \quad \forall T \geq 0,$$

where $\rho = \kappa \bar{\alpha} / \mu > 0$. \square

4. CONCLUSION

This paper investigated the consensus problem for networks of heterogeneous LTI agents with external disturbance and/or reference input over diffusive coupling. We introduced the indices that characterise the gaps between the adjacent subsystems. It has been shown that the output of the subsystems in the heterogeneous network reach a certain level of consensus if the sum of the level of heterogeneity of the network and the connectivity of the communication graph is positive.

REFERENCES

Bai, H., Arcak, M., and Wen, J. (2011). *Cooperative control design: a systematic, passivity-based approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.

- Biggs, N. (1993). *Algebraic graph theory*. 67. Cambridge university press.
- Bürger, M. and De Persis, C. (2015). Dynamic coupling design for nonlinear output agreement and time-varying flow control. *Automatica*, 51, 210–222.
- Chopra, N. and Spong, M.W. (2006). Passivity-based control of multi-agent systems. *Advances in robot control: from everyday physics to human-like movements*, 107–134.
- Dullerud, G.E. and Paganini, F. (2013). *A course in robust control theory: a convex approach*, volume 36. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Kelkar, A. and Joshi, S. (1998). Robust passification and control of non-passive systems. In *Proceedings of the 1998 American Control Conference*, volume 5, 3133–3137.
- Li, M., Su, L., and Chesi, G. (2019). Consensus of heterogeneous multi-agent systems with diffusive couplings via passivity indices. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 3(2), 434–439.
- Li, Z., Duan, Z., and Lewis, F.L. (2014). Distributed robust consensus control of multi-agent systems with heterogeneous matching uncertainties. *Automatica*, 50(3), 883–889.
- Loyka, S. and Charalambous, C.D. (2015). Novel matrix singular value inequalities and their applications to uncertain MIMO channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(12), 6623–6634.
- Olfati-Saber, R. and Shamma, J.S. (2005). Consensus filters for sensor networks and distributed sensor fusion. In *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 6698–6703.
- Qiao, W. and Sipahi, R. (2015). Consensus control under communication delay in a three-robot system: Design and experiments. *IEEE Transactions on control systems technology*, 24(2), 687–694.
- Qu, Z. and Simaan, M.A. (2014). Modularized design for cooperative control and plug-and-play operation of networked heterogeneous systems. *Automatica*, 50(9), 2405–2414.
- Scardovi, L., Arcak, M., and Sontag, E.D. (2010). Synchronization of interconnected systems with applications to biochemical networks: An input-output approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(6), 1367–1379.
- Stan, G.B., Hamadeh, A., Sepulchre, R., and Gonçalves, J. (2007). Output synchronization in networks of cyclic biochemical oscillators. In *2007 American Control Conference*, 3973–3978. IEEE.
- Van der Schaft, A. (2000). *L₂-gain and passivity techniques in nonlinear control*. Springer.
- Willems, J.C. (1972). Dissipative dynamical systems part ii: Linear systems with quadratic supply rates. *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, 45, 352–393.
- Yang, S., Tan, S., and Xu, J.X. (2013). Consensus based approach for economic dispatch problem in a smart grid. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(4), 4416–4426.
- Zhang, X. and Lewis, F.L. (2018). Cooperative output regulation of heterogeneous multi-agent systems based on passivity. *International Journal of Systems Science*, 49(16), 3418–3430.