

A Unified Attack Detection Strategy for Multi-Agent Systems over Transient and Steady Stages

Jinming Gao, Yijing Wang, Wentao Zhang, *Member, IEEE*, Rui Zhao, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Yang Shi, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Zhiqiang Zuo, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper proposes a unified detection strategy against three kinds of attacks for multi-agent systems (MASs) which is applicable to both transient and steady stages. For attacks on the communication layer, a watermarking-based detection scheme with Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence is designed. Different from traditional communication schemes, each agent transmits a message set containing two state values with different types of watermarking. It is found that the detection performance is determined by the relevant parameters of the watermarking signal. Unlike the existing detection manoeuvres, such a scheme is capable of transient and steady stages. For attacks on the agent layer, a convergence rate related detection approach is put forward. It is shown that the resilience of the considered system is characterized by the coefficient and offset of the envelope. For hybrid attacks, based on the above detection mechanisms, a general framework resorting to trusted agents is presented, which requires weaker graph conditions and less information transmission. Finally, an example associated with the platooning of connected vehicles is given to support the theoretical results.

Index Terms—Multi-agent systems, Watermarking, Detection strategy, Hybrid attacks, Transient stage.

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the development of communication and computer technologies, significant progress has been made in the field of cyber-physical systems (CPSs). This, however, makes them vulnerable to cyber attacks. The reasons lie in that, unlike traditional information security, the security issues in CPSs display several remarkable features: 1) The underlying plants are spatially distributed; 2) The types of attacks launched are diverse even complex; 3) New and unknown attacks are emerging. These facts have been greatly confirmed in security

incidents, for example, Stuxnet virus invaded Iran's nuclear facilities in 2010 [1], Havex virus attacked SCADA resulting in disabled hydropower dams in 2014 [2].

Existing literature on the security of CPSs can be divided into two categories. The first studies the vulnerability and performance limit with the aim of launching a more cunning attack [3]–[5]. By contrast, the second focuses on mitigating the negative effect of attacks, including attack mitigation [6], secure state estimation [7], and resilient control [8]. Apart from that, attack detection is also an active research field [9]–[11]. There have been numerous fault/attack detection mechanisms proposed here as well [12]–[14]. Additionally, watermarking is commonly utilized in detection work as a supplementary technology that has been extensively employed in industrial settings [15], [16]. The existing watermarking-based detection strategies can be divided into two categories: the additive watermarking and the multiplicative watermarking. For the former, a physical watermarking approach was first presented to expose replay attacks by χ^2 detector [17]. Furthermore, in order to better quantify the detection effect, watermarking Kullback-Libeler (KL) divergence detector was proposed in [1], [17]. In order to reduce control cost caused by the involved watermarking, an optimal watermarking scheduling strategy [18] and a quickest detection through parsimonious watermarking protocol [19] were suggested. To handle cunning attacks and even collaborating attacks, some complex procedures were designed. A multi-channel watermarking cooperative defense strategy joint with moving target ideas has been proposed in [20]. In addition, [21] developed a unified watermarking-based detection framework against a wider range of attack types. Besides, multiplicative watermarking has also been employed to tackle the drawbacks of the additive one [22]–[25]. It is noted that the additive watermarking technology itself has some shortcomings in defending against stealthy additive attacks, and multiplicative watermarking has been presented to tackle the drawbacks of the additive one. In [23] and [24], the sensor outputs were encrypted with the help of impulse response filters, and then were decrypted by equalizing filters to relieve the performance degradation caused by watermarking. In [22], a switching watermarking filter framework was devised to further increase the confidentiality of relevant parameters to the attacker. Recently, a secure estimation issue was also

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 62173243, No. 61933014.

J. Gao, Y. Wang, R. Zhao and Z. Zuo are with the Tianjin Key Laboratory of Intelligent Unmanned Swarm Technology and System, School of Electrical and Information Engineering, Tianjin University, 300072, P. R. China. (e-mail: gjinming@tju.edu.cn; yjwang@tju.edu.cn; ruizhao@tju.edu.cn; zqzuo@tju.edu.cn)

W. Zhang is with the Continental-NTU Corporate Lab, Nanyang Technological University, 639798, Singapore, and is also with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 639798, Singapore. (e-mail: wentao.zhang@ntu.edu.sg)

Y. Shi is with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC V8W 2Y2, Canada. (e-mail: yshi@uvic.ca)

addressed in [25]. It should be noted that in the existing related work, the watermarking technique is often utilized with estimator/observer, which belongs to the model-based strategy.

On the other hand, multi-agent systems (MASs) are featured by inherent properties in CPSs and have witnessed wide applications in various engineering areas, such as intelligent traffic systems [26], unmanned aerial vehicles [27], smart grid systems [28] and multi-sensor network [29]. Due to the dependence on network and computer technology, the properties such as openness, spatial distribution and inter-connection on MASs pave a way to malicious attacks within different layers including control layer, communication layer and agent layer [30]. Typical effort includes but is not limited to Worm virus [30], denial of service (DoS) attacks [31] and false data injection attacks [32]. When targeted on the controller layer, the vulnerability of MASs can be aroused by malicious computer malware via implanting some computer worm [30]. For attacks on the communication layer, several defense mechanisms have been proposed. With elaborate design of the attack signal, it can destroy data integrity and instrumental detection strategies [33]–[36]. Besides, on account of the distributed characteristics, each agent in MASs has multiple information sources. Therefore, additional detection approaches, for example, multi-hop communication [37] and consensus-based attack detection strategy [38] were introduced. A common feature of the aforementioned work is that they are all built on the observer/consensus-based framework. That is to say, the successful defense against attacks strongly depends on the convergence of estimation error which does not occur during the transient stage.

If the attacks act on the agent layer, they mainly affect the consensus of interacting agents. One of the representatives is the Byzantine attack [39]–[41]. Many defense strategies were resorted to network robustness-based mean-subsequence-reduced (MSR) algorithm. This algorithm is inspired by the idea of ignoring neighboring agents that may have extreme state values [40]. [39] designed a weighted-mean-subsequence-reduced (W-MSR) algorithm for Byzantine attacks. Furthermore, [42] further expanded the above results to multi-dimensional systems. However, the robustness of these findings is somewhat conservative. Actually, several normal neighbors may also be excluded, resulting in unnecessary defense cost. In order to locate malicious agents, an isolation-based approach was proposed in [43]. Nevertheless, the trade-off between detection accuracy and system resilience has not been fully investigated.

By contrast, the research on hybrid attacks is more challenging [44]. Since Byzantine attacks on the agent layer can be regarded as a special case in the attack on the communication layer from the receiving side as pointed out in [45], the performance of two kinds of attacks is similar for the receiving agent, causing additional difficulty in distinguishing them. Thus, the individual or simple combination of detection strategies will fail. It is noted that the effective identification of the attack categories helps to take more precise countermeasures in the subsequent procedures for communication or agent layers, thereby the reducing defense cost. Unfortunately, there are currently few relevant

work.

We emphasize that for attacks on the communication layer, no matter whether it is the traditional attack detector, the watermarking detection mechanism, or the consensus-based detector, they are all built on the observer/consensus-based framework [33], [38], [54]. That is to say, the successful execution of the detector strongly depends on the condition that the estimation error or consensus error is zero. Therefore, they are inapplicable to the transient stage. This in turn gives an opportunity for the attackers, especially the systems involving frequent dynamic adjustment such as vehicle formation [46]. In particular, when the attacks are injected during the transient stage, the observer-based detector will become invalid. For attacks on the agent layer, the MSR and its variants [39], [40], [47] may cause error isolation on normal agents, leading to increased defense cost. Then it is necessary to implement attack detection in MASs. The existing detector-based isolation work focuses on recognizing attacked ones accurately to pave a way for resilient consensus [33], [43]. However, from the perspective of achieving resilient consensus, there is no need to adopt a zero tolerance attitude towards malicious agents that do not affect the convergence of MASs. Moreover, when facing hybrid attacks composed of the above two kinds of attacks, the issue under consideration becomes more challenging for this situation [44]. The Byzantine attacks on the agent layer can be seen as a specific instance of attacks on the communication layer, particularly from the receiving side [45], causing further hinder in distinguishing them. Besides, more precise defensive action in the subsequent procedures for communication or agent layers can reduce defense cost. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a unified detection framework for MASs over different layers which are valid in both transient and steady stages. This is another important motivation for conducting this research. This paper studies the attack detection scheme for MASs. Specially, for attacks on the communication layer, a KL divergence detection scheme is proposed to transmit the message set equipped with two kinds of watermarking. This extends the detection range to the transient stage. For attacks on the agent layer, a detection scheme based on the convergence rate to prevent normal agents from being misjudged is put forward. Compared with MSR scheme, the proposed method enables to measure a trade-off between resilience and detection performance. Finally, a unified detection scheme is presented for hybrid attacks. By doing so, we can accurately locate and distinguish hybrid attacks when they occur.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- 1) A watermarking-based detection strategy is proposed with KL divergence. To implement detection during the transient stage, each agent transmits a message set containing two state values. And each state value is equipped with multiplicative and additive watermarking of different parameters. In this way, the attacks on the communication layer can be detected with the help of KL divergence after deleting watermarking. A sufficient condition is derived to ensure the detection performance.

In contrast to the existing results of [33] and [38], no estimation process or consensus process is employed. Therefore, the proposed detection scheme is valid for the transient stage.

- 2) For attacks on the agent layer, an envelope-based detector is proposed in our work. Unlike [39] and [40], the false isolation of normal agents can be efficiently avoided by employing a detector. Moreover, the detector can tolerate the misbehaving agents whose state values are contained in a monotonically decreasing envelope about tracking error. In other words, it can handle the attacks that do not affect system convergence. Hence, the proposed detector can facilitate system resilience while ensuring stability.
- 3) A detection scheme for hybrid attacks guaranteeing transient and steady stages is suggested. This scheme is constructed in terms of the trusted agents and two-hop communication. Specifically, the robustness of the graph regarding two-hop communication is utilized to guarantee that there exists at least one trusted agent in each pair of agents to distinguish situations of hybrid attacks. Compared with [37], the proposed method has a moderate graph requirement and less information transmission.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section II, some preliminaries are given, including notations, graph theory and system description. The detection strategies for three kinds of attacks and their performance analysis are presented in Section III. Simulation results about the platoon of connected vehicles are provided in Section IV. Finally, Section V concludes this paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notations and Graph Theory

Denote \mathbb{R}^n the set of n -dimensional real vectors and $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ the set of $n \times m$ -dimensional real matrices. \mathbb{R}^+ is the set of positive constants. $\text{diag}\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ represents a diagonal matrix. \mathbf{I} and $\mathbf{1}$ are the identity matrix and the vector whose all elements being 1, respectively. $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm.

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{V})$ be a directed graph containing $N + 1$ nodes, where \mathbb{E} is the set of edges and \mathbb{V} is the set of nodes. A path from v_m to v_n is a sequence of distinct nodes $(v_m, v_{m,1}, v_{m,2}, \dots, v_n)$, where $(v_{m,j}, v_{m,j+1}) \in \mathbb{E}$ for $j = 1, \dots, l - 1$. Such a path is also referred to an l -hop path. N_i^+ and N_i^- are sets of in-neighbors and out-neighbors for agent i . A weighted adjacency matrix is defined as $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $a_{ij} > 0$ if $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathbb{E}$, $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The Laplacian matrix of \mathcal{G} is $L = [l_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, where $l_{ii} = \sum_{i=1, j \neq i}^N a_{ij}$ and $l_{ij} = -a_{ij}$, for $i \neq j$.

B. System Description

Consider a group of $N + 1$ leader-following agents labeled as $\{0, \dots, N\}$, in which agent 0 is the leader and the others are the followers. Similar to [49], when there is no attack, the discrete-time dynamics of the i -th normal agent in $\{0, \dots, N\}$ is

$$x_i(k+1) = Ax_i(k) + Bu_i(k), \quad i = 0, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

where the time k is the discrete-time index, $x_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state vector, $u_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the control input and

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ \rho_1 & \rho_2 & \cdots & \rho_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \text{ and } B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n\}$ being the coefficients determined by the agent's dynamic characteristics.

To achieve leader-following consensus in the mean square sense, the control protocol can be designed as

$$u_i(k) = K_1 x_i(k) + a_i(k) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} K_2 (\tilde{y}_{ij}(k) - x_i(k)),$$

where $\tilde{y}_{ij}(k) = x_j(k) + w_{ij}(k)$ denotes the information that agent i receives from agent j . Here $w_{ij} \sim N(0, \Sigma_1)$ is the Gaussian noise in edge (j, i) with $\sigma_1^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ the diagonal element of $\Sigma_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. The controller gains $K_1 = [-\rho_1 + b_1, -\rho_2 + b_2 - b_1, \dots, -\rho_{n-1} + b_{n-1} - b_{n-2}, -\rho_n - b_{n-1} + 1] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$, $K_2 = [b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, 1] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ and $a_i(k) \in \mathbb{R} > 0$ is the time-varying noise-attenuation gain, please see [49] for details.

Now we give some assumptions, which will be used throughout this paper.

Assumption 1: [49]

(A1-1) The communication graph has a spanning tree;

(A1-2) $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a(k) = \infty$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a^2(k) < \infty$;

(A1-3) All roots of $s^{n-1} + b_{n-1}s^{n-2} + \dots + b_2s + b_1 = 0$ are inside the unit circle.

Assumption 2: [40], [51] ((L, P) -local attack model) For each agent, there are at most L misbehaving agents in the in-neighbors of any agent and at most P malicious in-communication channels.

Assumption 3: The range of states in normal systems is disclosed to the attacker, that is, $\epsilon_1 = \min_{l \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left\{ \min_{i \in \mathbb{V}} x_{i, l}(k) \right\}$ and $\epsilon_2 = \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left\{ \max_{i \in \mathbb{V}} x_{i, l}(k) \right\}$ are available to the attacker.

Remark 1: In *Assumption 2*, L and P are known and determined by the prior knowledge of the system, including the topological structure, the vulnerability of agents and communication channel [52]. Due to the impact of control objectives and hardware constraints, the state information of normal system is bounded, and will be accessible by the attacker [11]. Furthermore, if system output caused by the attack exceeds the normal range in reality, the attack can be easily exposed. Therefore, in order to keep stealthy, the attacker will keep the output signal within a normal range [9]. More detailed results will be discussed in the sequel.

Under *Assumption 1*, if the underlying graph of system (1) without any attack contains a spanning tree, the MASs can achieve consensus, i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \|x_i(k) - x_0(k)\|^2 = 0, \\ \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \|x_i(k)\|^2 < \infty.$$

Note that most existing findings are only valid for the steady stage, that is, the time required for the signal $\eta(k) \triangleq \max_{i \in \mathbb{V} \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\|x_i(k) - x_0(k)\|}{\|x_0(k)\|} \right) \right\}$ [53] to reach and stay within a given tolerance range thereafter, with the help of estimator [10], [43] or consensus value [38]. Such a scenario is not applicable in practice, especially for multiple dynamic adjustment processes, such as vehicle formation with leaders [46]. Thus, the goal of this paper is to develop a detection framework for MASs against attacks on different layers while guaranteeing its effectiveness in both transient and steady stages.

III. MAIN RESULTS

Three kinds of attacks shall be addressed in this part, including attacks on the communication layer, attacks on the agent layer, and hybrid attacks.

A. Detection Strategy for Attacks on the Communication Layer

In this subsection, we focus on the attacks that tamper data $\tilde{y}_{ij}(k)$ transmitted in the communication channel between two agents. Without loss of generality, we set the attack strategy on edge (j, i) as $\tilde{y}_{ij}^a(k) = \Xi_{ij}(k)\tilde{y}_{ij}(k) + \Lambda_{ij}(k)$ where $\Xi_{ij}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix with $\Xi_{ijl}(k)$ being its l -th diagonal element and $\Lambda_{ij}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\Lambda_{ijl}(k)$ being its l -th element. It is worth emphasizing that $\Xi_{ij}(k)$ means multiplicative attack and $\Lambda_{ij}(k)$ corresponds to additive attack.

For MASs, attacks need to keep stealthy to prevent them from being detected so that system output operates like a normal one [33]. Thus, according to *Assumption 3*, the attacker aims to design a signal guaranteeing the received state information by normal agent staying within the normal range, that is, $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{y}_{ijl}^a(k)) \in [\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$, where $\tilde{y}_{ijl}^a(k)$ is the l -th entry. Thus, we give the following claim.

Proposition 1: For the attacked system (1), $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{y}_{ijl}^a(k)) \in [\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{ijl}(k) &\in [-1, 1], \\ \Lambda_{ijl}(k) &\in \begin{cases} [0, \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2], \epsilon_1 > 0 \\ [\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, 0], \epsilon_2 < 0 \\ [\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2], \epsilon_1 < 0 < \epsilon_2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Proof: Note that $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{y}_{ijl}^a(k)) \in [\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \epsilon_1 \leq \Xi_{ij}(k)\epsilon_1 + \Lambda_{ij}(k) \leq \epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1 \leq \Xi_{ij}(k)\epsilon_2 + \Lambda_{ij}(k) \leq \epsilon_2. \end{cases}$$

Through linear programming, the proof is evident. ■

To handle the noise, KL divergence detector and χ^2 -detector are common choices. It is known that the former can tackle disturbance, where χ^2 -detector fails. Besides, KL divergence provides a quantitative measure on the distance between two distributions [1]. Thus, the following concept about KL divergence is given.

Definition 1: Let $f_a(\gamma)$ and $f_b(\gamma)$ be the probability density functions (PDFs) of a and b , the KL divergence $D_{KL}(a||b)$ between a and b is

$$D_{KL}(a || b) \triangleq \int_{\{\gamma | f_a(\gamma) > 0\}} f_a(\gamma) \log \frac{f_a(\gamma)}{f_b(\gamma)} d\gamma, \quad (3)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ is an integral variable. For simplicity, the item $\{\gamma | f_a(\gamma) > 0\}$ is omitted in the following discussions.

A KL divergence-based detection scheme was proposed to study the resilient consensus in [38]. However, the scheme becomes invalid if an attack is injected in the transient stage, see Fig. 1 for details. Specifically, we set the time transient stage as the time interval that the state value of each follower satisfies $\eta(k) \triangleq \max_{i \in \mathbb{V} \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\|x_i(k) - x_0(k)\|}{\|x_0(k)\|} \right) \right\} \geq \varsigma$, where $\varsigma \in \mathbb{R}$ is a small scalar which is usually chosen as 0.01, 0.02 or 0.05 [53]. It corresponds to $k \leq 14$, which is indicated by the left side of black dash-dot line in Fig. 1. From Fig. 1, it is seen that during the transient stage, the KL divergence cannot be guaranteed to stay within the safe range. As a result, the detector's alarm will be triggered incorrectly




Fig. 1: KL divergences of detection strategy in [38].

To avoid the defect incurred by KL divergence, a watermarking-based detection scheme is put forward for both transient and steady stages in this paper, see Fig. 2. More specific, each agent transmits a message set consisting of two state values with multiplicative watermarking $M_1^{-1}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $M_2^{-1}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and additive watermarking $F_1(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $F_2(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The key idea is to measure the difference between two values to determine whether the data has been tampered. To this end, let $M_1^{-1}(k) \triangleq \lambda_1 \mathbf{I} + \text{diag} \{M_{11}^2(k), \dots, M_{1l}^2(k), \dots, M_{1n}^2(k)\}$ with $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, where $M_{1l}(k) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{M_1}^2)$ and $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ is a positive constant. Similarly, $M_2^{-1}(k) \triangleq \lambda_2 \mathbf{I} + \text{diag} \{M_{21}^2(k), \dots, M_{2l}^2(k), \dots, M_{2n}^2(k)\}$ with $M_{2l}(k) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{M_2}^2)$. $F_1(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a random vector where the l -th element satisfies $F_{1l}(k) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{F_1}^2)$ and $F_2(k)$ is equipped with the same structure and $F_{2l}(k) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{F_2}^2)$. In this way, the attack model on edge (j, i) becomes $\tilde{y}_{ij}^a(k) = \Xi_{1ij}(k)\tilde{y}_{ij}(k) + \Lambda_{1ij}(k)$ and $\tilde{y}_{ij}^a(k) = \Xi_{2ij}(k)\tilde{y}_{ij}(k) + \Lambda_{2ij}(k)$ where $\Xi_{rij}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\Lambda_{rij}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ($r \in \{1, 2\}$) are the attack signals. The defense steps are summarized in *Algorithm 1* and its framework is given as below.

The attack detection suggested by hypothesis test [54] has the form $D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k)||y_{2ij}^*(k)) \stackrel{H_0}{\leq} \theta$, where θ is a pre-set threshold. H_0 and H_1 imply that edge (j, i) is secure or under attack.




Fig. 2: Block diagram of *Algorithm 1* for attacks on the communication layer.

Algorithm 1 Watermarking-based Detection Strategy for Attacks on the Communication Layer

- 1: For agent i , each agent $j \in N_i^+$ generates the message set $\{\tilde{y}_{1ij}(k), \tilde{y}_{2ij}(k)\}$;
- 2: The message set $\{\tilde{y}_{1ij}(k), \tilde{y}_{2ij}(k)\}$ is equipped with watermarking as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{y}_{1ij}(k) &= M_1^{-1}(k)\tilde{y}_{1ij}(k) + F_1(k), \\ \bar{y}_{2ij}(k) &= M_2^{-1}(k)\tilde{y}_{2ij}(k) + F_2(k);\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

- 3: The message set $\{\bar{y}_{1ij}(k), \bar{y}_{2ij}(k)\}$ is transmitted into communication edge (j, i) ;
- 4: Once $\{\bar{y}_{1ij}^a(k), \bar{y}_{2ij}^a(k)\}$ has been received, the watermarking is removed by performing

$$\begin{aligned}y_{1ij}^*(k) &= M_1(k)(\bar{y}_{1ij}^a(k) - F_1(k)), \\ y_{2ij}^*(k) &= M_2(k)(\bar{y}_{2ij}^a(k) - F_2(k));\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

- 5: Decision making: Calculate $D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k)||y_{2ij}^*(k))$.
- 6: **if** $D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k)||y_{2ij}^*(k)) \leq \theta$ **then**
- 7: Communication channel (j, i) is free of attack;
- 8: **else** $D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k)||y_{2ij}^*(k)) > \theta$
- 9: Communication channel (j, i) is attacked;
- 10: **end if**

Next, the effectiveness of *Algorithm 1* is quantitatively analyzed. To this end, we first give the performance of *Algorithm 1* without attack.

Proposition 2: Under *Algorithm 1*, if edge (j, i) is attack-free, then

$$D_{KL}(y_{2ij}^*(k)||y_{1ij}^*(k)) \leq \theta.$$

Proof: The proof is straightforward according to Definition 1. ■

When the agent suffers from attacks, we have the following results.

Theorem 1: Consider the KL divergence $D_{KL}(y_{2ij}^*(k)||y_{1ij}^*(k))$ of edge (j, i) with watermarking strategy in *Algorithm 1*. If $\lim_{\sigma_{F_1}^2, \sigma_{F_2}^2 \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\sigma_{F_1}^2}{\sigma_{F_2}^2} = 0$ and

$\lim_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} = 0$, there exist attacks in edge (j, i) and the KL divergence satisfies

$$\lim_{\substack{\sigma_{F_1}^2, \sigma_{F_2}^2 \rightarrow +\infty \\ \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \rightarrow +\infty}} D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k)||y_{2ij}^*(k)) = +\infty. \quad (6)$$

Proof: For the sake of brevity, the time index k and the edge index ij for edge (j, i) will be omitted in the sequel. Since the structure of y_1^* and y_2^* in one message set is the same, we focus on y_1^* and replace 1 with 2 on the index of relevant parameters to generate the second data in the message set.

For edge (j, i) suffering from attacks on the communication layer, according to (4) and (5), the received data after removing watermarking admits

$$\begin{aligned}y_{1l}^* &= \Xi_1(x + w) + M_1\Xi_1F_1 + M_1\Lambda_1 - M_1F_1 \\ &= \Xi_1x + \Xi_1w + \lambda_1(\Xi_1 - \mathbf{I})F_1 + \text{diag}\{M_{1l}^2\}\Lambda_1 \\ &\quad + \text{diag}\{M_{1l}^2\}(\Xi_1 - \mathbf{I})F_1 + \lambda_1\Lambda_1,\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

and the l -th element of y_{1l}^* has the form

$$\begin{aligned}y_{1l}^* &= \Xi_{1l}x_l + \Xi_{1l}w_l + \lambda_{1l}(\Xi_{1l} - 1)F_{1l} + M_{1l}^2\Lambda_{1l} \\ &\quad + M_{1l}^2(\Xi_{1l} - 1)F_{1l} + \lambda_{1l}\Lambda_{1l}.\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

We divide the proof into 8 cases under different kinds of attack parameters, see TABLE I. Here $S_1 = \{\Xi_{1l}|\Xi_{1l} \rightarrow 1\} \cup \{\Xi_{1l}|\Xi_{1l} = 1\}$ and $S_2 = \{\Xi_{2l}|\Xi_{2l} \rightarrow 1\} \cup \{\Xi_{2l}|\Xi_{2l} = 1\}$. In this way, $\Xi_{1r} \notin S_r$ and $\Lambda_{1r} \neq 0$ ($r \in \{1, 2\}$) correspond to multiplicative and additive attacks respectively.

TABLE I: Classification of attack parameters selection

		y_{1l}^*		$\Xi_{1l} \notin S_1$		$\Xi_{1l} \in S_1$	
		$\Lambda_{2l} = 0$	$\Lambda_{2l} \neq 0$	$\Lambda_{1l} = 0$	$\Lambda_{1l} \neq 0$	$\Lambda_{1l} = 0$	$\Lambda_{1l} \neq 0$
y_{2l}^*	$\Xi_{2l} \notin S_2$	$\Lambda_{2l} = 0$	$\Lambda_{2l} \neq 0$	Case 1		Case 2	Case 3
	$\Xi_{2l} \in S_2$	$\Lambda_{2l} = 0$	$\Lambda_{2l} \neq 0$	Case 4		Security	Case 7
				Case 5		Case 8	Case 6

First of all, we will consider the situations where there exist multiplicative attacks destroying the message set.

Case 1: For convenience, we rewrite (8) as $y_{1l}^* = \hat{y}_{1l}^* + \hat{y}_{2l}^*$ where

$$\hat{y}_{1l}^* = \Xi_{1l}x_l + \Xi_{1l}w_l, \quad (9a)$$

$$\hat{y}_{2l}^* = (M_{1l}^2 + \lambda_1)((\Xi_{1l} - 1)F_{1l} + \Lambda_{1l}). \quad (9b)$$

With (9b), set $\hat{y}_{2l}^* = \hat{y}_m^* \hat{y}_n^*$ where $\hat{y}_m^* = M_{1l}^2 + \lambda_1$ and $\hat{y}_n^* = (\Xi_{1l} - 1)F_{1l} + \Lambda_{1l}$.

It is obvious that the PDFs of \hat{y}_m^* and \hat{y}_n^* become

$$f_{\hat{y}_m^*}(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(-(\gamma - \lambda_1)/2\sigma_{M_1}^2)}{\sqrt{2\pi(\gamma - \lambda_1)\sigma_{M_1}^2}}, & \gamma > \lambda_1 \\ 0, & \gamma \leq \lambda_1, \end{cases} \quad (10a)$$

$$f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(\gamma) = \frac{\exp(-(\gamma - \Lambda_{1l})^2/2(\Xi_{1l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_1}^2)}{\sqrt{2\pi(\Xi_{1l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_1}^2}}. \quad (10b)$$

In terms of (10a) and (10b), the PDF of \hat{y}_{2l}^* is

$$\begin{aligned}f_{\hat{y}_{2l}^*}(\gamma) &= \int_{\lambda_1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{|z|} f_{\hat{y}_m^*}(z) f_{\hat{y}_n^*}\left(\frac{\gamma}{z}\right) dz \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \int_{\lambda_1}^{+\infty} g_{\hat{y}_{2l}^*}(z) dz,\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

where (a) holds for $\lambda_1 \in (0, +\infty)$ and $g_{\hat{y}_{2l}^*}(z) = \frac{1}{z} f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(z) f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(\frac{\gamma}{z})$.

Based on (10b), it turns out that

$$f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(\gamma) = \int_{\lambda_1}^{+\infty} g_{\hat{y}_n^*}(z) dz, \quad (12)$$

where

$$g_{\hat{y}_n^*}(z) = \exp(-\ln^2(z - \lambda_1) + 2 \ln(z - \lambda_1)) \frac{f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(\gamma)}{e\sqrt{\pi}(z - \lambda_1)}.$$

From (11) and (12), it is straightforward that there exists a positive constant $\hat{\xi}_{11}$ which is bounded away from zero, such that $\frac{1}{\hat{\xi}_{11}} f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(\gamma) < f_{y_{2l}^*}(\gamma)$. In this way, the PDF of y_{1l}^* can be scaled as

$$\begin{aligned} f_{y_{1l}^*}(\gamma) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_{\hat{y}_{1l}^*}(z) f_{\hat{y}_{2l}^*}(\gamma - z) dz \\ &< \frac{1}{\hat{\xi}_{11}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(z) f_{\hat{y}_{2l}^*}(\gamma - z) dz \\ &= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(\gamma - (\Lambda_{1l} + \Xi_{1l}x_l))^2}{2((\Xi_{1l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_1}^2 + \Xi_{1l}^2\sigma_1^2)}\right)}{\hat{\xi}_{11}\sqrt{2\pi((\Xi_{1l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_1}^2 + \Xi_{1l}^2\sigma_1^2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Similarly, the PDF of y_{2l}^* can be transformed by inequality manipulation into

$$f_{y_{2l}^*}(\gamma) > \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(\gamma - (\Lambda_{2l} + \Xi_{2l}x_l))^2}{2((\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2)}\right)}{\hat{\xi}_{12}\sqrt{2\pi((\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2)}}. \quad (14)$$

From (13) and (14), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} &D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^* \| y_{2ij}^*) \\ &> \frac{1}{2\hat{\xi}_{11}} \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\log \frac{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2}{(\Xi_{1l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_1}^2 + \Xi_{1l}^2\sigma_1^2} - 1 \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{(\Xi_{1l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_1}^2 + \Xi_{1l}^2\sigma_1^2}{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{((\Lambda_{2l} + \Xi_{2l}x_l) - (\Lambda_{1l} + \Xi_{1l}x_l))^2}{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2} \right) + \frac{n}{\hat{\xi}_{11}} \log \frac{\hat{\xi}_{12}}{\hat{\xi}_{11}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can see that Ξ_{1l} , Ξ_{2l} , $\hat{\xi}_{1h}$ and σ_1^2 with $h \in \{1, 2\}$ are bounded. Therefore, if $\lim_{\sigma_{F_1}^2, \sigma_{F_2}^2 \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\sigma_{F_1}^2}{\sigma_{F_2}^2} = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\sigma_{F_1}^2, \sigma_{F_2}^2 \rightarrow +\infty} D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^* \| y_{2ij}^*) = +\infty. \quad (15)$$

Case 2: In this condition, only \tilde{y}_2 in the message set transmitted suffers from the attack such that $y_{1l}^* = x_l + w_l$, where the PDF is

$$f_{y_{1l}^*}(\gamma) = \frac{\exp\left(-(\gamma - x_l)^2 / 2\sigma_1^2\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_1^2}}.$$

By following a similar procedure of **Case 1**, it indicates

$$\begin{aligned} &D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^* \| y_{2ij}^*) \\ &> \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\log \frac{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_1^2} - 1 \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma_1^2}{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{((\Lambda_{2l} + \Xi_{2l}x_l) - x_l)^2}{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2} \right) + n \log \frac{\hat{\xi}_{12}}{\hat{\xi}_{11}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Based on (16), since Ξ_{2l} and $\hat{\xi}_{12}$ are bounded, we have

$$\lim_{\sigma_{F_2}^2 \rightarrow +\infty} D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k) \| y_{2ij}^*(k)) = +\infty. \quad (17)$$

Case 3: In this scenario, \tilde{y}_1 only suffers from the additive attack and $y_{1l}^* = \hat{y}_a^* + \hat{y}_b^*$, where $\hat{y}_a^* = x_l + w_l + \lambda_1 \Lambda_{1l}$ and $\hat{y}_b^* = M_{1l}^2 \Lambda_{1l}$. If $\Lambda_{1l} > 0$, the PDFs of \hat{y}_a^* and \hat{y}_b^* are

$$f_{\hat{y}_a^*}(\gamma) = \frac{\exp\left(-(\gamma - x_l - \lambda_1 \Lambda_{1l})^2 / 2\sigma_1^2\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_1^2}}, \quad (18a)$$

$$f_{\hat{y}_b^*}(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(-\gamma / 2\sigma_{M_1}^2 \Lambda_{1l})}{\sqrt{2\pi\gamma \Lambda_{1l} \sigma_{M_1}^2}}, & \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \gamma \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (18b)$$

According to (18a) and (18b), the PDF of y_{1l}^* is

$$f_{y_{1l}^*}(\gamma) = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{z}{2\sigma_{M_1}^2 \Lambda_{1l}} - \frac{(\gamma - z - x_l - \lambda_1 \Lambda_{1l})^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right)}{\sqrt{4\pi^2 \sigma_1^2 \Lambda_{1l} \sigma_{M_1}^2 \sigma_1^2 z}} dz.$$

(18a) can be further transformed into

$$f_{y_{1l}^*}(\gamma) = \int_0^{+\infty} g_{\hat{y}_a^*}(z) dz, \quad (19)$$

where

$$g_{\hat{y}_a^*}(z) = \exp(-\ln^2(z) + 2 \ln(z)) \frac{f_{\hat{y}_a^*}(\gamma)}{e\sqrt{\pi}(z)}.$$

Similar to (13), there exists a positive constant $\hat{\xi}_{31}$ which is bounded away from zero, such that $\frac{1}{\hat{\xi}_{31}} f_{\hat{y}_n^*}(\gamma) < f_{y_{1l}^*}(\gamma)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^* \| y_{2ij}^*) \\ &> \frac{1}{2\hat{\xi}_{31}} \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\log \frac{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_1^2} - 1 \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma_1^2}{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{((\Lambda_{2l} + \Xi_{2l}x_l) - (\Lambda_{1l} + x_l))^2}{(\Xi_{2l} - 1)^2\sigma_{F_2}^2 + \Xi_{2l}^2\sigma_1^2} \right) + \frac{n}{\hat{\xi}_{31}} \log \frac{\hat{\xi}_{12}}{\hat{\xi}_{31}}. \end{aligned}$$

Performing the same procedure as **Case 2**, one gets

$$\lim_{\sigma_{F_2}^2 \rightarrow +\infty} D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^* \| y_{2ij}^*) = +\infty. \quad (20)$$

Since the treatment of scenario $\Lambda_{1l} < 0$ is similar to the one that $\Lambda_{1l} > 0$, no relevant research will be further conducted.

For **Case 4** and **Case 5**, through the same analytical framework in **Case 2** and **Case 3**, it follows that

$$\lim_{\sigma_{F_1}^2 \rightarrow +\infty} D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^* || y_{2ij}^*) = +\infty. \quad (21)$$

Next, we will address the situations that the message set only suffers from the additive attack.

Case 6: In this scenario, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{1l}^* &= x_l + w_l + M_{1l}^2 A_{1l} + \lambda_1 A_{1l}, \\ y_{2l}^* &= x_l + w_l + M_{2l}^2 A_{2l} + \lambda_2 A_{2l}. \end{aligned}$$

Spurred by the arguments in **Case 2** and **Case 3**, it is indicated that if $\lim_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \rightarrow +\infty} D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^* || y_{2ij}^*) = +\infty. \quad (22)$$

As for **Case 7** and **Case 8**, the above conclusion can also be drawn out through similar technical routes in **Case 6** and will not be repeated here.

Based on the statements discussed above, the proof is thus completed. ■

Remark 2: According to the proof of Theorem 1, we can see that additive attacks are subject to multiplicative watermarking while multiplicative attacks will be affected by additive watermarking. In *Algorithm 1*, two types of watermarking are involved, allowing for simultaneous disclosure of additive and multiplicative attacks.

Remark 3: In contrast to [48] and [38], the proposed scheme is capable of transient stage since the analysis process spans the entire system evolution time. In other words, it is not only applicable to the situation $k \rightarrow \infty$. The applicability of transient stage comes from our special provision that each agent transmits a message set on the communication layer, rather than a single state value under traditional communication strategies. At the same time, in order to prevent attackers from eavesdropping on the detection strategy, we match different watermarking strategies for different state values in one message set. This lays the foundation for real-time data verification subsequently.

Remark 4: As shown in the proof of Theorem 1, for the attacks containing multiplicative signals which correspond to Cases 1-5, the additive watermarking with parameters $\sigma_{F_l}^2, l \in \{1, 2\}$ plays a major role. See (15) in Case 1, (17) in Case 2, (20) in Case 3 and (21) in Cases 4 and 5. For Cases 6-8 having single additive attacks, it turns to multiplicative watermarking with relevant parameters as $\lambda_l, l \in \{1, 2\}$ to keep a central position in attack detection. Therefore, the parameters involving both multiplicative and additive watermarking are settled in (6) in Theorem 1. Besides, once an attack occurs, the inverse process under the watermarking removal mechanism at the receiving end becomes invalid. This leads to the presence of watermarking relevant statistical characteristics in the attacked data in the message set $\{\bar{y}_{1ij}^a(k), \bar{y}_{2ij}^a(k)\}$ at the receiving end, which

is the key factor that exposes an attack on the communication layer.

Remark 5: There are currently numerous model-based fault/attack detection mechanisms available. In [12], an adaptive fault diagnosis method was proposed by synthesizing fault detection estimators and a bank of fault isolation estimators. A detector based on the Luenberger observer together with a series of unknown input observers was designed to implement distributed detection in DC microgrids in [13]. In [14], a detection mechanism with the foundation of model-based observer was put forward for covert attacks in interconnected systems to implement distributed attack detection among subsystems. However, a common feature of the aforementioned work is that they are all built on the observer-based framework. That is to say, the successful defense against attacks strongly depends on the convergence of estimation error. This also leads to its inapplicability for transient stage.

B. Detection Strategy for Attacks on the Agent layer

In recent years, the attack issue of agent layer has also received much attention [39], [41]. Typical attacks launched include malicious attacks and Byzantine attacks. In this subsection, we focus on the latter which is implemented by sending malicious information to different out-neighbors [40]. Thus it is a more threatening one than malicious attack which spreads influence through broadcasting of malicious agents. Besides, we pay attention to the Byzantine attacks that shake the convergence of MASs.

The existing literature shows that the norm of tracking error between the leader and followers without attack has an envelope of the upper bound [50]. That is, if the system operates normally, the norm of tracking error will always be restricted by an envelope. In this paper, we choose the envelope with the form

$$\tau(k) = \rho e^{-g(k)},$$

where $g(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a positive increasing function with time k . Moreover, the consensus problem in MASs is usually recast into the stability issue of error system. To this end, we define the error signal $d_{ij}(k) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \|y_{ij}(k) - x_i(k)\|$. In this section, in order to concentrate defensive forces on attacks that affect system performance and avoid unnecessary losses, we investigate a class of attackers that impact the convergence performance which manifests as overstepping the envelope of state error in normal systems. For convenience, the Byzantine attacks mentioned below refer to the ones that the state error exceeds the envelope.

If $d_{ij}(k) < d_{ij}(k-1)(\tau(k) + \delta)$, agent j is free of Byzantine attack; otherwise, j is appointed to be a Byzantine agent. Here $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is an offset indicating the resilience of system. *Algorithm 2* illustrates the detailed steps for Byzantine attack detection strategy and its skeleton is shown as below.




Fig. 3: Block diagram of *Algorithm 2* for attacks on the agent layer.

Algorithm 2 Byzantine Attacks Detection Strategy

- 1: Each agent j with $j \in N_i^+$ sends the message $y_{ij}(k)$ into communication edge (j, i) ;
 - 2: Decision making: Calculate $d_{ij}(k)$ and $\tau(k)$;
 - 3: **if** $\mathbb{E}(d_{ij}(k)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_2^2}} \mathbb{E}(d_{ij}(k-1))(\tau(k) + \delta)$ **then**
 - 4: Agent j is not attacked;
 - 5: **else** $\mathbb{E}(d_{ij}(k)) > \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_2^2}} \mathbb{E}(d_{ij}(k-1))(\tau(k) + \delta)$
 - 6: j is a Byzantine agent;
 - 7: **end if**
-

Before demonstrating the effectiveness of *Algorithm 2*, we first introduce Lemma 1 to assist the subsequent analysis.

Lemma 1: For vectors $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in which $\Gamma_i, \Omega_i \in [\varrho_1, \varrho_2]$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and Γ_i and Ω_i are the i -th element of Γ and Ω , we have

$$\|\Gamma\| + \|\Omega\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\varrho_1^2 + \varrho_2^2}{\varrho_1^2}} \|\Omega + \Gamma\|. \quad (23)$$

Proof: According to the definition of 2-norm, it is clear

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\|\Omega + \Gamma\|}{\|\Gamma\| + \|\Omega\|} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\Omega_i^2 + \Gamma_i^2) + \sum_{i=1}^n 2\Omega_i\Gamma_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\Omega_i^2 + \Gamma_i^2) + 2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \Omega_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i^2}} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{>} \frac{\varrho_1^2}{\varrho_1^2 + \varrho_2^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Specially, the inequality manipulation (d) comes from

- 1) $2n\varrho_1^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (\Omega_i^2 + \Gamma_i^2) \leq 2n\varrho_2^2$; 2) $\sum_{i=1}^n 2\Omega_i\Gamma_i \geq 0$;
- 3) $2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \Omega_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i^2} \leq 2n\varrho_1^2$. Besides, since each scaling from 1) to 3) is fulfilled independently but cannot be met simultaneously, “=” will not occur. This completes the proof. ■

For the convenience of analysis, an assumption is provided.

Assumption 4: [50]

- (A4-1) There exist positive constants $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 < \infty$ and $\Lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $k \geq 1$, $\mu_1 k^{-\Lambda} \leq a_i(k) \leq \mu_2 k^{-\Lambda}$;
- (A4-2) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_i[k]/a_j[k] = c_{ij}$, $c_{ij} > 0$.

Then, for any normal agent i and its normal neighbor $j \in N_i^+$, we give the following distributed condition about the convergence rate.

Proposition 3: Given $\tau(k) = M_r e^{(-\lambda_{\min} k^{(1-\phi)})}$, where M_r is a bounded positive constant, λ_{\min} is the smallest eigenvalue of CL_2 with $C = \text{diag}\{c_1, \dots, c_N\}$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_i(t)}{\bar{a}(t)} =$

c_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$), $\bar{a}(t) = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \{a_i(t)\}$ and $\phi \in (0, \min\{1, \lambda_{\min}\})$, suppose *Assumption 4* is satisfied. Then, for any normal agent i , it follows that

$$d_{ij}(k) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}} (\tau(k) + \delta) d_{ij}(k-1), \quad j \in N_i^+. \quad (24)$$

Proof: According to [50], by *Assumption 1*, one gets $d_{i0}(k) < d_{i0}(k-1)(\tau(k) + \delta)$ when there is no attack.

Define a path from leader 0 to follower i be $(v_0, v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_m}, \dots, v_{i_{p-2}}, v_i)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \|x_0(k) - x_i(k)\| \\ &= \mathbb{E} \|x_0(k) - x_{i_1}(k) + x_{i_1}(k) + \dots \\ & \quad + x_{i_{m-1}}(k) - x_{i_m}(k) + \dots + x_{i_{p-2}} - x_i(k)\| \\ &= \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{y}_{i_1 0}(k) - x_{i_1}(k) + \tilde{y}_{i_2 i_1}(k) - x_{i_2}(k) + \dots \\ & \quad + \tilde{y}_{i_m i_{m-1}}(k) - x_{i_m}(k) + \dots + \tilde{y}_{i_{p-2} i_{p-2}} - x_i(k)\| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{y}_{i_1 0}(k) - x_{i_1}(k)\| + \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{y}_{i_2 i_1}(k) - x_{i_2}(k)\| + \dots \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{y}_{i_m i_{m-1}}(k) - x_{i_m}(k)\| + \dots + \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{y}_{i_{p-2} i_{p-2}}(k) - x_i(k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

From Lemma 1 and (25), if for $\forall m \in \{1, \dots, p-2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{y}_{i_m i_{m-1}}(k) - x_{i_m}(k)\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}} (\tau(k) + \delta) \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{y}_{i_m i_{m-1}}(k-1) - x_{i_m}(k-1)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|x_0(k) - x_i(k)\| \leq (\tau(k) + \delta) \mathbb{E} \|x_0(k-1) - x_i(k-1)\|, \quad (27)$$

which means that $\|x_0(k) - x_i(k)\|$ will converge to zero over time. The proof is completed. ■

Therefore, under *Algorithm 2*, if there is no attack, the detector will not be alarmed. While if the system suffering from Byzantine attacks causes $\|x_{i_{p-2}}(k) - x_i(k)\| > \sqrt{\frac{\varrho_1^2 + \varrho_2^2}{\varrho_2^2}} (\tau(k) + \delta) (x_{i_{p-2}}(k-1) - x_i(k-1))$, the detector alarm is triggered.

Now, the effectiveness of *Algorithm 2* is portrayed by the following proposition.

Proposition 4: If $\tau(k)$ is chosen as $M_r e^{(-\lambda_{\min} k^{(1-\phi)})}$ and *Assumption 4* is guaranteed, *Algorithm 2* can detect Byzantine attacks of which the state value exceeds the state envelope that matches the convergence rate.

Proof: Based on Proposition 3 and the types of target attacks to be detected, the proof can be directly obtained. ■

Remark 6: Proposition 4 provides a solution to examine whether there exists a Byzantine attack or not. Since the detection scheme is related to the convergence rate, it is also valid for transient stage. Unlike strategy in [54], the proposed scheme concentrates on the impact of attack on convergence. Such a treatment occupies less resources while guaranteeing a desirable consensus performance. Besides, M_r and δ reflect the level of resilience to attacks.

Remark 7: There are some options for $\tau(k)$, such as $\varrho e^{-g(k)}$ [50] and $c\varrho^k$ [42]. The design idea of the detector in this section is to provide an envelope of decreasing time in terms of the upper bound of the relative error of state values

among agents, so as to conform to the operation law of the normal system. In this way, the malicious agents that affect the system convergence are screened out. However, from the theoretical perspective, we aim to find a detector where its effectiveness can be rigorously demonstrated. With the leader-follower multi-agent model in (1), the upper bound of the convergence rate for the tracking error between the leader and the follower is $M_\tau e^{(-\lambda_{\min} k^{(1-\phi)})}$. However, the envelope of the detector cannot be directly adopted for this kind of $\tau(k)$. Considering the fully distributed requirement of the algorithm proposed in this paper, not every agent can acquire the state of the leader. That is to say, the results of this article, namely Propositions 3 and 4, cannot be directly obtained from the relevant literature in [50], [55]. Therefore, it is necessary to transform the detection indicators from differences in the state of followers and the leader to differences in the state of neighbors, in order to achieve full distribution of the algorithm.

Remark 8: δ actually reflects the degree of the envelope $\tau(k)$ moving up along the vertical axis, which is related to the robustness of the detector. The larger the envelope of $\tau(k)$ is, the greater tolerance for outliers will be with lower false alarm rate to the corresponding attacks. Therefore, this parameter is very important, especially for (1) with uncertain factors, which is more realistic. However, an inappropriate high value of δ will cause the failure to detect malicious attacks on the target, ultimately leading to a decrease in detection rate. This understanding has been clearly stated in the design of detectors, for example, [56], [57].

Remark 9: A common sense needs to be stated here: when the system needs more agents to be isolated, more redundant edges are required in the initial graph to maintain the connectivity of the network communication topology which implies a higher connectivity of the initial graph [40]. Next, two cases are considered: a) Too low detection accuracy: This can be characterized in extreme cases. That is, the detector cannot detect misbehaving nodes that have too much influence on the system, so that normal agents maintain information interaction with these extremely misbehaving agents. It may cause malicious information to be injected, preventing the realization of resilient consensus, and greatly reducing system resilience. b) Too high detection accuracy: Here we give an example when a malicious message sent by a misbehaving agent is small enough, even combined with a short attack time, that will not disrupt the convergence. If the detector has high accuracy and exposes this attack, it leads to a series of node isolation behaviors [37], [38]. In addition, under the same number of Byzantine agents, more redundant edges are needed to maintain the connectivity of the communication topology. Naturally, a high connectivity of the initial graph will weaken system resilience. Thus, we consider the issue of balancing system resilience and detection accuracy in this paper. If the attack does not affect the convergence of the system, the detector is expected to tolerate these malicious behaviors. To achieve this goal, we design an envelope-based detector to identify whether the behavior of misbehaving agents will disrupt the convergence trend of the system. In particular, the envelope is a decreasing curve that characterizes the upper

bound on the tracking error of the system. In this way, only the attacked agents that affect the convergence trend of the system are identified, and the malicious behaviors that do not affect the convergence trend of the system will be ignored. By doing so, the secure resilience is enhanced. This implements the tradeoff what we call.

C. Detection Strategy for Hybrid Attacks

In this subsection, we design the detection scheme for hybrid attacks that can destroy communication channel and agent at the same time. It is noted that most existing literature on detection strategy becomes infeasible for the problem formulated here. This is because the behavior of hybrid attacks becomes more complicated and the overall effect is not a simple superposition of two attacks. For example, a detector may regard the attacks on the communication layer as Byzantine attacks. This will cause a degradation of control performance and increase the security cost. In addition, a simple parallel or composition of two detection strategies will become ineffective. Hence, the study on hybrid attacks is somewhat challenging and meaningful. A framework of detection strategy, e.g., *Algorithm 3* in this subsection is shown in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4: Block diagram of *Algorithm 3* for hybrid attacks.

In *Algorithm 3*, at instant k , for $j \in N_i^+$, flag $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k), \varphi_{ij2}(k)\}$ will be generated for the consequence of detection. Specially, $\varphi_{ij1}(k) = 0, 1, 2$ indicates that the communication channel (j, i) is not attacked, attacked, pending, respectively. Similarly, $\varphi_{ij2}(k) = 0, 1, 2$ stands for the identity of agent j judged by agent i .

To be specific, for each agent i with one of its in-neighbors $j \in N_i^+$, the attacks on the communication channel (j, i) are first determined in steps 2-8 which corresponds to *Algorithm 1* to judge whether the message set has been tampered. If

the communication channel (j, i) is not falsified, steps 9-13 will be used in terms of *Algorithm 2* to judge whether agent j is a Byzantine agent. Next, agent i sends the information $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k), \varphi_{ij2}(k)\}$ to its out-neighbors. For the worst scenario where the communication channel (j, i) is attacked, agent i will generate $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k) = 1, \varphi_{ij2}(k) = 2\}$ for agent j , in which $\varphi_{ij2}(k) = 2$ indicates that it is unclear whether agent j is attacked or not. Then the flag $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k) = 1, \varphi_{ij2}(k) = 2\}$ is sent to the agents in N_j^- . If there exists an agent $\hat{j} \in N_j^-$ (trusted agent) satisfying $\{\varphi_{\hat{j}j1}(k) = 1, \varphi_{\hat{j}j2}(k) = 0\}$ and $\{\varphi_{i\hat{j}1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{i\hat{j}2}(k) = 0\}$, agent j will be viewed as a Byzantine agent; otherwise, a normal one consistent with steps 14-23. The following *Algorithm 3* gives the detailed procedure.

With the help of detection schemes proposed in Subsections III – A and III – B, *Algorithm 3* provides a way to detect and distinguish the hybrid attacks by introducing the concept of trusted agent \hat{j} . The following criterion is given to address this.

Theorem 2: Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 1 and Proposition 4 hold and there exist at least $L + P + 1$ directed two-hop paths between any pair of neighboring agents, aligned with the direction of the corresponding edge. Then, the hybrid attacks with *Algorithm 3* are detectable.

Proof: We prove this by contradiction and divide the proof procedure into two cases: for normal agent i , **Case A:** there exists at least one normal agent $m \in N_i^+$ or normal edge (m, i) which is accused of being attacked mistakenly; **Case B:** there exists at least one Byzantine agent $\varepsilon \in N_i^+$ or edge (ε, i) attacked that is mistaken as the normal one.

Case A: We further separate it into two subcases. **Subcase A-1:** A normal agent m is mistakenly identified as the Byzantine one. If the normal agent m is judged as the Byzantine agent, according to *Algorithm 2*, $d_{im}(k) > d_{im}(k-1)(\tau(k) + \delta)$. This contradicts Proposition 4 in which the normal agent satisfies $d_{im}(k) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_2^2}} d_{im}(k-1)(\tau(k) + \delta)$. **Subcase A-2:** A normal edge (i, m) is mistakenly believed to be attacked from communication layer. In this way, it gives $D_{KL}(y_{1im}^*(k) \| y_{2im}^*(k)) > \theta$. However, for the attack-free system, based on (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{1im}^*(k) &= M_1(k)(\bar{y}_{1im}(k) - F_1(k)) = \tilde{y}_{1im}(k), \\ y_{2im}^*(k) &= M_1(k)(\bar{y}_{2im}(k) - F_2(k)) = \tilde{y}_{1im}(k). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

This indicates that the two state values in message set transmitted after the reverse process have the same distribution. From Definition 1, it is obvious that $D_{KL}(y_{1im}^*(k) \| y_{2im}^*(k)) \leq \theta$, a contradiction.

Case B: Four subcases will be addressed. First, two single attack scenarios are under consideration. **Subcase B-1:** Byzantine agent ε is viewed as a normal one. In this way, we get $d_{i\varepsilon}(k) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_2^2}} d_{i\varepsilon}(k-1)(\tau(k) + \delta)$ which contradicts Proposition 4. **Subcase B-2:** Attacked edge (ε, i) is regarded as a normal one. Thus we have $D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k) \| y_{2ij}^*(k)) \leq \theta$. However, in terms of Theorem 1, the above conclusion becomes invalid with appropriate θ and watermarking parameters including $\sigma_{M_1}^2$, $\sigma_{F_2}^2$, $\sigma_{M_2}^2$

Algorithm 3 Hybrid Attacks Detection Strategy

- 1: **Initialization:** $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k) = 2, \varphi_{ij2}(k) = 2\}, \forall i, j \in \mathbb{V}$;
- 2: For each agent i , agent $j \in N_i^+$ generates the message set $\{\tilde{y}_{1ij}(k), \tilde{y}_{2ij}(k)\}$;
- 3: The message set $\{\tilde{y}_{1ij}(k), \tilde{y}_{2ij}(k)\}$ is equipped with watermarking as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{y}_{1ij}(k) &= M_1^{-1}(k)\tilde{y}_{1ij}(k) + F_1(k), \\ \bar{y}_{2ij}(k) &= M_2^{-1}(k)\tilde{y}_{2ij}(k) + F_2(k); \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

- 4: The message set $\{\bar{y}_{1ij}(k), \bar{y}_{2ij}(k)\}$ is transmitted into communication edge (j, i) ;
- 5: If $\{\bar{y}_{1ij}^a(k), \bar{y}_{2ij}^a(k)\}$ is received, the watermarking is removed according to

$$\begin{aligned} y_{1ij}^*(k) &= M_1(k)(\bar{y}_{1ij}^a(k) - F_1(k)), \\ y_{2ij}^*(k) &= M_2(k)(\bar{y}_{2ij}^a(k) - F_2(k)); \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

- 6: Decision making: calculate $D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k) \| y_{2ij}^*(k))$;
- 7: **if** $D_{KL}(y_{1ij}^*(k) \| y_{2ij}^*(k)) \leq \theta$ **then**
- 8: The communication channel (i, j) is not attacked;
- 9: **if**

$$\forall \mathbb{E}(d_{ijr}(k)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_2^2}} \mathbb{E}(d_{ijr}(k-1))(\tau(k) + \delta),$$

$r \in \{1, 2\}$ **then**

- 10: Agent j is not attacked and $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{ij2}(k) = 0\}$;
 - 11: **else**
 - 12: Agent j is attacked and $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{ij2}(k) = 1\}$;
 - 13: **end if**
 - 14: **else**
 - 15: The communication channel (i, j) is attacked and set $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k) = 1, \varphi_{ij2}(k) = 2\}$;
 - 16: **end if**
 - 17: Agent i sends $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k), \varphi_{ij2}(k)\}$ to its out-neighbors;
 - 18: Select a trusted agent $\hat{j} \in N_i^+ \cap \{\hat{j} | \varphi_{i\hat{j}1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{i\hat{j}2}(k) = 0\} \cap \{\hat{j} | \varphi_{\hat{j}j1}(k) = 0\}$;
 - 19: **if** $\varphi_{\hat{j}j2} = 1$ **then**
 - 20: Agent j is a Byzantine agent;
 - 21: **else**
 - 22: Agent j is a normal agent;
 - 23: **end if**
-

and $\sigma_{F_1}^2$. Next, we consider a more complex situation that both agent ω and edge (ω, i) are suffer from attacks, which corresponds to the hybrid attacks. **Subcase B-3:** Attacked edge (ω, i) is judged as a normal one. Similar to the analysis process, it is derived that the above statement fails. **Subcase B-4:** Byzantine agent ω bypasses the detection strategy in *Algorithm 3*. If there exist at least $L + P + 1$ two-hop paths between any two agents, under *Assumption 2*, we can always find one trusted two-hop path between any two agents such that edge (ω, s) , agent s and edge (s, i) are safe. Based on the analysis in **Subcase A-1**, **Subcase A-2** and **Subcase B-2**, we have $\{\varphi_{is1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{is2}(k) = 0\}$




Fig. 5: Information flow topology for platoons.

and $\{\varphi_{i\omega 1}(k) = 1, \varphi_{i\omega 2}(k) = 2\}$. By resorting to *Algorithm 3*, if agent ω is regarded as a safe one, it has $\{\varphi_{s\omega 1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{s\omega 2}(k) = 0\}$. While, this violates the conclusion in **Subcase B-1** which should be $\{\varphi_{s\omega 1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{s\omega 2}(k) = 1\}$. The proof is thus completed. ■

Remark 10: At present, the detection mechanism based on two-hop communication is mainly targeted at the agent layer. Since this paper studies the hybrid attacks (including agent layer and communication layer), we degrade the attacks to agent layer attacks and compare the detection mechanism. That is, by fixing $P = 0$, we can compare our results with the case of L -local [37]. Our algorithm brings some moderate graph requirement and less information transmission. As for the classical literature for two-hop detector [37], the required condition about graph is that: for each edge (i, j) in \mathcal{G} and each agent $h \in N_j^+$, we have $h \in N_i^+$ or there are at least $2L + 1$ directed two-hop edges from each agent h to agent i . In this paper, as shown in Theorem 2, we can see that under the model parameter requirements of system (1), our graph connectivity condition requires only $L + 1$ directed two-hop paths between any pair of neighboring agents with the same direction of the corresponding edge. Moreover, as described in [37], it is demonstrated that within this two-hop communication detection framework, the transmitted information from each agent $i \in \mathbb{V}$ encompasses its own state value, its own identity information, the identity and state value of neighboring agents in the two-hop process, as well as the final result of local detection for malicious agents. However, according to *Algorithm 3*, it is found that the entire network only transmits the following information: the data set encrypted by the watermarking $\{\bar{y}_{1ij}(k), \bar{y}_{2ij}(k)\}$, and two flag values $\{\varphi_{ij1}(k), \varphi_{ij2}(k)\}$. Besides, it should be noted that only two flag values which belong to real numbers indicate a two-hop communication. This means that our findings provide relatively limited amounts of informational content.

IV. PLATOONING SIMULATIONS

In this part, we evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed method for platooning of connected vehicles numbered 0-6 [46], and agent 0 is the leader. Each vehicle is regarded as an agent that communicates with its neighbors via network. Fig. 5 is the information flow topology for platoons. Fig. 6 is the communication network topology under attacks.




Fig. 6: Network topology for platooning of connected vehicles.

The dynamics of vehicle model i have the form

$$\begin{cases} \dot{p}_i(t) = v_i(t), \\ \dot{v}_i(t) = a_i(t), \\ \Delta \dot{a}_i(t) + a_i(t) = u_i(t), \end{cases}$$

where $p_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}$, $v_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}$, $a_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ are position, velocity, acceleration and inertial time lag in the powertrain, respectively.

The discretized version of the above model is

$$\begin{bmatrix} p_i(k+1) \\ v_i(k+1) \\ a_i(k+1) \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \begin{bmatrix} p_i(k) \\ v_i(k) \\ a_i(k) \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{B}u_i(k),$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{T}{\Delta} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the sampling period. Here $\Delta = 1.2$, $T = 1$.

For attacks on the communication layer, 100 Monte Carlo trials are carried out. The parameters of additive and multiplicative watermarking are set as $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = 5$, $\sigma_{M_1}^2 = 7.2$, $\sigma_{M_2}^2 = 4.3$, $\sigma_{F_1}^2 = 2$, $\sigma_{F_2}^2 = 3.5$ and $\sigma_1^2 = 4$ as well as the detection threshold $\theta = 4.61$.

Fig. 7 depicts the transient performance comparison for different detection schemes at $k = 4$, which corresponds to the transient stage satisfying $\eta(k) \geq 0.05$. We can see that for the normal system, the maximum KL divergence

monotonically increases with $\max \|d_{ij}(0)\|$ in [38]. However, the KL divergence under *Algorithm 1* almost keeps unchanged which indicates that our detection scheme is more suitable for transient stage. When the system is attacked on the communication layer from $k \geq 10$ at which the system has not reached steady state, the attack signals $\bar{y}_{125}(k) = \Xi_{125}(k)\bar{y}_{125}(k) + \Lambda_{125}(k)$ and $\bar{y}_{225}(k) = \Xi_{225}(k)\bar{y}_{225}(k) + \Lambda_{225}(k)$ are injected into edge (5, 2) where the forms of $\Xi_{125}(k)$, $\Lambda_{125}(k)$, $\Xi_{225}(k)$ and $\Lambda_{225}(k)$ are listed below. Fig. 8 plots the KL divergence of the system under such an attack. It can be seen that the alarm of detector associated with edge (5, 2) is triggered after $k = 10$.

$$\begin{cases} \Xi_{125}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \sin(k) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 8.3 \sin(k) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2.4 \sin(k) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Lambda_{125}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 3.73 \sin(k) \\ -1.32 \sin(k) \end{bmatrix}. \\ \Xi_{225}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 7.3 \sin(k) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2.32 \sin(k) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Lambda_{225}(k) = 0. \end{cases}$$




Fig. 7: The maximum KL divergence curves after $k = 4$ under different initial relative errors $\max \|d_{ij}(0)\|$ of detection strategy in [38] and Algorithm 1 in this paper.




Fig. 8: KL divergence of system suffering from attacks on the communication layer under Algorithm 1.

For attacks acting on the agent layer, we set $M_r = 100$, $\phi = 0.16$ and $\delta = 6$. From Fig. 9, when there is no attack, we can see that $\|y_{ij}(k) - x_i(k)\|$ is below the envelope, and the detector alarm will not be triggered. When the system is attacked for $k \geq 20$ in which the Byzantine agent is 5, Fig. 10 gives the corresponding curves of $\|y_{ij}(k) - x_i(k)\|$. It is found that the detector alarm is triggered immediately.




Fig. 9: $\|y_{ij}(k) - x_i(k)\|$ of normal system under Algorithm 2.




Fig. 10: $\|y_{ij}(k) - x_i(k)\|$ suffering Byzantine attacks under Algorithm 2.

For the hybrid attacks, we consider the scenario that attacks are implemented on agent 5 and edge (5, 2). In order to make the simulations clearer, three attack conditions are addressed, e.g., for $k \in [2, 4)$, attacks on the communication layer are implemented on edge (5, 2); for $k \in [4, 6)$, hybrid attacks are injected into agent 5 and edge (5, 2); for $k \in [6, 8)$, only attacks on agent 5 are imposed. TABLE II lists the detailed results. It can be observed that, over all times, agent 2 judges the flag value of the two hop agent $\hat{j} \in \{1, 3, 4\}$ between agent 2 and agent 5 as $\{\varphi_{2\hat{j}1}(k) = 0, \varphi_{2\hat{j}2}(k) = 0\}$ which means that agents 1, 3 and 4 are trusted agents. More specific,

- 1) Attacks on the communication layer: For $k \in [2, 4)$, the flag judged by agent 2 to agent 5 is $\{\varphi_{251}(k) = 1, \varphi_{252}(k) = 2\}$, indicating edge (5, 2) is attacked. And the flag incurred by agent \hat{j} to agent 5 becomes $\{\varphi_{\hat{j}51}(k) = 0, \varphi_{\hat{j}52}(k) = 0\}$, which implies that agent 5 is not affected by the attacks on the agent layer. That is to say, agent 5 suffers from attacks only on the communication layer.

- 2) Hybrid attacks: For $k \in [4, 6)$, the flag caused by agent 2 to agent 5 turns to be $\{\varphi_{251}(k) = 1, \varphi_{252}(k) = 2\}$, which means that edge (2, 5) is attacked. Moreover, the flag judged by agent \hat{j} to agent 5 is $\{\varphi_{\hat{j}51}(k) = 0, \varphi_{\hat{j}52}(k) = 1\}$, indicating that agent 5 is attacked. Thus agent 5 is under hybrid attacks.
- 3) Attacks on the agent layer: For $k \in [6, 8)$, the flag induced by agent 2 to agent 5 has the form $\{\varphi_{251}(k) = 0, \varphi_{252}(k) = 0\}$, showing edge (5, 2) has not attacked. In addition, the flag judged by agent \hat{j} to agent 5 is $\{\varphi_{\hat{j}51}(k) = 0, \varphi_{\hat{j}52}(k) = 1\}$ which implies that agent 5 is attacked. We can say that there are attacks for agent 5 only on the agent layer.

TABLE II: The flags of Algorithm 3 against hybrid attacks

Flags	Time(k)		
	[2, 4)	[4, 6)	[6, 8)
$\{\varphi_{201}(k), \varphi_{202}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 0}	{0, 0}
$\{\varphi_{211}(k), \varphi_{212}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 0}	{0, 0}
$\{\varphi_{231}(k), \varphi_{232}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 0}	{0, 0}
$\{\varphi_{241}(k), \varphi_{242}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 0}	{0, 0}
$\{\varphi_{251}(k), \varphi_{252}(k)\}$	{1, 2}	{1, 2}	{0, 1}
$\{\varphi_{151}(k), \varphi_{152}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 1}	{0, 1}
$\{\varphi_{351}(k), \varphi_{352}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 1}	{0, 1}
$\{\varphi_{451}(k), \varphi_{452}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 1}	{0, 1}
$\{\varphi_{211}(k), \varphi_{212}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 0}	{0, 0}
$\{\varphi_{231}(k), \varphi_{232}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 0}	{0, 0}
$\{\varphi_{241}(k), \varphi_{242}(k)\}$	{0, 0}	{0, 0}	{0, 0}

V. CONCLUSION

This paper has proposed a detection framework for single/hybrid attacks on the communication layer and agent layer. It can handle both transient and steady stages. For attacks on the communication layer, a KL divergence detection algorithm has been given based on a modified watermarking, as well as a sufficient condition ensuring the detection capability. For attacks on the agent layer, a detection scheme involving the convergence rate has been designed, which can enhance the resilience of the system against attacks while guaranteeing the detection effect. For hybrid attacks (i.e. attacks on both the communication layer and agent layer), a general detection framework in terms of trusted agents has been suggested, which can detect and locate attacks accurately, while relaxing the requirements of the graph. In the future, we will focus on the resilient control of systems under different kinds of attacks.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Mo, S. Weerakkody, and B. Sinopoli, "Physical authentication of control systems: Designing watermarked control inputs to detect counterfeit sensor outputs," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 93–109, 2015.
- [2] A. K. Maitra, "Offensive cyber-weapons: Technical, legal, and strategic aspects," *Environment Systems and Decisions*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 169–182, 2015.
- [3] T. Y. Zhang and D. Ye, "False data injection attacks with complete stealthiness in cyber-physical systems: A self-generated approach," *Automatica*, vol. 120, pp. 109117, 2020.
- [4] A. Y. Lu and G. H. Yang, "False data injection attacks against state estimation without knowledge of estimators," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 4529–4540, 2022.
- [5] H. Zhang, P. Cheng, L. Shi, and J. Chen, "Optimal denial-of-service attack scheduling with energy constraint," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 3023–3028, 2015.
- [6] C. Kwon and I. Hwang, "Cyber attack mitigation for cyber-physical systems: Hybrid system approach to controller design," *IET Control Theory & Applications*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 731–741, 2016.
- [7] H. Fawzi, P. Tabuada, and S. Diggavi, "Secure estimation and control for cyber-physical systems under adversarial attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1454–1467, 2014.
- [8] Y. Yuan, H. Yuan, L. Guo, H. Yang, and S. Sun, "Resilient control of networked control system under DoS attacks: A unified game approach," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1786–1794, 2016.
- [9] F. Pasqualetti, F. Dörfler, and F. Bullo, "Attack detection and identification in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 2715–2729, 2013.
- [10] A. Y. Lu and G. H. Yang, "Detection and identification of sparse sensor attacks in cyber physical systems with side information," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 5349–5364, 2022.
- [11] L. K. Carvalho, Y. C. Wu, R. Kwong, and S. Laforune, "Detection and mitigation of classes of attacks in supervisory control systems," *Automatica*, vol. 97, pp. 121–133, 2018.
- [12] X. Zhang, M. M. Polycarpou, and T. Parisini, "Fault diagnosis of a class of nonlinear uncertain systems with Lipschitz nonlinearities using adaptive estimation," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 290–299, 2010.
- [13] A. J. Gallo, M. S. Turan, F. Boem, T. Parisini, and G. Ferrari-Trecate, "A distributed cyber-attack detection scheme with application to DC microgrids," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 3800–3815, 2020.
- [14] A. Barboni, H. Rezaee, F. Boem, and T. Parisini, "Detection of covert cyber-attacks in interconnected systems: A distributed model-based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 3728–3741, 2020.
- [15] C. Yang, Z. Chu, L. Ma, G. Wang, and W. Dai, "Joint watermarking-based replay attack detection for industrial process operation optimization cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 8910–8922, 2022.
- [16] C. M. Ahmed, V. R. Palleti, and V. K. Mishra, "A practical physical watermarking approach to detect replay attacks in a CPS," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 116, pp. 136–146, 2022.
- [17] Y. Mo and B. Sinopoli, "Secure control against replay attacks," in *Proc. Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pp. 911–918, 2009.
- [18] C. Fang, Y. Qi, P. Cheng, and W. X. Zheng, "Optimal periodic watermarking schedule for replay attack detection in cyber-physical systems," *Automatica*, vol. 112, pp. 108698, 2020.
- [19] A. Naha, A. Teixeira, A. Ahlén, and S. Dey, "Quickest detection of deception attacks on cyber-physical systems with a parsimonious watermarking policy," *Automatica*, vol. 155, pp. 111147, 2023.
- [20] M. Ghaderi, K. Gheithasi, and W. Lucia, "A blended active detection strategy for false data injection attacks in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 168–176, 2020.
- [21] H. Liu, Y. Zhang, Y. Li, and B. Niu, "Proactive attack detection scheme based on watermarking and moving target defense," *Automatica*, vol. 155, pp. 111163, 2023.
- [22] R. M. G. Ferrari and A. Teixeira, "A switching multiplicative watermarking scheme for detection of stealthy cyber-attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2558–2573, 2020.
- [23] R. M. G. Ferrari and A. Teixeira, "Detection and isolation of routing attacks through sensor watermarking," in *Proc. IEEE American Control Conference*, pp. 5436–5442, 2017.

- [24] A. Teixeira and R. M. G. Ferrari, "Detection of sensor data injection attacks with multiplicative watermarking," in *Proc. IEEE European Control Conference*, pp. 338–343, 2018.
- [25] R. M. G. Ferrari and A. Teixeira, "Detection of cyber-attacks: A multiplicative watermarking scheme," in *Safety, Security and Privacy for Cyber-Physical Systems*. Springer, 2021, pp. 173–201.
- [26] M. Luo, B. Du, W. Zhang, T. Song, K. Li, H. Zhu, M. Birkin, and H. Wen, "Fleet rebalancing for expanding shared e-mobility systems: A multi-agent deep reinforcement learning approach," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 3868–3881, 2023.
- [27] Z. Yu, Z. Liu, Y. Zhang, Y. Qu, and C. Y. Su, "Distributed finite-time fault-tolerant containment control for multiple unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 2077–2091, 2019.
- [28] Z. Fan, W. Zhang, and W. Liu, "Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning based distributed optimal generation control of DC microgrids," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 3337–3351, 2023.
- [29] X. Wang, Y. Cao, B. Niu, and Y. Song, "A novel bipartite consensus tracking control for multiagent systems under sensor deception attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 5984–5993, 2022.
- [30] W. He, W. Xu, X. Ge, Q. L. Han, W. Du, and F. Qian, "Secure control of multiagent systems against malicious attacks: A brief survey," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 3595–3608, 2021.
- [31] Z. Zuo, X. Cao, Y. Wang, and W. Zhang, "Resilient consensus of multiagent systems against denial-of-service attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 2664–2675, 2021.
- [32] X. M. Li, Q. Zhou, P. Li, H. Li, and R. Lu, "Event-triggered consensus control for multi-agent systems against false data-injection attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1856–1866, 2020.
- [33] Y. Mao, H. Jafarnejadsani, P. Zhao, E. Akyol, and N. Hovakimyan, "Novel stealthy attack and defense strategies for networked control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 3847–3862, 2020.
- [34] I. Shames, A. Teixeira, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "Distributed fault detection for interconnected second-order systems," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 2757–2764, 2011.
- [35] S. Sundaram and C. N. Hadjicostis, "Distributed function calculation via linear iterative strategies in the presence of malicious agents," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 1495–1508, 2010.
- [36] F. Pasqualetti, A. Bicchi, and F. Bullo, "Consensus computation in unreliable networks: A system theoretic approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 90–104, 2011.
- [37] L. Yuan and H. Ishii, "Secure consensus with distributed detection via two-hop communication," *Automatica*, vol. 131, pp. 109775, 2021.
- [38] A. Mustafa, H. Modares, and R. Moghadam, "Resilient synchronization of distributed multi-agent systems under attacks," *Automatica*, vol. 115, pp. 108869, 2020.
- [39] H. J. LeBlanc, H. Zhang, X. Koutsoukos, and S. Sundaram, "Resilient asymptotic consensus in robust networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 766–781, 2013.
- [40] H. Ishii, Y. Wang, and S. Feng, "An overview on multi-agent consensus under adversarial attacks," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 53, pp. 252–272, 2022.
- [41] Z. Wu, Q. Ling, T. Chen, and G. B. Giannakis, "Federated variance-reduced stochastic gradient descent with robustness to Byzantine attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 4583–4596, 2020.
- [42] J. Yan, X. Li, Y. Mo, and C. Wen, "Resilient multi-dimensional consensus in adversarial environment," *Automatica*, vol. 145, pp. 110530, 2022.
- [43] D. Zhao, Y. Lv, X. Yu, G. Wen, and G. Chen, "Resilient consensus of higher order multiagent networks: An attack isolation-based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 1001–1007, 2022.
- [44] D. Zhang, G. Feng, Y. Shi, and D. Srinivasan, "Physical safety and cyber security analysis of multi-agent systems: A survey of recent advances," *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 319–333, 2021.
- [45] W. Fu, J. Qin, Y. Shi, W. X. Zheng, and Y. Kang, "Resilient consensus of discrete-time complex cyber-physical networks under deception attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 4868–4877, 2019.
- [46] Y. Bian, Y. Zheng, W. Ren, S. E. Li, J. Wang, and K. Li, "Reducing time headway for platooning of connected vehicles via V2V communication," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 102, pp. 87–105, 2019.
- [47] X. Lu and Y. Jia, "Bipartite Byzantine-resilient event-triggered consensus control of heterogeneous multi-agent systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 282–310, 2023.
- [48] H. Yang and D. Ye, "Observer-based fixed-time secure tracking consensus for networked high-order multiagent systems against DoS attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 2018–2031, 2022.
- [49] Y. Wang, L. Cheng, Z. G. Hou, M. Tan, C. Zhou, and M. Wang, "Consensus seeking in a network of discrete-time linear agents with communication noises," *International Journal of Systems Science*, vol. 46, no. 10, pp. 1874–1888, 2015.
- [50] L. Cheng, Y. Wang, W. Ren, Z. G. Hou, and M. Tan, "On convergence rate of leader-following consensus of linear multi-agent systems with communication noises," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 3586–3592, 2016.
- [51] A. Y. Lu and G. H. Yang, "Byzantine-resilient distributed state estimation: A min-switching approach," *Automatica*, vol. 129, pp. 109664, 2021.
- [52] S. Gracy, J. Milošević and H. Sandberg, "Security index based on perfectly undetectable attacks: Graph-theoretic conditions," *Automatica*, vol. 134, pp. 109925, 2021.
- [53] G. F. Franklin, J. D. Powell, and A. Emami-Naeini, *Feedback Control of Dynamic Systems*, 8th ed. London, U.K.: Pearson, 2019.
- [54] J. Zhou, W. Yang, W. Ding, W. X. Zheng, and Y. Xu, "Watermarking-based protection strategy against stealthy integrity attack on distributed state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 628–635, 2023.
- [55] L. Cheng, Y. Wang, Z. G. Hou, and M. Tan, "Convergence rate of leader-following consensus of networks of discrete-time linear agents in noisy environments," in *Proc. IEEE Chinese Control Conference*, pp. 8102–8107, 2016.
- [56] D. Ye and T. Y. Zhang, "Summation detector for false data-injection attack in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 2338–2345, 2020.
- [57] Y. Mo, and B. Sinopoli, "False data injection attacks in control systems," in *Proc. Workshop Secure Control System*, pp. 1–7, 2010.