

# A Generalized Discrete-Time Altafini Model

L. Wang<sup>1</sup>, J. Liu<sup>2</sup>, A. S. Morse<sup>1</sup>, B. D. O. Anderson<sup>3</sup>, and D. Fullmer<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**—A discrete-time modulus consensus model is considered in which the interaction among a family of networked agents is described by a time-dependent gain graph whose vertices correspond to agents and whose arcs are assigned complex numbers from a cyclic group. Limiting behavior of the model is studied using a graphical approach. It is shown that, under appropriate connectedness, a certain type of clustering will be reached exponentially fast for almost all initial conditions if and only if the sequence of gain graphs is “repeatedly jointly structurally balanced” corresponding to that type of clustering, where the number of clusters is at most the order of a cyclic group. It is also shown that the model will reach a consensus asymptotically at zero if the sequence of gain graphs is repeatedly jointly strongly connected and structurally unbalanced. In the special case when the cyclic group is of order two, the model simplifies to the so-called Altafini model whose gain graph is simply a signed graph.

## I. INTRODUCTION

With the rapid expansion of online social services, there has been an increasing interest in understanding how individuals’ opinions and behaviors evolve over time in a social network [1]. Opinion dynamics has a long history in the social sciences [2]. Probably the simplest and most well-known model of opinion dynamics is the classical DeGroot model originated in statistics [3]. The DeGroot model deals with a time-invariant connected network of individuals, each of which updates his/her opinion by taking a convex combination of the opinions of his/her neighbors at each discrete time step. The model is also called a consensus model and has attracted considerable attention in the systems and control community [4]–[13], with a focus on time-varying networks. It is well known that under appropriate joint connectivity assumptions, the DeGroot model with time-varying neighbor relationships causes all individuals’ opinions to reach a consensus.

Although consensus is an important collective phenomenon, splits of opinions on issues are often observed in social networks, such as political polarization [14] and cohesive subgroups [15]. Various models have been proposed for opinion dynamics to understand and explain the formation of polarization, fragmentation, and clustering of opinions in

a social network. Notable examples include the Friedkin-Johnsen model [16], [17], the Hegselmann-Krause model [19], [20], which explore the effects of individuals’ stubbornness and homophily, respectively. Specifically, the Friedkin-Johnsen model may lead to fragmentation of opinions, and the Hegselmann-Krause model can cause clustering among the individuals, while the number of clusters is unpredictable.

In recent results, the so-called Altafini model [21], incorporates in the DeGroot model a binary social relationship among individuals. Specifically, the Altafini model uses a signed, directed graph to depict the neighbor relationships among the individuals, in which vertices correspond to individuals, directions of arcs indicate directions of information flow, and each (directed) arc is associated with a positive or negative sign in that positive signs represent friendly or cooperative relationships and negative signs represent antagonistic or competitive relationships. The continuous-time Altafini model has been considered in [21]–[24], and the discrete-time counterpart has been studied in [22], [24]–[26]. For the discrete-time Altafini model over time-varying signed directed graphs, it was shown in [25] that for any “repeatedly jointly strongly connected” sequence of graphs, the absolute values of all individuals’ opinions will asymptotically reach a consensus, which has consensus and two-clustering as special cases. Necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential convergence with respect to each possible type of limit state were established in [24] in terms of structural balance/unbalance, a concept from social sciences [27].

The Altafini model is restricted to two clusters. In a realistic social network, multiple clusters of opinions occur from time to time. Thus, there is ample motivation to generalize or modify the Altafini model, which yields the possibility of multiple clusters. In [28], a generalization of the continuous-time Altafini model was proposed by allowing the gains of the neighbor graph to be the elements of a finite group, with the order of the group determining the largest possible number of clusters; the paper considers fixed neighbor graphs. Another generalization was introduced in [29] which allows the weights to be any complex numbers. It was shown in [29] that when the complex-weighted neighbor graph is fixed and strongly connected, either all individuals’ opinions converge to zero, or their magnitudes reach a consensus, which is called a modulus consensus; the paper also considers a special discrete-time model. A discrete-time counterpart of the model in [29] was studied in [30] which studies time-varying graphs and establishes sufficient conditions for exponential convergence. It is worth emphasizing that both the models in [29] and [30] require nontrivial matrix analysis to determine the maximum possible number of clusters.

This work was supported by NSF grant 1607101.00, AFOSR grant FA9550-16-1-0290, and ARO grant W911NF-17-1-0499

<sup>1</sup> L. Wang, A. S. Morse and D. Fullmer are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA. {lili.wang, as.morse, daniel.fullmer}@yale.edu

<sup>2</sup> J. Liu is with Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, New York ji.liu@stonybrook.edu

<sup>3</sup> B. D. O. Anderson is with Research School of Engineering, Australian National University, Action ACT, Australia Brian.Anderson@anu.edu.au

In this paper, we consider a generalized discrete-time Altafini model over time-varying directed graphs, in which the gains are complex numbers from a cyclic group whose order determines the maximum possible number of clusters. Although the model is a special case of the model in [30], such a setting allows us to analyze the model using a graphical approach and establish a necessary and sufficient condition for exponentially fast nonzero modulus consensus, whereas only a sufficient condition was provided in [30]. A sufficient condition for asymptotic consensus at zero is also provided. It turns out that the cyclic group composed of complex numbers is a special case of the group considered in [28]. We focus on the cyclic group for simplicity. It appears likely that the results derived in this paper can be generalized to any point group, which will be addressed in future work.

Complex-weighted graphs and the associated complex-valued adjacency matrices find applications in formation control [31], [32] and localization problems [33]. The work in this paper is also related to “group consensus” [34] and “cluster synchronization” [35]–[37].

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We are interested in a network of  $n$  agents labeled  $1, 2, \dots, n$  which are able to receive information from their neighbors where by the neighbor of agent  $i$  is meant any other agent in agent  $i$ 's reception range. We write  $\mathcal{N}_i(t)$  for the set of labels of agent  $i$ 's neighbors at discrete time  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  and we take agent  $i$  to be a neighbor of itself. A directed graph  $\mathbb{G}$  with  $n$  vertices labeled  $1, 2, \dots, n$  is a *gain graph* if each arc  $(j, i)$  is assigned a *gain*  $g_{ij}$  where  $g_{ij}$  is a complex number from the cyclic group  $\mathcal{G} = \{e^{\frac{2\pi(k-1)}{m}j} : k \in \mathbf{m}\}$ ; here  $m$  is a positive integer greater than 1 and  $\mathbf{m} = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . We say that  $\mathbb{G}$  is a gain graph associated with the gain set  $\mathcal{G}$ . The simplest case of a gain graph is when  $m = 2$  in which case the set of possible gains is  $\{1, -1\}$  and  $\mathbb{G}$  is typically called a *signed graph* [21]. One interpretation for a signed graph is that agent  $i$  is a friend of agent  $j$  if arc  $(j, i)$  is assigned with 1, or a foe of agent  $j$  if arc  $(j, i)$  is assigned with  $-1$ . It is more difficult to assign meaning to a gain graph if  $m > 2$ . Nonetheless such graphs have found applications in network flow theory, geometry, and physics [38]. Neighbor relations at time  $t$  are characterized by a gain graph  $\mathbb{N}(t)$  associated with the gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  with  $n$  vertices, and a set of arcs defined so that there is an arc from vertex  $j$  to vertex  $i$  whenever agent  $j$  is a neighbor of agent  $i$ . It is natural to assume that each self-arc in  $\mathbb{N}(t)$  is assigned with a gain “1”.

Each agent  $i$  in the network has a complex-valued state  $x_i(t)$  and updates its state using a discrete-time iterative rule given by

$$x_i(t+1) = \frac{1}{m_i(t)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} g_{ij}(t)x_j(t) \quad t \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $m_i(t)$  is the number of neighbors of agent  $i$  at time  $t$ , and  $g_{ij}(t) \in \mathcal{G}$  is the gain assigned to the arc  $(j, i)$ .

The  $n$  update equations in (1) can be written as one linear recursion equation

$$x(t+1) = G(t)x(t), \quad t \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

where each  $x(t)$  for  $t \geq 0$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  whose  $i$ th entry is  $x_i(t)$ , and  $G(t)$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix whose  $ij$ th entry is  $\frac{1}{m_i(t)}g_{ij}(t)$  if  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)$ , or 0 if  $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i(t)$ . We call matrix  $G(t)$  a *gain matrix* of the gain graph  $\mathbb{N}(t)$ . Let  $F(t)$  be the *flocking matrix* of  $\mathbb{N}(t)$  whose  $ij$ -th entry  $f_{ij}(t)$  is  $\frac{1}{m_i(t)}$  if  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)$ , or 0 if  $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i(t)$ . It is easy to see that  $|G(t)| = F(t)$  where  $|G(t)|$  is the  $n \times n$  matrix which results when each entry of  $G(t)$  is replaced by its modulus.

We are interested in the convergence of the state in system (2). System (1) or (2) achieves *modulus consensus* if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |x_i(t)| = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |x_j(t)|, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathbf{n}$$

where  $\mathbf{n} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Moreover, system (1) or (2) achieves *m-modulus consensus* if it achieves modulus consensus and  $\mathbf{n}$  can be partitioned into  $m$  subsets such that for any  $i, j \in \mathbf{n}$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_j(t)$  if  $i$  and  $j$  are in the same subset, and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) \neq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_j(t)$  if  $i$  and  $j$  are in different subsets.

The problem of interest is to derive necessary and sufficient graphical conditions on a sequence of  $\mathbb{N}(t)$  under which system (2) will achieve *m-modulus consensus* exponentially fast.

## III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we first introduce some definitions and notation. Then main results of the paper are given.

Given a gain graph  $\mathbb{G}$  associated with gain set  $\mathcal{G}$ , a *walk* in  $\mathbb{G}$  is a sequence of vertices connected by arcs corresponding to the order of the vertices in the sequence. We define the *gain along a walk* of a gain graph to be the product of gains assigned to arcs in the walk. A *semi-walk* in  $\mathbb{G}$  is a sequence of vertices connected by arcs in which the arc directions are ignored. We define the *gain along a semi-walk* of a gain graph to be the value of the product of gains assigned to arcs whose directions are consistent with the order of the vertices in the semi-walk multiplying the product of the inverse of gains assigned to arcs whose directions are consistent with the reverse order of the vertices in the semi-walk. A walk is called a *path* if there is no repetition of vertices in the walk. A walk is *closed* if it has the same starting vertex and ending vertex. A walk is a *cycle* if it is closed and there is no repetition of vertices in the walk except the starting and ending vertices. A semi-walk is called a *semi-path* if there is no repetition of vertices in the semi-walk. A semi-walk is *closed* if it has the same starting vertex and ending vertex. A semi-walk is a *semi-cycle* if it is closed and there is no repetition of vertices in the semi-walk except the starting and ending vertices. For the gain graph  $\mathbb{G}$  associated with the gain set  $\mathcal{G}$ , it is said to be *structurally m-balanced* if all semi-walks joining the same ordered pair of vertices in  $\mathbb{G}$  have the same gain. Otherwise, the gain graph  $\mathbb{G}$  is *structurally unbalanced*.

According to [28], the following lemma can be used to check whether a gain graph associated with the gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced or unbalanced.

*Lemma 1:* Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a gain graph associated with the gain set  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\mathbb{G}$  is *structurally  $m$ -balanced* if and only if all the semi-cycles of  $\mathbb{G}$  have gain 1. If, in addition,  $\mathbb{G}$  is strongly connected,  $\mathbb{G}$  is *structurally  $m$ -balanced* if and only if all the cycles of  $\mathbb{G}$  have gain 1.

More can be said. Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a set of vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  such that for each  $b \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $b(1) = 1$  and  $b(i)$  is an element in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Here  $b(i)$  is the  $i$ -th entry of vector  $b$  and  $i \in \mathbf{n}$ . We call an element  $b$  a *clustering vector*. Consider a gain graph  $\mathbb{G}$  with  $n$  vertices labeled  $1, 2, \dots, n$  and associated with the gain set  $\mathcal{G}$ . The vertex set  $\mathbf{n}$  of  $\mathbb{G}$  will be separated into  $m$  disjoint sets  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m$  such that  $\cup_{i=1}^m V_i = \mathbf{n}$  according to a given clustering vector  $b$ . For any vertex  $i \in \mathbf{n}$ ,  $i \in V_p$  if  $b(i) = e^{\frac{2\pi(p-1)}{m}j}$  for any  $p \in \mathbf{m}$ . Set  $1 \in V_1$ . If all semi-walks from vertex  $i \in V_p$  to vertex  $j \in V_q$  have the same gain  $e^{\frac{2\pi(p-q)}{m}j}$  for  $p \geq q \in \mathbf{m}$ , the gain graph  $\mathbb{G}$  associated with  $\mathcal{G}$  is said to be *structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the clustering vector  $b$* . Otherwise we say  $\mathbb{G}$  is *not structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the clustering vector  $b$* . Later in Section IV, we will show that any gain graph  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced if and only if there exist a clustering vector  $b$  such that  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the vector  $b$ .

A finite sequence of directed graphs  $\mathbb{G}(1), \mathbb{G}(2), \dots, \mathbb{G}(p)$  with the same vertex set is *jointly strongly connected* if the union<sup>1</sup> of the directed graphs in this sequence is strongly connected. Meanwhile, an infinite sequence of directed graphs  $\mathbb{G}(1), \mathbb{G}(2), \dots$  with the same vertex set is *repeatedly jointly strongly connected* if there exist positive integers  $p$  and  $q$  such that each the finite sequence  $\mathbb{G}(q + kp), \mathbb{G}(q + kp + 1), \dots, \mathbb{G}(q + kp + p - 1)$  for all  $k \geq 0$  is jointly strongly connected. Based on the above definitions, we give the definitions of jointly balancedness for gain graphs. A finite sequence of directed gain graphs  $\mathbb{G}(1), \mathbb{G}(2), \dots, \mathbb{G}(p)$  with the same vertex set and same gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  is *jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced* with respect to a clustering vector  $b \in \mathcal{I}$  if the union<sup>2</sup> of the gain graphs in this sequence is structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the vector  $b$ . If there is no  $b \in \mathcal{I}$  such that the union of the digraphs in this sequence is structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to, this sequence of graphs is *jointly structurally unbalanced*. Meanwhile, an infinite sequence of directed gain graphs  $\mathbb{G}(1), \mathbb{G}(2), \dots$  with the same vertex set and same gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  is *repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced* with respect to a clustering vector  $b \in \mathcal{I}$  (or *repeatedly jointly structurally unbalanced*) if there exist positive integers  $p$  and  $q$  such that each finite sequence  $\mathbb{G}(q + kp), \mathbb{G}(q + kp + 1), \dots, \mathbb{G}(q + kp + p - 1)$  is structurally  $m$ -

<sup>1</sup>The union of a finite sequence of directed graphs with the same vertex set is a directed graph with the same vertex set and the arc set which is the union of the arc sets of all directed graphs in the sequence.

<sup>2</sup>The union of a finite sequence of directed gain graphs with the same vertex set is a multi-directed gain graph? which can have multiple (can be more than two) directed arcs from a vertex  $i$  to another vertex  $j$  with different gains.

balanced with respect to  $b$  (or jointly structurally unbalanced) for all  $k \geq 0$ . It is worth emphasizing that the converse of repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced is not repeatedly jointly structurally unbalanced.

The main results of this paper are as follows.

*Theorem 1:* Suppose that the sequence of neighbor graphs  $\mathbb{N}(0), \mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  with the same gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  is repeatedly jointly strongly connected. System (2) reaches an  $m$ -modulus consensus corresponding to  $b \in \mathcal{I}$  exponentially fast for almost all initial conditions if and only if the graph sequence  $\mathbb{N}(0), \mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  is repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the clustering vector  $b$ .

*Theorem 2:* Suppose that the sequence of neighbor graphs  $\mathbb{N}(0), \mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  with the same gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  is repeatedly jointly strongly connected. System (2) asymptotically converges to zero for all initial conditions if the graph sequence  $\mathbb{N}(0), \mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  is repeatedly jointly structurally unbalanced.

Both theorems are proved in the next section.

#### IV. ANALYSIS

In this section, we first give a result on the graph structurally  $m$ -balancedness. Analysis on Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 will be provided as well.

*Proposition 1:* Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a gain graph with  $n$  vertices labeled  $1, 2, \dots, n$  and associated with gain set  $\mathcal{G}$ .  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced if and only if there exist a clustering vector  $b$  such that  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the vector  $b$ .

**Proof:** (Sufficiency) Since there exist a clustering vector  $b$  such that  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the vector  $b$ , we can get  $m$  disjoint sets  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m$  such that  $\cup_{i=1}^m V_i = \mathbf{n}$ ,  $1 \in V_1$ , and all semi-walks from vertex  $i \in V_p$  to vertex  $j \in V_q$  have the same gain  $e^{\frac{2\pi(p-q)}{m}j}$  for  $p \geq q \in \mathbf{m}$ . Since all semi-walks from vertex  $i \in V_q$  to  $j \in V_p$  have the same gain, all semi-walks joining the same pair of vertices have the same gain. According to the definition of structurally  $m$ -balanced graph, the gain graph  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced.

(Necessity) Start with  $m$  empty vertex sets  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ . First, choose vertex 1 to be in set  $V_1$ . If a vertex  $i \in \mathbf{n}$  is disconnected to vertex 1,  $i \in V_1$ . If a vertex  $i \in \mathbf{n}$  is weakly connected to vertex 1, all the semi-walks between  $i$  and vertex 1 have gain 1,  $i \in V_1$ . Repeat this procedure until there is no such vertex which can be found in  $\mathbf{n}$ . Next, for any vertex  $i \in \mathbf{n}/V_1$ , if there exists a vertex in  $V_1$  such that all the semi-walks from the vertex in  $V_1$  to vertex  $i$  have gain  $e^{\frac{2\pi(p-1)}{m}j}$ , let the vertex  $i \in V_p$  where  $p \in \mathbf{m}/\{1\}$ . The  $m$  disjoint sets  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  have been obtained. Next, we are going to show  $\cup_{i=1}^m V_i = \mathbf{n}$ . It is obvious that  $\cup_{i=1}^m V_i \subset \mathbf{n}$ . On the other hand, any vertex  $v \in \mathbf{n}/V_1$  must be weakly connected to vertex 1  $\in V_1$  with a gain  $e^{\frac{2\pi(q-1)}{m}j}$  where  $q \in \mathbf{m}/\{1\}$ . Since graph  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced, all semi-walks with the same starting and ending vertices have the same gain. Then  $v \in V_q$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{n} \subset \cup_{i=1}^m V_i$ . In all,  $\cup_{i=1}^m V_i = \mathbf{n}$ .

Suppose there is a semi-walk from vertex  $i \in V_q$  to  $j \in V_p$  where  $p \geq q$  whose gain is  $g^*$ . The gain of a semi-walk from a vertex  $m_1 \in V_1$  to  $i$  is  $e^{\frac{2\pi(q-1)}{m}j}$  while the gain of a semi-walk from vertex  $m_2 \in V_1$  to  $j$  is  $e^{\frac{2\pi(p-1)}{m}j}$ . Since there is a semi-walk from vertex  $i$  to  $j$  with a gain  $\alpha^*$ , there is a semi-walk from vertex  $m_1$  to  $m_2$  with gain  $e^{\frac{2\pi(q-1)}{m}j}e^{-\frac{2\pi(p-1)}{m}j}g^*$  which is  $e^{\frac{2\pi(q-p)}{m}j}g^*$ . As defined earlier in the proof  $e^{\frac{2\pi(q-p)}{m}j}g^* = 1$ . Thus  $g^* = e^{\frac{2\pi(p-q)}{m}j}$ . In all, all semi-walks from vertex  $i \in V_q$  to  $j \in V_p$  where  $p \neq q$  have the same gain which is equal to  $e^{\frac{2\pi(p-q)}{m}j}$  for  $p \geq q$ . For  $i \in \mathbf{n}$ , let  $b(i) = e^{\frac{2\pi(p-1)}{m}j}$  if  $i \in V_p$  for  $p \in \mathbf{m}$ . This clustering vector  $b$  is the vector such that  $\mathbb{G}$  is structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to. ■

When  $m = 2$ , the model becomes the Altafini model which has been well studied in [21], [24]–[26]. As defined in [21], a graph  $\mathbb{G}$  with the gain set  $\{1, -1\}$  is structurally 2-balanced if the vertices of  $\mathbb{G}$  can be partitioned into two sets such that each arc connecting two agents in the same set has a positive gain and each arc connecting two agents in different sets has a negative gain. This definition also satisfies Proposition 1 for which we can say the graph is structurally 2-balanced with respect to a clustering vector composed of 1 and  $-1$ .

In the following, we are going to show each element  $b$  in  $\mathcal{I}$  uniquely defines a clustering pattern of all the agents in the connected network by the gains of the entries of  $b$ . That is if two entries say  $b(i)$  and  $b(j)$  of vector  $b$  have the same gain, agents  $i$  and  $j$  are in the same clustering. For a structurally  $m$ -balanced graph  $\mathbb{G}$  with gain set  $\mathcal{G}$ , the agents in the same vertex set  $V_i$  for  $i \in \mathbf{m}$  will converge to the same value.

Define a time-dependent  $mn$ -dimensional vector  $z(t)$  such that for each time  $t$ ,

$$z(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 x(t) \\ \alpha_1 x(t) \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{m-1} x(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $\alpha_i = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{m}t}$  for  $i \in \mathbf{m} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ .

Then for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, mn\}$ ,

$$z_i(t+1) = \sum_{j=1}^{mn} \bar{a}_{ij}(t) z_j(t)$$

in which if  $g_{ij}(t) = 1$  for  $p \in \mathbf{m}$  and  $i, j \in \mathbf{n}$

$$\bar{a}_{i+pn, j+pn} = \max\{f_{ij}(t), 0\},$$

if  $g_{ij}(t) = \alpha_q$  for a fixed  $q \in \mathbf{m}$ , for each  $p \in \mathbf{m}$ , and  $i, j \in \mathbf{n}$ ,

$$\bar{a}_{i+pn, j+((p+q) \bmod m)n} = \max\{f_{ij}(t), 0\}$$

where  $(p+q) \bmod m$  is the remainder of  $p+q$  divided by  $m$ . It is obvious that the expanded system is equivalent to system (2). The system can be written in the form of a state equation

$$z(t+1) = \bar{G}(t)z(t) \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{G}(t) = [\bar{a}_{ij}(t)]$  is an  $mn \times mn$  stochastic matrix. With this fact, the graph of  $\bar{G}(t)$  is a directed graph with  $mn$  vertices. It is not difficult to see that  $\bar{G}(t)$  can be seen as an  $n \times n$  block circulant matrix with blocks of size  $m \times m$  where each row block vector is rotated one block to the right relative to the preceding row block vector.

Let  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}(t)$  be the graph of  $\bar{G}(t)$ .  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}(t)$  has the following properties.

**Lemma 2:** For any  $i, j \in \mathbf{n}$ , if  $g_{ij}(t) = \alpha_q$  where  $q \in \mathbf{m}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}(t)$  has an arc from vertex  $j + ((p+q) \bmod m)n$  to vertex  $i + pn$  for  $p \in \mathbf{m}$ . In particular,  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}(t)$  has self-arcs at all  $mn$  vertices.

**Lemma 3:** Suppose that  $\mathbb{N}(t)$  has a directed path from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j$  with  $i, j \in \mathbf{n}$ . Then  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}(t)$  has a directed path from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j + ((m-q) \bmod m)n$  if the directed path from  $i$  to  $j$  in  $\mathbb{N}(t)$  has a gain  $\alpha_q$  for  $q \in \mathbf{m}$ .

**Lemma 4:** For a fixed  $q \in \mathbf{m}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}(t)$  has a directed path from vertex  $i + pn$  to vertex  $j + ((m-q+p) \bmod m)n$  with  $i, j \in \mathbf{n}$   $p \in \mathbf{m}$ , if and only if it has a directed path from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j + ((m-q) \bmod m)n$ .

Look at the example below. For simplicity, self-arcs in the graphs are eliminated. Fig. 1 is the graph of  $G$ , which is a three vertex graph associated with the gain set  $\{1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$  where  $\alpha_1 = e^{\frac{2\pi}{3}j}$  and  $\alpha_2 = e^{\frac{4\pi}{3}j}$ . Correspondingly, the matrix  $G$  for system (2) associated with Fig. 1 is

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2}\alpha_1 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}\alpha_2 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

The matrix  $\bar{G}$  for system (3) is

$$\bar{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & | & 0 & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & | & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & | & 0 & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & | & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & | & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & | & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & | & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & | & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & 0 & 0 & | & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & | & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & | & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

It is easy to see that  $\bar{G}$  is a  $3 \times 3$  block circulate matrix with blocks of size  $3 \times 3$ . The graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  of  $\bar{G}$  is shown in Fig. 2.




Fig. 1. Graph  $\mathbb{N}$  associated with the sign set  $\{1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$

**Proposition 2:** Suppose that the gain graph of  $G(t)$  associated with the gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  is strongly connected and structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to a clustering vector  $b \in \mathcal{I}$ . Then, the graph of  $\bar{G}(t)$  consists of  $m$  disjoint strongly connected components of the same size,  $n$ .

**Proof:** Since the graph of  $G(t)$ ,  $\mathbb{N}(t)$ , is structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to a clustering vector  $b \in \mathcal{I}$ , according to Proposition 1, there exist  $m$  disjoint vertex sets




Fig. 2. Graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$

$V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m$  such that  $\bigcup_{p=1}^m V_p = \mathbf{n}$  and for any vertex  $i \in \mathbf{n}$ ,  $i \in V_p$  if  $b(i) = \alpha_{p-1}$  for any  $p \in \mathbf{m}$ . For the  $m$  disjoint vertex sets  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m$ ,  $1 \in V_1$ , and all semi-walks from vertex  $i \in V_q$  to  $j \in V_p$  have the same gain  $\alpha_{p-q}$  for any  $p \geq q \in \mathbf{m}$ . Let  $V_{pq}$  for any  $p, q \in \mathbf{m}$  be a vertex set such that

$$V_{pq} = \{(p-1)n + i | \forall i \in V_q\}. \quad (4)$$

We get that  $V_{pq}$  are disjoint for different  $p, q$ , and  $\bigcup_{p=1}^m \bigcup_{q=1}^m V_{pq}$  is the vertex set of  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ . Note  $V_{1q} = V_q$  for any  $q \in \mathbf{m}$ . Next we are going to show that the following  $m$  components for  $p \in \mathbf{m}$

$$\mathcal{C}_p = \{V_{p,1}, V_{p-1,2}, \dots, V_{1,p}, V_{p+1,m}, V_{p+2,m-1}, \dots, V_{m,p+1}\} \quad (5)$$

are disjoint. Moreover, each component is strongly connected and has size  $n$ .

Since the size of  $V_{pq}$  is same as the size of  $V_q$ . The size of  $\mathcal{C}_p$  is  $n$ . To begin with, we are going to show that any two vertices in  $\mathcal{C}_p$  are mutually reachable for  $p \in \mathbf{m}$ . Since  $\bar{G}$  is an  $n \times n$  block circulate matrix, if any two vertices in  $\mathcal{C}_m$  are mutually reachable, any two vertices in  $\mathcal{C}_p$  for any  $p \in \mathbf{m}$  are mutually reachable. Now look at  $\mathcal{C}_m = \{V_{m1}, V_{m-1,2}, \dots, V_{1m}\}$ . Arbitrarily choose two nonempty elements of  $\mathcal{C}_m$ . Say  $V_{m-p+1,p}$  and  $V_{m-q+1,q}$  where  $1 \leq p < q \leq m$ . Due to the definition, in graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ , there is a path from a vertex  $i \in V_p$  to a vertex  $j \in V_q$  with a gain  $\alpha_{q-p}$ . According to Lemma 3,  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  has a directed path from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j + (m-q+p)n$ . Moreover, according to Lemma 4,  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  has a directed path from a vertex  $i + (m-p)n$  which is in  $V_{m-p+1,p}$  to a vertex  $j + (m-q)n$  which is in  $V_{m-q+1,q}$ . Since the graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  is strongly connected and structurally  $m$ -balanced, if there is a path from a vertex  $i \in V_p$  to a vertex  $j \in V_q$  with a gain  $\alpha_{q-p}$ , there must be a path from the vertex  $j \in V_q$  to a vertex  $i \in V_p$  with a gain  $\alpha_{m-q+p}$ . Similarly, we get the result that  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  has a directed path from a vertex  $j + (m-q)n$  which is in  $V_{m-q+1,q}$  to a vertex  $i + (m-p)n$  which is in  $V_{m-p+1,p}$ . That is, any two vertices from  $V_{m-p+1,p}$  and  $V_{m-q+1,q}$  are mutually reachable. Thus any two vertices in  $\mathcal{C}_p$  for  $p \in \mathbf{m}$  are mutually reachable.

Next, we prove that all the  $m$  components are disconnected by contradiction. Suppose there is a path from a vertex in  $\mathcal{C}_p$

to a vertex in  $\mathcal{C}_q$  for  $p < q$ . Arbitrarily choose two vertices  $i$  and  $j$  from  $V_1$ . Since we have shown that any two vertices in  $\mathcal{C}_p$  and  $\mathcal{C}_q$  are mutually reachable respectively, there is a path from a vertex  $i + (p-1)n$  in  $V_{p1}$  to a vertex  $j + (q-1)n$  in  $V_{q1}$ . According to Lemma 4, there is a path from a vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j + (q-p)n$ . This means that there is a path from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j$  with a gain  $\alpha_{m-q+p}$ . But both  $i$  and  $j$  belong to  $V_1$  which means that the path between these two vertices should have gain 1. A contradiction. Thus all the  $m$  components are disconnected.  $\blacksquare$

Look at the graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  in Fig. 1.  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  is a strongly connected and structurally 3-balanced graph. Here we can get  $V_1 = \{1, 3\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{2\}$ , and  $V_3 = \emptyset$  where the semi-walks from a vertex in  $V_1$  to a vertex in  $V_2$  have gain  $\alpha_1$ . Correspondingly, we get the expanded graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  as shown in Fig. 2. For graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ , we have  $V_{11} = \{1, 3\}$ ,  $V_{12} = \{2\}$ ,  $V_{21} = \{4, 6\}$ ,  $V_{22} = \{5\}$ ,  $V_{31} = \{7, 9\}$ ,  $V_{32} = \{8\}$ , and  $V_{13} = V_{23} = V_{33} = \emptyset$ . Three disjoint strongly connected components of size 3 are achieved as shown in Fig 3. The first component consists of vertex 1, 3, and 8. The second component consists of vertex 2, 4, and 6. And the last component consists of vertex 5, 7, and 9.




Fig. 3. Vertex sets of strongly connected components of graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$

**Proposition 3:** Suppose that the graph of  $G(t)$  is strongly connected and structurally unbalanced. Then, the graph of  $\bar{G}(t)$  consists of at most  $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$  disjoint strongly connected components, of at least size  $2n$ .

**Proof:** Since the graph of  $G(t)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{N}(t)$  is strongly connected and structurally unbalanced, for a fixed vertex  $i$  and any other vertex  $j$  in  $\mathbb{N}(t)$ , suppose there is a path from  $i$  to  $j$  with a gain  $\alpha_p$  and there is a path from  $j$  to  $i$  with a gain  $\alpha_q$  such that  $1 \leq p + q < m$ . According to Lemma 3, there is a path from  $i$  to  $j + (m-p)n$  in graph  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ , and a path from  $j$  to  $i + (m-q)n$  in  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ . Based on Lemma 4, there is a path from  $j + (m-p)n$  to  $i + ((2m-p-q) \bmod m)n$  in  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ . Since  $p + q < m$ ,  $(2m-p-q) \bmod m \neq i$  that is  $i + ((2m-p-q) \bmod m)n$  can not be vertex  $i$ . Based on Lemma 4, there is a path from  $i + ((2m-p-q) \bmod m)n$  to  $j + ((3m-2p-q) \bmod m)n$ . Repeat this procedure, eventually there is a path from vertex  $j + (((2k-1)m-kp-(k-1)q) \bmod m)n$  to  $i + ((2km-kp-kq) \bmod m)n$  in  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  where  $k$  is an integer which is greater than 1. There exist  $k$  such that  $(2km-kp-kq) \bmod m = 0$ . The easiest choice is to let

$k = m$ . It means that there is a cycle starting from vertex  $i$ , passing vertex  $j + (m-p)n$ , vertex  $i + ((2m-p-q) \bmod m)n$  ... and eventually ending with vertex  $i$  again. Since  $j$  can be any other vertex in  $\mathbb{N}$ , for a component in graph  $\mathbb{N}$  consisting of agent  $i$ , it is strongly connected and the size must be greater than  $2n$ . ■

Next we are going to prove the main results of this paper.

**Proof of Theorem 1:** (Sufficiency) Since the sequence of neighbor graphs  $\mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  is repeatedly jointly strongly connected, and repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the clustering vector  $b$ , without loss of generality, suppose there exists positive integers  $p$  and  $q$  such that each finite sequence of graphs  $\mathbb{N}(q+kp), \mathbb{N}(q+kp+1), \dots, \mathbb{N}(q+kp+p-1)$  is jointly strongly connected and jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the clustering vector  $b$  for  $k \geq 0$ . Let

$$\mathbb{H}(k) = \mathbb{N}(q+kp) \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+1) \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+p-1)$$

Then  $\mathbb{H}(k)$  is strongly connected and structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the clustering vector  $b$ . According to Proposition 1, there exist  $m$  disjoint vertex sets  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m$  such that  $\bigcup_{p=1}^m V_p = V$ . Without loss of generality, let  $1 \in V_1$ , and all walks from vertex  $i \in V_q$  to  $j \in V_p$  have the same gain  $\alpha_{p-q}$  for any  $p \geq q \in \mathbf{m}$ . Now consider the expanded graph  $\mathbb{H}(k)$  which is  $\mathbb{H}(k) = \mathbb{N}(q+kp) \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+1) \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+p-1)$ . According to Proposition 2, graph  $\mathbb{H}(k)$  consists of  $m$  disjoint strongly connected components of the same size  $n$ .  $V_{pq}$  and  $C_p$  are defined the same as Eq. (4) and (5). Each  $C_p$  is a strongly connected component of size  $n$ . According to the result of discrete-time linear consensus process [10], all the vertices in  $C_p$  achieve consensus exponentially fast for almost all initial conditions. From the structural of  $C_p$  and system (3), for any fixed  $p, q \in \mathbf{m}$ ,  $i \in V_p, j \in V_q$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{p-1} x_i(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{q-1} x_j(t) \neq 0.$$

That is the same as we say system (1) or (2) achieves  $m$ -modulus consensus corresponding to the clustering vector  $b$  exponentially fast for almost all initial states .

(Necessity) Prove by contradiction. Suppose the sequence of neighbor graphs  $\mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  is repeatedly jointly strongly connected, but not repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to a clustering vector  $b$ . Two scenarios need to be considered.

First, if the sequence of neighbor graphs is repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to another clustering vector  $b_1$ , according to sufficiency we just proved system (1) achieves  $m$ -modulus consensus corresponding to  $b_1$  not  $b$ .

Second, the sequence of the neighbor graphs is not repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to any clustering vector. It means that either structurally unbalanced graphs or more than one class of structurally  $m$ -balanced graphs, or both appear infinitely many times. Since the sequence of neighbor graphs  $\mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  is repeatedly jointly strongly connected, there exist two positive integers

$q$  and  $p$  such that each finite sequence of graphs  $\mathbb{N}(q+kp), \mathbb{N}(q+kp+1), \dots, \mathbb{N}(q+kp+p-1)$  is jointly strongly connected for  $k \geq 0$ . Let

$$\mathbb{F}(k) = \mathbb{N}(q+kp) \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+1) \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+p-1)$$

Then  $\mathbb{F}(k)$  is strongly connected. If a gain graph  $\mathbb{N}$  is structurally unbalanced, then any finite sequence of gain graphs which contains  $\mathbb{N}$  must be jointly structural unbalanced. If two gain graphs  $\mathbb{N}_1$  and  $\mathbb{N}_2$  are structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to two different clustering vectors  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  correspondingly, then any finite sequence of gain graphs which contains  $\mathbb{N}_1$  and  $\mathbb{N}_2$  must be jointly structural unbalanced. Since either structurally unbalanced gain graphs or more than one class of structurally  $m$ -balanced graphs, or both appear infinitely many times, the graphs in the sequence  $\mathbb{F}(k)$  will be structurally unbalanced for infinitely many times. There must exist two integers  $n_1, n_2$  satisfying  $1 \leq n_1 + n_2 < m$  such that the graphs in the sequence  $\mathbb{F}(k)$ , which has a path from  $i$  to  $j$  with a gain  $\alpha_{n_1}$  and a path from  $j$  to  $i$  with a gain  $\alpha_{n_2}$ , appear infinitely many times. From the proof of Proposition 3, if  $\mathbb{F}(k)$  has a path from  $i$  to  $j$  with a gain  $\alpha_{n_1}$  and a path from  $j$  to  $i$  with a gain  $\alpha_{n_2}$ , the union of expanded graph  $\mathbb{F}(k) = \mathbb{N}(q+kp) \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+1) \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{N}(q+kp+p-1)$  must have at most  $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$  disjoint strongly connected components, of at least size  $2n$ . Moreover, vertex  $i$ , vertex  $j + (m - n_1)n$ , vertex  $i + ((2m - n_1 - n_2) \bmod m)n$  must belong to one strongly component. According to [11], state  $z(i)$  and  $z(i + ((2m - n_1 - n_2) \bmod m)n)$  would achieve consensus asymptotically which means that  $z(i)$  would converge to zero asymptotically fast. Since  $i$  is randomly chosen,  $z$  converges to zero asymptotically fast. Thus the sequence of the neighbor graphs is repeatedly jointly structurally  $m$ -balanced with respect to the clustering vector  $b$ . ■

**Proof of Theorem 2:** Since the sequence of neighbor graphs  $\mathbb{N}(1), \mathbb{N}(2), \dots$  with the same gain set  $\mathcal{G}$  is repeatedly jointly strongly connected and repeatedly jointly structurally unbalanced, system (2) converges to zero asymptotically fast for almost all initial conditions based the analysis of necessity of theorem 1. ■

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a generalized discrete-time Altafini model over time-varying gain graphs, in which the arcs are assigned complex numbers from a cyclic group whose order determines the maximum possible number of clusters, has been studied through a graphical approach. Necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential convergence of the system with respect to nonzero limit states have been established under the assumption of repeatedly jointly strong connectivity. A sufficient condition for asymptotic consensus at zero has also been provided. The results in this paper can be extended to the case where the gains of the neighbor graph are the elements of a finite abelian group. Necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential convergence at zero of the system will be studied in the future. The time-varying

case without the strong connectivity assumption is another direction for future research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Centola. The spread of behavior in an online social network experiment. *Science*, 329(5996):1194–1197, 2010.
- [2] J. R. P. French. A formal theory of social power. *Psychological Review*, 63(5):181–194, 1956.
- [3] M. H. DeGroot. Reaching a consensus. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69(345):118–121, 1974.
- [4] J. N. Tsitsiklis. *Problems in Decentralized Decision Making and Computation*. PhD thesis, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, MIT, 1984.
- [5] A. Jadbabaie, J. Lin, and A. S. Morse. Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(6):988–1001, 2003.
- [6] L. Moreau. Stability of multi-agent systems with time-dependent communication links. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(2):169–182, 2005.
- [7] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray. Consensus seeking in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(9):1520–1533, 2004.
- [8] W. Ren and R. W. Beard. Consensus seeking in multiagent systems under dynamically changing interaction topologies. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(5):655–661, 2005.
- [9] R. Olfati-Saber, J. A. Fax, and R. M. Murray. Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 95(1):215–233, 2007.
- [10] M. Cao, A. S. Morse, and B. D. O. Anderson. Reaching a consensus in a dynamically changing environment: a graphical approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 47(2):575–600, 2008.
- [11] J. M. Hendrickx and J. N. Tsitsiklis. Convergence of type-symmetric and cut-balanced consensus seeking systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(1):214–218, 2013.
- [12] J. Liu, A. S. Morse, A. Nedić, and T. Başar. Internal stability of linear consensus processes. In *Proceedings of the 53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 922–927, 2014.
- [13] A. Nedić and J. Liu. On convergence rate of weighted-averaging dynamics for consensus problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(2):766–781, 2017.
- [14] D. Baldassarri and P. Bearman. Dynamics of political polarization. *American Sociological Review*, 72(5):784–811, 2007.
- [15] S. Wasserman and K. Faust. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [16] N. E. Friedkin and E. C. Johnsen. Social influence networks and opinion change. *Advances in Group Processes*, 16(1):1–29, 1999.
- [17] N. E. Friedkin. The problem of social control and coordination of complex systems in sociology: a look at the community cleavage problem. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 35(3):40–51, 2015.
- [18] R. Hegselmann and U. Krause. Opinion dynamics and bounded confidence models, analysis, and simulation. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 5(3):1–24, 2002.
- [19] V. D. Blondel, J. M. Hendrickx, and J. N. Tsitsiklis. On Krause’s multi-agent consensus model with state-dependent connectivity. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(11):2586–2597, 2009.
- [20] S. R. Etesami and T. Başar. Game-theoretic analysis of the Hegselmann-Krause model for opinion dynamics in finite dimensions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(7):1886–1897, 2015.
- [21] C. Altafini. Consensus problems on networks with antagonistic interactions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(4):935–946, 2013.
- [22] J. M. Hendrickx. A lifting approach to models of opinion dynamics with antagonisms. In *Proceedings of the 53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 2118–2123, 2014.
- [23] A. V. Proskurnikov, A. Matveev, and M. Cao. Opinion dynamics in social networks with hostile camps: consensus vs. polarization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(6):1524–1536, 2016.
- [24] J. Liu, X. Chen, T. Başar, and M.-A. Belabbas. Exponential convergence of the discrete- and continuous-time altafini models. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(12), 2017. to appear.
- [25] Z. Meng, G. Shi, K. H. Johansson, M. Cao, and Y. Hong. Behaviors of networks with antagonistic interactions and switching topologies. *Automatica*, 73:110–116, 2016.
- [26] W. Xia, M. Cao, and K. H. Johansson. Structural balance and opinion separation in trust-mistrust social networks. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 3(1):46–56, 2016.
- [27] D. Cartwright and F. Harary. Structural balance: a generalization of Heider’s theory. *Psychological Review*, 63(5):277–292, 1956.
- [28] X. Chen, M.-A. Belabbas, and T. Başar. Voltage graphs and cluster consensus with point group symmetries. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 2018. to appear.
- [29] J. Dong and L. Qiu. Complex Laplacians and applications in multi-agent systems. 2015. arXiv:1406.1862v2 [math.OC].
- [30] J. Liu, D. Wang, W. Chen, and T. Başar. Modulus consensus over time-varying digraphs. In *Proceedings of the 2017 American Control Conference*, pages 948–953, 2017.
- [31] Z. Lin, L. Wang, Z. Han, and M. Fu. Distributed formation control of multi-agent systems using complex laplacian. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(7):1765–1777, 2014.
- [32] M. I. El-Hawwary and M. Maggiore. Distributed circular formation stabilization for dynamic unicycles. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(1):149–162, 2013.
- [33] Y. Diao, Z. Lin, and M. Fu. A barycentric coordinate based distributed localization algorithm for sensor networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 62(18):4760–4771, 2014.
- [34] J. Yu and L. Wang. Group consensus in multi-agent systems with switching topologies and communication delays. *Systems and Control Letters*, 59:340–348, 2010.
- [35] W. Wu, W. Zhou, and T. Chen. Cluster synchronization of linearly coupled complex networks under pinning control. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, 56(4):829–839, 2009.
- [36] W. Xia and M. Cao. Clustering in diffusively coupled networks. *Automatica*, 47(11):2395–2405, 2011.
- [37] J. M. Montenbruck, M. Bürger, and F. Allgöwer. Practical synchronization with diffusive couplings. *Automatica*, 53:235–243, 2015.
- [38] T. Zaslavsky. A mathematical bibliography of signed and gain graphs and allied areas. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 1998.