

Distributed Nash Equilibrium Seeking for Constrained Aggregative Games over Jointly Connected and Weight-Balanced Switching Networks

Zhaocong Liu and Jie Huang, *Life Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The property of the communication network and the constraints on the strategic space are two factors that determine the complexity of the distributed Nash equilibrium (DNE) seeking problem. The DNE seeking problem of aggregative games has been studied for unconstrained case over all types of communication networks and for various types of constrained games over static and connected communication networks. In this paper, we investigate the DNE seeking problem for constrained aggregative games over jointly connected and weight-balanced switching networks, which can be directed and disconnected at every time instant. By integrating the projected gradient technique and the dynamic average consensus algorithm, we convert our problem to the stability problem of a well-defined time-varying nonlinear system. By constructing a time-varying Lyapunov's function candidate for this time-varying nonlinear system, we conduct a rigorous Lyapunov's analysis to conclude the exponential stability of this system and hence solve our problem.

Index Terms—Projection operator, constrained games, Nash equilibrium, switching networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

The distributed Nash equilibrium (DNE) seeking problem has been extensively studied in recent years. One of the main challenges of the problem is caused by the fact that the players lack full information about the actions of all other players. Thus, they have to estimate the actions of other players over a communication network. Therefore, the nature of the communication network dictates the complexity of the problem. The simplest case occurs when the network is fixed and connected and such a case was studied in, for example, [7], [8], [11], [16], [31]. References [4], [28], [32] further studied the case where the network is time-varying and every-time connected. The most challenging case is when the players exchange their information over a so-called jointly strongly connected switching network, which can be disconnected at every time instant. Such a case was first studied in [14] and was further pursued in several other papers such as [21], [24].

Another challenge of the DNE seeking problem arises from the constraints on the strategic space of the players. Most of the papers cited above studied the unconstrained

case, i.e., the strategic space of the players is the whole space. In practice, due to limitations in the allocated resources or the shortcomings of players' mechanisms, the actions of players may be subject to various constraints. One typical constraint is that the players' actions are restricted to certain compact sets. Such a scenario is seen in, for example, the positioning of unmanned aerial vehicles [3], Nash-Cournot games [4], distributed resource allocation [8], interference and anti-interference problems [20], optical networks [27], etc. To deal with such a case, one often resorts to the projected gradient-based algorithm. For example, references [7], [8], [13], [35] considered this case over fixed and connected communication networks. Reference [15] further considered this case over jointly strongly connected switching networks under the assumption that the pseudogradient mapping vanishes at the unique Nash equilibrium. This assumption was removed recently in [6].

There is a special type of games in which the cost function of each player depends on the player's action and an aggregative function of the actions of all players. Such a game is called aggregative game. Unlike the general game where each player knows his/her own cost function, in an aggregative game, since the cost function of every player i also depends on the aggregate function which is not fully known by the player, when seeking the Nash equilibrium of an aggregative game, one not only needs to enable each player to estimate the actions of others, but also enable each player to estimate the aggregate function. As a result, even though an aggregative game is a special case of a general game, the DNE seeking problem of an aggregative game presents an additional challenge. The DNE seeking problem in an aggregative game has also been studied by a number of papers over fixed and connected networks in [5], [10], [17], [34] and time-varying and every-time connected networks in [18]. Very recently, by combining the dynamic average consensus protocol and the pseudogradient update module, the DNE seeking problem of aggregative games over a jointly connected and weight-balanced network was further solved in [25]. Nevertheless, none of the aforementioned papers considered constrained action space and switching communication networks simultaneously. In this paper, we will further consider the constrained DNE seeking problem of aggregative games over a jointly connected and weight-balanced network. The main contributions are summarized as follows:

This work was supported by the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region under grant No. 14203924.

The authors are with the Department of Mechanical and Automation Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong E-mail: {zcliu, jhuang}@mae.cuhk.edu.hk.

Corresponding Author: Jie Huang (jhuang@mae.cuhk.edu.hk).

- (1) Compared with [25], which considered the unconstrained strategic space, this paper studies the constrained case which cannot be dealt with by the approach of [25]. The difficulty is overcome by applying a projection-based algorithm as will be made clear in Remark 4.
- (2) References [19] and [33] studied the DNE seeking problem of aggregative games over static networks. Their problem comes down to the stability issue of a time-invariant system. In contrast, our technical challenge is a stability issue of a time-varying system. We need to develop a rigorous Lyapunov approach to conclude the exponential stability of some time-varying nonlinear system. More detailed comparison will be given in Remark 7.

The new result is obtained by an integration of a projection-based algorithm and the average consensus protocol which is able to estimate the actions of all players and the aggregative function over some jointly connected and weight-balanced network. It should be noted that the DNE seeking problem of aggregative games over switching networks has also been studied by the discrete-time algorithms in [2], [22], [23] and the hybrid dynamic system-based algorithm in [30]. These approaches are quite different from ours and do not apply to our problem.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II provides the preliminaries. Section III presents the proposed algorithm and the convergence proof. The conclusion is summarized in Section IV.

Notations: \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{Z}_+ denote the set of positive numbers and positive integers, respectively. For vector x or matrix A , $\|x\|$ denote the Euclidean norm of x and $\|A\|$ denote the Euclidean-induced matrix norm of A . For column vectors a_i , $\text{col}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = [a_1^T, \dots, a_n^T]^T$. \otimes denotes the Kronecker product. $\mathbf{1}_p$ is the p -dimensional column vector with all 1's, $\mathbf{0}_{p \times q}$ is the $p \times q$ -dimensional matrix with all 0's, and I_p is the p -dimensional identity matrix.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Game theory

A non-cooperative game is defined by a triplet $\Gamma \triangleq (\mathcal{V}, f_i, U_i)$. Here, $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ is the set of N players, $U_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the action space for player i . Let $U = \prod_{i=1}^N U_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ be the strategy space, $\mathbf{x} = \text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in U$ be the strategy vector with $x_i \in U_i$ representing player i 's action, and define $\mathbf{x}_{-i} = \text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn-n}$. A Nash equilibrium denoted by $\mathbf{x}^* = \text{col}(\mathbf{x}_i^*, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*) \in U$ is such that

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*) \leq f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \forall x_i \in U_i. \quad (1)$$

Let $\nabla_i f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) = (\frac{\partial f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})}{\partial x_i})^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, we call

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \text{col}(\nabla_1 f_1(x_1, \mathbf{x}_{-1}), \dots, \nabla_N f_N(x_N, \mathbf{x}_{-N})) \quad (2)$$

the *pseudo-gradient* operator of the game.

The following two assumptions are standard.

Assumption 1. For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, i) U_i is nonempty, closed and convex; ii) the cost function $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})$ is convex and

continuously differentiable in x_i for every fixed $\mathbf{x}_{-i} \in U_{-i}$;

iii) F in (2) is μ -strongly monotone on U , i.e., for some $\mu > 0$,

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')^T (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}')) \geq \mu \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|^2 \quad (3)$$

Assumption 2. F in (2) is θ -Lipschitz continuous on U , i.e.,

$$\|F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq \theta \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in U \quad (4)$$

Remark 1. By [12, Prop. 1.4.2], under parts (i) and (ii) of Assumption 1, a pure Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{x}^* \in U$ exists, which satisfies the following variational inequality:

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)^T F(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in U \quad (5)$$

Further, by [12, Thm. 2.3.3], under Assumption 1, a unique NE point $\mathbf{x}^* \in U$ exists. In the special case where $U = \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$, condition (5) reduces to the following

$$F(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1} \quad (6)$$

To introduce an aggregative game, let an aggregate function $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ be defined as follows:

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i(x_i) \quad (7)$$

where $\phi_i(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ is a private function known to player i . An aggregative game is a game whose cost functions $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})$ satisfy $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) = \bar{f}_i(x_i, \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$ for some functions \bar{f}_i . Even though an aggregative game is a special case of a general game, the seeking of the NE over a communication network presents some specific challenge since, unlike the general game where player i is aware of his/her own cost function $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})$ in [14], [15] while player i in an aggregative game lacks some information about his/her cost function $\bar{f}_i(x_i, \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$ due to the presence of the unknown functions $\phi_j (j \neq i)$. As a result, in seeking the Nash equilibrium of an aggregative game over a communication network, one also needs to develop a technique to estimate $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$. To overcome this challenge, we need one more assumption. For this purpose, let $\mathbf{s} = \text{col}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ with $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \text{col}(\phi_1(x_1), \phi_2(x_2), \dots, \phi_N(x_N)) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$. We call the following *extended pseudo-gradient* operator

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) = \text{col}(J_1(x_1, s_1), \dots, J_N(x_N, s_N)) \quad (8)$$

where

$$J_i(x_i, s_i) \triangleq \nabla_y \bar{f}_i(y, s_i)|_{y=x_i} + \frac{1}{N} \nabla \phi_i(x_i) \nabla_y \bar{f}_i(x_i, y)|_{y=s_i} \quad (9)$$

From $f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) = \bar{f}_i(x_i, \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$, and Eqs. (2), (8), (9), one has

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \sigma(\mathbf{x})) = F(\mathbf{x}) \quad (10)$$

Assumption 3.

- 1) \mathbf{F} in (8) is Lipschitz continuous in the second argument, i.e., $\|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}')\| \leq \hat{\theta} \|\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}'\|, \forall \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}' \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ for some $\hat{\theta} > 0$.
- 2) The Jacobian of $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies $\|\frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\| \leq l$ for some $l > 0$.

Remark 2. Part 1) of Assumption 3 is standard and has been used in many literature on aggregative games, see [2, Assump. 5] [9, Assump. 4] [25, Assump. 3.1)] [33, Assump. 3] [34, Assump. 3]. Part 2) of Assumption 3 includes the average aggregate function $\phi_i(x_i) = x_i$ in [29] and the matrix weighted aggregate function $\phi_i(x_i) = A_i x_i$ in [3] as special cases.

B. Graph theory

A time-varying graph is denoted by $\mathcal{G}(t) = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}(t))$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ is the node set corresponding to the N players, and $\mathcal{E}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the edge set. We denote $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}(t)$ if node i can receive information from node j . A directed path from node i_1 to node i_k at time t is denoted by $\{(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_{k-1}, i_k)\} \subseteq \mathcal{E}(t)$. The graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is said to be *connected* at time t if one node has directed paths to every other node at time t , and is said to be *strongly connected* at time t if there is a directed path between any two nodes at time t .

Define a piece-wise constant switching function $\rho : [0, +\infty) \mapsto \mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, n_0\}$ with $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $\{t_j : j = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ be a sequence satisfying $t_0 = 0, t_{j+1} - t_j \geq \tau$ for some constant $\tau > 0$ and for all $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}), \rho(t) = p$ for some $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Then, \mathcal{P} is called the switching index set, t_j is called the switching instant, and τ is called the dwell time.

Given a set of n_0 graphs $\{\mathcal{G}_i = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_i), i = 1, \dots, n_0\}$, one can build a time varying graph $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_{\rho(t)})$ via a piece-wise constant switching signal $\rho(t)$ with range $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, n_0\}$. We call $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_{\rho(t)})$ a *switching graph* or a *switching network*. Denote the weighted adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)}$ by $\mathcal{A}_{\rho(t)} = [a_{ij}(t)] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ where $a_{ij}(t) > 0$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_{\rho(t)}$ and $a_{ij}(t) = 0$ otherwise. Since there exists no such edge as (i, i) , we have $a_{ii}(t) = 0$. The in-degree of node i is defined as $d_i^{in} = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(t)$. Let $D(t) = \text{diag}(d_1^{in}, \dots, d_N^{in})$. The matrix $\mathcal{L}_{\rho(t)} = D(t) - \mathcal{A}_{\rho(t)}$ is called the Laplacian matrix of $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)}$. For any $t \geq 0, s > 0$, let $\mathcal{G}_{\rho([t, t+s])} = \cup_{t_i \in [t, t+s)} \mathcal{G}_{\rho(t_i)}$. We call $\mathcal{G}_{\rho([t, t+s])}$ the *union graph* of $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)}$ over time interval $[t, t+s)$. $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)}$ is called weight-balanced at time t if $\sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ji}(t)$ holds for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

Assumption 4.

- 1) There exists a positive number T such that the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\rho([t, t+T])}$ is connected for all $t \geq 0$.
- 2) The graph $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)}$ is weight-balanced for any $t \geq 0$.

Remark 3. For convenience, we say a switching graph $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)}$ satisfying Assumption 4 is jointly connected and weight-balanced. Under Assumption 4, $\mathcal{G}_{\rho(t)}$ can be disconnected for any time, thus is the mildest one in existing literature of distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games [25].

III. MAIN RESULT

For a game satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2, by viewing the action variables to be governed by the following first-order integrator dynamics

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = u_i(t), \quad i \in \mathcal{V} \quad (11)$$

we can treat our problem to that of finding a distributed control protocol u_i such that the solution of the closed-loop system converges to the Nash equilibrium. The special case of our problem where $U = \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$ was studied in [25]. But, when U is a compact set, the approach in [25] does not work since the control protocol in [25] cannot guarantee the action variables $x_i(t)$ belongs to U_i even if $x_i(0) \in U_i$. The standard way for dealing with this difficulty is to introduce the projection operator. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed convex set. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the (Euclidean) projection operator $\mathbf{P}_{\Omega}(\cdot)$ is defined as $\mathbf{P}_{\Omega}(x) \triangleq \arg \min_{x' \in \Omega} \|x' - x\|^2$, which is to find a unique vector $x' \in \Omega$ that is closest to x in the Euclidean norm. By [12, Theorem 1.5.5 (d)], $\mathbf{P}_{\Omega}(\cdot)$ is non-expansive, i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{\Omega}(x) - \mathbf{P}_{\Omega}(y)\| \leq \|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (12)$$

We now define our control protocol for each player i as follows

$$u_i = \delta_2(\mathbf{P}_{U_i}(x_i - \delta_1 J_i(x_i, s_i)) - x_i) \quad (13a)$$

$$\dot{s}_i = -\alpha(s_i - \phi_i(x_i)) - \beta \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(t)(s_i - s_j) - v_i \quad (13b)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = \alpha\beta \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(t)(s_i - s_j), \quad \sum_{j=1}^N v_j(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \quad (13c)$$

where $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are two internal variables, $\delta_1, \delta_2, \alpha, \beta$ are adjustable constant parameters to be specified later. The zero sum initial condition indicated in (13c) will be utilized in Proposition 1 later.

Let $\mathbf{x} = \text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}, \mathbf{s} = \text{col}(s_1, \dots, s_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}, \mathbf{v} = \text{col}(v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$. Then, the compact form of Eqs. (11) and (13a)-(13c) is as follows

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \delta_2(\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) - \mathbf{x}) \quad (14a)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{s}} = -\alpha(\mathbf{s} - \phi(\mathbf{x})) - \beta \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{v} \quad (14b)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \alpha\beta \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{s}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^N v_j(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \quad (14c)$$

where $\mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} := \mathcal{L}_{\rho(t)} \otimes I_n$.

Remark 4. As explained in [25], $J_i(x_i, s_i)$ is used to estimate the pseudo-gradient F defined in (2), $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is used to estimate the unknown aggregate function $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$, and $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is employed to compensate the mismatch between the N local functions $\phi_i(x_i)$ and the aggregate function $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ at steady state. The R.H.S. of (14a) is modified from [6, Eq. (11a)], which studied the DNE seeking for general games. The non-expansive condition (12) together with Assumptions 2 and 3 guarantee that the R.H.S. of (14) is Lipschitz in its all arguments, thus for any initial condition, the solution of (14) exists and is unique. Moreover, since $\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) \in U, \dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{T}_U(\mathbf{x})$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in U$ where $\mathbb{T}_U(\mathbf{x})$ is the tangent cone of U at \mathbf{x} , by Nagumo's theorem in [1, pp. 174 & 214], $\mathbf{x}(t) \in U, \forall t \geq 0$ if $x_i(0) \in U_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ in (14a). If we replace (13a) by $u_i = -\delta_1 J_i(x_i, s_i)$, then (13) reduces to the one used in [25]. However, in this case, even if $x_i(0) \in U_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, there is no guarantee that $\mathbf{x}(t) \in U, \forall t \geq 0$.

Thus, the control law in [25] does not apply to the constrained case.

By [12, Prop. 1.5.8] or [26, Lem. 2.38], \mathbf{x}^* is an NE if and only if

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x}^* - kF(\mathbf{x}^*)), \quad \forall k > 0 \quad (15)$$

Using (15) shows that $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \sigma(\mathbf{x}^*), \alpha(I_{Nn} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n)\phi(\mathbf{x}^*))$ is an equilibrium of (14). Thus, if the solution of (14) converges to this equilibrium, then the NE is obtained.

To facilitate subsequent convergence analysis of (14), like in [25], let $Q = [r, R] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ be an orthogonal matrix with $r = \frac{\mathbf{1}_N}{\sqrt{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (N-1)}$. One can verify that $r^T R = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (N-1)}$ and $R^T R = I_{N-1}$. Also, let $P_n = \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}^T = \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n$, $P_n^\perp = I_{Nn} - \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}^T = I_{Nn} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N} \otimes I_n$, and

$$\mathbf{Q} = Q \otimes I_n = [r \otimes I_n, R \otimes I_n] = [\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}] \quad (16)$$

The matrices P_n and P_n^\perp represent the operations of projecting a vector onto the n -dimensional consensus and dispersion spaces, respectively.

Performing the following coordinate transformation on (14b) and (14c)

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s} - P_n \phi(\mathbf{x}) \quad (17a)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{v} - \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}) \quad (17b)$$

and utilizing the identity $\mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)}(\mathbf{1}_N \otimes \sigma(\mathbf{x})) = (\mathcal{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{1}_N) \otimes \sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \geq 0$ gives the following system

$$\dot{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} = -\alpha \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \beta \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \bar{\mathbf{v}} - P_n \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad (18a)$$

$$\dot{\bar{\mathbf{v}}} = \alpha \beta \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \bar{\mathbf{s}} - \alpha P_n^\perp \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad (18b)$$

Further, let

$$\mathbf{e}_s = \mathbf{Q}^T \bar{\mathbf{s}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}^T \\ \mathbf{R}^T \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{s}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_{s1} \\ \mathbf{e}_{s2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (19a)$$

$$\mathbf{e}_v = \mathbf{Q}^T \bar{\mathbf{v}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}^T \\ \mathbf{R}^T \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{v}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_{v1} \\ \mathbf{e}_{v2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (19b)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{s1}, \mathbf{e}_{v1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{e}_{s2}, \mathbf{e}_{v2} \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn-n}$. By (19) and the weight-balanced condition in Assumption 4, we can put Eqs. (18) into the following form

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}}_{s1} = -\alpha \mathbf{e}_{s1} - \mathbf{e}_{v1} - \mathbf{r}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad (20a)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}}_{s2} = -\alpha \mathbf{e}_{s2} - \beta \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{e}_{s2} - \mathbf{e}_{v2} \quad (20b)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}}_{v1} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \quad (20c)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}}_{v2} = \alpha \beta \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{e}_{s2} - \alpha \mathbf{R}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad (20d)$$

where we have utilized identities $\mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(\mathbf{1}_N^T \mathcal{L}_{\rho(t)}) \otimes I_n = \mathbf{0}_{n \times (Nn)}$, $\mathbf{r}^T P_n = \mathbf{r}^T$, $\mathbf{r}^T P_n^\perp = \mathbf{0}_{n \times (Nn)}$, $\mathbf{R}^T P_n = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times Nn}$, $\mathbf{R}^T P_n^\perp = \mathbf{R}^T$.

The following proposition simplifies our problem to the exponential stability of system (21).

Proposition 1. Consider the following system:

$$\dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} = g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \quad (21a)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}}_{s1} = -\alpha \mathbf{e}_{s1} - \mathbf{r}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \quad (21b)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}}_{s2} = -\alpha \mathbf{e}_{s2} - \beta \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{e}_{s2} - \mathbf{e}_{v2} \quad (21c)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}}_{v2} = \alpha \beta \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{e}_{s2} - \alpha \mathbf{R}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \quad (21d)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*$ and

$$g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) = \delta_2(\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) - \mathbf{x}) \quad (22)$$

Under part 2) of Assumptions 4, if system (21) is exponentially stable with its domain of attraction containing any initial $x_i(0) \in U_i$, any $\mathbf{e}_s(0)$ and any $\mathbf{e}_{v2}(0)$, then, for any initial condition $x_i(0) \in U_i$, any $\mathbf{s}_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathbf{v}_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^N v_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, the solution of (14) exponentially converges to the following

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}^* \quad (23a)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{s}(t) = P_n \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \quad (23b)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \quad (23c)$$

Proof. Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1}$, exponentially, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t) + \mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{x}^* \quad (24)$$

Combining (17b), (19b) and the initial condition $\sum_{j=1}^N v_j(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ in (14c), we have $\mathbf{e}_{v1}(0) = \mathbf{r}^T(\mathbf{v}(0) - \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}(0))) = \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{v}(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$. Thus, $\mathbf{e}_{v1}(t) = \mathbf{e}_{v1}(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$ for all $t \geq 0$ by (20c), which together with the fact that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{e}_s(t) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn) \times 1}$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{e}_{v2}(t) = \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1}$ both exponentially implies the following:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{s}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{e}_s(t) + P_n \phi(\mathbf{x}(t))) = P_n \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \quad (25a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{v}(t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{e}_v(t) + \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}(t))) \\ &= \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \end{aligned} \quad (25b)$$

both exponentially. The proof is thus complete. \square

Let $\zeta = \text{col}(\mathbf{e}_{s1}, \mathbf{e}_{s2}, \mathbf{e}_{v2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2Nn-n}$ and define

$$A(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha I_n & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\alpha I_{Nn-n} - \beta \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{R} & -I_{Nn-n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \alpha \beta \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{L}_{\rho(t)} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

Then, system (21) can be put in the following compact form:

$$\dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} = g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \quad (27a)$$

$$\dot{\zeta} = A(t)\zeta - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \\ \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1} \\ \alpha \mathbf{R}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (27b)$$

The following lemma originally established in [25, Lem. 1] lays the foundation of our main result.

Lemma 1. Under part 1) of Assumption 4, the origin of the linear switched system

$$\dot{\zeta} = A(t)\zeta \quad (28)$$

is exponentially stable.

Remark 5. By the proof of [25, Thm. 1], Lemma 1 ascertains the existence of a time-varying bounded matrix $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{(2Nn-n) \times (2Nn-n)}$ such that $h_1 \|v\|^2 \leq v^T H(t)v \leq h_2 \|v\|^2$ for two positive constants $h_1, h_2 > 0$ and any vector v , and, on each time interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$ with $j = 0, 1, \dots$, $H(t)$ satisfies the following differential Lyapunov equation

$$-\dot{H}(t) = A^T(t)H(t) + H(t)A(t) + I_{2Nn-n} \quad (29)$$

Since $H(t)$ is bounded, there exists a positive constant $p > 0$ such that

$$\|H(t)\| \leq p, \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad (30)$$

Note that (27b) can be viewed as a perturbed version of the unforced system (28). Therefore, the existence of $H(t)$ provides a natural construction of the Lyapunov function candidate (32) in Theorem 1 later.

Then we present the following main theorem.

Theorem 1. Under Assumptions 1 to 4, let $\delta_1^* = \frac{2\mu}{\theta^2} > 0$ and $\delta_2^*(\delta_1) = \frac{k_1(\delta_1)}{k_1(\delta_1)k_3(\delta_1) + k_2^2(\delta_1)} > 0$, where

$$k_1(\delta_1) = \frac{\delta_1(2\mu - \delta_1\theta^2)}{2 + \delta_1\theta} \quad (31a)$$

$$k_2(\delta_1) = \frac{(\delta_1\theta + 2)M + \delta_1\hat{\theta}}{2} \quad (31b)$$

$$k_3(\delta_1) = \delta_1 M \hat{\theta} \quad (31c)$$

$$M = 2pl\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} \quad (31d)$$

Then, for any $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$, any $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_1^*$, $0 < \delta_2 < \delta_2^*(\delta_1)$, any initial conditions $x_i(0) \in U_i, s_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $v_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^N v_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}$, the solution $\text{col}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{s}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$ of the closed-loop system (14) converges to the equilibrium $\text{col}(\mathbf{x}^*, P_n\phi(\mathbf{x}^*), \alpha P_n^\perp \phi(\mathbf{x}^*))$ exponentially.

Proof. By Proposition 1, under part 2) of Assumption 4, it suffices to show that the solution of system (21), or equivalently, (27) converges exponentially to its equilibrium point for any $x_i(0) \in U_i$, any $e_s(0)$ and $e_{v2}(0)$. To this end, first note that by Remark 4, $x_i(t) \in U_i$ for all $t \geq 0$. Let $V_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2$, $V_2(\zeta, t) = \zeta^T H(t)\zeta$. Consider a time-varying Lyapunov function for the closed-loop system (27) as follows

$$V(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \zeta, t) = V_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + V_2(\zeta, t) = \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \zeta^T H(t)\zeta \quad (32)$$

Then, by Remark 5, $V(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \zeta, t)$ is positive-definite, proper, and decrescent in the sense that $\min\{\frac{1}{2}, h_1\}(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \|\zeta\|^2) \leq V(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \zeta, t) \leq \max\{\frac{1}{2}, h_2\}(\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \|\zeta\|^2)$.

The time derivative of V_1 along the solution of (27a) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1 &= \delta_2 \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T (\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) - \mathbf{x}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \delta_2 \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T (\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) - \mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, P_n\phi(\mathbf{x}))) \\ &\quad + \delta_2 \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T (\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, P_n\phi(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{x}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \delta_1 \delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\hat{\theta}\| \|\mathbf{s} - P_n\phi(\mathbf{x})\| + \delta_2 \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T (\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, P_n\phi(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\quad - \mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x}^* - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*))) - \delta_2 \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \delta_1 \delta_2 \hat{\theta} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}\| + \delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \delta_1 (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*))\| - \delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where (a) results from adding and subtracting the term $\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, P_n\phi(\mathbf{x})))$, (b) follows from (12), (15), and part 1) of Assumption 3, (c) is derived from (12), (17a), and the identity (10).

For the last two terms in (33), like in [6], we consider the following two cases:

(i) When $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \neq \mathbf{0}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \delta_1 (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*))\| - \delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \\ &= -\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 - \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \delta_1 (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*))\|^2}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| + \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \delta_1 (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*))\|} \\ &= -\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \frac{2\delta_1 \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)) - \delta_1^2 \|F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| + \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \delta_1 (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*))\|} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} -\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \frac{2\delta_1 \mu \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 - \delta_1^2 \theta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| + \|\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \delta_1 (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*))\|} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \frac{2\delta_1 \mu \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 - \delta_1^2 \theta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2}{2\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| + \delta_1 \theta \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|} \\ &= -\delta_1 \delta_2 \frac{2\mu - \delta_1 \theta^2}{2 + \delta_1 \theta} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

To derive the numerator in (a), we have made use of the strong monotone property and Lipschitz continuity of $F(\cdot)$ by part iii) of Assumption 1 and Assumption 2, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} &2\delta_1 \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T (F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)) - \delta_1^2 \|F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \\ &\geq 2\delta_1 \mu \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 - \delta_1^2 \theta^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The last strict positive sign follows from $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_1^* = \frac{2\mu}{\theta^2}$. To derive (b), we have utilized the θ -Lipschitz continuity of $F(\cdot)$ by Assumption 2.

(ii) When $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^*$, inequality (34) obviously holds since both sides are zero.

Using (34) in (33) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1 &\leq \delta_1 \delta_2 \hat{\theta} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}\| - \frac{\delta_1 \delta_2 (2\mu - \delta_1 \theta^2)}{2 + \delta_1 \theta} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \\ &\leq \delta_1 \delta_2 \hat{\theta} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\zeta\| - \frac{\delta_1 \delta_2 (2\mu - \delta_1 \theta^2)}{2 + \delta_1 \theta} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where the last inequality follows from $\|\bar{\mathbf{s}}\| = \|\mathbf{Q}e_s\| = \|e_s\| \leq \|\text{col}(e_s, e_{v2})\| = \|\zeta\|$ by (19a).

Next, consider the time derivative of V_2 w.r.t. (27b). For any $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ with $j = 0, 1, \dots$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2 &= \zeta^T H(t) \dot{\zeta} + \zeta^T \dot{H}(t) \zeta + \dot{\zeta}^T H(t) \zeta \\ &= \zeta^T (A^T(t) H(t) + \dot{H}(t) + H(t) A(t)) \zeta \\ &\quad - 2\zeta^T H(t) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \\ \mathbf{0}_{(Nn-n) \times 1} \\ \alpha \mathbf{R}^T \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} -\|\zeta\|^2 + 2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} \|\zeta\| \|H(t)\| \|\mathbf{Q}^T\| \left\| \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right\| \|g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\|\zeta\|^2 + 2pl\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} \|\zeta\| \|g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})\| \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where (a) follows from (29) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (b) is derived from (30), $\|\mathbf{Q}^T\| = 1$, and part 2) of Assumption 3.

Before we proceed, let us give an estimate of the norm of g_0 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\|g_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})\| \\ &= \delta_2 \|\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) - \mathbf{x}\| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \delta_2 \|\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) - \mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{P}_n \phi(\mathbf{x})))\| \\ &\quad + \delta_2 \|\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{P}_n \phi(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x}^* - \delta_1 \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*))\| \\ &\quad + \delta_2 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \delta_1 \delta_2 \|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{P}_n \phi(\mathbf{x}))\| + \delta_1 \delta_2 \|F(\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)\| \\ &\quad + 2\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \delta_1 \delta_2 \hat{\theta} \|\bar{\mathbf{s}}\| + \delta_1 \delta_2 \theta \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| + 2\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \\ &\leq \delta_1 \delta_2 \hat{\theta} \|\zeta\| + (\delta_1 \theta + 2)\delta_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where we have used (15) to derive (a) since $\delta_1 > 0$, used (12) and the identity $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{P}_n \phi(\mathbf{x})) = F(\mathbf{x})$ to derive (b), and used Assumption 2, part 1) of Assumption 3 to derive (c).

Define $M = 2pl\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} > 0$. Then, by (38), one can further simplify (37) as follows

$$\dot{V}_2 \leq -(1 - \delta_1 \delta_2 M \hat{\theta}) \|\zeta\|^2 + (\delta_1 \theta + 2)\delta_2 M \|\zeta\| \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \quad (39)$$

Combining (32), (36) and (39) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \dot{V}_1 + \dot{V}_2 \\ &\leq - \begin{bmatrix} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \\ \|\zeta\| \end{bmatrix}^T \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \delta_2 k_1(\delta_1) & -\delta_2 k_2(\delta_1) \\ -\delta_2 k_2(\delta_1) & 1 - \delta_2 k_3(\delta_1) \end{bmatrix}}_{B(\delta_1, \delta_2)} \begin{bmatrix} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \\ \|\zeta\| \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $k_1(\delta_1), k_2(\delta_1), k_3(\delta_1)$ are defined in (31a)-(31c), respectively. For any positive δ_1 such that $\delta_1 < \delta_1^* = \frac{2\mu}{\theta^2}$, one has $k_1(\delta_1) > 0$ by (31a). Then, $\delta_2 k_1(\delta_1) > 0$ for any $\delta_2 > 0$. Setting the determinant of $B(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ to be greater than zero gives

$$\det(B(\delta_1, \delta_2)) = \delta_2(k_1 - (k_1 k_3 + k_2^2)\delta_2) > 0 \quad (41)$$

One can verify that, for any $0 < \delta_2 < \delta_2^* = \frac{k_1(\delta_1)}{k_1(\delta_1)k_3(\delta_1) + k_2^2(\delta_1)}$, inequality (41) holds. In this case, (40) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &\leq -\lambda_{\min}(B(\delta_1, \delta_2)) (\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 + \|\zeta\|^2) \\ &\leq -\frac{\lambda_{\min}(B(\delta_1, \delta_2))}{\max\{\frac{1}{2}, h_2\}} V \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

$$\implies V(t) \leq V(0) e^{-\frac{\lambda_{\min}(B(\delta_1, \delta_2))}{\max\{\frac{1}{2}, h_2\}} t} \quad (43)$$

That is, system (21) or (27) is exponentially stable with its domain of attraction containing any initial conditions $x_i(0) \in U_i$, any $e_s(0)$ and any $e_{v2}(0)$. The proof is thus complete by noting Proposition 1. \square

Remark 6. Since the solution of system (14) exists globally, from the proof of Theorem 1, it is not difficult to see that system (14) is globally exponentially stable if Assumptions 1 and 2 are strengthened so that inequalities (3) and (4) hold for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$. In this case, Theorem 1 holds for all $x_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Remark 7. References [19] and [33] studied distributed NE seeking for constrained aggregative games with local set constraints. Compared with [19], [33], our work offers at least three new features as follows:

- 1) *Communication network:* The approaches proposed in [19], [33] only apply to fixed and strongly connected graph while our approach apply to jointly connected and weight-balanced switching networks which can be directed and disconnected for any time.
- 2) *Convergence speed:* [33, Thm. 1 & 2] only ensure asymptotical stability of both algorithms at the NE point. In contrast, our result guarantees exponential convergence.
- 3) *Parameter adjustment:* Using our terminologies, the last line of [33, Eqs. (17), (18)] can be put as follows

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \alpha(t) (\mathbf{P}_U(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})) - \mathbf{x}) \quad (44)$$

where $\alpha(t) > 0$ is a decreasing function satisfying $\int_0^\infty \alpha(t) dt = \infty$ and $\int_0^\infty \alpha^2(t) dt < \infty$. In contrast, our projected gradient-play module in (14a) used fixed gains δ_1, δ_2 to fine tune the algorithm, which increases the convergence speed and simplify the complexity of overall Lyapunov stability analysis.

Remark 8. Reference [6] studied the NE seeking for general games on compact sets over jointly strongly connected switching networks. However, the problem in [6] is quite different from the problem here because, as pointed out in Section II, the player i here lacks some information about its cost function $f_i(x_i, \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$ due to the presence of the unknown functions ϕ_j for $j \neq i$. Thus, the overall distributed dynamics (14) is totally different from [6, Eq. (11)] since, as in [14], [15], each player i of [6] only needs to estimate all players' actions by a distributed estimator [6, Eq. (11b)]. In contrast, we not only need to estimate all players' actions but also the unknown aggregate function, which cannot be done by the distributed estimator in [6], [14], [15] and has to be done by the dynamic average consensus module (14b)-(14c). As a result, the convergence analysis of (14) is much more complicated than the convergence analysis of [6, Eq. (11)]. Nevertheless, since,

for N player games with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, [6, Eq. (11b)] requires each player to exchange a Nn dimensional vector with his/her neighbors, the total dimension for [6, Eq. (11)] is $Nn + N^2n$. In contrast, to implement the estimation module (14b)-(14c), each player only needs to exchange a $2n$ dimensional vector with others, which means that the total dimension of (14) is $3Nn$, which is strictly less than $Nn + N^2n$ for $N > 2$. Thus, the communication and computation burden of the algorithm here is much smaller than the one in [6].

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the DNE seeking problem for constrained aggregative games over jointly connected and weight-balanced switching networks, which can be directed and disconnected for every time instant. By integrating the projected gradient technique and the dynamic average consensus algorithm, we have converted our problem to the stability problem of a time-varying nonlinear system which is solved by establishing its exponential stability. Although we have not yet considered coupling constraints, a natural extension for future work is to investigate the generalized Nash equilibrium seeking problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aubin, J. P., and Cellina, A. (1984). *Differential inclusions: set-valued maps and viability theory* (vol. 264), Springer Science & Business Media.
- [2] G. Belgioioso, A. Nedić, and S. Grammatico, "Distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking in aggregative games on time-varying networks", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 2061–2075, May 2021.
- [3] M. Bianchi and S. Grammatico, "Continuous-time fully distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking for multi-integrator agents", *Automatica*, vol. 129, 2021, Art. no. 109660.
- [4] M. Bianchi and S. Grammatico, "Fully distributed Nash equilibrium seeking over time-varying communication networks with linear convergence rate", *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 499–504, Apr. 2021.
- [5] X. Cai, F. Xiao, and B. Wei, "Distributed strategy-updating rules for aggregative games of multi-integrator systems with coupled constraints", *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 170, 2022, Art. no. 105401.
- [6] S. Dai and Y. Zhang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for constrained games over jointly strongly connected switching networks under dynamic event-triggered mechanism", *Neurocomputing*, vol. 624, 2025, Art. no. 129465.
- [7] C. De Persis, and S. Grammatico, "Distributed averaging integral Nash equilibrium seeking on networks", *Automatica*, vol. 110, 2020, Art. no. 108548.
- [8] D. Gadjov and L. Pavel, "A passivity-based approach to Nash equilibrium seeking over networks", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1077–1092, Mar. 2019.
- [9] D. Gadjov and L. Pavel, "Single-timescale distributed GNE seeking for aggregative games over networks via forward-backward operator splitting", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 7, pp. 3259–3266, Jul. 2021.
- [10] Z. Deng, X. Nian, "Distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking algorithm design for aggregative games over weight-balanced digraphs", *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 695–706, Mar. 2019.
- [11] Z. Feng, G. Hu, X. Dong, J. Lü, "Adaptively distributed Nash equilibrium seeking of noncooperative games for uncertain heterogeneous linear multi-agent systems", *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 3871–3882, Nov./Dec. 2023.
- [12] F. Facchinei, and J. S. Pang, (2003). *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*, New York, NY: Springer New York.
- [13] W. Huo, K. F. E. Tsang, Y. Yan, K. H. Johansson, and L. Shi, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking with stochastic event-triggered mechanism", *Automatica*, vol. 162, 2024, Art. no. 111486.
- [14] X. He and J. Huang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking over strongly connected switching networks," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 533, pp. 206–213, 2023.
- [15] X. He and J. Huang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking on compact action sets over jointly strongly connected switching networks," *J. Syst. Sci. Complexity*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 63–81, 2024.
- [16] B. Huang, Z. Meng, F. Chen, W. Lan, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for multi-cluster aggregative games with applications to location control", *Int. J. Control*, vol. 97, no. 10, pp. 2253–2263, 2024.
- [17] J. Koshal, A. Nedic, and U. V. Shanbhag, "Distributed algorithms for aggregative games on graphs," *Oper. Res.*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 680–704, May-Jun. 2016.
- [18] S. Liang, P. Yi, and Y. Hong, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games with coupled constraints", *Automatica*, vol. 85, pp. 179–185, 2017.
- [19] S. Liang, P. Yi, Y. Hong, K. Peng, "Exponentially convergent distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for constrained aggregative games", *Auton. Intell. Syst.*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2022.
- [20] F. Liu, J. Yu, Y. Hua, X. Dong, Q. Li, Z. Ren, "Dynamic generalized Nash equilibrium seeking for N-coalition noncooperative games", *Automatica*, vol. 147, 2023, Art. no. 110746.
- [21] L. Liu, M. Lu, S. Wang, F. Deng and J. Chen, "Robust distributed Nash equilibrium seeking subject to communication constraints", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2024, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2024.3476195.
- [22] N. Liu, S. Tan, Y. Tao, Ye J. Lü, "A timestamp-based Nesterov's accelerated projected gradient method for distributed Nash equilibrium seeking in monotone games", *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 194, 2024, Art. no. 105966.
- [23] P. Liu, K. Lu, F. Xiao, B. Wei, Y. Zheng, "Online distributed learning for aggregative games with feedback delays", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 10, pp. 6385–6392, Oct. 2023.
- [24] Z. Liu and J. Huang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for uncertain Euler-Lagrange systems over jointly strongly connected networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 8293–8307, Dec. 2024.
- [25] Z. Liu and J. Huang, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking in aggregative games over jointly connected and weight-balanced networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2025, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2024.3520809.
- [26] Ruszczyński, A. (2011). *Nonlinear optimization*, Princeton university press.
- [27] L. Pavel, "A noncooperative game approach to OSNR optimization in optical networks", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 848–852, 2006.
- [28] J. I. Poveda, M. Krstic, and T. Basar, "Fixed-time Nash equilibrium seeking in time-varying networks", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 1954–1969, Apr. 2023.
- [29] M. Shakarami, C. De Persis, N. Monshizadeh, "Distributed dynamics for aggregative games: Robustness and privacy guarantees", *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 5048–5069, Feb. 2022.
- [30] X. Wang, A. R. Teel, X. Sun, K. Liu, G. Shao, "A distributed robust two-time-scale switched algorithm for constrained aggregative games", vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 6525–6540, Nov. 2023.
- [31] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking by a consensus based approach", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 4811–4818, Sep. 2017.
- [32] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking in multi-agent games under switching communication topologies", *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 3208–3217, Nov. 2018.
- [33] Y. Zhu, W. Yu, G. Wen, G. Chen, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking in an aggregative game on a directed graph", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2746–2753, Jun. 2021.
- [34] R. Zhu, J. Zhang, K. You, T. Başar, "Asynchronous networked aggregative games", *Automatica*, vol. 136, 2022, Art. no. 110054.
- [35] Y. Zou, B. Huang, Z. Meng, Z., and W. Ren, "Continuous-time distributed Nash equilibrium seeking algorithms for non-cooperative constrained games," *Automatica*, vol. 127, May 2021, Art. no. 109535.