

Optimization and Learning in Open Multi-Agent Systems

Diego Deplano, *Member, IEEE*, Nicola Bastianello, *Member, IEEE*
Mauro Franceschelli, *Senior, IEEE*, and Karl H. Johansson, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Modern artificial intelligence relies on networks of agents that collect data, process information, and exchange it with neighbors to collaboratively solve optimization and learning problems. This article introduces a novel distributed algorithm to address a broad class of these problems in “open networks”, where the number of participating agents may vary due to several factors, such as autonomous decisions, heterogeneous resource availability, or DoS attacks. Extending the current literature, the convergence analysis of the proposed algorithm is based on the newly developed “Theory of Open Operators”, which characterizes an operator as open when the set of components to be updated changes over time, yielding to time-varying operators acting on sequences of points of different dimensions and compositions. The mathematical tools and convergence results developed here provide a general framework for evaluating distributed algorithms in open networks, allowing to characterize their performance in terms of the punctual distance from the optimal solution, in contrast with regret-based metrics that assess cumulative performance over a finite-time horizon. As illustrative examples, the proposed algorithm is used to solve dynamic consensus or tracking problems on different metrics of interest, such as average, median, and min/max value, as well as classification problems with logistic loss functions.

Index Terms—Open Operator Theory, ADMM, Open Networks, Open Multiagent Systems, Distributed optimization, Distributed Learning, Dynamic Consensus.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many real-world systems consists of multiple interacting agents in a network, where new agents may join (start interacting) and others may leave (stop interacting), forming what is called an “open” multi-agent systems: Bitcoin miners

The work of D. Deplano was supported by the project e.INS- Ecosystem of Innovation for Next Generation Sardinia (cod. ECS 00000038) funded by the Italian Ministry for Research and Education (MUR) under the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) - MISSION 4 COMPONENT 2, “From research to business” INVESTMENT 1.5, “Creation and strengthening of Ecosystems of innovation” and construction of “Territorial R& D Leaders”.

The work of N. Bastianello and K. H. Johansson was partially supported by the European Union’s Horizon Research and Innovation Actions programme under grant agreement No. 101070162, and partially by Swedish Research Council Distinguished Professor Grant 2017-01078 Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation Wallenberg Scholar Grant.

D. Deplano and M. Franceschelli is with DIEE, University of Cagliari, 09123 Cagliari, Italy. Emails: {diego.deplano,mauro.franceschelli}@unica.it

Nicola Bastianello and Karl H. Johansson are with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science and Digital Futures, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. Emails: {nicolba,kallej}@kth.se

compete in a network to gain a reward by adding a block of transactions to the blockchain, leaving after winning or when the profitability does not justify the costs [1]; mobile robots cooperate in a network to achieve global tasks such as move goods or perform inventory checks, leaving the network to charge their battery or due to malfunctioning [2]; people participate in a network to share their thoughts and learn from others, leaving when they lose interest [3].

Despite observing this dynamic behavior in practice, traditional cooperation schemes, optimization algorithms, game strategies, and learning techniques often assume a static network with a fixed set of participants. Under this simplified assumption, it is typically possible to prove the stability of these methods and characterize their performance in reaching equilibrium points, representing best-response strategies in games, optimal solutions in optimization tasks, or finest trained models in machine learning applications. Such guarantees may lose their relevance in the context of open networks, because an equilibrium may never be reached and divergent behavior could arise due to the join/leave events which the network is subject. Within the control community, a growing interest in the study of open networks is demonstrated by the high number of papers published within the last decade, where the major topics of interest are represented by distributed consensus protocols, both in continuous-time [7–10] and in discrete-time [11–22], distributed optimization algorithms [4–6, 23, 24], distributed resource allocation [25–27], and learning problems [28, 29]. The difficulty in designing distributed algorithms that can be deployed over open networks, and in providing formal performance guarantees, is mainly due to the lack of formal mathematical tools to analyze the dynamics of systems with a varying number of components.

To fill this gap, the **first contribution** of this manuscript is the formalization of fundamental concepts for what we call “open operators”, i.e., time-varying operators acting on sequences of points of different dimensions and compositions. We extend usual concepts for standard operators [30, 31] – such as distance between points and sets, projections of points into sets, fixed points and convergence of the iteration toward fixed points – to the set-up of open operators, along with illustrative examples. Since exact convergence cannot be reached in general due to the varying nature of the set of fixed point, both in size and composition, this manuscript provide sufficient conditions for a more general class of contractive operators, ensuring the convergence of the iteration to a bounded distance from the fixed point set.

TABLE I
COMPARISON WITH THE STATE OF THE ART FOR DISTRIBUTED OPTIMIZATION AND LEARNING
IN OPEN MULTI-AGENT SYSTEMS WITH DISCRETE-TIME DYNAMICS.

[Ref.]	Algorithm	Assumptions on the problem	Assumptions on the network	Time independent step sizes	Convergence metric	Convergence rate
[4] Hendrickx <i>et al.</i> (2020)	DGD	Static + Smooth + Strongly convex + Minimizers in a ball	✗ Only replacement	✓	Distance from minimizers	Linear (inexact)
[5] Hsieh <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Dual averaging	Static + Lipschitz + Convex + Shared convex constraint set	✖ Vertex-connected [†] (jointly)	✗	Regret	Sublinear (if the network's size is known)
[6] Hayashi (2023)	Sub-gradient	Time-varying + Lipschitz + Convex + Shared compact constraint set	✖ Vertex-connected [†] (jointly)	✗	Regret	Sublinear (if the network's size is bounded)
[This work]	ADMM	Time-varying + Semicontinuous + Convex Unconstrained	✓ Connected	✓	Distance from minimizers	Linear (exact)

The **second contribution** of this manuscript is the presentation and characterization of an open and distributed version of ADMM to solve optimization and learning problems in a distributed way over open networks. We call the proposed algorithm “Open ADMM” which enjoys the following advantages if compared with other state-of-the-art algorithms (cfr. Table I): 1) it accommodates arbitrary changes in the network, including unbounded growth, and requires no conditions beyond simple connectivity; 2) it never needs a centralized re-initialization procedure as the step sizes are neither vanishing or time-varying; 3) it works with time-varying cost functions that are only convex and not necessarily strongly convex; 4) it converges linearly to the set of minimizers, achieving exact convergence if the network composition and the local costs remains unchanged for sufficiently long time. Assuming all cost functions are static, smooth, strongly convex, and that their minimizers lie within a given ball, the authors of [4] have shown that the Decentralized Gradient Descent (DGD) Algorithm remains stable in the constrained scenario where departing agents are immediately replaced by new arrivals. Relaxing strong convexity to convexity and smoothness to Lipschitz continuity, the authors of [5] proposed a dual averaging method and proved sublinear convergence of the running loss, provided the running ratio of the quadratic mean to the average number of active agents is bounded, which accommodates unbounded network growth. Under the stronger assumption that the network's size is bounded from above, the author of [6] introduced a subgradient approach and proved sublinear convergence of the running loss while accounting with time-varying local loss functions. Unlike this manuscript and [4], these works analyze performance using a regret-based metric and require the network to be (jointly) vertex-connected[†]. Instead, this work only assumes the network to be connected and characterizes the punctual distance of the local estimates from the global optimum, making the performance evaluation less coarse and more informative than regret-based metrics.

[†]A graph $\mathcal{G}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$ is said to be jointly vertex connected if there exists $B, \kappa \geq 1$ such that at least κ nodes need to be removed to disrupt the connectivity of the union graph $(\bigcup_{t=k-B}^k \mathcal{V}_t, \bigcup_{t=k-B}^k \mathcal{E}_t)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

As a **third contribution**, this manuscript applies the proposed algorithm to solve dynamic consensus problems over open networks. Specifically, we derive closed-form updates for Open ADMM and establish sufficient conditions on the signals being tracked to ensure the correct tracking of three different metrics of interest: the maximum, the median, and the average of a set of signals, each of which is locally accessible to the agents. Notably, for the median metric, this work introduces the first discrete-time protocol in the literature designed for open scenarios. Additionally, the proposed approach demonstrates superior performance for both the maximum and average metrics. We refer the interested reader to Section IV-A and specifically to Remark 2 for a comparison of performance and working assumption between our algorithms and those in the state of the art.

As a **fourth contribution**, this manuscript applies the proposed algorithm to learning problems with logistic loss functions and provide thorough numerical simulations demonstrating its performance under various scenarios: (i) in networks with Poisson arrivals and departures, the distance from the optimal solution is proportional to the Poisson rates but remains bounded; (ii) in eventually closed networks, with decaying Poisson rates, the algorithm achieves exact convergence at steady state; (iii) in networks with only node replacements, larger networks exhibit higher robustness. Additionally, alternative initialization methods for Open ADMM are explored to address cases where computing local optima is computationally expensive.

Structure of the manuscript: Section II introduces all relevant concepts at the root of open operator theory, generalizing the standard concepts of fixed points, sequences and their convergence, projections, and distances. Section III formalize the problem of interest together with the working assumptions, then presents and characterizes the proposed Open ADMM algorithm. Section IV exploits Open ADMM to solve the tracking problem (or dynamic consensus) over the maximum, median, and average functions, and learning problems with logistic loss function. Section V concludes the paper by discussing some future research directions.

II. OPEN OPERATOR THEORY: ITERATIVE BEHAVIOR OF OPERATORS BETWEEN SPACES OF DIFFERENT DIMENSION

The set of real and integer numbers are denoted by \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{Z} , respectively, while \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{N} denote their restriction to positive entries. Matrices are denoted by uppercase letters, vectors and scalars by lowercase letters, while sets and spaces are denoted by uppercase calligraphic letters. The identity matrix is denoted by I_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, while the vectors of ones and zeros are denoted by $\mathbb{1}_n$ and $\mathbb{0}_n$; subscripts are omitted if clear from the context. Letting $\mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ be a finite set of labels, we adopt the non-standard yet intuitive notation $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ to denote a vector space of finite dimension equal to the number of elements of \mathcal{I} , and by $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ we denote a vector with labeled components $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ where each label $i \in \mathcal{I}$ corresponds to a label in \mathcal{I} . We limit our discussion to finite-dimensional Euclidean normed spaces $(\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}, \|\cdot\|_2)$ and denote the distance between two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ with the same labeled components by $d: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, given by $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|_2$. In turn, the distance of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ from a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ and the distance between two sets $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ are defined as follows

$$d(x, \mathcal{Y}) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} d(x, y), \quad d(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d(x, \mathcal{Y}). \quad (1)$$

In the remainder of this section, we introduce all relevant concepts about operators mapping spaces $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ into spaces $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ where $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2$ are set of labels with possibly different dimension and elements, we call them “open” operators.

A. Open-operators and sets of interest

A time-varying “open” operator $\mathbb{T}_k: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}$ maps points with components labeled by \mathcal{I}_{k-1} into points with components labeled by \mathcal{I}_k , which may have different size, yielding the following iteration:

$$x_k = \mathbb{T}_k(x_{k-1}), \quad x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}. \quad (2)$$

The sequence $\{x_k: k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generated by the iteration (2) is such that the points $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}$ may have different dimensions for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus are called “open sequences”. According to Fig. 1, we identify the following subsets:

- *Remaining labels* $\mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{I}_k \cap \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$: labels present both at time $k-1$ and time k ;
- *Arriving labels* $\mathcal{A}_k = \mathcal{I}_k \setminus \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$: labels present at time k but not at time $k-1$;
- *Departing labels* $\mathcal{D}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k-1} \setminus \mathcal{I}_k$: labels present at time $k-1$ but not at time k .




Fig. 1. Venn diagram of labels at two consecutive steps $k-1$ and k .

By convention, $\mathcal{I}_{-1} = \emptyset$, yielding $\mathcal{R}_0 = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{I}_0$. Note that, in general, the set of departing labels may contain both remaining and arriving labels, which are instead disjoint:

$$\mathcal{D}_k \subset \mathcal{I}_k = \mathcal{R}_k \cup \mathcal{A}_k, \quad \mathcal{R}_k \cap \mathcal{A}_k = \emptyset.$$

Example 1. Consider the sets of labels $\mathcal{I}_0 = \{a, b, c\}$, $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{b, c, d\}$, $\mathcal{I}_3 = \{e, f\}$. Then:

- (at the initial step 0) $\mathcal{D}_{-1} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{a, b, c\}$, $\mathcal{R}_0 = \emptyset$;
- (from step 0 to step 1) $\mathcal{D}_0 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{d\}$, $\mathcal{R}_1 = \{a, b, c\}$;
- (from step 1 to step 2) $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{a\}$, $\mathcal{A}_2 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{R}_2 = \{b, c, d\}$;
- (from step 2 to step 3) $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{b, c, d\}$, $\mathcal{A}_3 = \{e, f\}$, $\mathcal{R}_3 = \emptyset$.

Accordingly, the points in the open sequence $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ are described component-wise as follows:

$$x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} x_0^a \\ x_0^b \\ x_0^c \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_1 = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^a \\ x_1^b \\ x_1^c \\ x_1^d \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_2 = \begin{bmatrix} x_2^b \\ x_2^c \\ x_2^d \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_3 = \begin{bmatrix} x_3^e \\ x_3^f \\ x_3^3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since x_k takes values in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}$ at all times k , components $i \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$ are simply left out from x_k . Instead, new components $i \in \mathcal{A}_k$ need to be initialized to some value $x_k^{A,i}$ and remaining components $i \in \mathcal{R}_k$ need to be updated according to a scalar operator $F_k^i: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Thus, the iteration in (2) of the open operator \mathbb{T}_k can be written component-wise for each $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$, as follows:

$$x_k^i = \mathbb{T}_k^i(x_{k-1}) = \begin{cases} F_k^i(x_{k-1}) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k-1} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{k-1}, \\ x_k^{A,i} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{A}_k = \mathcal{I}_k \setminus \mathcal{I}_{k-1}. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Note that if the components of the system remain unchanged, that is $\mathcal{I}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$, then the operator $F_k: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_{k-1}}$ rules the so-called “standard iteration”:

$$x_k = F_k(x_{k-1}), \quad \text{when } \mathcal{I}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k-1}. \quad (4)$$

Example 2. Consider the time-varying open operator as in (3) ruled by $F_k: x \mapsto F_k x$ where

$$F_k = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{k-1}|} \mathbb{1}_{|\mathcal{I}_{k-1}|} \mathbb{1}_{|\mathcal{I}_{k-1}|}^\top.$$

If the set of labels evolves as in Example 1, then a possible open sequence generated by the iteration $x_k = \mathbb{T}_k(x_{k-1})$ is:

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_0^a \\ x_0^b \\ x_0^c \end{bmatrix}}_{x_0} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_1^a \\ x_1^b \\ x_1^c \\ x_1^d \end{bmatrix}}_{x_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 7 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_2^b \\ x_2^c \\ x_2^d \end{bmatrix}}_{x_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 4 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_3^e \\ x_3^f \\ x_3^3 \end{bmatrix}}_{x_3} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where:

- (from step 0 to step 1) all components associated with remaining labels update their value to the average of x_0 , that is $(2+3+4)/3 = 3$; label d arrives, and component x_1^d is initialized at 1;
- (from step 1 to step 2) all components associated with remaining labels update their value to the average of x_1 , that is $(3+3+3+7)/4 = 4$; label a departs, and component x_2^a is left out;
- (from step 2 to step 3) labels b, c, d departs, and components x_3^b, x_3^c, x_3^d are left out; labels e, f arrive, and components x_3^e, x_3^f are initialized at 0, 1, respectively.

The need to generalize the usual concept of “set of fixed points” $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = \{x : x = F(x)\}$ for time-invariant standard operators $F : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ arises naturally. For open operators holds instead $F_k : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_{k-1}}$ where \mathcal{I}_k may change at any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, yielding a trajectory of sets containing fixed points of different dimension, which we call the “trajectory of sets of interest”.

Definition 1 (Trajectory of sets of interest).

Consider the iteration of an open operator T_k as in (2) and let $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k$ be the set of fixed points of the operator F_{k+1} ruling the standard iteration as in (4), i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} \mid x = F_{k+1}(x)\}. \quad (5)$$

Then, the sequence $\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is called the “trajectory of sets of interest” (TSI) of the operator T_k .

If each operator F_k has a unique equilibrium point $\hat{x}_k = \{\hat{x}_k\}$, then the sequence $\{\hat{x}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of these points forms the “trajectory of points of interest” [21, Definition 3.1].

Example 3. Consider the iteration described in Example 2. Then, the TSI is given by

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k = \{\alpha \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Indeed, at each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of fixed points of the standard iteration ruled by $F_k : x \mapsto F_k x$ consists of the eigenvectors of F_k corresponding to the (unique) unitary eigenvalue.

We formalize the concept of convergence for open sequences, emphasizing that comparing distances in spaces of different dimensions is unfair without normalization by the corresponding space’s dimension. Without normalization, iterations of an open operator with increasing number of components may produce sequences diverging from the TSI, even if the distance between new components and their TSI counterparts remains bounded. We define convergence based on normalized distance from the TSI and provide an example clarifying the importance of this normalization.

Definition 2 (Convergence of open sequences).

Consider the open sequence $\{x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generated by the iteration of an open operator as in (2) whose TSI is $\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. The open sequence is said to “converge” to the TSI within a radius $R \geq 0$ if

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \leq R.$$

Example 4. Consider the iteration described in Example 2 and assume that the components are totally renewed at each step and increase in number by 2 at each step, namely, $D_k = \mathcal{I}_k$ and $|\mathcal{A}_k| = |\mathcal{I}_{k-1}| + 2$. A possible open sequence generated by the iteration $x_k = T_k(x_{k-1})$ is

$$x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} +1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_1 = \begin{bmatrix} +1 \\ +1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_2 = \begin{bmatrix} +1 \\ +1 \\ +1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \dots,$$

where half of the components are initialized at +1 and the other half at -1. The point $\hat{x}_k \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k$ in the TSI attaining the minimum distance from x_k is the null vector $\hat{x}_k = \mathbf{0}_{2(k+1)}$ and therefore

$$d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) = d(x_k, \hat{x}_k) = d(x_k, \mathbf{0}_{2(k+1)}) = \sqrt{2(k+1)},$$

which, in the limit of $k \rightarrow \infty$, diverges even though the new components have bounded distance of 1 from the corresponding component of the TSI. Instead, when normalization is considered, it is possible to find a finite upper bound

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{2(k+1)}} = 1.$$

B. Open distances and projections

A notion of “open distance” is necessary to evaluate the distance between points with labeled components that belong to vector spaces of different dimensions. We propose to evaluate such distance by only taking into consideration the common labeled components, disregarding the others.

Definition 3 (Open distance). Let \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 be two finite sets of labels. If $\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2 \neq \emptyset$, the open distance $d : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ between points $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ is defined by

$$d(x, y) = \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}\|_2, \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{x} = [x^i \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2], \\ \tilde{y} = [y^i \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2]. \end{cases}$$

Otherwise, if $\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2 = \emptyset$ then $d(x, y) = 0$.

Example 5. Consider the sets of labels $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{a, b, c\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{b, c, d\}$ and let

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} x^a \\ x^b \\ x^c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}, \quad y = \begin{bmatrix} y^b \\ y^c \\ y^d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}.$$

Since the common components are those labeled by b and c , the distance between them is given by

$$d(x, y) = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x^b \\ x^c \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} y^b \\ y^c \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 5 \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \sqrt{8}.$$

For the sake of simplicity, we overload the notation of standard distance in a way that the distance of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ from a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ and the distance between two sets $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}$, $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_3}$ of different dimension are naturally defined as in (1). The projection of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ over a non-empty set $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ is, in general, a set of points $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ of minimum distance from x , given by the projection operator defined next

$$\text{proj}(x, \mathcal{Y}) = \left\{ y^* \in \mathcal{Y} : d(x, y^*) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} d(x, y) \right\}$$

Note that if $\mathcal{I}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{I}_2$ then the projection reduces to a singleton (see Fig. 2), but if $\mathcal{I}_2 \setminus \mathcal{I}_1 \neq \emptyset$ then it is indeed a set (see Fig. 3) because the components related to the elements in \mathcal{I}_2 that are not in \mathcal{I}_1 can be arbitrary within \mathcal{Y} . The same holds for the proximal.

Example 6. Consider the sets of labels $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{a, b\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{a\}$ as in Fig. 2 and let $\mathcal{Y} = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2} \mid y \in [1, 3]\}$. Then, considering the representation on the left of Fig. 2, the distance of $x = [x^a, x^b]^\top = [5, 1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ from \mathcal{Y} is

$$d(x, \mathcal{Y}) = d(x^a, \mathcal{Y}) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |5 - y| = |5 - 3| = 2,$$

and the projection of x into \mathcal{Y} is a singleton given by

$$\text{proj}(x, \mathcal{Y}) = 3 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}.$$

Instead, considering the representation on the right of Fig. 2, the distance of $x = [x^a, x^b]^\top = [2, 1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ from \mathcal{Y} is

$$d(x, \mathcal{Y}) = d(x^a, \mathcal{Y}) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |2 - y| = 0,$$

and the projection of x into \mathcal{Y} is a singleton given by

$$\text{proj}(x, \mathcal{Y}) = 2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}.$$




Fig. 2. Representation of the open distance (curly brace) and the open projection (bold dot) in two examples with $\mathcal{I}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}_1 \neq \emptyset$.

Example 7. Consider the sets of labels $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{a\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{a, b\}$ as in Fig. 3. Then, considering the representation on the left of Fig. 3, the distance of $x = 5 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ from $\mathcal{Y} = \{[y^a, y^b] \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2} \mid y^a \in [1, 2], y^b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is

$$d(x, \mathcal{Y}) = \min_{[y^a, y^b] \in \mathcal{Y}} |5 - y^a| = |5 - 2| = 3,$$

and the projection of x into \mathcal{Y} is a set given by

$$\text{proj}(x, \mathcal{Y}) = \{[z^a, z^b]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2} \mid z^a = 2, z^b \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Instead, considering the representation on the right of Fig. 3, the distance of $x = 5 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ from $\mathcal{Y} = \{[y^a, y^b] \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2} \mid y^a \in \mathbb{R}, y^b \in [-2, -1]\}$ is

$$d(x, \mathcal{Y}) = d(x^a, \mathcal{Y}) = \min_{[y^a, y^b] \in \mathcal{Y}} |2 - y^a| = 0,$$

and the projection of x into \mathcal{Y} is a set given by

$$\text{proj}(x, \mathcal{Y}) = \{[z^a, z^b]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2} \mid z^a = 5, z^b \in [-2, -1]\}.$$




Fig. 3. Representation of the open distance (curly brace) and the open projection (dashed line) in two examples with $\mathcal{I}_2 \setminus \mathcal{I}_1 \neq \emptyset$.

We also introduce the concept of *shadow distance* between two spaces $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1}$, $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_2}$, that is the maximum distance between any pair of projections, namely,

$$d_{\text{SH}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2}} d(\text{proj}(z, \mathcal{X}), \text{proj}(z, \mathcal{Y})).$$

The concept of shadow distance is essential as it allows formulating the following version of triangle inequality:

$$d(z, \mathcal{X}) \leq d(z, \mathcal{Y}) + d_{\text{SH}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}).$$

Example 8. Consider the set of labels $\mathcal{I} = \{a\}$ and the sets $\mathcal{X} = \{x^{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R} : x \in [1, 2]\}$, $\mathcal{Y} = \{y^{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R} : y \in [5, 6]\}$. The standard distance between these sets is attained by the points $x = 2$ and $y = 5$, namely,

$$d(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \inf_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} d(x, y) = |2 - 5| = 3.$$

On the other hand, the shadow distance (see Fig. 4) is attained for all points $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $z \in (-\infty, 2] \cup [6, +\infty)$. For $z \leq 2$, its projection onto \mathcal{X} is 1 and its projection onto \mathcal{Y} is 5, yielding

$$d_{\text{SH}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}} d(\text{proj}(z, \mathcal{X}), \text{proj}(z, \mathcal{Y})) = |1 - 5| = 4.$$




Fig. 4. Representation of the shadow distance compared to the standard distance in an example with $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_1 = \mathcal{I}_2$.

C. A convergence result for paracontractive operators

In this section, we provide sufficient conditions ensuring the convergence of open sequences generated by the iteration of open operators – in the sense of Definition 2 – whose standard iteration is ruled by a “*paracontractive*” operator [32–34]. Paracontractive operators are a class of operators that generalizes that of contractive operators, as they enjoy a contractivity property between trajectories and fixed points, rather than between trajectories in general. An alternative name could be “*quasicontractive*” operators, following the definition of “*quasinonexpansive*” operators given by Bauschke and Combettes in their book [31, Page 70].

Definition 4. An operator $F_k : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ is said to be “*paracontractive*” if there exists $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ such that for all $k \geq 0$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ it holds

$$d(F_{k+1}(x), \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) \leq \gamma \cdot d(x, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k), \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k$ is the set of fixed points of F_{k+1} for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The sufficient conditions we enforce correspond to limits on the variation of the TSI and on the process by which the labels components join and leave during the iteration. In plain words, the normalized shadow distance between two consecutive sets of interests and the normalized distance of the arriving labeled components from the set of interest must be bounded from above. Moreover, the dimension of the state space cannot

decrease too fast, i.e., there must be an upper bound to the ratio between the number of components in two consecutive steps. These limits are formally defined next.

Definition 5 (Bounded TSI). Consider the TSI is $\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of an open operator as in (2). The TSI is said to have “bounded variation” if

$$\exists B \geq 0 : \frac{d_{\text{SH}}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{R}_k|}} \leq B, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Definition 6 (Bounded departure process). Consider the open sequence $\{x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generated by the iteration of an open operator as in (2). The departure process is said to be “bounded” if

$$\exists \beta \in (0, 1) : \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \geq \beta \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_{k-1}|}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Definition 7 (Bounded arrival process). Consider the open sequence $\{x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generated by the iteration of an open operator as in (2) whose TSI is $\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Let $x_k^A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}_k}$ be the vector stacking the components of all arriving labels. The arrival process is said to be “bounded” if

$$\exists H \geq 0 : \frac{d(x_k^A, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}_k|}} \leq H, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Example 9. Consider the iteration described in Example 2 whose TSI is that described in Example 3 and assume that the components change as outlined in Example 4. Then:

- the TSI is bounded with $B = 0$ because there are never remaining components;
- the departure process is bounded for any $\beta \in [0, 1]$ because the number of components never decreases;
- the arrival process is bounded with $H = 1$ because all components are arriving components initialized at $\{-1, +1\}$ and the corresponding components of the TSI are zeros.

We now state and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 1. Consider the iteration of a time-varying open operator $\mathbb{T}_k : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}$ given component-wise for $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$ by

$$x_k^i = \mathbb{T}_k^i(x_{k-1}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_k^i(x_{k-1}) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k-1} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{k-1}, \\ x_k^{A,i} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{A}_k = \mathcal{I}_k \setminus \mathcal{I}_{k-1}. \end{cases}$$

and assume that

- \mathbb{F}_k is paracontractive with $\gamma \in (0, 1)$;
- the TSI has bounded variation $B \geq 0$;
- the arrival process is bounded with $H \geq 0$;
- the departure process is bounded with $\beta \in (\gamma, 1)$.

Then, the open sequence $\{x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converges linearly with rate $\theta = \gamma/\beta \in (0, 1)$ to the TSI within a radius

$$R = \frac{B + H}{1 - \theta}, \quad (7)$$

according to the following punctual upper bound

$$\frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \leq \theta^k \frac{d(x_0, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_0)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_0|}} + \frac{1 - \theta^k}{1 - \theta} (B + H).$$

Proof: Let us split the state $x_k = [x_k^R; x_k^A]$ into two vectors such that:

- $x_k^R \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{R}_k}$ is the vector of the remaining components;
- $x_k^A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}_k}$ is the vector of the new components.

For any two consecutive steps $k-1, k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) &= \sqrt{d^2(x_k^R, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) + d^2(x_k^A, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}, \\ &\leq \sqrt{d^2(x_k^R, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) + d^2(x_k^A, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}, \\ &= d(x_k^R, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) + d(x_k^A, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k), \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} d(x_k^R, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|} H, \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} d(x_k^R, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1}) + d_{\text{SH}}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1}) + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|} H, \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} d(x_k^R, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1}) + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|} (B + H), \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} d(\mathbb{F}_k(x_{k-1}), \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1}) + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|} (B + H), \\ &\stackrel{(v)}{\leq} \gamma d(x_{k-1}, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1}) + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|} (B + H), \end{aligned}$$

where (i) holds by assumption (c) and $|\mathcal{A}_k| \leq |\mathcal{I}_k|$; (ii) holds by triangle inequality; (iii) holds by assumption (b) and $|\mathcal{R}_k| \leq |\mathcal{I}_k|$; (iv) holds because the vector x_k^R is entirely contained into $\mathbb{F}_k(x_{k-1})$ by definition; (v) holds by assumption (a). Thus, we have shown that,

$$\frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \leq \gamma \frac{d(x_{k-1}, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_{k-1}|}} + B + H.$$

which, by assumption (d), becomes

$$\frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \leq \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \frac{d(x_{k-1}, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_{k-1}|}} + B + H,$$

By iterating over $k \in \mathbb{N}$ one gets

$$\frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \leq \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\right)^k \frac{d(x_0, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_0)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_0|}} + (B + H) \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\right)^i.$$

Since in the limit of $k \rightarrow \infty$, then $(\gamma/\beta)^k$ goes to 0 and the geometric series equals to $(1 - \theta^k)/(1 - \theta)$ and goes to $1/(1 - \gamma/\beta)$, it holds

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \leq \frac{B + H}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta}} =: R,$$

thus concluding the proof. \blacksquare

Corollary 1. Consider the scenario of Theorem 1 and the following simplified cases:

- The iteration is not open;
- The iteration is time-invariant.

Then, the results of Theorem 1 become:

- (a) implies that the convergence rate is equal to the paracontractivity constant $\theta = \gamma$ because $\beta = 1$ and implies that the radius reduces to $R = B/(1 - \gamma)$ because $H = 0$;
- (a) \wedge (b) implies that the radius reduces to zero because $B = 0$, i.e., the sequence converges to a fixed point for any initial condition.

III. PROBLEM OF INTEREST AND PROPOSED ALGORITHM: OPEN ADMM

With the theoretical framework designed in Section II, we have now the tools to design and analyze algorithms for optimization and learning over open networks. In particular, we are interested in algorithms that can solve the following

$$\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} f_k^i(y), \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{P} is a set of labels, $f_k^i : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ denotes the local objective function of an agent $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$ in the network at time k , where \mathcal{V}_k represents the time-varying set of agents. Most of the literature addresses this problem under the assumption that the set of agents in the network remains constant over time, i.e., $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_0 = \mathcal{V}_1, \dots$, which facilitates the application of various results from operator theory to study the convergence of custom-designed algorithms. Instead, this work considers the problem without this assumption, thus letting the agents be able to leave and join the network arbitrarily, which results in a time-varying number of agents $n_k = |\mathcal{V}_k| \in (0, \infty)$; such networks are usually called “Open Multi-Agent Systems” (OMASs). We propose a distributed algorithm called “Open ADMM” to solve the problem in (8) in OMASs and we carry out a convergence analysis by means of “open operator theory” developed in the previous Section II.

Remark 1 (Relationship with online optimization). *We remark that (8) is an online optimization problem because the optimal solution is time-varying due to two different factors: 1) the local costs are time-varying [35]; 2) the agents participating in the network change over time, thus yielding a change in the set of the local costs. Consequently, even when the local costs are static, the problem solution is still time-varying due to the open nature of the network.*

A. Problem set-up and working assumptions

An OMAS consists of a time-varying set of agents \mathcal{V}_k which may leave and join the network at any time $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the sets of remaining/arriving/departing agents as follows

$$\mathcal{V}_k^R = \mathcal{V}_k \cap \mathcal{V}_{k-1}, \quad \mathcal{V}_k^A = \mathcal{V}_k \setminus \mathcal{V}_{k-1}, \quad \mathcal{V}_k^D = \mathcal{V}_k \setminus \mathcal{V}_{k+1},$$

The agents are linked according to a graph $\mathcal{G}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$, where $\mathcal{E}_k \subseteq \mathcal{V}_k \times \mathcal{V}_k$ represents the set of agents’ pairs that are linked by a point-to-point communication channel. The set of agents that can communicate with the i -th agent at time k is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_k^i = \{j \in \mathcal{V}_k : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_k\}$ and its cardinality is denoted by $\eta_k^i = |\mathcal{N}_k^i|$; note that graphs are assumed to be without self-loops, i.e., $i \notin \mathcal{N}_k^i$. We also denote by $\xi_k = |\mathcal{E}_k| = \eta_k^1 + \dots + \eta_k^{n_k}$ the total number of communication channels. We formalize next our assumptions on the communication graph among the agents.

Assumption 1. *The communication graph $\mathcal{G}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$ of the OMAS satisfies the following at all times $k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

- *undirected, i.e., $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_k$ if and only if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_k$;*
- *connected, i.e., there is a sequence of consecutive pairs $(i, a), (a, b), \dots, (y, z), (z, j)$ in \mathcal{E}_k for all $i, j \in \mathcal{V}_k$.*

An OMAS can actually solve the under suitable assumptions of the local objective functions and the corresponding local and global solutions. We formalize our set of assumptions in Assumption 2, which makes use of the following notation for the set of solutions to the problem in (8),

$$\mathcal{Y}_k^* = \left\{ y_k^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} f_k^i(y_k^*) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} f_k^i(y) \right\},$$

and for the minimizers of each local cost function,

$$\mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*} = \left\{ y_k^{i,*} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}} : f_k^i(y_k^{i,*}) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}} f_k^i(y) \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Assumption 2. *The problem in (8) is such that, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

- the local cost functions f_k^i are proper [31, Definition 1.4], lower semi-continuous [31, Lemma 1.24], and convex [31, Definition 8.1] for all $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$;*
- the set of minimizers $\mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ for each local cost function f_k^i is not empty;*
- the distance between two consecutive global solutions $y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*$ and $y_{k-1}^* \in \mathcal{Y}_{k-1}^*$ is upper bounded by a constant $\sigma \geq 0$;*
- the distance between any local solution $y_k^{i,*} \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*}$ and any global solution $y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*$ is upper bounded by $\omega \geq 0$.*

Assumption 2(i) is standard in the context of distributed optimization, but it is not sufficient to guarantee that the set of solutions \mathcal{Y}_k^* is not empty. This is, instead, ensured by Assumption 2(ii), which requires that each local set of minimizers $\mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*}$ is not empty. On the other hand, \mathcal{Y}_k^* may also contain an infinite number of solutions and be unbounded. Thus, Assumption 2(iii) ensures an upper bound on the distance between any solution at time k and any solution at time $k - 1$. Due the heterogeneity of the local objective functions, the local minimizers in $\mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*}$ can be arbitrarily far away from the global minimizers in \mathcal{Y}_k^* . Thus, Assumption 2(iv) ensures that such distance is bounded by a constant at any time k .

B. Open ADMM and convergence analysis

To solve the problem in (8) in a distributed way over an open network of agents, we propose the open version of the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM), which we call “Open ADMM”, whose implementation is detailed in Algorithm 1 provided in the next page. Open ADMM requires each agent $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$ to update/initialize a state variable $x^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ for every agent $j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i$ with which it has an open communication channel. By further defining,

$$\mathcal{R}_k^i = \mathcal{N}_k^i \cap \mathcal{N}_{k-1}^i, \quad \mathcal{A}_k^i = \mathcal{N}_k^i \setminus \mathcal{N}_{k-1}^i, \quad \mathcal{D}_k^i = \mathcal{N}_k^i \setminus \mathcal{N}_{k+1}^i,$$

we can formalize the open operator describing Open ADMM as follows, which makes use of two design parameters, the relaxation $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and the penalty $\rho > 0$,

$$x_k^{ij} = \mathbb{T}_k^{ij}(x_{k-1}) = \begin{cases} F_k^{ij}(x_{k-1}) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R \wedge j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i, \\ \rho y_k^{i,*} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{V}_k^A \wedge j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i, \end{cases}$$

where $y_k^{i,*} \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*}$ is a local minimizer, and

$$F_k^{ij}(x_{k-1}) = (1 - \alpha)x_{k-1}^{ij} + \alpha(2\rho y_{k-1}^j - x_{k-1}^{ji}),$$

$$y_{k-1}^j = \text{prox}_{f_{k-1}^j}^{1/\rho\eta_{k-1}^j} \left(\frac{1}{\rho\eta_{k-1}^j} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1}^j} x_{k-1}^{\ell j} \right).$$

The local update $x_k^{ij} = F_k^{ij}(x_{k-1})$ requires that all agents $j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i$ have previously transmitted to agent $i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R$ both their state x_{k-1}^{ji} and the quantity resulting by the proximal operation, which are internal variables of Open ADMM denoted by y_{k-1}^j . Since the standard iteration of Open ADMM is ruled by the operator $F_k = [\dots, F_k^{ij}, \dots]^\top$, which is derived by applying the relaxed Peaceman-Rachford splitting method to the dual of the distributed version of the problem in (8) (see [36] and references therein), its fixed points are such that all the internal variables are the same and equal to an optimal solution $y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*$ of the problem in (8). Thus, the internal variables constitute the output estimation of the agents of the optimal solutions. The above described operations to be performed by each agent in the network to correctly execute Open ADMM are detailed in Algorithm 1. To prove the convergence of Open ADMM, we resort to our main convergence result in Theorem 1 for open operators. We first show that Assumptions 1-2 are sufficient to guarantee the existence of a TSI and its boundedness (Lemma 1) as well as the boundedness of the arrival process (Lemma 2).

Lemma 1. *Consider an OMAS running Open ADMM to distributedly solve an optimization problem as in (8) under Assumptions 1-2. Then, there is a TSI $\{\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ given by*

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k = \{\hat{x}_k \mid (I + P_k)\hat{x}_k = 2\rho P_k A_k(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*), y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*\}, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_k^* \neq \emptyset$ is the set of solutions to the problem in (8). Moreover, the TSI is bounded with

$$B = \rho\sigma. \quad (11)$$

Proof: See Section A in the Appendix. ■

Lemma 2. *Consider an OMAS running Open ADMM to distributedly solve an optimization problem as in (8) under Assumptions 1-2. Then, the arrival process is bounded with*

$$H = \rho\omega. \quad (12)$$

Proof: See Section B in the Appendix. ■

These intermediate lemmas allow proving convergence the convergence of Open ADMM. In particular, Theorem 2 (building on Theorem 1) demonstrates that Open ADMM is stable in the sense that the open sequences it generates converge within a radius of the set of interest. After proving stability, we analyze the performance of Open ADMM in Theorem 3, where we prove that the open sequences $\{y_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converge linearly within a time-varying radius of the optimal solution sets $\{C_k^* : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Finally, we provide Corollary 2 to characterize the performance in simplified scenarios.

Theorem 2. *Consider an OMAS running Open ADMM to distributedly solve an optimization problem as in (8) under Assumptions 1-2. If the standard iteration is paracontractive with $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and the departure process is bounded with $\beta \in (\gamma, 1)$, then the open sequence $\{x_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generated by the open operator of Open ADMM converges with linear rate $\theta = \gamma/\beta \in (0, 1)$ within a radius*

$$R = \rho \frac{(\sigma + \omega)}{(1 - \theta)}.$$

Proof: The proof consists in showing that conditions (a) – (d) of Theorem 1 hold, indeed: Paracontractivity of the

Algorithm 1 Open and distributed ADMM

Input: The relaxation $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and the penalty $\rho > 0$.

Output: Each agent returns y_k^i that is an (approximated) solution to the optimization problem in (8).

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **each agent** $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$:

if $i \in \mathcal{V}_k^A$ **is an arriving agent:**

initializes the state variables to a local optimum

$$x_k^{ij} = \rho y_k^{i,*} \quad (\text{see (9)}) \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i \quad (13)$$

else if $i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R$ **is a remaining agent:**

receives y_{k-1}^j, x_{k-1}^{ji} from each neighbor $j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i$
updates the remaining state variable according to

$$x_k^{ij} = (1 - \alpha)x_{k-1}^{ij} - \alpha x_{k-1}^{ji} + 2\rho\alpha y_{k-1}^j \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i \quad (14)$$

initializes the new state variables to a local optimum

$$x_k^{ij} = \rho y_k^{i,*} \quad (\text{see (9)}) \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i \quad (15)$$

end if

updates the output variable

$$y_k^i = \text{prox}_{F_k^i}^{1/\rho n_k^i} \left(\frac{1}{\rho n_k^i} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i} x_k^{ij} \right) \quad (16)$$

transmits y_k^i, x_k^{ij} to each neighbor $j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i$

end for

operator ruling the standard dynamics holds by assumption with $\gamma \in (0, 1)$; Boundedness of the variation of the TSI holds by Lemma 1 with $B = \rho\sigma/\sqrt{\rho}$; Boundedness of the arrival process holds by Lemma 2 with $H = \rho\sigma/\sqrt{\rho}$; Boundedness of the departure process holds by assumption with $\beta \in (\gamma, 1)$. The thesis follows by substituting H and B into (7). ■

Theorem 3. *In the scenario of Theorem 2, the open sequence of agents' estimates $\{y_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converges linearly to the consensus set on the optimal solutions denoted by $C_k^* := \{\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^* \mid y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*\}$, within a bound Δ_k ,*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_k, C_k^*)}{\sqrt{\rho n_k}} = \frac{R}{\rho} \sqrt{n_k} := \Delta_k.$$

Proof: See Section C in the Appendix. ■

Corollary 2. *Consider the scenario of Theorem 2 and the following simplified cases:*

- The network size is limited from above;
- The network is time-invariant and not open;
- The local costs are time-invariant.

Then, the result of Theorem 3 become:

- (a) implies that the tracking error can be upper bounded by $\Delta = \frac{\sqrt{n}(\sigma + \omega)}{(1 - \gamma)}$ where $n_k \leq n$;
- (b) implies that the convergence rate is equal to the paracontractivity constant $\theta = \gamma$ because $\beta = 1$, which implies that the tracking error reduces to $\Delta = \frac{\sqrt{n}\sigma}{(1 - \gamma)}$ because $\omega = 0$, where $n_k = n$;
- (b) \wedge (c) implies that the network achieves exact consensus on the optimal solution for any initial condition, i.e. the tracking error becomes null because $\sigma = 0$.

C. Discussion on the set-up and proposed algorithm

Let us discuss the set-up and Algorithm 1 from the perspective of learning. In this context, each agent has access to data sampled from a local distribution \mathcal{D}_i , which are then used to define the local cost function f_k^i as

$$f_k^i(y) = \frac{1}{m_k^i} \sum_{h=1}^{m_k^i} \ell(y; d_{k,h}^i)$$

where $\{d_{k,h}^i\}_{h=1}^{m_k^i}$ are the local data, and ℓ is a loss function. In principle, each agent could compute its model on the local data only, i.e., $y_k^{i,*} \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*}$ (which always exists according to Assumptions 2(i)-(ii)). However, this model in general can have *poor accuracy and generalization*. The poor accuracy is due to the limited amount of data that an agent can collect and store, while the poor generalization is due to the skewed/biased perspective that the local distribution \mathcal{D}_i has of the phenomenon being analyzed. Thus, each agent has an incentive to participate in the cooperative learning process to train a model that is more accurate (all data of all agents are involved) and more general (all distributions together offer a better perspective on the phenomenon). This interpretation then motivates our choice to initialize an agent's variables with the local minimizer $y_k^{i,*}$. That is, we assume that an agent has pre-trained its local model as best as possible with the given data, and then joins the network to cooperatively refine this model into a more accurate and general one.

The agents have therefore an incentive to join the cooperative learning to improve their local model – but practical constraints may limit their participation. For instance, in the case of networks of battery-powered devices – such as smartphones – then, depending on the battery level, an agent may choose to stop participating to preserve battery, and join again only once its charge is restored. An agent could also decide to leave the cooperative learning once the trained model exceeds a high enough test accuracy on its local distribution. However, in principle the joining/leaving of agents might disrupt the cooperative learning, resulting in trained models with poor accuracy. Thus, some assumptions on the time-variability of (8) are needed, in order to delineate a solvable open learning problem.

First of all, through Assumption 2(iii) we impose a bound to the variation of the global solutions over time. This implies that changes in the participating agents and their local dataset do not significantly disrupt the optimal trained model. As a consequence, the model trained until time $k-1$ is a good starting point for training the new model at time k . Secondly, we need to guarantee that suitable bounds on the departure and arrival process are satisfied. Assumption 2 ensures that Definition 7 holds by requiring that local models (which are the initializations of arriving agents) are not too far from the current best global model. This translates in asking that the local distributions should have, in a sense, a bounded distance. This still allows for heterogeneity of the local data, but limits the level of the heterogeneity in the local models. In a similar way, the leaving of an agent may drive away the current global solution to the local ones, thus requiring to assume that there is a bounded rate of departure in Theorem 2.

IV. APPLICATIONS AND NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we demonstrate the performance of the Open ADMM algorithm proposed in Section III by showcasing its application to tracking and classification problems in open multi-agent systems.

A. Consensus algorithms for open networks

Consider an OMAS in which the i -th agent with $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$ has access to a scalar, time-varying reference signal $u_k^i \in \mathbb{R}$. The dynamic consensus problems on the average, the maximum, and the median values of these signals can be recast as a time-varying optimization problem in (8) with local cost functions – satisfying Assumption 2(i)-(ii) – given by

$$f_k^i(y) := \frac{1}{q} |y - u_k^i|^q + \iota_{\mathcal{S}_k^i}(y) \quad (17)$$

where $\iota_{\mathcal{S}_k^i} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \cup \{+\infty\}$ is the indicator function defined as $\iota_{\mathcal{S}_k^i}(y) = 0$ if $y \in \mathcal{S}_k^i$, and $\iota_{\mathcal{S}_k^i}(y) = +\infty$ otherwise. Indeed, we have the following result.

Proposition 1. [39, Proposition 1] *Consider an open network $\mathcal{G}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$ distributedly solving the optimization problem in (8) with local costs in (17) under Assumption 1. Then, there is a unique solution $y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*$ to the problem such that:*

- i) *If $q = 2$ and $\mathcal{S}_k^i = \mathbb{R}$, then $y_k^* = \text{avg}(u_k)$;*
- ii) *If $q = 2$ and $\mathcal{S}_k^i = \{x \geq u_i(k)\}$, then $y_k^* = \max(u_k)$;*
- iii) *If $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{S}_k^i = \mathbb{R}$, then $y_k^* = \text{med}(u_k)$.*

The updates of the Open ADMM for the tracking (or alternatively, dynamic consensus) problems of the average, maximum, and median values can be written in closed-form. In particular, the initialization of the new state variables in eqs. (13) and (15) becomes $x_k^{ij} = \rho u_k^i$ because the local optimal solution is unique and equal to $y_k^{i,*} = u_k^i$; the updates of the state variables in (14) remain unchanged; the updates of the output variables in (16) becomes (cfr. [39, Lemmas 1-2-3]):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(average)} \quad y_k^i &= \frac{u_k^i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i} x_k^{ij}}{1 + \rho \eta_k^i}, \\ \text{(maximum)} \quad y_k^i &= \max \left\{ u_k^i, \frac{u_k^i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i} x_k^{ij}}{1 + \rho \eta_k^i} \right\}, \\ \text{(median)} \quad y_k^i &= u_k^i + \max\{\theta_k^{i,-} - u_k^i, 0\} + \min\{\theta_k^{i,+} - u_k^i, 0\}, \\ &\quad \text{with } \theta_k^{i,\pm} = \frac{1}{\rho \eta_k^i} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i} x_{k-1}^{ij} \pm 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It can also be verified that the general conditions required by Assumption 2(iii)-(iv) hold if the reference signals $u_k^i \in \mathbb{R}$ with $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$ are such that [39, 40]:

- their absolute variation is bounded by a constant $\sigma \geq 0$,
$$|u_k^i - u_{k-1}^i| \leq \sigma, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (18)$$
- they lie within a set of size $\omega \geq 0$,
$$|\bar{u}_k - \underline{u}_k| \leq \omega, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (19)$$

TABLE II
COMPARISON WITH THE STATE OF THE ART FOR DISTRIBUTED TRACKING (ALSO CALLED DYNAMIC CONSENSUS)
IN OPEN MULTI-AGENT SYSTEMS WITH DISCRETE-TIME DYNAMICS.

[Ref.]	Problem	Assumptions on the network	Assumptions on the signals	Bounded tracking error	Null steady-state error
[12] Deplano <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Max/Min	Undirected + Connected + Bounded diameter + Slowly varying	Bounded variation + Bounded span	✓	* (arbitrarily small)
[22] Abdelrahim <i>et al.</i> (2017)	Max/Min	Complete + Eventually closed	Constant	✗	✓
[37] Zhu <i>et al.</i> (2010)	Avg	Directed + Balanced + jointly strongly connected	Relative bounded variation	✗	✗
[21] Franceschelli <i>et al.</i> (2020)	Avg	Undirected + Connected + Bounded departures	Bounded variation + Bounded span	✓	✗
[17] Dashti <i>et al.</i> (2022)	Avg/Mode	Undirected + Connected + Eventually closed	Constant	✗	✓
[38] Makridis <i>et al.</i> (2024)	Avg	Directed + Strongly connected + Eventually closed	Constant	✗	✓
[13] Oliva <i>et al.</i> (2023)	Avg	Undirected + Connected + Eventually closed	Constant	✗	✓
[This work]	Avg, Max/Min, Median, ...	Undirected + Connected + Bounded departures	Bounded variation + Bounded span	✓	✓

Remark 2 (Comparison with the state-of-the-art).

A comparison of the working assumptions of the proposed protocols derived from Open ADMM and their performance with the state-of-the-art is detailed in Table II. The only algorithms accounting for directed communications are those provided in [37] and in [38], but their tracking error is not formally characterized. This is the most common case as the network is usually assumed to be eventually closed and the algorithm is characterized only at steady state. In contrast, the proposed Open ADMM and the algorithms proposed in [12], [21] work under the stronger assumption of undirected communications, but enjoy an eventually bounded tracking error. Moreover, the proposed Open ADMM is the only algorithm guaranteeing a null steady state error while accounting for time-varying reference signals, whereas that in [12] can be made arbitrarily small.

Figure 5 shows a typical realization of a network of agents running the proposed Open ADMM algorithm and compare it with the OPDC algorithm [21] in the scenario described next. We considered as tuning parameters $\rho = 0.5$, $\alpha = 0.99$ for Open ADMM and $\alpha = \varepsilon = 0.01$ for OPDC. The network starts with 200 agents whose state is initialized uniformly at random in the interval $[0, 500]$. The initial graph is randomly generated with edge probability $p = 0.1$. At any subsequent step $k \geq 0$, there is a probability $p_k^{\text{join}} \in [0, 1]$ that one node joins the network and there is a probability $p_k^{\text{leave}} \in [0, 1]$ that one node leaves the network, selected as follows:

$$[p_k^{\text{join}}, p_k^{\text{leave}}] = \begin{cases} [1\%, 1\%] & \text{if } k \leq 1000 \\ [10\%, 1\%] & \text{if } k \in (1000, 2000] \\ [1\%, 1\%] & \text{if } k \in (2000, 3000] \\ [1\%, 10\%] & \text{if } k \in (3000, 3500] \\ [5\%, 5\%] & \text{if } k > 3500 \end{cases}.$$

We model these events in a way that the network remains

connected whichever event occurs. Consequently, the set of network agents is frequently renewed and the number of agents changes according to Fig. 5(bottom).




Fig. 5. Comparison between Open ADMM and OPDC [21] in an open network: (top) evolution of the network state estimation y_k and (middle) its normalized distance from the consensus on the average $\text{avg}(u_k)$ of the reference signals – converging within a bound Δ_k according to Theorem 2 – during the (bottom) time-varying size of the network.

The arriving agent creates random communication channels with all other agents with probability $p = 0.1$. Input reference signals are randomly sampled in the interval $[0, 5]$ when agents join the network and evolve within this set with bounded variation given by $\sigma = 0.2$, yielding $\omega = 5$. Figure 5(top) shows the highest and the lowest agents' state estimations y_k^i and the objective signal to be tracked, that is the average $\text{avg}(u_k)$ of the reference signals. Figure 5(middle) shows the normalized distance of the whole network state $y_k = [y_k^1, \dots, y_k^{n_k}]^\top$ from the consensus on the average. One can verify that the convergence of both protocols is linear and approaches a bounded tracking error. In this simulation, Open ADMM outperforms OPDC both for the faster convergence rate and the smaller tracking error, which is bounded coherently with Theorem 3. In particular, we considered the best possible convergence radius $R = \rho(\sigma + \omega) = 0.52$ by letting $\gamma = 0$, thus yielding the bound $\Delta_k = 5.2\sqrt{n_k}$. It is evident that this bound on the tracking error is a quite conservative estimate of the actual error.

Figure 6 shows the behavior of the two algorithms when the network is closed and fixed with $n = 200$ agents and the reference signals are static: in this case, the two algorithms are called DOT-ADMM [41] and PDC [21]. It can be noticed that DOT-ADMM is able to converge to the desired average value of the reference signal – up to machine precision – according to Corollary 2, while PDC converges with a bounded error.

B. Learning over open networks

In this section we apply the Open ADMM to a classification problem, characterized by the (static) local costs

$$f_k^i := f_i(x) = \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \log(1 + \exp(-b_{i,j} a_{i,j}^\top x)) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|x\|^2$$




Fig. 6. Comparison between DOT-ADMM and PDC in [21] in a closed network: (top) evolution of the network state estimation y_k and (middle) its normalized distance from the consensus on the average $\text{avg}(u_k)$ of the reference signals – converging to zero according to Corollary 2.

where $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b_{i,j} \in \{-1, 1\}$ are the pairs of feature vector and label, randomly generated with `scikit-learn`, and $\epsilon = 0.05$. In the following sections we test Open ADMM on several open networks, with different models of arriving/remaining/departing events. We also test some variants of Open ADMM which differ in how arriving agents initialize their local states.

We remark that the local costs do not have a closed form prox for the selected logistic loss; rather, the agents approximate it with accelerated gradient descent, up to precision of 10^{-10} . For the same reason, it becomes quite impractical to numerically evaluate the distance of the agents estimations from the global optimal solution. Thus, in all following simulations, we use instead the following metric as a proxy of the algorithm's convergence to the solution of (8):

$$\varepsilon_k := \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \nabla f_i(\bar{y}_k) \right\|^2, \quad \text{with } \bar{y}_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} y_k^i \quad (20)$$

The above metric is zero if all the y_k^i , $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$, have converged to the optimal solution.

1) *Open network with Poisson arrivals/departures*: We start by applying Open ADMM to an open network in which the arrival and departure events occur according to the Poisson distributions $\text{Pois}(\lambda^{\text{join}})$ and $\text{Pois}(\lambda^{\text{leave}})$, respectively – resulting in λ^{join} and λ^{leave} arrivals and departures in mean. Additionally, arriving agents are connected to a number of remaining agents equal to the average degree in the network, and the network starts with $n_0 = 50$ agents. In Figure 7 we report the evolution of ε_k and the number of agents n_k over the course of a simulation where the network is characterized by three modes:

$$[\lambda_k^{\text{join}}, \lambda_k^{\text{leave}}] = \begin{cases} [1, 1] & \text{if } k \leq 320 \\ [1, 0.5] & \text{if } k \in (320, 640] \\ [0.5, 1] & \text{if } k > 640 \end{cases}$$




Fig. 7. Open ADMM applied to an open network with three modes: $\lambda^{\text{join}} = \lambda^{\text{leave}}$, $\lambda^{\text{join}} = 2\lambda^{\text{leave}}$, $\lambda^{\text{join}} = 0.5\lambda^{\text{leave}}$.

We can see that, after the initial transient, ε_k remains upper bounded, as predicted by our theoretical results. This is the case also when $\lambda^{\text{join}} = 2\lambda^{\text{leave}}$ and $\lambda^{\text{join}} = 0.5\lambda^{\text{leave}}$, which result in an increasing and decreasing (in mean) n_k , respectively. This observation is especially important, as it showcases the resilience of Open ADMM to wide changes in the network.

The values of λ^{join} and λ^{leave} of course affect that magnitude of the fluctuations in n_k that happen over the course of the simulation. To explore how this in turn impacts ε_k , we run a set of simulations with $\lambda^{\text{join}} = \lambda^{\text{leave}}$ and different choices of $\lambda^{\text{join}} \in \{0.1, 1, 10, 100\}$. The results are reported in Figure 8. We notice that the larger the mean of the arrival/departure events, the larger ε_k is, due to the wider fluctuations in the number of agents. This is further verified by the results of Table III, which report the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation of ε_k in the second half of the simulation (to exclude transient behaviors due to the initialization). The results are averaged over 10 Monte Carlo iterations. The results confirm that the more arrival/departure events, the larger ε_k , in line with our theoretical results. We remark that the algorithm does not diverge even in the challenging scenario $\lambda = 100$.

2) *Open network with decaying Poisson*: The previous section tested Open ADMM in scenarios where arrival and departure events keep happening with a constant probability. In this section, we test Open ADMM in a scenario where the arrival and departure events become rarer as time goes on, that is, they have distributions $\text{Pois}(\lambda\delta^{k/5})$ and $\text{Pois}(\lambda\delta^{k/5})$, with $\lambda = 5$ and $\delta = 0.9583$. This models a scenario

where at the initial learning stage there is high churn rate, but progressively the agents decide whether to participate or not, and the network settles.

In Figure 9 we report the evolution of ε_k and of the number of agents in the network. We notice that, similarly to the results of the previous section, while the arrival/departure events are frequent, Open ADMM achieves a bounded error. But as the probabilities decay, the network settles on an increasingly static structure, and the algorithm achieves exact convergence around iteration 800 (up to numerical precision). The probabilities of arrival/departure are not zero though, and we see that an agent enters the network at ~ 850 , causing a transient in the error, which then converges to zero again.

3) *Open network with replacement*: The open network models used in the previous sections allowed for the number of agents n_k to vary over time. In this section we consider a network with a fixed number of agents n , but allow a number of them – drawn from $\text{Pois}(\lambda)$, $\lambda = 1$ – to be replaced throughout the simulation.

Table IV reports the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation of ε_k in the second half of the simulation, with $n \in \{50, 100, 500\}$. The results are averaged over 10 Monte Carlo iterations. We notice that the higher the number of agents, the smaller the value of ε_k . Indeed, in larger networks the impact of replacing a few nodes (1 on average) is lesser, as the large number of cost functions in (8) ensure smaller sensitivity to individual changes in the agents. However, ε_k does not converge to zero, as changes in the network still cause transients similar to that at ~ 850 of Figure 9.

TABLE III

PERFORMANCE OF OPEN ADMM IN TERMS OF ε_k IN (20) FOR DIFFERENT NETWORK SIZES, AND ONLY REPLACEMENT EVENTS.

λ	Min	Mean \pm Std	Max
0.1	6.163×10^{-5}	$(6.765 \pm 7.988) \times 10^{-4}$	4.192×10^{-3}
1	3.178×10^{-3}	$(1.701 \pm 1.012) \times 10^{-2}$	5.655×10^{-2}
10	6.550×10^{-2}	$(1.765 \pm 0.968) \times 10^{-1}$	5.698×10^{-1}
100	9.282×10^{-1}	1.692 ± 0.624	3.046




Fig. 8. Open ADMM applied to an open network with $\lambda^{\text{join}} = \lambda^{\text{leave}} = \lambda \in \{0.1, 1, 10, 100\}$.

TABLE IV

PERFORMANCE OF OPEN ADMM IN TERMS OF ε_k IN (20) FOR DIFFERENT NETWORK SIZES, AND ONLY REPLACEMENT EVENTS.

n	Min	Mean \pm Std	Max
50	1.661×10^{-3}	$(1.253 \pm 0.980) \times 10^{-2}$	6.159×10^{-2}
100	3.997×10^{-4}	$(3.685 \pm 4.535) \times 10^{-3}$	3.382×10^{-2}
500	7.493×10^{-5}	$(4.676 \pm 3.045) \times 10^{-4}$	1.817×10^{-3}




Fig. 9. Open ADMM applied to an open network with decaying arrival/departure events probability.

4) *Initialization in Open ADMM*: The agents running Open ADMM use their local optimum as an initialization when they join the network (or when they connect to a new neighbor). However, in practice the agents may not have access to a locally optimal model (especially if their cost function changes over time). Thus, in this section we test the performance of Open ADMM with different local initializations: (a) the local optimum $x_k^{ij} = \rho y^{i,*}$; (b) the zero vector $x_k^{ij} = 0$; (c) the average state of i 's neighbors that were already part of the network $x_k^{ij} = \text{avg}(\{y_{k-1}^j\}_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i \cup \mathcal{R}_k})$. The choice of (c) enacts a “knowledge transfer” between remaining and arriving agents; this is similar to the sharing of subgradients in [5].

Table V reports the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation of ε_k (in the second half of the simulation) with the different initializations. The results are averaged over 10 Monte Carlo iterations. First of all, we remark that the naïve choice (b) leads to the worst performance overall, due to the fact that it causes the largest transient effect. Indeed, the zero vector is (on average) much farther from the fixed point than (a) and (c). On the other hand, these two better informed initializations have very close performance, with (c) being slightly worse. As mentioned above, (a) may not be accessible due to the computational cost of computing the local optimum. Thus (c) presents a less computationally expensive alternative which relies on communications rather than local computation.

TABLE V

PERFORMANCE OF OPEN ADMM IN TERMS OF ε_k IN (20) FOR DIFFERENT NETWORK SIZES, AND ONLY REPLACEMENT EVENTS.

Init.	Min	Mean \pm Std	Max
(a)	3.178×10^{-3}	$(1.701 \pm 1.012) \times 10^{-2}$	5.655×10^{-2}
(b)	2.665×10^{-3}	$(2.214 \pm 3.854) \times 10^{-1}$	1.692
(c)	3.212×10^{-3}	$(2.134 \pm 1.630) \times 10^{-2}$	7.773×10^{-2}

V. CONCLUSIONS

This article presents the Open ADMM algorithm to solve distributed optimization and learning problems in networks where agents may join or leave during the execution of the algorithm. The stability and performance of Open ADMM are discussed in the light of the newly introduced “*open operator theory*”, which are corroborated through extensive simulations in the to solve the dynamic consensus problems on different metrics and classification problems through logistic regressions. The superiority of our approach with respect to the state-of-the-art has been discussed both in terms of working assumptions and performance, as detailed in Tables I-II.

Many interesting future research directions originates from this manuscript, which mainly reside in providing new the technical tools for “*open operator theory*” to correctly describe and analyze more complex and realistic scenarios, such as asynchronous communications among the agents, unreliable and limited communications to deal with packet losses and quantization limitation, inexact local computations, and so on.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Nakamoto, “Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system,” *Satoshi Nakamoto*, 2008.
- [2] M. Brambilla, E. Ferrante, M. Birattari, and M. Dorigo, “Swarm robotics: A review from the swarm engineering perspective,” *Swarm Intelligence*, vol. 7, pp. 1–41, 2013.
- [3] H. Rainer and U. Krause, “Opinion dynamics and bounded confidence: Models, analysis and simulation,” 2002.
- [4] J. M. Hendrickx and M. G. Rabbat, “Stability of Decentralized Gradient Descent in Open Multi-Agent Systems,” in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Jeju Island, Korea (South): IEEE, 2020, pp. 4885–4890.
- [5] Y.-G. Hsieh, F. Iutzeler, J. Malick, and P. Mertikopoulos, “Optimization in Open Networks via Dual Averaging,” in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Austin, TX, USA: IEEE, 2021, pp. 514–520.
- [6] N. Hayashi, “Distributed Subgradient Method in Open Multi-agent Systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 10, pp. 6192–6199, 2023.
- [7] M. Xue, Y. Tang, W. Ren, and F. Qian, “Stability of multi-dimensional switched systems with an application to open multi-agent systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 146, p. 110644, 2022.
- [8] B. Zhou, J. H. Park, Y. Yang, R. Hao, and Y. Jiao, “Prescribed-time consensus of time-varying open multi-agent systems with delays on time scales,” *Information Sciences*, vol. 680, p. 120957, 2024.
- [9] E. Restrepo, A. Loria, I. Sarras, and J. Marzat, “Consensus of open multi-agent systems over dynamic undirected graphs with preserved connectivity and collision avoidance,” in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 4609–4614.
- [10] Z. A. Z. S. Dashti, C. Seatzu, and M. Franceschelli, “Dynamic consensus on the median value in open multi-agent systems,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2019, pp. 3691–3697.
- [11] V. S. Varma, I.-C. Morărescu, and D. Nešić, “Open multi-agent systems with discrete states and stochastic interactions,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 375–380, 2018.
- [12] D. Deplano, M. Franceschelli, and A. Giua, “Stability of paracontractive open multi-agent systems,” in *63rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2024.
- [13] G. Oliva, M. Franceschelli, A. Gasparri, and A. Scala, “A sum-of-states preservation framework for open multi-agent systems with nonlinear heterogeneous coupling,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [14] C. M. de Galland, R. Vizuete, J. M. Hendrickx, P. Frasca, and E. Panteley, “Random coordinate descent algorithm for open multi-agent systems with complete topology and homogeneous agents,” in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 1701–1708.
- [15] C. M. de Galland and J. M. Hendrickx, “Lower bound performances for average consensus in open multi-agent systems,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2019, pp. 7429–7434.
- [16] C. M. de Galland and J. M. Hendrickx, “Fundamental performance limitations for average consensus in open multi-agent systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 646–659, 2022.
- [17] Z. A. Z. S. Dashti, G. Oliva, C. Seatzu, A. Gasparri, and M. Franceschelli, “Distributed mode computation in open multi-agent systems,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 3481–3486, 2022.
- [18] J. M. Hendrickx and S. Martin, “Open multi-agent systems: Gossiping with deterministic arrivals and departures,” in *2016 54th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 1094–1101.
- [19] J. M. Hendrickx and S. Martin, “Open multi-agent systems: Gossiping with random arrivals and departures,” in *2017 IEEE*

- 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), IEEE, 2017, pp. 763–768.
- [20] M. Franceschelli and P. Frasca, “Proportional dynamic consensus in open multi-agent systems,” in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 900–905.
- [21] M. Franceschelli and P. Frasca, “Stability of open multiagent systems and applications to dynamic consensus,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 2326–2331, 2020.
- [22] M. Abdelrahim, J. M. Hendrickx, and W. Heemels, “Max-consensus in open multi-agent systems with gossip interactions,” in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2017, pp. 4753–4758.
- [23] Y.-G. Hsieh, F. Iutzeler, J. Malick, and P. Mertikopoulos, “Multi-agent online optimization with delays: Asynchronicity, adaptivity, and optimism,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, no. 78, pp. 1–49, 2022.
- [24] R. Sawamura, N. Hayashi, and M. Inuiguchi, “A Distributed Primal-Dual Push-Sum Algorithm on Open Multiagent Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [25] Y. Liu, M. Ye, L. Ding, L. Xie, and S. Xu, “Distributed Online Resource Allocation in Open Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [26] R. Vizuete, C. M. de Galland, J. M. Hendrickx, P. Frasca, and E. Panteley, “Resource allocation in open multi-agent systems: An online optimization analysis,” in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 5185–5191.
- [27] C. M. D. Galland, R. Vizuete, J. M. Hendrickx, E. Panteley, and P. Frasca, “Random Coordinate Descent for Resource Allocation in Open multiagent Systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [28] I. Bistritz and N. Bambos, “Gamekeeper: Online learning for admission control of networked open multiagent systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [29] T. Nakamura, N. Hayashi, and M. Inuiguchi, “Cooperative learning for adversarial multi-armed bandit on open multi-agent systems,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 1712–1717, 2023.
- [30] E. K. Ryu and S. Boyd, “Primer on monotone operator methods,” *Appl. Comput. Math.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 3–43, 2016.
- [31] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd ed. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2017.
- [32] L. Elsner, I. Koltracht, and M. Neumann, “Convergence of sequential and asynchronous nonlinear paracontractions,” *Numerische mathematik*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 305–319, 1992.
- [33] A. A. Raja and S. Grammatico, “Payoff distribution in robust coalitional games on time-varying networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 511–520, 2021.
- [34] A. Rai and S. Mou, “Distributed algorithms for edge-agreements: More than consensus,” in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2023, pp. 4417–4422.
- [35] X. Li, L. Xie, and N. Li, “A survey on distributed online optimization and online games,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 56, p. 100904, 2023.
- [36] N. Bastianello, R. Carli, L. Schenato, and M. Todescato, “Asynchronous distributed optimization over lossy networks via relaxed ADMM: Stability and linear convergence,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2620–2635, 2021.
- [37] M. Zhu and S. Martinez, “Discrete-time dynamic average consensus,” *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 322–329, 2010.
- [38] E. Makridis, A. Grammenos, G. Oliva, E. Kalyvianaki, C. N. Hadjicostis, and T. Charalambous, “Average consensus over directed networks in open multi-agent systems with acknowledgement feedback,” in *63rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2024.
- [39] D. Deplano, N. Bastianello, M. Franceschelli, and K. H. Johansson, “A unified approach to solve the dynamic consensus on the average, maximum, and median values with linear convergence,” in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2023, pp. 6442–6448.
- [40] D. Deplano, M. Franceschelli, and A. Giua, “Dynamic min and max consensus and size estimation of anonymous multiagent networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 202–213, 2023.
- [41] N. Bastianello, D. Deplano, M. Franceschelli, and K. H. Johansson, “Robust online learning over networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [42] N. Parikh and S. Boyd, “Proximal algorithms,” *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 127–239, 2014.
- [43] P. Lancaster and H. K. Farahat, “Norms on direct sums and tensor products,” *mathematics of computation*, vol. 26, no. 118, pp. 401–414, 1972.
- [44] D. Serre, *Matrices: Theory and Applications (2nd Edition)*. ASpringer New York, NY, 2012.

APPENDIX:

PROOFS OF LEMMAS 1-2 AND THEOREM 3

The standard iteration of Open ADMM is that of DOT-ADMM proposed by the same authors in [41], which is given by (cfr. [41, Eq. (11)])

$$\begin{aligned} x_k &= F_k(x_{k-1}) = [(1-\alpha)I - \alpha P_{k-1}]x_{k-1} + 2\alpha\rho P_{k-1}A_{k-1}y_{k-1} \\ y_k &= P_k(x_k) = \text{prox}_{f_k}^{1/\rho\eta_k}(D_k A_k^\top x_k) \end{aligned}$$

where:

- the operator $\text{prox}_{f_k}^{1/\rho\eta_k} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{J}_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{J}_k}$ with $\mathcal{J}_k = \{(i, \ell) : i \in \mathcal{V}_k \text{ and } \ell = 1, \dots, p\}$ applies block-wise the proximal of the local costs f_k^i ;
- the matrix $A_k = \Lambda \otimes I_p \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{I}_k \times \mathcal{J}_k}$ is given by $\Lambda \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{E}_k \times \mathcal{V}_k}$ defined block-wise for $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$ and $j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i$ by the matrices $\Lambda^{ij} = [e_i, e_j]^\top$ for $j > i$ where $e_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{V}_k}$ denotes a canonical vector;
- the matrix $D_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{J}_k \times \mathcal{J}_k}$ is given by $D_k = \text{blkdiag}\{(\rho\eta_k^i)^{-1}I_p\}_{i=1}^n$;
- the matrix $P_k \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{I}_k \times \mathcal{I}_k}$ is a squared block-diagonal matrix given by $P_k = I_{\xi_k/2} \otimes (\Pi \otimes I_p)$ with $\Pi = [0 \ 1; 1 \ 0]$.

A. Proof of Lemma 1

Let \hat{x}_k be a fixed point of standard iteration, namely

$$\hat{x}_k = F_{k+1}(\hat{x}_k).$$

Since the updates of DOT-ADMM are the result of the application of the Peaceman-Rachford operator to the dual of the distributed version of the problem in (8), then the output variable at a fixed point is equal to $(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*)$ where $y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*$ is a solution to problem in (8) (cfr. [30, Theorem 26.11]), namely,

$$(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*) = \text{prox}_{f_k}^{1/\rho\eta_k}(D_k A_k^\top \hat{x}_k).$$

Consequently, the fixed point \hat{x}_k of the standard iteration satisfies

$$(I + P_k)\hat{x}_k = 2\rho P_k A_k (\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*),$$

The symbol \otimes denotes the Kronecker product.

thus completing the first part of the proof. Now, we need to prove that the following is bounded from above,

$$d_{\text{SH}}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1}) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}} d(\text{proj}(z, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k), \text{proj}(z, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1})).$$

Let us denote by \hat{z}_k the projection of $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}$ onto $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}_k}$, namely $\hat{z}_k = \text{proj}(z, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)$, then by [42, Section 6.2.2] it holds

$$\hat{z}_k = z - (I + P_k)^\dagger((I + P_k)z - 2\rho P_k A_k (\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*)).$$

Since $I + P_k = I_{\xi_k/2} \otimes (J \otimes I_p)$ where $J = (\Pi + I_2)$ is a matrix with all ones with pseudoinverse $J^\dagger = \frac{1}{4}J$, we can decompose \hat{z}_k into vectors $\hat{z}_k^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{2p}$ where $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_k^i$ such that $j > i$, given by

$$\hat{z}_k^{ij} = z^{ij} - \frac{1}{2}(J \otimes I_p)(z^{ij} - \rho(\Lambda^{ij} \otimes I_p)(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*)).$$

Similarly, the components of $\text{proj}(z, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1})$ belonging to \mathcal{I}_k are given by

$$\hat{z}_{k-1}^{ij} = z^{ij} - \frac{1}{2}(J \otimes I_p)(z^{ij} - \rho(\Lambda^{ij} \otimes I_p)(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_{k-1}^*)).$$

Thus, $d(\text{proj}(z, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k), \text{proj}(z, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{k-1})) =$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \|\hat{z}_k^{ij} - \hat{z}_{k-1}^{ij}\|^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2}{4} \|(J \otimes I_p)(\Lambda^{ij} \otimes I_p)(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes (y_k^* - y_{k-1}^*))\|^2} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2}{4} \|(J \otimes I_p)\|^2 \|(\Lambda^{ij} \otimes I_p)(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes (y_k^* - y_{k-1}^*))\|^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2}{4} \|(J \otimes I_p)\|^2 \left\| \begin{bmatrix} y_k^* - y_{k-1}^* \\ y_k^* - y_{k-1}^* \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2 \sigma^2}{2} \|J \otimes I_p\|^2} \stackrel{(iii)}{=} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2 \sigma^2}{2} \|J\|^2 \|I_p\|^2} \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{=} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2 \sigma^2}{2} \|J\|^2} \stackrel{(v)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2 \sigma^2}{2} \|J\|_1 \|J\|_\infty} \\ &\stackrel{(vi)}{=} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} \frac{\rho^2 \sigma^2}{2} \cdot 2 \cdot 2} = \rho\sigma \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_k^i} 2} \leq \rho\sigma \sqrt{|\mathcal{R}_k|} \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows by sub-multiplicativity of the norm; (ii) holds by Assumption 2(iii); (iii) follows by [43, Theorem 8]; (iv) holds because the 2-norm of an identity matrix is equal to 1; (v) follows by the Riesz-Thorin Theorem [44, Theorem 4.3.1]; (vi) follows by the fact that $\|M\|_1$ and $\|M\|_\infty$ are, respectively, the row- and column- sum of the absolute values of the matrix M , and from the fact that J has exactly 2 ones in each row and each column while Λ^{ij} has exactly 1 one in each row and each column; (vii) holds because the number of remaining channels at time k is equal to $|\mathcal{R}_k|$. Therefore, the TSI is bounded with $B = \rho\sigma/\sqrt{p}$, completing the proof.

B. Proof of Lemma 2

Open ADMM requires that state components x_k^{ij} of all arriving agents $i \in \mathcal{V}_k^A$ and new state components of the remaining agents $i \in \mathcal{V}_k^R$, $j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i$ are initialized to the minimizer $y_k^{i,*}$ of the local cost f_k^i , scaled by the penalty parameter $\rho > 0$, namely,

$$x_k^{ij} = \rho y_k^{i,*}, \text{ where } y_k^{i,*} \in \mathcal{Y}_k^{i,*} = \left\{ y : f_k^i(y) = \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^p} f_k^i(z) \right\}.$$

Let $x_k^A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}_k}$ be the vector stacking the components of all arriving labels, and denote $\hat{x}_k^A = \text{proj}(x_k^A, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)$. Further, let us decompose x_k^A, \hat{x}_k^A into vectors $x_k^{ij}, \hat{x}_k^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ where $i \in \mathcal{V}_k$, $j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i$. Then, by Lemma 1 it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_k^A, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) &= d(x_k^A, \text{proj}(x_k^A, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)) = d(x_k^A, \hat{x}_k^A) \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x_k^{ij} \\ x_k^{ji} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k^{ij} \\ \hat{x}_k^{ji} \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2} \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} \left\| \frac{1}{2}(J \otimes I_p) \left(\begin{bmatrix} x_k^{ij} \\ x_k^{ji} \end{bmatrix} - \rho(\Lambda^{ij} \otimes I_p)(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*) \right) \right\|^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} \left\| \frac{\rho}{2}(J \otimes I_p) \left(\begin{bmatrix} y_k^{i,*} \\ y_k^{j,*} \end{bmatrix} - (\Lambda^{ij} \otimes I_p)(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*) \right) \right\|^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} \left\| (J \otimes I_p) \left(\begin{bmatrix} y_k^{i,*} \\ y_k^{j,*} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} y_k^* \\ y_k^* \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\|^2} \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} \|(J \otimes I_p)\|^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} y_k^{i,*} - y_k^* \\ y_k^{j,*} - y_k^* \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2} \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\leq} \sqrt{\rho^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} y_k^{i,*} - y_k^* \\ y_k^{j,*} - y_k^* \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2} \stackrel{(4)}{\leq} \sqrt{\rho^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} 2\omega^2} \\ &\stackrel{(6)}{=} \rho\omega \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}_k^i} 2} \leq \rho\omega \sqrt{|\mathcal{A}_k|}, \end{aligned}$$

where (1) hold by Lemma 1; (2) holds by triangle inequality; (3) holds as explained in steps (3) – (6) at the end of the proof of Lemma 1; (4) holds by Assumption 2(iv); (5) holds because the number of arriving channels at time k is equal to $|\mathcal{A}_k|$. Therefore, the arrival process is bounded with $H = \frac{\rho\omega}{\sqrt{p}}$, completing the proof.

C. Proof of Theorem 3

We compute an upper bound to the distance of the estimation vector $y_k = [y_k^i, \dots, y_k^{n_k}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k}$ of the whole network from the consensus state on the solutions, which we call $\mathcal{C}_k^* := \{\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^* \mid y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*\}$. By [36, Proposition 3], for each point $\hat{x}_k \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k$ in the TSI there is a solution $y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*$ to the problem in (8) such that $(\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*) = P_k(\hat{x}_k)$ for all

$i \in \mathcal{V}_k$. Thus we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
d(y_k, \mathcal{C}_k^*) &= \inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}_k^*} \|y_k - z\| \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \|y_k - (\mathbb{1}_{n_k} \otimes y_k^*)\| = \|\mathbf{P}_k(x_k) - \mathbf{P}_k(\hat{x}_k)\| \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \left\| \text{prox}_{f_k}^{1/\rho\eta_k}(D_k A_k^\top x_k) - \text{prox}_{f_k}^{1/\rho\eta_k}(D_k A_k^\top \hat{x}_k) \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \|D_k A_k^\top(x_k - \hat{x}_k)\| \stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\rho} \|\rho D_k A_k^\top\| d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) \\
&\stackrel{(v)}{=} \frac{1}{\rho \sqrt{\min_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \eta_k^i}} d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) holds since $y_k^* \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*$ and because of the consensus constraint; (ii) holds with by definition of \mathbf{P}_k ; (iii) follows by the non-expansiveness of the proximal, and (iv) holds by choosing $\hat{x}_k = \text{arginf}_{y \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k} \|x_k - y\|$; (v) holds because matrix $\rho D_k A_k^\top$ is row-stochastic and its columns sums up to $1/\eta_k^i$.

This means that the linear convergence of y_k to a neighborhood of \mathcal{C}_k^* is implied by that of x_k to a neighborhood of $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k$, which follows from Theorem 2 and Lemmas 1-2. Moreover, the convergence radius becomes time-varying and depending on the number of agents because y_k^i and x_k have different dimensions, indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(y_k, \mathcal{C}_k^*)}{\sqrt{pn_k}} &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(x_k, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k)}{\rho \sqrt{pn_k}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{p\xi_k}}{\rho \sqrt{pn_k}} \frac{B + H}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta}} \\
&\leq \frac{n_k}{\rho \sqrt{n_k}} \frac{B + H}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta}} = \frac{\sqrt{n_k}}{\rho} \frac{B + H}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{\beta}}
\end{aligned}$$

and, using $B = \rho\sigma$ in (11), $H = \rho\omega$ in (12), yields the thesis.