
OPINION DYNAMIC UNDER MALICIOUS AGENT INFLUENCE IN MULTI-AGENT SYSTEMS: FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF OPINION EVOLUTION COST *

Yuhan Suo,[†] Runqi Chai, Senchun Chai, Ishrak MD Farhan, Yuanqing Xia

Beijing Institute of Technology,
Beijing, China

Xudong Zhao

Dalian University of Technology,
Dalian, China

ABSTRACT

In human social systems, debates are often seen as a means to resolve differences of opinion. However, in reality, debates frequently incur significant communication costs, especially when dealing with stubborn opponents. Inspired by this phenomenon, this paper examines the impact of malicious agents on the evolution of normal agents' opinions from the perspective of opinion evolution cost, and proposes corresponding solutions for the scenario in which malicious agents hold different opinions in multi-agent systems(MASs). First, this paper analyzes the negative impact of malicious agents on the opinion evolution process, reveals the additional evolution cost it brings, and provides a theoretical basis for the subsequent solutions. Secondly, based on the characteristics of opinion evolution, the malicious agent isolation algorithm based on opinion evolution direction vector is proposed, which does not strongly restrict the proportion of malicious agents. Additionally, an evolution rate adjustment mechanism is introduced, allowing the system to flexibly regulate the evolution process in complex situations, effectively achieving the trade-off between opinion evolution rate and cost. Extensive numerical simulations demonstrate that the algorithm can effectively eliminate the negative influence of malicious agents and achieve a balance between opinion evolution costs and convergence speed.

Keywords Multi-Agent Systems · Social Norms · Opinion Dynamics · Malicious Agent Isolation · Evolution Rate Adjustment

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

In today's information age, MASs have found widespread applications across diverse fields, ranging from intelligent transportation systems [1] to social networks [2]. These systems are characterized by independent agents that collaborate to accomplish tasks through information exchange. Given their reliance on coordination and consistency, consensus has become a central focus of research. Achieving consensus enhances the robustness and stability of the system, enabling it to effectively handle external disturbances, even in uncertain environments.

In MASs, agents continuously adjust their states based on the information provided by their neighbors, gradually converging toward consensus. In an ideal scenario, free from interference by malicious agents, MASs typically achieve

*This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

[†]yuhan.suo@bit.edu.cn

consensus naturally [3]. Social systems represent a special type of MAS, where social norms guide individuals' behaviors and thus facilitate structured consensus [4]. However, some malicious agents disregard these norms, deliberately spreading misinformation to mislead others. This issue is particularly evident on social platforms, where misinformation can lead to public division and even severe societal consequences. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, certain media outlets disseminated false information, fueling widespread panic [5]. To maintain system stability and ensure information accuracy, it is therefore crucial to develop methods that enable normal agents to identify and filter out malicious information.

The formation of social consensus inevitably involves the dynamic evolution of opinions, with each agent's unique characteristics leading to different paths of opinion development. While normal agents may follow varying trajectories, they generally converge toward a shared overall trend. However, the presence of malicious agents complicates this process. These agents may intentionally disrupt consensus-building by spreading false information, holding extreme views, or outright rejecting others' input. As a result, minimizing the influence of malicious agents to ensure effective consensus formation becomes a critical challenge.

A common approach to addressing this issue is isolating malicious agents. Current research often uses residual-based methods to detect anomalies by comparing an agent's local information with that of its neighbors. However, in the opinion evolution process, obtaining available residuals is challenging, which increases the risk of misidentifications [6, 7]. Therefore, in scenarios with limited information, effectively identifying malicious agents while minimizing the incorrect isolation of normal agents remains a significant challenge.

Moreover, interactions among agents in social systems have a profound impact on the evolution of opinions. This influence becomes particularly pronounced when neighboring agents hold differing views, such as in the presence of malicious agents. In such cases, each agent faces the challenge of balancing their own stance with incorporating the perspectives of others. This trade-off adds further complexity to the problem and introduces additional uncertainty into the research.

When the number of malicious agents in a system is relatively small, fault tolerance mechanisms are typically sufficient to manage them. However, in more complex scenarios, where the proportion of malicious agents rises significantly, decision-making for normal agents becomes exceedingly difficult [8]. Such situations are often inevitable in real-world applications, highlighting the need for effective consensus mechanisms that can function even in the presence of a substantial number of malicious agents.

Overall, opinion evolution in the presence of malicious agents presents significant challenges. This paper seeks to provide a solution that enables agents to identify and block harmful information while maintaining a balance in the opinion evolution process under various influences.

1.2 Related Works

Achieving consensus in MASs has long been a central focus of research. Traditional consensus algorithms typically assume that all agents behave normally and will inevitably converge to a unified state. These algorithms are known for their fast convergence and robustness in scenarios without malicious agents [9], as seen in average consensus algorithms [10] and Laplacian matrix-based consensus protocols [11]. Further research has also explored consensus problems in leader-follower models [12, 13], where agents follow a common leader and theoretically converge to a consensus as time approaches infinity [14]. However, in more complex settings, such as social systems, agents are more likely to reach a consensus within a range that aligns with social norms, rather than achieving a fully unified state. This scenario better reflects the dynamics of real-world complex systems.

In environments with malicious agents, enhancing traditional algorithms to counteract disruptive interference becomes particularly essential. Malicious agents may interfere with the consensus process by spreading false information, manipulating data, or rejecting the decisions of other agents [15]. Consequently, recent studies have increasingly focused on robust consensus algorithms, aiming to detect and isolate malicious agents within MASs [16, 17]. Some robust algorithms assess and isolate malicious behaviors by defining an agent's trust value [18, 19, 20], while other methods employ residual calculations, detecting anomalies by comparing local information with neighboring information [6, 21, 22]. In addition, taking approaches similar to moving target defense can also reduce the impact of malicious attackers on consensus [23, 24]. These methods improve fault tolerance and interference resistance, enabling the system to maintain consensus even when a certain number of malicious agents are present.

Current studies predominantly focus on detecting and isolating malicious agents after the system has fully converged, with limited investigation into the convergence phase itself. In reality, due to inherent differences among agents, their convergence processes vary significantly. During convergence, to ensure accurate isolation, the system requires sufficient time to identify malicious agents accurately, avoiding false positives among normal agents. Therefore, how to

buy time for the isolation process of malicious agents is an area worthy of further exploration. Some studies have shown that by converting the traditional algebraic Riccati equation (ARE) into a parameterized form, the state convergence process of the control system will be related to the parameter value [25, 26]. Inspired by this, this paper considers regulating the convergence process by dynamically adjusting parameters. However, this leads to a new issue, namely how to ensure that the dynamic regulation of parameters does not affect the positive definiteness of the solution of ARE.

Moreover, existing methods face limitations in complex environments with high proportions of malicious agents and significant information uncertainty. Specifically, when addressing Byzantine attacks, the system often requires an upper limit on the number of malicious agents, typically not exceeding half of the total [27]. These challenges have driven researchers to explore new consensus mechanisms that can handle situations with a high proportion of malicious agents. Hosseini et al. [28] examined how to design voting mechanisms to restore truth when the majority of agents are misled. However, developing effective isolation mechanisms to separate a majority of malicious agents during convergence remains an unresolved issue.

In conclusion, although existing research has made strides in isolating malicious agents and improving system robustness, many of the challenges outlined above remain unresolved, providing further motivation for the research presented in this paper.

1.3 Contributions of This Paper

Building on existing research, this paper proposes an innovative approach that combines malicious agent isolation with the regulation of the opinion evolution process to address the limitations of current methods, aiming to mitigate the impact of malicious influences and facilitate the formation of social consensus. And the main contributions of this paper include:

1. On the impact of malicious agents on opinion evolution in MASs, this paper innovatively uses the concept of opinion evolution cost as an entry point, providing a detailed analysis of how malicious agents interfere with the opinion evolution of normal agents. The theoretical result (Theorem 3.1) shows that the presence of malicious agents introduces additional costs to the opinion evolution process of normal agents, and this conclusion is validated by simulation results. Furthermore, in contrast to existing literature (e.g., [29, 30]), which focuses on the convergence of agent opinions, this paper pays more attention to the regulation of the opinion evolution process to effectively reduce the additional costs and ensure the subsequent opinion convergence performance.
2. To address the issue that malicious agents cannot be isolated by calculating available residuals (e.g., [6, 7, 31]) during opinion evolution process, this paper models the opinion evolution of agents as points on a Grassmann manifold, thereby capturing the direction of opinion evolution and adjusting the agents' trust values accordingly (Algorithm 1). The theoretical result (Theorem 3.2) shows that the proposed algorithm can effectively isolate malicious agents after a finite number of time steps, thereby reducing the subsequent opinion evolution costs. Simulation results confirm the algorithm's effectiveness in isolating malicious agents. Unlike existing studies (e.g., [7, 8, 32]) which usually consider the case where the proportion of malicious agents is less than half, the proposed algorithm only compares the opinion evolution directions of a part of neighboring agents at each time step, which relaxes the restriction on the proportion of malicious agents.
3. At different stages of opinion evolution, agents place varying levels of importance on the opinion evolution cost and opinion evolution rate. To accommodate this differential emphasis, it is necessary for agents to have the ability to adjust the evolution rate. Therefore, this paper proposes an opinion evolution rate adjustment mechanism by dynamically tuning the γ parameter in the parameterized ARE to regulate the rate of opinion evolution (Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3). Theorem 3.3 shows that during the evolution process, although the opinion evolution rate is adjusted, the stable convergence of opinions will not be affected. Simulation results further validate that the proposed algorithm effectively balances the trade-off between opinion evolution rate and cost.

1.4 Structural Organization

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section II builds the foundational model, including the system model based on graph theory and opinion dynamics, and raises problems of interest. The III section introduces the main results of this paper, analyzes the impact of malicious agents on the cost of opinion evolution, and proposes the malicious agent isolation algorithm and evolution rate adjustment mechanism. Section IV provides the simulation results to validate the effectiveness and robustness of the proposed algorithms. Section V summarizes the paper and suggests directions for future research.

Notations: Throughout this paper, \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ represent the n -dimensional Euclidean space and $n \times n$ real matrices, respectively. $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ refers to the mathematical expectation. For a matrix A , $\|A\|$ and $\|A\|_1$ separately stand for the l_2 -norm and l_1 -norm, while A^T denotes its transpose. The function $rand()$ generates random numbers uniformly distributed between 0 and 1. And for the set \mathcal{N} , the $N = |\mathcal{N}|$ denotes its cardinality. For $j \in \mathcal{N}$, denote $[w_j]_{j \in \mathcal{N}}$ as a N -dimensional column vector composed of the values of all elements w_j , that is, $[w_j]_{j \in \mathcal{N}} = [w_1, \dots, w_j, \dots, w_N]^T$. The vector $\mathbf{1}_n(\mathbf{0}_n)$ is an n -dimensional column vector where every element is 1(0).

2 Problem Formulation

2.1 Graph Theory

Graph theory can be used to describe complex networks, such as social systems and multi-robot systems. By examining the relationships between nodes and edges, graph theory provides an effective way to analyze and reveal the structure and dynamics of these systems. Assume that there is an agent network consisting of a series of agents participating in the opinion dynamics process, and regard the network as an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{N} and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ represent the agent set and edge set, respectively. The neighbor agent set \mathcal{N}_i of agent i is represented as $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{N} : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Therefore, we can get $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{N}_N$.

2.2 Opinion Dynamics

In an undirected graph \mathcal{G} , each normal agent $i \in \mathcal{N}$ has an expected opinion $x_i^t(k)$ that aligns with social norms, and gradually adjusts its behavior according to this guiding expectation. The definition of social norms is given below:

Definition 2.1. (Social norms) *Social norms are a virtual range, and opinions within the range are diverse, regardless of good or bad. The center of social norms changes as follows:*

$$\eta(k+1) = S \cdot \eta(k) \quad (1)$$

The social norm range $\mathcal{R}(k)$ is the range with a radius of r centered at $\eta(k)$, which can be represented as:

$$\mathcal{R}(k) = \{x_i^t(k) \in \mathbb{R}^q : \|x_i^t(k) - \eta(k)\| \leq r\} \quad (2)$$

Therefore, at any time step k , the average of the expected opinions of all normal agents is $\eta(k)$.

Remark 2.1. *Social norms play a role similar to that of a leader, influencing the evolution of followers' opinions. Unlike the leader model, social norms are not fixed trajectories, but are modeled as a range - a region with a radius of r centered on $\eta(k)$. Therefore, each agent may have different expected opinion $x_i^t(k)$.*

At time step k , the behavior of an agent i is called the opinion $x_i(k)$, and as John Locke stated in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 'People begin life as a Tabula Rasa, or a blank slate' [33]. Thus, initially, the opinion of each agent i is blank, i.e., $x_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the following opinion evolution refers to the process by which each agent i gradually forms and shapes its own opinion.

Definition 2.2. (Agent opinion evolution) *Under the influence of societal norms and interactions with other agents, the opinion of each agent i will evolve dynamically over time as follows:*

$$x_i(k+1) = A_i x_i^f(k) + B_i u_i(k), \quad (3)$$

where $x_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x_i^f(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $u_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ represent the individual opinion, the fusion opinion of agent i , and the opinion evolution input at time step k , respectively. In addition, the system matrices A_i and B_i are matrices with appropriate dimensions.

For a normal agent, it is necessary to maintain communication with its neighbors and constantly revise its own opinions to ensure that the opinions do not deviate from the masses. At time step k , the agent i can obtain the fusion opinion $x_i^f(k)$ by

$$x_i^f(k) = x_i(k) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \omega_{ij}(k) (x_j(k) - x_i(k)), \quad (4)$$

where $\omega_{ij}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ represents the fusion weight assigned by agent i to agent j , and satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \omega_{ij}(k) = I_{n \times n}$. The specific calculation of $\omega_{ij}(k)$ will be introduced later.

In addition to normal agents, other agents are malicious agents, which are "stubborn" and do not listen to others' opinions at all, but impose their own wrong opinions on others. Therefore, the $x_i^f(k)$ of malicious agent i is exact the individual opinion $x_i(k)$.

Definition 2.3. (Opinion of malicious agents) The opinion dynamics of the malicious agent is also calculated by equation (3). However, the expected opinion x_i^t of the malicious agent i is contrary to social norms.

Before the agent i makes an accurate judgment on the agent $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, the malicious agent j is called a "potential malicious agent". In this paper, the set of malicious agents is defined as \mathcal{N}^a . The number of malicious agents may be greater than half, that is, $N^a > \frac{N}{2}$.

Remark 2.2. According to the literature [7, 8, 32], it is difficult to achieve secure consensus when the number of malicious agents is greater than half. Therefore, how to effectively isolate a larger proportion of malicious agents through a few normal agents remains to be studied.

And the objective of all normal agent is to ensure that resilient consensus, especially under the negative influence of malicious agents.

Definition 2.4. (Resilient consensus) Resilient consensus means that all normal agents $i \in \mathcal{N}^u = \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}^a$ can successfully eliminate the influence of malicious agents and the opinion of each agent i can eventually converge to the expected opinion x_i^t , i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\{i \in \mathcal{N}^u \mid |x_i(k) - x_i^t| \leq \epsilon\}| = N^u, \quad (5)$$

where ϵ represents a small scale positive number.

2.3 Opinion Evolution Input

In this paper, the opinion evolution input $u_i(k)$ of each agent i in equation (3) is defined below

Definition 2.5. [34] Consider the agent i with linear system (3) and wish to stabilize the state $x_i(k)$ to an arbitrary position x_i^t with minimal control cost. Assume that $\{A_i, B_i\}$ is stabilizable. Define the state deviation as $\tilde{x}_i(k) = x_i(k) - x_i^t$, and the cost function $J_i(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - \gamma)^{-k} (u_i^T(k) R_i u_i(k))$. Then, the cost function $J_i(u)$ is minimized with

$$u_i(k) = -K_i(k) \tilde{x}_i(k) = -(R_i + B_i^T P_i(k) B_i)^{-1} B_i^T P_i(k) A_i \tilde{x}_i(k) \quad (6)$$

where $P_i(k)$ is the iterative positive definite solution of the parametric discrete-time algebraic Riccati equation (PDARE)

$$(1 - \gamma_i) P_i(k) = A_i^T P_i(k+1) A_i - A_i^T P_i(k+1) B_i \times \left(R_i + B_i^T P_i(k+1) B_i \right)^{-1} B_i^T P_i(k+1) A_i. \quad (7)$$

and will eventually converge to the unique positive definite solution. Given the matrices A_i , B_i , and R_i , the convergence rate of K_i is closely related to the convergence rate of P_i . Therefore, under the same state deviation $\tilde{x}_i(k)$, adjusting the convergence rate of P_i can influence the control input $u_i^*(k)$. This phenomenon provides the motivation for the subsequent research in this paper.

2.4 Problem of Interest

When disagreements arise in human social systems, debates are often seen as an effective means of resolving conflicts. However, in practice, debates frequently lead to lose-lose outcomes or unnecessary resource expenditure. Thus, in some cases, it may be more prudent to avoid confrontation. Inspired by this phenomenon, this paper focuses on the strategies adopted by normal agents in MASs when facing malicious agents—whether to incur additional costs to resist the influence of malicious agents or to adopt avoidance strategies that reduce confrontation and conserve resources. In response to this consideration, this paper raises three problems of interest:

1. **Examining the impact of malicious agents from the perspective of opinion evolution costs:** Investigating how malicious agents influence the opinion evolution process of normal agents, specifically in terms of the opinion evolution cost.
2. **Developing isolation mechanisms for malicious agents based on opinion evolution characteristics:** Designing isolation strategies that leverage the characteristics of opinion evolution to address the challenges posed by malicious agents, particularly in complex scenarios.
3. **Adjusting the opinion evolution rate to meet the needs of different stages of opinion evolution:** Investigating methods to adjust the opinion evolution rate to achieve a balance between the opinion evolution cost and opinion evolution speed.

3 Main Results

3.1 The Influence of Malicious Agent on Opinion evolution Cost

To facilitate the subsequent proposal of targeted defense measures against malicious agents, this section analyzes the impact of malicious agents on the cost of opinion evolution.

In the absence of malicious agents, each agent's opinion $x_i(k)$ gradually tends to fall within the social norm range \mathcal{R} under the guidance of its respective expected opinion x_i^t . In this case, the normal agent's fusion opinion $x_i^f(k)$ is expressed as $x_i^f(k) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \omega_{ij}(k) \cdot x_j(k)$. Since $\mathbb{E}[x_i^t]$ is the center of social norms \mathcal{R} . Therefore, the fusion opinion $x_i^f(k)$ also gradually converges to social norms. Under this condition, the input of equation (6) will not be significantly affected, thus maintaining its optimal characteristics.

However, when malicious agents are present, the situation changes significantly. Malicious agents disrupt the opinion evolution of normal agents by holding opinions that deviate from social norms. This interference triggers a chain reaction, causing changes in the input of normal agents' opinions, which in turn results in additional costs. Theorem 3.1 is given to illustrate this phenomenon.

Theorem 3.1. *For a normal agent $i \in \mathcal{N}^u$, if there are malicious agents in its neighbor set \mathcal{N}_i , the opinion evolution input of the normal agent i is affected by the offset term $\Delta u_i(k) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \alpha_j(k) \eta(k)$, which results in additional opinion evolution cost*

$$\Delta J_i(k) \leq \frac{N_i^a \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \alpha_j^2(k) \eta(k)^T (\omega_{ij})^T (K_i^T R_i K_i) (\omega_{ij}) \eta(k)}{(1 - \gamma)^k}, \quad (8)$$

Proof. Let the set of malicious agents in the neighbor set of agent i be \mathcal{N}_i^a . Define the scaling factor $\alpha_j(k) > 0$ to describe the approaching degree of the opinions of malicious agents to their expected opinions, then the opinion of malicious agent $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a$ is expressed as

$$x_j^a(k) = -\alpha_j(k) \eta(k), \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha_j(k)$ can be calculated by $\alpha_j(k) = \|x_j^a(k) - x_j^t\| / \|x_j^t\|$. According to equation (4), the fusion opinion $x_i^f(k)$ of the normal agent can be expressed as the weighted sum of the normal agent opinions and the malicious agent opinions:

$$x_i^f(k) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} x_j(k) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} x_j^a(k). \quad (10)$$

Substituting the approximate expression for the malicious agents' opinions, we get

$$x_i^f(k) \approx \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} x_j(k) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \alpha_j(k) \eta(k). \quad (11)$$

Here, we see that the fusion opinion $x_i^f(k)$ includes a negative offset term, denoted as $\Delta x_i^a(k)$, given by

$$\Delta x_i^a(k) = - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \alpha_j(k) \eta(k). \quad (12)$$

This negative offset causes the current fusion opinion $x_i(k)$ of agent i to deviate from the expected opinion x_i^t . Therefore, when there exists malicious agents, the opinion evolution input $u_i(k)$ is calculated as

$$u_i'(k) = -K_i \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} x_j(k) + \Delta x_i^a(k) - x_i^t \right). \quad (13)$$

Expanding this expression, we obtain

$$u_i'(k) = u_i^*(k) + \Delta u_i(k) = u_i^*(k) + K_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \alpha_j(k) \eta(k).$$

By introducing the offset impact of malicious agents into the control cost function, we obtain the additional cost $\Delta J(k)$ caused by the malicious agents:

$$\Delta \tilde{J}_i(k) = \Delta u_i(k)^T R_i \Delta u_i(k). \quad (14)$$

Substituting the expression for $\Delta u_i(k)$, we get:

$$\Delta \tilde{J}_i(k) = \left(K_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \alpha_j(k) \eta(k) \right)^T R_i \left(K_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \alpha_j(k) \eta(k) \right)$$

Further simplifying, we obtain:

$$\Delta \tilde{J}_i(k) = \alpha_j^2(k) \eta(k)^T \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \right)^T (K_i^T R_i K_i) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \right) \eta(k). \quad (15)$$

According to Lemma 6.1, the upper bound for the squared sum in the above expression can be derived:

$$\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \right)^T (K_i^T R_i K_i) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij} \right) \leq N_i^a \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} (\omega_{ij})^T (K_i^T R_i K_i) (\omega_{ij}) \quad (16)$$

Therefore, the upper bound for the additional control cost $\Delta J_i(k)$ can be expressed as $\Delta J_i(k) = \Delta \tilde{J}_i(k)/(1 - \gamma)^k$, where $\Delta \tilde{J}_i(k)$ is as follows:

$$\Delta \tilde{J}_i(k) \leq N_i^a \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \alpha_j^2(k) \eta(k)^T (\omega_{ij})^T (K_i^T R_i K_i) (\omega_{ij}) \eta(k),$$

where the term N_i^a indicates that the number of malicious agents is positively related to the overall control cost. This implies that as the number of malicious agents increases, the cost of control rises faster. In addition, the $\alpha_j^2(k)$ term indicates the degree to which the malicious agent's opinions deviate from social norms, which also significantly influence the control cost.

Therefore, due to the negative influence of the malicious agent, the opinion evolution input $u_i'(k)$ contains additional increments, which hinders the agent opinions from converging to the social consensus. This completes the proof. \square

It should be noted that the additional opinion evolution cost paid by normal agents is used to offset the influence of malicious agents (not necessarily completely offset, or may over-offset). Therefore, this part of the cost can be considered as a "meaningless" cost. In addition to the direct influence of neighbor malicious agents considered in Theorem 3.1, normal agents may also be affected by indirect malicious influence. And this kind of influence requires all normal agents to take defensive measures to alleviate the influence of malicious agents on their own opinion evolution.

According to Theorem 3.1, this paper considers mitigating the impact of malicious agents from two aspects. First, by reducing the influence weight of malicious agents on $x_i^f(k)$, the value of $\Delta x_i^a(k)$ can be decreased, thereby weakening the interference on the system. Second, to minimize unnecessary additional control input consumption caused by malicious agents, we consider reducing the convergence rate of P_i to slow down the convergence rate of K_i .

3.2 Malicious Agent Isolation Algorithm Based on Opinion Evolution Direction vector

In a MAS, the opinions of malicious agents will inevitably affect the opinion dynamics of normal agents. Therefore, it is necessary to effectively isolate malicious agents. Existing literature (e.g., [6, 7, 31]) usually isolates malicious agents by calculating the residual between local information and neighboring information. However, available residuals are difficult to obtain during opinion evolution. On the one hand, the existing residual calculations are generally aimed at the situation where the state has converged, and when the opinions have not converged, the residuals are meaningless. On the other hand, due to the fundamental differences in the evolution of opinions among different agents, such as system matrices, evolutionary rates, etc., it is difficult for residual-based methods to determine the detection threshold. Therefore, this paper proposes a trust value management method from the perspective of opinion evolution characteristics.

Definition 3.1. (Trust value) The trust value $T_{ij}(k)$ represents the weight that an agent i assigns to the neighboring agent j . The trust value considered has a lower bound T_{\min} . If the trust value that agent i assigns to neighboring agent j is lower than T_{\min} , the interaction will be directly disconnected.

Definition 3.2. (Opinion Evolution Characteristics) Opinion evolution characteristics refer to some information obtained from the opinion evolution direction vector, such as the direction of opinion evolution.

Compared with the method of judging malicious agents by calculating the residual between local information and neighboring information, opinion evolution characteristics can provide more assistance.

For agent i 's neighbor agent set \mathcal{N}_i , including a subset \mathcal{N}_i^a of N_i^a malicious agents. Each agent has an initial trust value $T_{ij}(0) = 1/N_i$. At each time step k , an agent i randomly selects $S = \min(q, |\mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{M}_i^d|)$ neighbors for comparison the opinion evolution direction, denoted as $\mathcal{S}(k) = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_S\}$.

Before the comparison, the definition of the Grassmann distance is introduced

Definition 3.3. [35] (*Grassmann distance*) For two subspaces U and V , the Grassmann distance $d_G(U, V)$ can be calculated by performing singular value decomposition(SVD) on the bases of these subspaces, as $d_G(U, V) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i^2}$, where m is the minimum dimension of U and V , and θ_i represents the i -th principal angle between U and V . Specifically, when subspaces U and V are each spanned by only one vector, the principal angle is $d_G(U, V) = \theta$.

At each time step k , each neighbor agent j of agent i broadcasts its opinion $x_j(k)$ for the calculation of $x_i^f(k)$ in equation (4). By combining opinion information from the time step k and time step $k - 1$, agent i can determine the opinion evolution direction vector $v_{ij}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of each neighboring agent j as:

$$v_{ij}(k) = x_j(k) - x_j(k - 1). \quad (17)$$

Then, the principal angle can be calculated as $d_G(v_i(k), v_{ij}(k)) = \theta_{ij}(k)$. In this way, the evolution of the opinion of each agent i can be represented as points on the Grassmann manifold, which can capture the direction of opinion evolution and reasonably manage the trust values of each agent. This subspace construction can not only capture the changes in the opinions of the agents within a certain period of time, but also analyze the deviation of opinions between agents through the geometric relationship of the subspace. Arrange the principal angles of the past $\max(k, m_1)$ time steps into a matrix $\Theta_{ij}(k)$:

$$\Theta_{ij}(k) = \begin{cases} \Theta_{ij}(k-1) \cup \{\theta_{ij}(k)\}, & \text{if } |\Theta_{ij}(k-1)| < m_1, \\ \Theta_{ij}(k-1) \cup \{\theta_{ij}(k)\} \setminus \{\theta_{ij}(k-m_1)\}, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where m_1 is the predefined time window size, the maximum principal angle is defined as $\theta_{ij}^{\max}(k) = \max(\Theta_{ij}(k)) = \max_{\ell=k-\max(k, m_1)+1:k} \theta_{ij}(\ell)$.

For each agent $j \in \mathcal{S}(k)$, if the cardinality of $\Theta_{ij}(k)$ is exactly m_1 , identify the set of neighbors whose maximum principal angle is not larger than a strict threshold θ_{strict} . And the set \mathcal{T}_i is updated as:

$$\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}_i \cup \{j \in \mathcal{S}(k) \mid \theta_{ij}^{\max}(k) \leq \theta_{\text{strict}}\}, \text{ if } |\Theta_{ij}(k)| = m_1. \quad (19)$$

Furthermore, the temporary trust agent set $\mathcal{T}'_i(k)$ is obtained

$$\mathcal{T}'_i(k) = \{j \in \mathcal{S}(k) \setminus \mathcal{T}_i \mid \theta_{ij}(k) \leq \theta_{\text{strict}}\}. \quad (20)$$

It is worth noting that the difference between \mathcal{T}_i and $\mathcal{T}'_i(k)$ is that \mathcal{T}_i is obtained through very strict screening, while the conditions for obtaining $\mathcal{T}'_i(k)$ are relatively loose, which is mainly to avoid misjudgment due to temporary deviations.

Next, based on the size relationship between \mathcal{T}_i , $\mathcal{T}'_i(k)$ and $\mathcal{S}(k)$, the potential malicious agents are judged. If $|\mathcal{S}^t(k)| = |\mathcal{S}(k) \cap (\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}'_i(k))| > S/2$, it indicates that most of the agents in the set $\mathcal{S}(k)$ are normal. In this case, all agents in the set $\mathcal{S}(k) \setminus (\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}'_i(k))$ are considered potential malicious agents. If the condition is not satisfied, the agent $j' \in \mathcal{S}(k)$ with the maximum $\theta_{ij'}^{\max}(k)$ is identified as a potential malicious agent, that is, $j' = \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(k) \setminus (\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}'_i(k))} \theta_{ij}^{\max}(k)$. In summary, the set of potential malicious agents can be obtained:

$$\mathcal{M}_i^p(k) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{M}_i^p(k) \cup (\mathcal{S}(k) \setminus \mathcal{S}^t(k)), & \text{if } |\mathcal{S}^t(k)| > S/2, \\ \mathcal{M}_i^p(k) \cup \{j'\}, & \text{if } |\mathcal{S}^t(k)| \leq S/2, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Then, the trust value $T_{ij}(k+1)$ of neighbor agent $j \in \mathcal{M}_i^p(k)$ is updated

$$T_{ij}(k+1) = \begin{cases} T_{ij}(k) - \Delta T, & \text{if } T_{ij}(k) - \Delta T(k) > T_{\min}, \\ 0, & \text{if } T_{ij}(k) - \Delta T \leq T_{\min} \end{cases}. \quad (22)$$

And the trust value $T_i(k) = [T_{ij}(k)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$ is updated by normalization.

At time step k , by calculating and comparing the opinion evolution directions of different agents, potentially malicious agents will be identified and collected in set $j \in \mathcal{M}_i^p(k)$. Define the process parameter 0-1 binary $flag_i^k$, which can

usually be obtained quickly. The initial value of $flag_1^i$ is 0. During multiple rounds of iterations, for agent i , if the set $\mathcal{M}_i^p(k)$ is not empty for the first time, $flag_1^i$ becomes 1. If the remaining agents are all trusted, $flag_1^i$ becomes 0. The $flag_1^i$ will be output to the subsequent evolution rate adjustment algorithm.

In general, for agent i , the pseudocode of the proposed algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1. Theorem 3.2 will show that by comparing the evolution characteristics of neighbors' opinions, the proposed Algorithm 2 can gradually offset the influence of malicious agents.

Theorem 3.2. *For the neighbor set \mathcal{N}_i of agent i , by continuously adjusting the trust value, the proposed algorithm can always completely offset the impact of the malicious agent set \mathcal{N}_i^a on the opinion evolution of the normal agent i within a finite number of time steps.*

Proof. According to equation (12), the influence of the malicious agents on the opinion evolution input $u_i^l(k)$ of the normal agent i primarily comes from the negative offset term $\Delta x_i^a(k) = -\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^a} \omega_{ij}(k) \alpha_j(k) \eta(k)$. Here, $-\alpha_j(k) \eta(k)$ gradually increases over time, which means the impact of the negative offset also intensifies. On the other hand, the weight $\omega_{ij}(k)$ of neighbor agent j is managed by the normal agent i . At time step k , if the neighbor agent j is judged as a potential malicious agent, its trust value will decrease by ΔT , thereby reducing its weight $\omega_{ij}(k)$.

However, as long as the malicious agent j still has opinion interactions with the normal agent i , that is, the trust value is still higher than T_{\min} , the malicious influence will continue to exist. Therefore, to prove that the proposed algorithm can completely offset the influence of malicious agents on normal agents, it is necessary to prove that the proposed algorithm can ensure that the trust value of the malicious agent is reduced to below T_{\min} .

Next, we will prove that the proposed algorithm can reduce the trust value of the malicious agent j below T_{\min} after a finite number of time steps.

For any malicious agent $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, the probability of being selected by agent i as one of its S neighbors is approximately $p_j = \frac{S}{N_i}$, assuming $N_i \gg S$. In a sufficiently large network, the probability of any malicious agent being selected is close to $1 - e^{-S}$, so each malicious agent will be frequently selected with high probability.

Then, at each time step k , this paper considers judging potential malicious agents based on the opinion evolution direction of different agents, see steps 15-25 in Algorithm 1. And the trust value of the potentially malicious agent $j \in \mathcal{M}_i^p$ is calculated by the equation (22). Then, after k time steps, the expected trust value of the malicious agent j can be obtained:

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{ij}(k)] = T_{ij}(0) - \Delta T \cdot p_j \cdot k. \quad (23)$$

To determine the minimum number of iterations K such that $\mathbb{E}[T_{ij}(K)] \leq T_{\min}$, we solve for K :

$$K \geq \frac{T_{ij}(0) - T_{\min}}{\Delta T \cdot p_j}. \quad (24)$$

As time step k grows, the trust values concentrate around their expectation by Chebyshev's inequality, with variance bounded linearly in k . This ensures that for sufficiently large k , $T_{ij}(k)$ falls below T_{\min} with high probability. This completes the proof. \square

At each time step k , the algorithm judges potential malicious agents by comparing the opinion evolution direction of a subset of neighboring agents $\mathcal{S}(k)$, and does not strongly restrict the proportion of malicious agents. Therefore, the proposed algorithm can cope with the situation where the proportion of malicious agents is the majority. However, when the proportion of malicious agents is greater than half, the time steps required to isolate malicious agents also increase. Therefore, in the next section, the evolution rate adjustment mechanism will be further investigated to buy time for the isolation process of malicious agents.

3.3 Opinion evolution rate adjustment mechanism

In the early stage of opinion evolution, when malicious agents have not yet been completely isolated, normal agents inevitably bear some additional opinion evolution costs to offset malicious opinions. Therefore, normal agents expect to slow down the convergence speed. While after the malicious agents are completely isolated, normal agents need to speed up the convergence speed. Therefore, this paper aims to propose an opinion evolution rate adjustment mechanism to adjust the evolution speed of different opinion evolution stages.

Existing literature indicates that the parameter γ_i in equation (7) is related to the state convergence speed of agent i [34]. Inspired by this, this paper considers adjusting γ_i to achieve the purpose of adjusting the opinion evolution rate. In a

Algorithm 1 Malicious Agent Isolation Algorithm Based on Opinion Evolution Direction Vector

Input: The neighbor set \mathcal{N}_i of agent i , sample size q , angle threshold θ_{strict} , γ_k sequence $\{\gamma_k\}$, time window size m_1 .
Output: $flag_1^i$.

- 1: **Initialize:** Set the initial trust value of each neighbor as $[T_{ij}(0)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} = 1/N_i \cdot \mathbf{1}_{N_i}$, the flag $flag_1^i = 0$, the trust agent set \mathcal{T}_i and the determined malicious agent set \mathcal{M}_i^d , as \emptyset .
- 2: **for** each time step $k > 0$ **do**
- 3: Initialize the potentially malicious agent set $\mathcal{M}_i^p(k)$, the temporary trust agent set $\mathcal{T}_i'(k)$ and the select agent set $\mathcal{S}(k)$ as \emptyset .
- 4: **if** $\mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{M}_i^d == \mathcal{T}_i$ **then**
- 5: $flag_1^i = 0$.
- 6: Set the fusion weight $[\omega_{ij}(k)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} = [\omega_{ij}(k-1)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$.
- 7: Jump to Step 35.
- 8: **end if**
- 9: **for** $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ or i **do**
- 10: Calculate the opinion evolution direction vector v_{ij} (or v_i) of agent j by $v_{ij}(k) = x_j(k) - x_j(k-1)$.
- 11: Calculate the Grassmann distance $\theta_{ij}(k)$.
- 12: Update the vector $\Theta_{ij}(k)$ by equation (18).
- 13: **end for**
- 14: Randomly sample $S = \min(q, |\mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{M}_i^d|)$ neighbors from $\mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{M}_i^d$, denoted as $\mathcal{S}(k) = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_S\}$.
- 15: **for** $j \in \mathcal{S}(k)$ **do** Obtain $\theta_{ij}^{\max}(k) = \max(\Theta_{ij}(k))$.
- 16: **if** $|\Theta_{ij}(k)| == m_1$ **then**
- 17: Update the set \mathcal{T}_i by equation (19).
- 18: **end if**
- 19: **end for**
- 20: Obtain set $\mathcal{T}_i'(k)$ by equation (20).
- 21: Obtain the $j' = \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(k) \setminus (\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_i'(k))} \theta_{ij}^{\max}(k)$.
- 22: **if** $|\mathcal{S}(k) \cap (\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_i'(k))| > S/2$ **then**
- 23: $\mathcal{M}_i^p(k) = \mathcal{M}_i^p(k) \cup (\mathcal{S}(k) \setminus (\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_i'(k)))$.
- 24: **else** $\mathcal{M}_i^p(k) = \mathcal{M}_i^p(k) \cup \{j'\}$.
- 25: **end if**
- 26: **if** $\exists j \in \mathcal{M}_i^p(k)$ **then** $flag_1^i = 1$.
- 27: **for** each neighbor $j \in \mathcal{M}_i^p(k)$ **do**
- 28: Update the trust value by equation (22).
- 29: **if** $T_{ij}(k+1) \leq T_{\min}$ **then** $\mathcal{M}_i^d = \mathcal{M}_i^d \cup \{j\}$.
- 30: **end if**
- 31: **end for**
- 32: **end if**
- 33: Update the trust value $[T_{ij}(k)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$ by $T_{ij}(k) = T_{ij}(k) / \|\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} T_{ij}(k)\|$.
- 34: Update $[\omega_{ij}(k)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} = [T_{ij}(k)]_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$.
- 35: Calculate the fusion opinion $x_i^f(k+1)$.
- 36: Calculate the control input $u_i(k)$ by equation (6).
- 37: Update the opinion $x_i(k+1)$ by equation (3).
- 38: Broadcast the opinion value $x_i(k+1)$ to all neighbors, and receive the opinion value $x_j(k+1)$ of $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{M}_i^d$.
- 39: **return** Output $flag_1^i$ to Algorithm 3.
- 40: **end for**

multi-agent system, if the agent i discovers a potential malicious agent, that is, the parameter $flag_1^i = 1$, then the γ_i will reduce, thereby slowing down the evolution rate of its own opinion.

However, frequent adjustment of γ_i may lead to instability in the process of opinion evolution, so we consider starting from different aspects. The literature [34] proves the stability by considering each $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$, $\tau = 1, \dots, T$, of the periodic γ_i function of period T as a subfunction. Based on the study of discrete-time periodic linear systems by literature [34], when the system matrices A_i and B_i are fixed, the following Corollary can be obtained:

Corollary 3.1. *For the agent i with discrete-time linear system (3), consider the case where there is no malicious agent, the opinion can converge stably with the opinion evolution input in equation (6), if and only if the system matrix (A_i, B_i) is stabilizable and the γ_i sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(1)}, \dots, \gamma_i^{(T)}\} < 1$ satisfy*

$$\prod_{\tau=1}^T (1 - \gamma_i^{(\tau)}) \leq |\lambda(\underbrace{A_i \cdot A_i \cdot A_i \cdots A_i}_{\text{The number of } A_i \text{ is } T})|_{\min}^2, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\gamma_i^{(\tau)} = \{f_i(k) \mid k \bmod T = \tau\} \quad (26)$$

holds for $\tau = 1, \dots, T$, and T represents the period of the γ_i sequence.

The objective of Corollary 3.1 is to ensure that $P_i(k)$ is positive definite, where $P_i(k)$, $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ is the maximal T -periodic solution following parametric DPARE

$$(1 - \gamma_i^{(\tau)}(k)) P_i(k) = A_i^T P_i(k+1) A_i - A_i^T P_i(k+1) B_i \times (R_i + B_i^T P_i(k+1) B_i)^{-1} B_i^T P_i(k+1) A_i.$$

To facilitate the management of the value of $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$, the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ variation mechanism based on peak clipping operation is proposed, as shown in Algorithm 2. By adopting the peak clipping operation, the gradually changing $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ is converted into a staged change. Based on this, when $f_i(k)$ is determined in advance, we can set the value of a finite number of $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ offline. To do this, the region between the minimum and maximum of the $f_i(k)$ function is divided into L parts, we get $\gamma_{i,\min} = \gamma_{i,L} < \gamma_{i,L-1} < \dots < f_{i,\ell} < \dots < \gamma_{i,0} = \gamma_{i,\max}$. The comparison of the number of values in $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$ with different $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ variations mechanism is shown in table 1.

Table 1: Comparison of the number of values in $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$

	Gradually Changing	Peak clipping
Number of values in $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$	$L \cdot T$	L

Algorithm 2 The $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ variation mechanism based on peak clipping operation

Input: The result of $f_i(k)$ divided by the number of parts L is $f_{i,\min} = f_{i,L} < f_{i,L-1} < \dots < f_{i,\ell} < \dots < f_{i,1} = f_{i,\max}$, and the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\} = \{\gamma_i^{(1)}, \gamma_i^{(2)}, \dots, \gamma_i^{(T)}\}$ with a period of T , the nearest lower bound f_{i,ℓ_1} and higher bound f_{i,ℓ_2} for $\gamma_{k,\max}$, $flag_1^i$.

Output: The updated $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau,t)}\}$.

- 1: Find the maximum value $\gamma_{i,\max}(k)$ in the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence and its position in the sequence.
 - 2: **if** there exists $f_{i,\ell}$ such that $f_{i,\ell} = \gamma_{i,\max}(k)$ **then**
 - 3: The $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence remains unchanged.
 - 4: **else**
 - 5: **if** $flag_1^i == 1$ **then** Set all instances of $\gamma_{i,\max}(k)$ in the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence to f_{i,ℓ_1} .
 - 6: **else** Set all instances of $\gamma_{i,\max}(k)$ in the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence to f_{i,ℓ_2} .
 - 7: **end if**
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **return** The updated $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau,t)}\} = \{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$.
-

Then, the opinion evolution rate adjustment mechanism is proposed as the Algorithm 3. Based on this algorithm, when the parameter $flag_1^i = 1$, the value of the $f_i(k)$ function will gradually adjust (no large mutation will occur). When the parameter $flag_1^i$ changes back to 0, the $f_i(k)$ function will gradually recover.

Next, the performance analysis of the proposed algorithm will be given. Before that, the lemma 3.1 is given below.

Lemma 3.1. [34] *If the parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ is continuous, differentiable and monotonically increasing with respect to ε , then $\frac{dP_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))}{d\varepsilon} > 0$ holds, and the initial value $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(0))$ is positive definite, then the system can be guaranteed to be stable.*

This lemma shows that for a $f_i(k)$ function with a period of T , as long as each $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ satisfies certain conditions, the opinion of agent i can be guaranteed to be stable under the periodically changing $f_i(k)$ function. However, it is not a necessary condition, and we cannot infer how $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ will change if $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ does not satisfy the relevant conditions.

The definition of a generalized periodic function $f_i(k)$ with a period of T is given below:

Definition 3.4. (Generalized Periodic Function) *The properties of the generalized periodic function $f_i(k)$ are:*

1. *Generalized periodicity: For any function $f_i(k)$ of period T , $f_i(k + T) = f_i(k)$ may not be satisfied, but $f_i(k + T)$ must be a value in the $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$ sequence, that is*

$$f_i(k + T) = \gamma_i^{(\tau)}, \tau = 1, 2, \dots, T, k \bmod T = \tau, \quad (27)$$

2. *Boundedness: The value range of the function $f_i(k)$ has upper and lower limits, that is, satisfy $\gamma_{\min} \leq f_i(k) \leq \gamma_{\max}$. The range of the function $f_i(k)$ can be variable. However, for any adjacent period, the range of change is no greater than $\Delta_{\max} = \max_{\ell=2, \dots, L} \Delta_{\ell-1, \ell}$,*

where the first property is to ensure the finiteness of the value of $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$, and the second property is to ensure that for any $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$, there will be no large mutation.

Example 3.1. *Assume that the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ parameter of an agent i obeys the periodic function $f_i(k)$ of period 7, and the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$ is $\{\gamma_i^{(1)}, \gamma_i^{(2)}, \gamma_i^{(3)}, \gamma_i^{(4)}, \gamma_i^{(5)}, \gamma_i^{(6)}, \gamma_i^{(7)}\}$, where $\gamma_i^{(1)} = \gamma_i^{(7)}$, $\gamma_i^{(2)} = \gamma_i^{(6)}$, $\gamma_i^{(3)} = \gamma_i^{(5)}$. and its upper and lower bounds are $\gamma_{i, \max} = \gamma_i^{(4)}$ and $\gamma_{i, \min} = \gamma_i^{(1)}$. Therefore, each $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ can be defined as a function related to ε , such as $\gamma_i^{(\tau)} = \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Assume that agent i finds that there may be potential malicious agents around, so it uses Algorithm 3 to gradually reduce $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ to slow down the evolution of opinions. Take the peak $\gamma_i^{(4)}(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ as an example. However, due to the adaptive reduction of γ , it is no longer a continuous function of ε , but becomes:*

$$\gamma_i^{(4)}(\varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon, & \varepsilon \in (0, 1/4], \\ \varepsilon - 1/4 - (\gamma_i^{(4)} - \gamma_i^{(3)}), & \varepsilon \in (1/4, 1/2], \\ \varepsilon - 1/2 - (\gamma_i^{(3)} - \gamma_i^{(2)}), & \varepsilon \in (1/2, 3/4], \\ \varepsilon - 3/4 - (\gamma_i^{(2)} - \gamma_i^{(1)}), & \varepsilon \in (3/4, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

Therefore, before each change in $\gamma_i^{(1)}$, a new value ε should be taken within the corresponding ε value range and the new $\gamma_i^{(1)}$ value can be obtained. Then, similar operations are performed on other $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$, and the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ change diagram can be obtained as shown in Fig. 1.

It can be seen that due to the peak clipping operation, some $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ have a finite number of small mutations. At this time, the conditions in Lemma 3.1 will no longer be satisfied. Therefore, the following Theorem 3.3 is given.

Theorem 3.3. *Consider an agent i that satisfies a discrete-time linear system (3). For any of its parameters $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$, assume that it is a piecewise function defined on $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Based on the proposed Algorithms 2 and 3, regardless of whether $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ increases or decreases, the matrix $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ remains positive definite. Furthermore, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, the opinion of agent i ultimately achieves stable convergence.*

Proof. Firstly, this paper achieves the purpose of regulating the evolution rate by adjusting parameter $\gamma_i(k)$. At this point, each parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ will take on a piecewise form similar to equation (28). Consequently, the conditions in Lemma 3.1, which require each parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ to be continuously, differentiable and monotonically increasing, will no longer be satisfied. This poses a challenge to ensuring the positive definiteness of the matrix $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$.

Algorithm 3 The opinion evolution rate adjustment mechanism

Input: The $flag_1^i$ of agent i , the result of $f_i(k)$ divided by the number of copies L is $f_{i,\min} = f_{i,L} < f_{i,L-1} < \dots < f_{i,\ell} < \dots < f_{i,1} = f_{i,\max}$, and the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\} = \{\gamma_i^{(1)}, \gamma_i^{(2)}, \dots, \gamma_i^{(T)}\}$ with a period of T .

Output: The $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$ and the updated $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau,t)}\}$

- 1: Pairwise comparison for all $\Delta_{\ell-1,\ell} = f_{i,\ell-1} - f_{i,\ell}$, $\ell = 2, \dots, L$.
- 2: Find the minimum value Δ_{\min} from all $\Delta_{\ell-1,\ell}$, $\ell = 2, \dots, L$.
- 3: **for** each time step k **do**
- 4: Obtain $flag_1^i$ from Algorithm 1.
- 5: Find the maximum value $\gamma_{i,\max}$ in the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence and its position in the sequence.
- 6: Set the change of γ_i as $\delta \leq \Delta_{\min}/T$, ensuring an update every period.
- 7: % This step is to avoid cross-level mutations of $\gamma_{k,\max}$.
- 8: **if** ($flag_1^i == 1$) & ($\gamma_{i,\max} > f_{i,\min}$) **then**
- 9: Obtain the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence by update the maximum value $\gamma_{i,\max} \leftarrow \gamma_{i,\max} - \delta$.
- 10: **else if** $\gamma_{i,\max} < f_{i,\max}$ **then**
- 11: Obtain the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence by update the maximum value $\gamma_{i,\max} \leftarrow \gamma_{i,\max} + \delta$.
- 12: **end if**
- 13: Output the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$ and the f_{i,ℓ_1} to the Algorithm 2 and obtain the updated $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau,t)}\}$.
- 14: **return** The $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$ and the updated $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau,t)}\}$.
- 15: % The Step 9 is to reduce $\gamma_{k,\max}$ in the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau)}\}$ that has not been processed by Algorithm 2. The evolution rate of agent i is affected by the sequence processed by Algorithm 2, that is, the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ used in the control input calculation of Step 36 in Algorithm 1 is based on $\{\gamma_i^{(\tau,t)}\}$.
- 16: **end for**

Due to the properties of the peak clipping operation, the proposed algorithm ensures that for any two adjacent periods, the change of each parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ does not result in cross-level mutations. Instead, the changes are gradual. Below, we discuss whether the matrix $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ remains positive definite when the parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ increases and decreases.

For the decreasing case as shown in the period 1 – 4 of Fig. 1: As the parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ decreases, the peak clipping operation ensures that its value is always consistent with its neighbors $\gamma_i^{(\tau-1)}(\varepsilon)$ and $\gamma_i^{(\tau+1)}(\varepsilon)$. A recursive method is used to analyze the positive definiteness of $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$.

Before the first adjustment to reduce $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$, the conditions of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied. Therefore, any τ -th $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ is guaranteed to be positive definite.

In the first adjustment to reduce $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$, find the maximum value $\gamma_{i,\max}(k)$ in the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ sequence and its position in the sequence. For a continuous position interval of $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ with a constant value of $\gamma_{i,\max}(k)$, the result after peak clipping will ensure that the value of $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ in the interval $[\tau_1 - 1, \tau_2 + 1]$ is a constant function.

Therefore, combining $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ on the interval $[\tau_1 - 1, \tau_2 + 1]$, this is essentially a special case with a period of 1. Since the constant function $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ is continuous, differentiable, and monotonically increasing, the conditions of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied. Therefore, we only need to ensure that the initial $P(\gamma_i^{(\tau_1-1)}(\varepsilon))$ is positive definite.

In fact, since this peak clipping operation has no effect on $\gamma_i^{(\tau_1-1)}(\varepsilon)$, the positive definiteness of $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau_1-1)}(\varepsilon))$ can be directly satisfied. Therefore, in the interval $[\tau_1 - 1, \tau_2 + 1]$, $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ is always positive definite.

Similarly, if $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ needs to be further reduced, the above process can be repeated. Each peak clipping operation will expand the constant interval, but since each adjustment satisfies the corresponding conditions, the $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ always remains positive definite.

For the increasing case as shown in the period 4 – 7 of Fig. 1: Before adjusting the increase parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$, any τ -th $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ is already positive definite.

Period 1	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(3)}$	$\gamma_i^{(4)}$	$\gamma_i^{(5)}$	$\gamma_i^{(6)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$
Period 2	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(3)}$	$\gamma_i^{(3)}$	$\gamma_i^{(5)}$	$\gamma_i^{(6)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$
Period 3	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(6)}$	$\gamma_i^{(6)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$
Period 4	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$
Period 5	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(6)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$
Period 6	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(3)}$	$\gamma_i^{(3)}$	$\gamma_i^{(5)}$	$\gamma_i^{(6)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$
Period 7	$\gamma_i^{(1)}$	$\gamma_i^{(2)}$	$\gamma_i^{(3)}$	$\gamma_i^{(4)}$	$\gamma_i^{(5)}$	$\gamma_i^{(6)}$	$\gamma_i^{(7)}$

Smallest
 Second smallest
 Second largest
 Largest

Figure 1: For $f_i(k)$ with a 7 period, the change of any $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$, $\tau = 1, \dots, 7$.

During the first adjustment to increase $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$, we also find the maximum value $\gamma_{i,\max}$ of $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ in the current sequence and determine the interval $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ where it is located. Then, the result after peak clipping will ensure that the value of $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ in the interval $[\tau_1 + 1, \tau_2 - 1]$ is the same.

Therefore, for any $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)$ in the interval $[\tau_1 + 1, \tau_2 - 1]$, it is equivalent to a small increment compared to the previous adjacent period. Considering Lemma 3.1 as a discrete case, that is, $\frac{\Delta\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon)}{\Delta\varepsilon} > 0$, then $\frac{\Delta P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))}{\Delta\varepsilon} > 0$ holds. Therefore, $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ is still positive definite.

Finally, according to Theorem 3.2, Algorithm 1 guarantees that the influence of malicious agents is eliminated in a finite number of iterations. Assume that at a certain time k' , the influence of all malicious agents is eliminated. Then, for $k > k'$, the $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ parameter gradually increases and eventually returns to its original function form. This means that, starting from time k' , the conditions of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied again, and the subsequent $P_i(\gamma_i^{(\tau)}(\varepsilon))$ will remain positive definite. According to the system stability theory, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, the opinion of agent i will converge stably. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.3 demonstrates that, despite the proposed algorithm dynamically adjusting the parameter $\gamma_i^{(\tau)}$ through peak clipping and other operations, the matrix $P(\gamma_i^{(\tau)})$ remains positive definite. This property ensures the stability of agent i 's opinion throughout the entire dynamic adjustment process, and ensures that the opinion of any agent i can eventually converge stably. Furthermore, building on Algorithm 1 for isolating malicious agents, the proposed algorithm successfully achieves dynamic regulation: it reduces the evolution rate to lower the evolution cost when the influence of malicious agents has not been fully isolated, and accelerates the opinion evolution to improve convergence efficiency after malicious agents have been isolated.

Remark 3.1. *As far as we know, there is no literature that controls the cost of opinion evolution by adjusting the evolution rate. The reason why this paper adopts the periodically changing γ function is that*

1. *Enhancing system resilience and disturbance rejection: Using a periodically varying γ_i allows flexible feedback gain adjustment across different operational stages, strengthening the system's resilience against attacks and disturbances. This approach lets the system reduce gain during specific intervals, thus enhancing robustness when facing external disturbances or malicious attacks.*

2. *Smooth adjustment for stability assurance: Periodic, smooth adjustments of γ_i prevent abrupt changes in feedback gain, maintaining stability while optimizing performance. By carefully setting the period and peak of $f_i(k)$, the system can gradually improve its adaptability and robustness to disturbances without compromising stability.*

4 Numerical Simulation

To verify the effectiveness of the proposed malicious agent isolation algorithm and evolution rate adjustment mechanism, this paper considers a MAS containing 10 agents. These agents are numbered $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$, where $\mathcal{N}^u = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ are normal agents and $\mathcal{N}^a = \{5, 6, \dots, 10\}$ are malicious agents. At this time, the number of malicious agents are greater than that of normal agents. These 10 agents form an undirected graph, and the neighbor sets \mathcal{N}_i of each normal agent $i = 1 : 4$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1 &= \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10\}, & \mathcal{N}_2 &= \{1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_3 &= \{1, 2, 7, 8, 10\}, & \mathcal{N}_4 &= \{1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10\}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The opinion evolution process of each agent i satisfies the equation (3), where the system matrix $A_i = [0.99 \quad -0.01 \quad 0; -0.01 \quad 0.99 \quad 0; 0 \quad 0 \quad 0.99] + rand() \cdot diag([1, 1, 1]/100)$, $B_i = [0 \quad 0.5; 0.5 \quad 0; -0.5 \quad 0]$, the pair $\{A_i, B_i\}$ is stabilizable. The initial opinion of each agent i is $x_i(0) = [0; 0; 0]$, and $R_i = I_{2 \times 2}$. For the social norm, consider the case of $S = I_{3 \times 3}$, $\eta(0) = [3; 3; 3]$. Therefore, the expected opinions of normal agents are randomly distributed in a sphere with $[3; 3; 3]$ as the center and $R = 0.01$ as the radius. The opinions of malicious agents are completely opposite, and the expected opinions are randomly distributed in a sphere with $[-3; -3; -3]$ as the center and $R = 0.01$ as the radius. What's more, $\Delta T = 0.01$, $T_{\min} = 0.1$, $m_1 = 8$, $\theta_{\text{strict}} = \pi/3$. The period of the function $f_i(k)$ is set to 7, the initial function $f_i(k)$ is period 1 = $[0.0850, 0.1175, 0.1413, 0.1500, 0.1413, 0.1175, 0.0850]$. And according to the proposed Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3, the function $f_i(k)$ will adaptively change from period 1 to the period below


$$\begin{aligned} \text{period 2} &= [0.0850, 0.1175, 0.1413, 0.1413, 0.1413, 0.1175, 0.0850], \\ \text{period 3} &= [0.0850, 0.1175, 0.1175, 0.1175, 0.1175, 0.1175, 0.0850], \\ \text{period 4} &= [0.0850, 0.0850, 0.0850, 0.0850, 0.0850, 0.0850, 0.0850]. \end{aligned}$$

First of all, in the absence of the proposed algorithm, simulation results confirm that erroneous opinions from malicious agents do indeed lead to a deviation in the opinions of normal agents, specifically $distance = \|x_i(k) - x_i^t\|$ fails to converge to zero. The parameter γ_i of each agents is set to a constant value of 0.1500. Without implementing the proposed algorithm 1, malicious agents, by holding opinions contrary to social norms and disregarding external information, prevent normal agents' opinions from converging to the expected value, as illustrated in Fig. 2(a). Under these conditions, the opinions of normal agents are strongly influenced by malicious agents, causing the opinion evolution process to diverge from social norms. To address this, it is essential to introduce the proposed algorithm, enabling normal agents to gradually isolate the influence of malicious agents.


For comparison, Fig. 2(b) shows the convergence of agent opinions after adopting the trust mechanism. At this time, the opinion evolution rate of all normal agents is set to be periodic and time-varying as shown in period 1 – 4. By evaluating the opinion evolution direction of neighboring agents and adjusting trust values accordingly, normal agents can progressively reduce their trust in malicious agents, ultimately isolating them. With malicious agents' influence significantly reduced, normal agents successfully align their opinions with social norms, demonstrating the effectiveness of the malicious agent isolation algorithm. It is worth noting that in Fig. 2(b), the distance between the normal agent opinion and the expected opinion reaches a peak around time step 30. However, in Fig. 2(a), the same distance is reached around time step 24. This means that the proposed algorithm effectively reduces the evolution speed of opinions in the early stage. Subsequent simulations will further verify the contribution of the proposed algorithm in reducing the meaningless opinion evolution cost.

Fig. 3 illustrates the changes in trust values assigned by normal agents to their neighboring agents. Despite the influence of malicious agents, normal agents can update trust values based on the evolution direction of neighbors' opinions. When a neighbor's opinion evolution direction significantly diverges, the trust value assigned by the normal agent to the neighbor will be reduced, and the malicious agent will be isolated eventually. This process indicates that the trust update mechanism effectively assists normal agents in identifying malicious agents, thereby reducing their adverse impact on system consensus.

Taking the normal agent 1 as an example, Fig. 4 shows the changes in the opinion evolution input cost with and without of the proposed algorithm, respectively. In Fig. 4(b), during the first 50 time steps, the control input gradually increases




(a) Without the proposed algorithm




(b) With the proposed algorithm

Figure 2: Distance from expected opinion with and without the proposed algorithm.




(a) Agent 1



(b) Agent 2




(c) Agent 3




(d) Agent 4

Figure 3: The trust value changes for normal agents towards neighbors.

due to the influence of malicious information. However, as communication with malicious agents is cut off, the control input gradually decreases, aligning with the convergence of agent opinions. By contrast, in Fig. 4(a), the control input continues to increase, eventually converging around 1.20, significantly higher than the peak of around 0.066 in Fig. 4(b). Therefore, if the malicious agent isolation mechanism is not deployed, the opinion evolution input always remains at a high level. This means that the normal agents will pay infinite costs in trying to offset the influence of malicious agents, resulting in a waste of effort.



(a) Without the proposed algorithm



(b) With the proposed algorithm

Figure 4: Opinion evolution input cost with and without the proposed algorithm.

To further validate the effectiveness of the proposed evolution rate adjustment mechanism in reducing control costs, this simulation compares the norms of opinion evolution inputs under 8 different $f_i(k)$ functions. The *time-varying period* represents the dynamic $f_i(k)$ function under the proposed evolution rate adjustment mechanism. As shown in Fig. 5, as the peak of function $f_i(k)$ decreases, the control cost gradually decreases, but the convergence speed also slows down. This shows that the proposed algorithm can initially reduce the control cost and leave time for the isolation of malicious agents. While in the later stage, once the malicious agent is completely isolated, the peak of the periodic function increases to achieve faster opinion convergence.




Figure 5: Opinion evolution input cost with different γ_i function $f_i(k)$.

To compare the performance of different $f_i(k)$ functions from a quantitative perspective, we introduce three evaluation metrics: early stage cost (ESC), later stage cost (LSC) and convergence step. Among them, ESC represents the area enclosed by the opinion evolution input function and the coordinate axis until the peak of the opinion evolution input; LSC represents the area enclosed by the opinion evolution input function and the coordinate axis from the peak of the opinion evolution input to convergence; the convergence step is defined as the moment when the $u_i(k)R_i u_i(k)$ of input satisfies $u_i(k)R_i u_i(k) \leq 0.001$. As shown in Table 2, when the proposed malicious agent isolation mechanism is implemented, the time-varying period function effectively combines the fast convergence and the low control cost.

Finally, Fig. 6 illustrates the construction of the time-varying γ function under the proposed algorithm. The period is set to 13, dividing the function into a series of $\gamma_k, k = 1 : 13$, with a peak of 0.08 and a lower bound of 0.05. By dynamically adjusting the parameter γ , the convergence speed will be reduced in the presence of potential malicious agents, thereby reducing the opinion evolution cost and providing normal agents with time to isolate malicious agents. In this case, the scenario described in Example 3.1 does occur, where certain segments of the γ_k function show discontinuities, but cross-level jumps are avoided. Due to the sufficient number of periods, the maximum $|\gamma_{k-1} - \gamma_k|$ change is only 0.0078.

Table 2: The Cost and Convergence Step of Opinion Evolution input under Different γ_i Function $f_i(k)$

Function $f_i(k)$	ESC	LSC	Convergence Step
Time-varying Period	1.1188	1.0853	97
Period 1	1.7197	1.2240	93
Period 2	1.6370	1.2054	94
Period 3	1.1452	1.0765	100
Period 4($\gamma_i = 0.0850$)	0.3545	0.4536	109
$\gamma_i = 0.1175$	1.5937	1.1982	95
$\gamma_i = 0.1413$	3.9314	1.5066	85
$\gamma_i = 0.1500$	5.0063	1.5075	82




Figure 6: Time-varying γ values and some γ_k values.

5 Conclusions

This paper investigates the challenges posed by opinion divergence in MASs, particularly in scenarios where malicious agents are in the majority. First, the impact of malicious agents is analyzed from the perspective of opinion evolution costs. Next, the method for isolating malicious agents based on the direction of opinion evolution is proposed, enabling the system to effectively identify and isolate malicious agents, thereby minimizing their negative impact on the overall opinion dynamics. Finally, the opinion evolution rate adjustment mechanism is introduced, which enables the agent to autonomously regulate the opinion evolution process. Simulation results confirm the effectiveness of the proposed method, demonstrating that the algorithm can effectively handle the challenges arising from opinion divergence.

Future research may explore ways to enhance the security of opinion dynamics in MASs that include LLM-based agents, enabling these agents to adaptively adjust evolution rates in complex and diverse scenarios, thereby improving resilience against potential malicious agents.

6 Lemma 6.1

Lemma 6.1. [36] For any positive definite matrix $M > 0$, two integers r_2 and r_1 with $r_2 \geq r_1$, and a vector-valued function $\omega : \mathbb{I}[r_1, r_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\left(\sum_{i=r_1}^{r_2} \omega(i) \right)^\top M \left(\sum_{i=r_1}^{r_2} \omega(i) \right) \leq (r_2 - r_1 + 1) \sum_{i=r_1}^{r_2} \omega^\top(i) M \omega(i). \quad (30)$$

References

- [1] Shuhong Dai, Shike Li, Haichuan Tang, Xin Ning, Fang Fang, Yunxiao Fu, Qingle Wang, and Long Cheng. Marp: A cooperative multi-agent drl system for connected autonomous vehicle platooning. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2024.
- [2] Xiaochao Wei, Haobo Gong, and Lin Song. Product diffusion in dynamic online social networks: A multi-agent simulation based on gravity theory. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 213:119008, 2023.
- [3] Olle Abrahamsson, Danyo Danev, and Erik G Larsson. Strong convergence of a random actions model in opinion dynamics. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 2024.
- [4] Siyue Ren, Zhiyao Cui, Ruiqi Song, Zhen Wang, and Shuyue Hu. Emergence of social norms in generative agent societies: Principles and architecture. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2024.
- [5] Samantha Sinclair and Jens Agerström. Do social norms influence young people’s willingness to take the covid-19 vaccine? *Health Communication*, 38(1):152–159, 2023.
- [6] Jiayu Zhou, Wen Yang, Heng Zhang, Wei Xing Zheng, Yong Xu, and Yang Tang. Security analysis and defense strategy of distributed filtering under false data injection attacks. *Automatica*, 138:110151, 2022.
- [7] Yuhan Suo, Senchun Chai, Runqi Chai, Zhong-Hua Pang, Yuanqing Xia, and Guo-Ping Liu. Security defense of large-scale networks under false data injection attacks: An attack detection scheduling approach. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 19:1908–1921, 2024.
- [8] Tianci Yang and Chen Lv. Secure estimation and attack isolation for connected and automated driving in the presence of malicious vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 70(9):8519–8528, 2021.
- [9] Abdollah Amirkhani and Amir Hossein Barshooi. Consensus in multi-agent systems: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(5):3897–3935, 2022.
- [10] Charles Monnoyer de Galland and Julien M Hendrickx. Fundamental performance limitations for average consensus in open multi-agent systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(2):646–659, 2022.
- [11] Karlo Griparic, Marsela Polic, Marko Krizmancic, and Stjepan Bogdan. Consensus-based distributed connectivity control in multi-agent systems. *IEEE transactions on network science and engineering*, 9(3):1264–1281, 2022.
- [12] Zhongkui Li, Zhisheng Duan, and Lin Huang. Leader-follower consensus of multi-agent systems. In *2009 American control conference*, pages 3256–3261. IEEE, 2009.
- [13] Kai Zhang, Zhao-Yan Li, and Bin Zhou. Fully distributed output regulation of linear discrete-time multiagent systems with time-varying topology and delays. *Automatica*, 167:111755, 2024.
- [14] Hanfeng Li, Qingrong Liu, Gang Feng, and Xianfu Zhang. Leader–follower consensus of nonlinear time-delay multiagent systems: A time-varying gain approach. *Automatica*, 126:109444, 2021.
- [15] Chong-Xiao Shi and Guang-Hong Yang. Secure bearing-based target localization for multi-agent networks against malicious agents. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023.
- [16] Dan Zhao, Yuezu Lv, Xinghuo Yu, Guanghui Wen, and Guanrong Chen. Resilient consensus of higher order multiagent networks: an attack isolation-based approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(2):1001–1007, 2021.
- [17] Wenbin Yue, Yang Yang, and Wei Sun. Resilient consensus control for heterogeneous multiagent systems via multiround attack detection and isolation algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2023.
- [18] Aquib Mustafa, Hamidreza Modares, and Rohollah Moghadam. Resilient synchronization of distributed multi-agent systems under attacks. *Automatica*, 115:108869, 2020.
- [19] Matthew Cavorsi, Orhan Eren Akgün, Michal Yemini, Andrea J Goldsmith, and Stephanie Gil. Exploiting trust for resilient hypothesis testing with malicious robots. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 7663–7669. IEEE, 2023.
- [20] Arif Kerem Dayı, Orhan Eren Akgün, Stephanie Gil, Michal Yemini, and Angelia Nedić. Fast distributed optimization over directed graphs under malicious attacks using trust. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06541*, 2024.
- [21] Yi Hua, Fangyi Wan, Hongping Gan, Youmin Zhang, and Xinlin Qing. Distributed estimation with cross-verification under false data-injection attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 53(9):5840–5853, 2023.
- [22] Najeebuddin Ahmed, Amir Ameli, and Hassan Naser. Detection, identification, and mitigation of false data injection attacks in vehicle platooning. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, pages 1–15, 2024.

- [23] Jingyu Zhang, Yongtao Sun, Deke Guo, Lailong Luo, Liyao Li, Qifeng Nian, Shi Zhu, and Fangliao Yang. A reputation awareness randomization consensus mechanism in blockchain systems. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 11(20):32745–32758, 2024.
- [24] Mengxiang Liu, Chengcheng Zhao, Zhenyong Zhang, Ruilong Deng, Peng Cheng, and Jiming Chen. Converter-based moving target defense against deception attacks in dc microgrids. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 13(5):3984–3996, 2022.
- [25] Bin Zhou, Guangren Duan, and Zongli Lin. A parametric lyapunov equation approach to the design of low gain feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(6):1548–1554, 2008.
- [26] Kai Zhang, Bin Zhou, Wei Xing Zheng, and Guang-Ren Duan. Event-triggered and self-triggered gain scheduled control of linear systems with input constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 52(10):6452–6463, 2022.
- [27] Xin Gong, Xiuxian Li, Zhan Shu, and Zhiguang Feng. Resilient output formation-tracking of heterogeneous multiagent systems against general byzantine attacks: A twin-layer approach. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 54(4):2566–2578, 2023.
- [28] Hadi Hosseini, Debmalya Mandal, and Amrit Puhan. The surprising effectiveness of sp voting with partial preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00870*, 2024.
- [29] Liwang Zhu, Xiaotian Zhou, Jiahe Tian, Wei Li, and Zhongzhi Zhang. Defending against malicious influence control in online leader-follower social networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 19:4809–4819, 2024.
- [30] Yujie Song, Yue Cao, Chaklam Cheong, Debiao He, Kim-Kwang Raymond Choo, and Juan Wang. Cat: A consensus-adaptive trust management based on the group decision making in iovs. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 19:7730–7743, 2024.
- [31] Dong-Jin Xin, Ling-Feng Shi, and Xingkai Yu. Distributed kalman filter with faulty/reliable sensors based on wasserstein average consensus. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 69(4):2371–2375, 2022.
- [32] An-Yang Lu and Guang-Hong Yang. A polynomial-time algorithm for the secure state estimation problem under sparse sensor attacks via state decomposition technique. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(12):7451–7465, 2023.
- [33] John Locke. *An essay concerning human understanding*. Kay & Troutman, 1847.
- [34] Bin Zhou. *Truncated predictor feedback for time-delay systems*. Springer, 2014.
- [35] Alan Edelman, Tomás A Arias, and Steven T Smith. The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints. *SIAM journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 20(2):303–353, 1998.
- [36] Bin Zhou and Zongli Lin. Parametric lyapunov equation approach to stabilization of discrete-time systems with input delay and saturation. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, 58(11):2741–2754, 2011.