

Distributed Synthesis of Local Controllers for Networked Systems with Arbitrary Interconnection Topologies

Etika Agarwal*, S. Sivaranjani*, Vijay Gupta, and Panos Antsaklis

Abstract—We consider the problem of designing distributed controllers to guarantee dissipativity of a networked system comprised of dynamically coupled subsystems. We require that the control synthesis is carried out locally at the subsystem-level, without explicit knowledge of the dynamics of other subsystems in the network. We solve this problem in two steps. First, we provide distributed subsystem-level dissipativity analysis conditions whose feasibility is sufficient to guarantee dissipativity of the networked system. We then use these conditions to synthesize controllers locally at the subsystem-level, using only the knowledge of the dynamics of that subsystem, and limited information about the dissipativity of the subsystems to which it is dynamically coupled. We show that the subsystem-level controllers synthesized in this manner are sufficient to guarantee dissipativity of the networked dynamical system. We also provide an approach to make this synthesis compositional, that is, when a new subsystem is added to an existing network, only the dynamics of the new subsystem, and information about the dissipativity of the subsystems in the existing network to which it is coupled are used to design a controller for the new subsystem, while guaranteeing dissipativity of the networked system including the new subsystem. Finally, we demonstrate the application of this synthesis in enabling plug-and-play operations of generators in a microgrid by extending our results to networked switched systems.

Index Terms—Distributed control synthesis, networked systems, distributed control, compositional control, microgrids, dissipativity.

I. INTRODUCTION

Control of large-scale networked dynamical systems, comprising of several dynamically coupled subsystems, has recently gained prominence due to emerging applications in infrastructure networks. For example, in power networks, new architectures where subsystems comprised of small clusters of renewable generators and loads, known as microgrids, are connected to form the large-scale power grid have been proposed [1]. As another example, subsystems comprising of autonomous vehicles that communicate with each other to travel in close formation (platoons), have been proposed to alleviate congestion and enhance safety in transportation networks [2][3].

In such large-scale networks, decentralized and distributed control approaches to guarantee stability and robustness, have been proposed to decrease communication overhead and computational complexity. In these approaches, the subsystem-

level controllers only use states from a subset of neighboring subsystems to determine their control actions, however, the process of designing the controllers is centralized, that is, the knowledge of the dynamics of all subsystems is used in the design [4]-[10]. This centralized design process has two drawbacks. Firstly, it may be impractical to assume that the control designer has knowledge of the dynamics of all subsystems in the network. For example, in interconnected microgrid networks, where the internal dynamics of the microgrid are continually changing due to renewable energy and load fluctuations, it is not practical to access the dynamics of all the microgrids. Secondly, the topology and interconnection structure of a network may change due to addition or removal of subsystems. For example, in vehicle platooning applications, vehicles may enter or leave the platoon at any time. In such cases, a centralized design process will necessitate redesign of all controllers in the network, which is neither computationally scalable nor desirable for real-time operation.

Therefore, distributed *synthesis*, where controllers are designed locally at the subsystem-level without explicit knowledge of the dynamics of other subsystems, is the only viable option for the realization of such large-scale networks [11][12]. Typically, distributed synthesis of controllers has been carried out using three types of approaches. The first class of approaches relies on either exploiting or inducing weak coupling between subsystems in the network to distribute the synthesis problem [3], [13]-[17]. The second class of approaches are based on using numerical techniques like methods of multipliers, subgradient algorithms or distributed invariant set computations to decompose the control synthesis problem into more tractable problems [18]-[22]. The final class of approaches is hierarchical, involving a centralized computation of subsystem-level conditions to guarantee network-level control objectives such as stability, robustness or dissipativity, and local synthesis of controllers at the subsystem-level to guarantee these objectives [23]-[28].

In this paper, we consider the problem of synthesizing distributed controllers to guarantee dissipativity for a networked system comprised of dynamically coupled subsystems. We require that the controllers be designed locally at the subsystem-level without explicit knowledge of the dynamics of other subsystems in the network. The contributions of this paper in addressing this problem are as follows.

- **Distributed analysis:** We first decompose a centralized dissipativity analysis condition on the networked dynamical system into conditions on the dissipativity of individual subsystems. Passivity analysis of a networked system comprised of dynamically coupled subsystems has been studied for star-shaped and cyclical symmetries [29][30], as well as more general interconnection topolo-

The authors are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN. {eagarwal,sseethar,vgupta2,pantsakl}@nd.edu.

Funding: E. Agarwal and P. Antsaklis were funded by ARO under grant no. ARL W911NF-17-1-0072. The work of S. Sivaranjani was supported in part by NSF grants CNS-1544724 and ECCS-1550016, and that of V. Gupta by NSF grant CNS-1739295, DARPA grant FA8750-20-2-0502 and ARO grant W911NF1910483.

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

gies [31]-[34]. However, the passivity verification for the networked system is centralized in these approaches, requiring information about the passivity of all subsystems. In contrast, we propose distributed dissipativity analysis conditions at the subsystem-level, whose feasibility is sufficient to guarantee dissipativity of the networked system. The subsystem-level conditions use only the knowledge of the subsystem dynamics and information about the dissipativity of its neighbors. Further, we do not impose any conditions on the network topology or homogeneity of the subsystem dynamics.

- **Distributed synthesis:** Using the distributed dissipativity analysis conditions, we then formulate a distributed procedure to synthesize local controllers at the subsystem-level to guarantee dissipativity of the networked system. The control synthesis is distributed in the sense that subsystems only use information about their dynamics and the dissipativity of the subsystems to which they are dynamically coupled, to design local subsystem-level controllers.
- **Compositionality:** Finally, we propose an approach to design local controllers for networked systems which may be expanded by adding subsystems at a later stage. When a new subsystem is connected to the networked dynamical system, we formulate a control synthesis procedure that is compositional, that is, the design procedure uses only the knowledge of the dynamics of the newly added subsystem, and the dissipativity of its neighboring subsystems in the existing network, to synthesize local control inputs for the new subsystem, such that the new networked system is dissipative. This procedure does not require redesigning the existing controllers in the network when a new subsystem is added.

In addition, we describe how the proposed synthesis approach can be extended to networks of switched systems. Such networks are encountered in several practical applications such as microgrids, where the dynamics and coupling between subsystems change with the availability of renewable generators. Therefore, extending our approach to this setting expands the applicability of our results to a larger class of applications. We illustrate the step-by-step implementation of the proposed distributed synthesis through a numerical example, and provide a case study demonstrating the application of this technique in enabling plug-and-play of generators in microgrids.

In [35], we proposed a preliminary version of this approach to guarantee passivity for a limited class of networked systems with a cascade interconnection topology. In this paper, we consider arbitrary network topologies, as well as a more general quadratic dissipativity framework, which allows us to capture a variety of properties of interest, such as, \mathcal{L}_2 stability, sector-boundedness, conicity, as well as passivity and its variants. We further extend the approach to networks of switched systems, which were not considered in [35].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we describe the model of a networked system comprised of dynamically coupled subsystems. We then define dissipativity and formu-

late the problem of distributed synthesis of local controllers for this system in Section III. In Section IV, we present results on the distributed verification of dissipativity, and distributed synthesis of local controllers to guarantee dissipativity of the networked system. In Section V, we present a step-by-step illustration of the proposed synthesis approach on a numerical example. We then extend these synthesis results to switched systems in Section VI, and demonstrate an application to microgrids in Section VII. The proofs of all the results in this paper are collected in the Appendix.

Notation: We denote the sets of real numbers, positive real numbers including zero, and n -dimensional real vectors by \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^+ and \mathbb{R}^n respectively. Define $\mathbb{N}_N = \{1, \dots, N\}$, where N is a natural number excluding zero. Given a block matrix $A = [A_{i,j}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_n, j \in \mathbb{N}_m}$, $A_{i,j}$ represents the (i, j) -th block, and $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ represents its transpose. Given matrices A_1, \dots, A_i , $\text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_i)$ represents a block-diagonal matrix with A_1, \dots, A_i as its diagonal entries. A symmetric positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is represented as $P > 0$ (and as $P \geq 0$, if it is positive semi-definite). The standard identity matrix is denoted by \mathbf{I} , with dimensions clear from the context. Given sets A and B , $A \setminus B$ represents the set of all elements of A that are not in B .

II. SYSTEM DYNAMICS

Consider a networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N comprised of N subsystems, as shown in Fig. 1, where the dynamics of the i -th subsystem Σ_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ is described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i(t) &= A_i x_i(t) + B_i^{(1)} v_i(t) + B_i^{(2)} w_i(t) + B_i^{(3)} u_i(t), \\ y_i(t) &= C_i x_i(t), \\ v_i(t) &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_N} H_{i,j} x_j(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $y_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$, $v_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{z_i}$, $w_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i}$ and $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ are the state, output, coupling input, exogenous disturbance, and control input respectively.

A subsystem Σ_j , $j \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{i\}$ is said to be dynamically coupled with the subsystem Σ_i if $H_{i,j} \neq 0$. Define the neighbor set for Σ_i to be

$$\mathcal{E}_i = \{j : H_{i,j} \neq 0, j \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{i\}\}.$$

The dynamics of the networked system \mathbf{T}_N is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + B^{(1)}v(t) + B^{(2)}w(t) + B^{(3)}u(t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) \\ v(t) &= Hx(t) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \text{diag}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N) \\ B^{(j)} &= \text{diag}(B_1^{(j)}, B_2^{(j)}, \dots, B_N^{(j)}), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_3, \\ C &= \text{diag}(C_1, C_2, \dots, C_N) \\ H &= [H_{i,j}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}, \end{aligned}$$

and $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^z$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^l$ are the augmented system state, output, coupling input, control input, and disturbance formed by stacking $x_i(t)$,




Fig. 1. Example of a networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N .

$y_i(t)$, $v_i(t)$, $u_i(t)$, and $w_i(t)$ respectively of all N subsystems. The matrix H represents the dynamical coupling in the system, and is referred to as the coupling matrix.

We denote the interconnected system \mathbf{T}_{N+1} obtained by connecting a new subsystem Σ_{N+1} to \mathbf{T}_N by $\mathbf{T}_{N+1} := \mathbf{T}_N | \Sigma_{N+1}$.

III. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

In this section, we formulate the problem of synthesizing local controllers at the subsystem-level in a distributed manner to enforce a quadratic dissipativity property on the interconnected system.

Definition 1: [36] A dynamical system (2) is said to be *QSR-dissipative* from w to y , if there exists a positive definite function $V(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, called the storage function, such that, for all $t > t_0 \geq 0$, $x(t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^l$,

$$\int_{t_0}^t \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix}' \begin{bmatrix} Q & S \\ S' & R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix} d\tau \geq V(x(t)) - V(x(t_0)) \quad (3)$$

holds, where $x(t)$ is the state at time t resulting from the initial condition $x(t_0)$, and Q , S and R are matrices of appropriate dimension.

We consider the objective of enforcing *QSR-dissipativity* on the networked system, as it can be used to capture a wide variety of dynamical properties of interest through appropriate choices of the Q , S and R matrices as follows.

Remark 1: [37] System (2) satisfying Definition 1 is,

- 1) *passive*, if $Q = 0$, $S = \frac{1}{2}I$ and $R = 0$,
- 2) *strictly passive*, if $Q = -\rho I$, $S = \frac{1}{2}I$ and $R = -\nu I$, where $\rho, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}$,
- 3) \mathcal{L}_2 *stable*, if $Q = -\frac{1}{\gamma}I$, $S = 0$ and $R = \gamma I$ where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is an \mathcal{L}_2 gain of the system,
- 4) *conic*, if $Q = -I$, $S = cI$ and $R = (r^2 - c^2)I$, where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}$, and,
- 5) *sector-bounded*, if $Q = -I$, $S = \frac{a+b}{T}$ and $R = -abI$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Note that the *QSR-dissipativity* condition (3) is a special case of an integral quadratic constraint (IQC) on (w, y) , where the multiplier is an identity matrix [38]. Under mild assumptions, the *QSR-dissipativity* property can also be used to guarantee Lyapunov stability [39]. *QSR-dissipativity* of the dynamical system (2) can be analyzed as follows.

Proposition 1 (Centralized dissipativity analysis): [39] A dynamical system (2) is *QSR-dissipative* with $V(x) = x'Px$ if there exists a positive definite matrix $P > 0$ and matrices Q , S and R of appropriate dimensions such that

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} -\hat{A}'P - P\hat{A}' + C'QC & -PB^{(2)} + C'S \\ -B^{(2)'}P + S'C & R \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (4)$$

holds, where $\hat{A} = A + B^{(1)}H$.

The analysis condition in Proposition 1 is centralized in the sense that a solution to (4) requires knowledge of the dynamics and coupling of all subsystems in the networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N . However, for large-scale networks where new subsystems may be added or removed, it is desirable to develop an analysis and control synthesis that can be carried out locally at the subsystem-level with limited knowledge of the dynamics and coupling with neighboring subsystems. In this context, the aim of this paper is to address the following problems:

- 1) **Distributed analysis:** Decompose the analysis condition in Proposition 1 into conditions on the dissipativity of subsystems Σ_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$.
- 2) **Distributed synthesis:** Formulate a procedure to design local control inputs

$$u_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\}} u_{i,j}(t), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \quad (5)$$

$$u_{i,j}(t) = K_{i,j}x_j(t), \quad j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\}, \quad (6)$$

such that \mathbf{T}_N is *QSR-dissipative*, where the synthesis of the controller matrices $K_{i,j}$ only uses the dynamics (1), and information about the dissipativity of its neighboring subsystems Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_i$.

- 3) **Compositionality:** When a new subsystem Σ_{N+1} is connected to the networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N , obtain a control synthesis procedure which is compositional, that is, the design procedure uses only the knowledge of the dynamics of Σ_{N+1} , and the dissipativity of its neighboring subsystems Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1}$, to synthesize local control inputs $u_{j,N+1}(t)$, $j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1}$, and

$$u_{N+1}(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1} \cup \{N+1\}} u_{N+1,j}(t),$$

such that $\mathbf{T}_{N+1} := \mathbf{T}_N | \Sigma_{N+1}$ is *QSR-dissipative*.

IV. DISTRIBUTED SYNTHESIS OF LOCAL CONTROLLERS

In this section, we present a distributed approach to synthesize local (subsystem-level) controllers that guarantee dissipativity of the networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N . In this approach, every subsystem synthesizes a local controller using only the knowledge of its own dynamics, and information about the dissipativity of the subsystems to which it is dynamically coupled. The proofs of all the results in this section are collected in the Appendix.

A. Distributed Analysis

We begin by distributing the dissipativity analysis condition in Proposition 1. We derive a property of positive definite matrices that will be useful in this context.

Lemma 1: A symmetric block matrix

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} W_{1,1} & W_{1,2} & \dots & W_{1,N} \\ W_{2,1} & W_{2,2} & \dots & W_{2,N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ W_{N,1} & W_{N,2} & \dots & W_{N,N} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where $W_{i,j}$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N$ are block matrices of appropriate dimension, is positive definite if and only if

$$M_i > 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \\ M_i = \begin{cases} W_{i,i}, & i = 1 \\ W_{i,i} - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} W_{i,k} M_k^{-1} W_{k,i}, & i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

The condition (8) allows for the verification of the positive definiteness of a matrix to be carried out row-wise. Now, observe that the dissipativity of a networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N can be analyzed by ascertaining the positive definiteness of matrix Γ in (4). We can then use Lemma 1 to decompose (4) into conditions that can be verified at the subsystem-level. We have the following result.

Theorem 1 (Distributed dissipativity analysis): The networked system \mathbf{T}_N (2) is QSR -dissipative from w to y with

$$Q = \text{diag}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N), \quad Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i} \\ S = \text{diag}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N), \quad S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times l_i} \\ R = \text{diag}(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N), \quad R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_i},$$

$i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, if there exist matrices P_i , termed *energy matrices*, such that

$$\mathbb{P}_1 : \text{Find } P_i \\ \text{s.t. } P_i > 0, \mathcal{M}_i > 0, \quad (9) \\ P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$$

is feasible $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, where \mathcal{M}_i is computed in (10).

Remark 2 (Messenger matrix): Theorem 1 provides distributed subsystem-level conditions for the verification of network-level dissipativity. The centralized analysis condition (4) is decomposed into local conditions (9), where each subsystem computes and stores an information matrix called as the *messenger matrix* \mathcal{M}_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$. The messenger matrix for each subsystem Σ_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, is the difference between two terms, (i) μ_i^s , which can be interpreted as the dissipativity of the subsystem, and (ii) μ_i^c , which can be interpreted as the energy flow from its neighbors. The term μ_i^c contains information about the dynamical coupling between the subsystem Σ_i and its neighbors, as well as aggregated information about the dissipativity of its neighboring subsystems through the messenger matrices \mathcal{M}_j , and energy matrices P_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$, which are communicated by neighbors Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$. The positive definiteness of all messenger matrices (which can be verified at the subsystem-level) is sufficient to guarantee the dissipativity of the networked system \mathbf{T}_N .

The analysis in Theorem 1 can be implemented as described in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Distributed Analysis for \mathbf{T}_N

```

1: Initialize  $i = 1$ .
2: while  $i \leq N$ , at subsystem  $\Sigma_i$ , do
3:   if  $i \neq 1$  then
4:     Receive  $\mathcal{M}_j$  and  $P_j$  from  $\Sigma_j$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$ .
5:   end if
6:   if  $\mathbb{P}_1$  is feasible then
7:     Compute  $\mathcal{M}_i > 0$  and  $P_i > 0$  from (10).
8:   else
9:     Return “infeasible”.
10:  Go to Step 13.
11: end if
12:  Set  $i \mapsto i + 1$ .
13: end while

```

Remark 3: We make the following remarks about the computation of the messenger matrix used in Theorem 1.

- (i) The computation of messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_i in (10) requires \mathcal{M}_j^{-1} , $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$. However, in cases where $R_j = 0$, \mathcal{M}_j takes the form $\mathcal{M}_j = \begin{bmatrix} a_{1,j} & a_{2,j} \\ a_{2,j} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Then, \mathcal{M}_i can be computed by replacing the expression for \mathcal{M}_j^{-1} in (10) by $\mathcal{M}_j^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{1,j}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and relaxing

$$\mathcal{M}_i = \begin{cases} \mu_1^s, & i = 1 \\ \mu_i^s - \mu_i^c, & i \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{1\} \end{cases} \quad (10a)$$

$$\hat{H}_{i,j} = P_i B_i^{(1)} H_{i,j}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N, j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\} \quad (10b)$$

$$\mu_i^s = \begin{bmatrix} -(A_i' P_i + P_i A_i) - (\hat{H}_{i,i} + \hat{H}_{i,i}') + C_i' Q_i C_i & -P_i B_i^{(2)} + C_i' S_i \\ -B_i^{(2)'} P_i + S_i' C_i & R_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N \quad (10c)$$

$$\mu_i^c = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_{j,i}' + \hat{H}_{i,j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} (\mathcal{M}_j)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_{j,i}' + \hat{H}_{i,j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}', \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{1\}. \quad (10d)$$

the condition $\mathcal{M}_j > 0$ to $\mathcal{M}_j \geq 0$ in \mathbb{P}_1 . Note that this holds for all the results to follow, which will involve computation of messenger matrix.

- (ii) If the dynamics of subsystem Σ_i includes a feedthrough term $D_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times l_i}$ such that $y_i(t) = C_i x_i(t) + D_i w_i(t)$, then the computation of the messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_i in (10) can be modified as follows. The term R_i in (10)-(c) is modified to $R_i \mapsto \hat{R}_i$, where $\hat{R}_i = -D_i' Q_i D_i - (D_i' S_i + S_i' D_i)$.

Remark 4: In the i -th iteration of Algorithm 1 (Steps 3-11), the dissipativity of the network \mathbf{T}_i formed by the interconnection of subsystems $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_i$ is verified. Therefore, the messenger matrices \mathcal{M}_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ will vary with the choice of numbering assigned to subsystems in the network, and the distributed analysis conditions in Theorem 1 are only sufficient to guarantee dissipativity of the networked system \mathbf{T}_N .

Remark 5 (Robustness to modeling uncertainties): In practice, the system matrices A_i , B_i , and C_i are known upto a certain level of modeling uncertainty. Since the proposed distributed analysis conditions only require the messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_i to be positive definite, it is possible to include a non-zero lower bound on \mathcal{M}_i which will account for uncertainties in the system model. For example, assume A_i has an additive uncertainty ΔA_i , that is, $A_i \mapsto A_i + \Delta A_i$. Then, the robustness margin for \mathcal{M}_i can be derived as follows. The term μ_i^s in (10)-(c) is updated to $\hat{\mu}_i^s$, where $\hat{\mu}_i^s = \mu_i^s + \left[\begin{array}{c|c} -(\Delta A_i' P_i + P_i \Delta A_i) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]$. The messenger matrix in Theorem 1 is now updated to

$$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_i = \mathcal{M}_i + \left[\begin{array}{c|c} -(\Delta A_i' P_i + P_i \Delta A_i) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right],$$

and the verification condition $\mathcal{M}_i > 0$ to $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_i > 0$, or

$$\mathcal{M}_i > \left[\begin{array}{c|c} (\Delta A_i' P_i + P_i \Delta A_i) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]. \quad (11)$$

If ΔA_i is norm bounded, that is, $\|\Delta A_i\| < \epsilon_i$ then updating the verification condition $\mathcal{M}_i > 0$ in Theorem 1 to $\mathcal{M}_i > \mathcal{M}_i^{\text{bound}} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} 2\epsilon_i P_i & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]$ will ensure (11), and hence the robustness of the proposed distributed analysis conditions to the additive uncertainty. The derivation of $\mathcal{M}_i^{\text{bound}}$ for other classes of uncertainties like multiplicative or parametric

uncertainties will require extending the proposed framework to a general integral quadratic constraint (IQC) setup [38], and is a subject of future work.

B. Distributed Synthesis

Theorem 1 provides sufficient conditions at the subsystem-level to guarantee dissipativity of the networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N . If the dissipativity conditions in Theorem 1 are not met, we would like to synthesize local controllers at the subsystem-level to guarantee dissipativity of the networked system. Further, we require that the control synthesis be carried out at the subsystem-level, using only the dynamics of the subsystem and the messenger matrices communicated from its neighbors. We have the following result on distributed synthesis.

Theorem 2: The local control inputs

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(t) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\}} u_{i,j}(t), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \\ u_{i,j}(t) &= K_{i,j} x_j(t), \quad j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

designed by solving

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_2 : \text{Find} \quad & P_i, K_{i,i}, K_{i,j}, K_{j,i}, \quad j \in \mathcal{E}_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & P_i > 0, \\ & \mathcal{M}_i > 0, \\ & P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}, \\ & K_{i,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times n_i}, \\ & K_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times n_j}, K_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_j \times n_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, where \mathcal{M}_i is the closed-loop messenger matrix of Σ_i computed from (14), render \mathbf{T}_N QSR-dissipative with

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \text{diag}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N), \quad Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i} \\ S &= \text{diag}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N), \quad S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times l_i} \\ R &= \text{diag}(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N), \quad R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_i}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N. \end{aligned}$$

The synthesis in Theorem 2 can be carried out as described in Algorithm 2.

$$\mathcal{M}_i = \begin{cases} \mu_i^s, & i = 1 \\ \mu_i^s - \mu_i^c, & i \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{1\} \end{cases} \quad (14a)$$

$$\hat{H}_{i,j} = P_i (B_i^{(1)} H_{i,j} + B_i^{(3)} K_{i,j}), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N, j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\} \quad (14b)$$

$$\mu_i^s = \begin{bmatrix} -(A_i' P_i + P_i A_i) - (\hat{H}_{i,i} + \hat{H}_{i,i}') + C_i' Q_i C_i & -P_i B_i^{(2)} + C_i' S_i \\ -B_i^{(2)'} P_i + S_i' C_i & R_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N \quad (14c)$$

$$\mu_i^c = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_{j,i}' + \hat{H}_{i,j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} (\mathcal{M}_j)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_{j,i}' + \hat{H}_{i,j} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}', \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{1\}. \quad (14d)$$

Algorithm 2 Distributed Synthesis for \mathbf{T}_N

- 1: Initialize $i = 1$.
 - 2: **while** $i \leq N$, at subsystem Σ_i , **do**
 - 3: **if** $i \neq 1$ **then**
 - 4: Receive \mathcal{M}_j and P_j from Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$.
 - 5: **end if**
 - 6: **if** \mathbb{P}_1 is feasible **then**
 - 7: Compute $\mathcal{M}_i > 0$ from (10).
 - 8: Set $K_{i,i} = K_{i,j} = K_{j,i} = 0$, $\forall j \in \mathcal{E}_i$.
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Control design: Solve \mathbb{P}_2 to compute $K_{i,i}$, $K_{i,j}$, $K_{j,i}$, $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{M}_i > 0$, $P_i > 0$ from (14).
 - 11: **end if**
 - 12: Send $K_{j,i}$ to Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$.
 - 13: Set $i \mapsto i + 1$.
 - 14: **end while**
-

At the i -th iteration of Algorithm 2 (Steps 3-12), two types of controller matrices are designed at subsystem Σ_i to guarantee the dissipativity of the subnetwork \mathbf{T}_i formed by the interconnection of subsystems $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_i$ - (i) self controller matrix $K_{i,i}$, and (ii) coupling controller matrices $K_{i,j}$ and $K_{j,i}$, $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$, corresponding to the bidirectional interconnections with its neighbors in \mathbf{T}_i . Note that the existing controllers in the subnetwork \mathbf{T}_{i-1} are not redesigned at the i -th iteration, since the control synthesis at Σ_i is carried out to ensure the dissipativity of $\mathbf{T}_i = \mathbf{T}_{i-1} | \Sigma_i$.

Remark 6: The energy flow between subsystems, $\mu_i^c, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ in (14), need not be small; therefore, the controller does not require or enforce weak coupling between subsystems.

The control synthesis equations in \mathbb{P}_2 are bilinear; however, they can readily be expressed as linear matrix inequalities using a Schur's complement method [40, Section 4.6]. We also note that akin to any distributed approach, our synthesis yields more conservative controllers than those obtained by a centralized synthesis.

Remark 7 (Feasibility of distributed synthesis and local performance): Theorem 2 relies on the distributed verification of dissipativity presented in Theorem 1 to locally design linear subsystem-level controllers that guarantee the dissipativity of the networked system. While the underlying verification problem relies on the sufficient-only conditions in Theorem 1 that may not always be feasible, the only consideration for the feasibility of the synthesis problem in Theorem 2 is the existence of a controller that ensures the positive-definiteness of the messenger matrix in (14). If all the subsystems in the network are minimum phase and $R_i \geq 0$ (or $\bar{R}_i \geq 0$ for systems with feedthrough terms, where \bar{R}_i is defined in Remark 3), then the linear feedback control design problem in Algorithm 2 is *always* feasible, irrespective of the sequence (numbering) of subsystems used to solve the synthesis problem. However, since (14) is an LMI that can have multiple solutions, a secondary control objective may be used to choose a controller for a specific application. In this context, it is also possible to incorporate subsystem-level performance objectives in the distributed control synthesis




Fig. 2. Schematic of compositional control design for $\mathbf{T}_{N+1} = \mathbf{T}_N |_{\Sigma_{N+1}}$ when a new subsystem Σ_{N+1} is connected to \mathbf{T}_N .

problem while providing global dissipativity guarantees, since the addition of local optimization objectives at the subsystem-level does not affect the feasibility of the synthesis. However, the addition of control constraints may affect the feasibility of the synthesis problem by restricting the space of controllers for which the positive-definiteness of the messenger matrix can be guaranteed.

C. Compositional Analysis and Control Synthesis

In large-scale networks, new subsystems may be connected to the existing network at a later time. In such scenarios, it is desirable to guarantee dissipativity of the updated network *compositionally*, that is, without redesigning pre-existing controllers. In this subsection, we extend the synthesis in Theorem 2 to design local controllers for the newly added subsystem, using only limited information from its neighbors to guarantee dissipativity of the new networked system.

Corollary 1: Given a QSR -dissipative system \mathbf{T}_N with energy matrices P_i and messenger matrices \mathcal{M}_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ satisfying (9) and (10), or (13) and (14), and a new subsystem Σ_{N+1} , the new networked system $\mathbf{T}_{N+1} := \mathbf{T}_N |_{\Sigma_{N+1}}$ is QSR -dissipative with new

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\mapsto \text{diag}(Q, Q_{N+1}), & Q_{N+1} &\in \mathbb{R}^{m_{N+1} \times m_{N+1}} \\ S &\mapsto \text{diag}(S, S_{N+1}), & S_{N+1} &\in \mathbb{R}^{m_{N+1} \times l_{N+1}} \\ R &\mapsto \text{diag}(R, R_{N+1}), & R_{N+1} &\in \mathbb{R}^{l_{N+1} \times l_{N+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

if there exist local control inputs

$$\begin{aligned} u_{N+1}(t) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1} \cup \{N+1\}} u_{N+1,j}(t), \\ u_{N+1,j}(t) &= K_{N+1,j} x_j(t), \\ u_j(t) &\rightarrow u_j(t) + u_{j,N+1}(t), \\ u_{j,N+1}(t) &= K_{j,N+1} x_{N+1}(t), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1} \cup \{N+1\}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_3 : \text{Find } & P_{N+1}, K_{N+1,j}, K_{j,N+1}, K_{N+1,N+1} \quad j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1} \\ \text{s.t. } & P_{N+1} > 0, \\ & \mathcal{M}_{N+1} > 0, \\ & P_{N+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{N+1} \times n_{N+1}} \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

is feasible, where \mathcal{M}_{N+1} is computed in (17).

Corollary 1 can be implemented algorithmically according to Algorithm 3.

$$\mathcal{M}_{N+1} = \mu_{N+1}^s - \mu_{N+1}^c \quad (17a)$$

$$\hat{H}_{N+1,j} = P_{N+1}(B_{N+1}^{(1)}H_{N+1,j} + B_i^{(3)}K_{N+1,j}), \quad j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1} \cup \{N+1\} \quad (17b)$$

$$\mu_{N+1}^s = \begin{bmatrix} -(A'_{N+1}P_{N+1} + P_{N+1}A_{N+1}) - (\hat{H}_{N+1,N+1} + \hat{H}'_{N+1,N+1}) + C'_{N+1}Q_{N+1}C_{N+1} & -P_{N+1}B_{N+1}^{(2)} + C'_{N+1}S_{N+1} \\ -B_{N+1}^{(2)'}P_{N+1} + S'_{N+1}C_{N+1} & R_{N+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (17c)$$

$$\mu_{N+1}^c = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1}} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}'_{j,N+1} + \hat{H}_{N+1,j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} (\mathcal{M}_j)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}'_{j,N+1} + \hat{H}_{N+1,j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}' \quad (17d)$$

In [18], a similar dissipativity-based approach is used to derive LMIs for the synthesis of distributed controllers, wherein the coupling of the LMIs (and, thereby, the underlying controllers) follows the same structure as the interconnection graph of the network. These LMIs can be distributed numerically and solved iteratively at each subsystem using the method of alternating projections or subgradient methods [41][42]. In contrast, the synthesis LMIs in (14) are distributed and are solved only once at each subsystem. Furthermore, we pose our synthesis as a sequential procedure, which allows for compositional synthesis for networks that may be expanded by adding new subsystems, as described in Section IV-C. When a new subsystem is added, the control synthesis problem \mathbb{P}_3 is only solved at the new subsystem, and is independent of the size of the existing networked system.

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In this section, we present a numerical example to illustrate the distributed synthesis of local controllers for networked dynamical systems, and demonstrate the compositionality of the approach when new subsystems are added to the existing network. We begin by considering a networked system \mathbf{T}_3 , comprised of three subsystems with dynamics and coupling given by

$$\Sigma_1 : \dot{x}_1(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -9 & 1 \\ 5 & 7 \end{bmatrix} x_1(t) + v_1(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0.5 \end{bmatrix} w_1(t) + u_1(t) \quad (18)$$

$$y_1(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \end{bmatrix} x_1(t) \quad (18)$$

$$v_1(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & -0.7 \end{bmatrix} x_1(t) + 0.1x_2(t) \quad (19)$$

$$\Sigma_2 : \dot{x}_2(t) = 3x_2(t) + v_2(t) + w_2(t) + u_2(t) \quad (20)$$

$$y_2(t) = x_2(t) \quad (20)$$

$$v_2(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix} x_1(t) + 0.5x_2(t) - 0.1x_3(t).$$

$$\Sigma_3 : \dot{x}_3(t) = -x_3(t) + v_3(t) + w_3(t) + u_3(t) \quad (21)$$

$$y_3(t) = x_3(t) \quad (21)$$

$$v_3(t) = -0.7x_2(t) + 0.2x_3(t).$$

The objective is to guarantee passivity of the networked system according to the definition in Remark 1-(1).

We begin by checking if Σ_1 is passive using Algorithm 2, and compute controller matrix $K_{1,1}$ to guarantee passivity of Σ_1 . We also compute the closed loop messenger and energy matrices \mathcal{M}_1 and P_1 respectively of Σ_1 . We then use \mathcal{M}_1 and P_1 communicated from Σ_1 , and the dynamics of Σ_2 to verify the sufficient conditions in Theorem 1 for the network comprised of Σ_1 and Σ_2 . Since the sufficient conditions are not satisfied, we use the procedure in Algorithm 2 to synthesize controller matrices $K_{2,2}$, $K_{2,1}$ and $K_{1,2}$ at Σ_2 to guarantee passivity of the interconnection of Σ_1 and Σ_2 . Additionally, we compute messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_2 and energy matrix P_2 at Σ_2 . Next, we use the dynamics of the subsystem Σ_3 , and \mathcal{M}_2 and P_2 communicated from Σ_2 to Σ_3 in Algorithm 2. Since \mathbb{P}_1 is feasible (Step 6 in Algorithm 2), the networked system \mathbf{T}_3 comprised of the interconnection of Σ_3 with Σ_1 and Σ_2 is passive, and no controller design is required at Σ_3 .

The controller matrices $K_{3,3}$, $K_{2,3}$ and $K_{3,2}$ are set to zero, and messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_3 and energy matrix P_3 are computed and stored at Σ_3 . The networked system \mathbf{T}_3 with its control architecture is shown in Fig. 3, and the controller matrices are as shown in Fig. 5.

Algorithm 3 Compositional Synthesis for $\mathbf{T}_{N+1} = \mathbf{T}_N | \Sigma_{N+1}$

Given : \mathbf{T}_N , Σ_{N+1} , \mathcal{E}_{N+1} , $\mathbf{T}_{N+1} = \mathbf{T}_N | \Sigma_{N+1}$, \mathcal{M}_i and P_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$

At subsystem Σ_{N+1} :

- 1: Receive \mathcal{M}_j and P_j from Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1}$.
- 2: **if** \mathbb{P}_1 is feasible for $i = N+1$ **then**
- 3: Compute $\mathcal{M}_{N+1} > 0$ from (10).
- 4: Set $K_{N+1,N+1} = K_{N+1,j} = K_{j,N+1} = 0$, $j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1}$.
- 5: **else**
- 6: *Control design:* Solve \mathbb{P}_3 to compute $K_{N+1,N+1}$, $K_{N+1,j}$, $K_{j,N+1}$, $j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1}$, and $\mathcal{M}_{N+1} > 0$, $P_{N+1} > 0$ from (17).
- 7: **end if**
- 8: Send $K_{j,N+1}$ to Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_{N+1}$.




Fig. 3. Schematic of the networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_3 with control architecture.

Now consider the networked system $\mathbf{T}_4 = \mathbf{T}_3|\Sigma_4$ formed by adding a new subsystem Σ_4 to \mathbf{T}_3 as shown in Fig. 4(a), where Σ_4 is dynamically coupled to Σ_1 and Σ_2 . The dynamics of Σ_4 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_4 : \dot{x}_4(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 3 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix} x_4(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 1.2 \\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix} v_1(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ -0.2 \end{bmatrix} w_4(t) \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} 1.2 \\ 0.8 \end{bmatrix} u_4(t) \\ y_4(t) &= [2.1 \quad 0.6] x_4(t) \\ v_4(t) &= [-0.9 \quad -0.3] x_1(t) - 0.9x_2(t) + [1.1 \quad 0.4] x_4(t). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Additionally, the coupling inputs $v_1(t)$ and $v_2(t)$ are updated to,

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(t) &= [0.5 \quad -0.7] x_1(t) + 0.1x_2(t) + [0.2 \quad 0.2] x_4(t), \\ v_2(t) &= [1 \quad -0.5] x_1(t) + 0.5x_2(t) - 0.1x_3(t) + [0.2 \quad 0.2] x_4(t). \end{aligned}$$

At subsystem Σ_4 , we use matrices \mathcal{M}_1 , P_1 , \mathcal{M}_2 and P_2 received from Σ_1 and Σ_2 (its neighboring subsystems) in the compositional synthesis procedure described in Algorithm 3 to design controller matrices $K_{4,4}$, $K_{1,4}$, $K_{4,1}$, $K_{4,2}$ and $K_{2,4}$ that guarantee passivity of the networked system $\mathbf{T}_4 = \mathbf{T}_3|\Sigma_4$. The compositional control synthesis procedure is illustrated in Fig. 4. The distributed synthesis algorithm allows for dynamics of subsystems to be dissimilar and of different dimensions, as long as the network is ‘proper’, that is, the input-output dimensions are suitable to define the interconnections between subsystems.

We would like to highlight the fact that the proposed algorithm distributes the analysis and control synthesis between subsystems *sequentially*. As described in Remark 7, Algorithm 2 is generally always feasible (with only one exception). In the next part of this example, we demonstrate the feasibility of the control synthesis by reapplying the distributed synthesis approach to the same network, but solving the synthesis problem in Algorithm 2 in two different sequences as shown in Fig. 6 and Fig. 8.




Fig. 4. (a) Schematic of compositional control design for $\mathbf{T}_4 = \mathbf{T}_3|\Sigma_4$ when a new subsystem Σ_4 is connected to \mathbf{T}_3 . (b) Networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_4 with control architecture.

$K_{1,1} = [1.79 \quad -11.63]$	$K_{2,1} = [-2.83 \quad 22.6] \times 10^{-4}$
$K_{1,2} = 0$	$K_{2,2} = [-4.95]$
$K_{1,4} = [0.06 \quad 0]$	$K_{2,3} = 0$
	$K_{2,4} = [0.06 \quad 0]$
$K_{3,2} = 0$	$K_{4,1} = [0.81 \quad 0.19]$
$K_{3,3} = 0$	$K_{4,2} = [0.87]$
	$K_{4,4} = [-4.18 \quad -2.06]$

Fig. 5. Controller matrices for networked system \mathbf{T}_4 with solution sequence {1-2-3-4}.

1) *Solution sequence {3-2-1-4}*: Consider the set-up shown in Fig. 6. As opposed to the discussion so far in this example, where the distributed synthesis Algorithm 2 solves \mathbb{P}_1 (and \mathbb{P}_2) for Σ_1 first, followed by Σ_2 , Σ_3 , and Σ_4 , in that order, we now begin by analyzing Σ_3 first, followed by Σ_2 , Σ_1 , and Σ_4 , in that order. The design steps are summarized below:

- We use the sufficient conditions in Theorem 1 to verify that Σ_3 is passive. Therefore, no controller design is required at Σ_3 , and we set $K_{3,3} = 0$. We also compute and store the messenger and energy matrices \mathcal{M}_3 and P_3 respectively of Σ_3 .
- We then consider the network \mathbf{T}_2 , comprised of the interconnection of Σ_3 and Σ_2 , as shown in Fig. 6-(b). We use the messenger and energy matrices \mathcal{M}_3 and P_3 respectively, communicated from Σ_3 , along with the dynamics of Σ_2 in Algorithm 2 to verify the passivity of this network. Since the passivity conditions for \mathbf{T}_2 are not met, we use Step 10 of Algorithm 2 to synthesize controller matrices $K_{2,2}$, $K_{2,3}$, and $K_{3,2}$ at Σ_2 to guarantee passivity of interconnection of Σ_3 and Σ_2 . In this case, the controller matrices $K_{2,3}$, and $K_{3,2}$ turn out to be zero. We also compute messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_2 and energy matrix P_2 at Σ_2 .




Fig. 6. Schematic of distributed control synthesis for networked system \mathbf{T}_4 with solution sequence $\{3-2-1-4\}$.

- (c) Next, we consider the network $\mathbf{T}_3 = \mathbf{T}_2|\Sigma_1$, as shown in Fig. 6-(c). We use the dynamics of the subsystem Σ_1 , and \mathcal{M}_2 and P_2 communicated from Σ_2 to Σ_1 in Algorithm 2 to verify that the network \mathbf{T}_3 is not passive, that is, problem \mathbb{P}_1 is infeasible. Therefore, we solve \mathbb{P}_2 to design controller matrices $K_{1,1}$, $K_{1,2}$, and $K_{2,1}$ at Σ_1 to guarantee passivity of the networked system \mathbf{T}_3 comprised of the interconnection of Σ_3 , Σ_1 and Σ_2 . We also compute messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_1 and energy matrix P_1 at Σ_1 .
- (d) Lastly, we apply Algorithm 2 to subsystem Σ_4 . The dynamics of the subsystem Σ_4 , and messenger matrices \mathcal{M}_1

$K_{1,1} = [2.16 \quad -11.13]$	$K_{2,1} = [-1.38 \quad 0]$
$K_{1,2} = 0.0259$	$K_{2,2} = [-7.27]$
$K_{1,4} = [0.06 \quad 0]$	$K_{2,3} = 0$
	$K_{2,4} = [0.06 \quad 0]$
$K_{3,2} = 0$	$K_{4,1} = [0.81 \quad 0.18]$
$K_{3,3} = 0$	$K_{4,2} = [0.87]$
	$K_{4,4} = [-4.15 \quad -2.04]$

Fig. 7. Controller matrices for networked system \mathbf{T}_4 with solution sequence $\{3-2-1-4\}$.

and \mathcal{M}_2 , and energy matrices P_1 and P_2 , communicated to Σ_4 from its neighboring subsystems Σ_1 and Σ_2 , are used in \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_2 to solve for the controller gains $K_{4,4}$, $K_{4,1}$, $K_{4,2}$, $K_{1,4}$, and $K_{2,4}$. The closed loop system \mathbf{T}_4 is guaranteed to be passive.

The designed controller matrices are shown in Fig. 7. Note that although the distributed synthesis algorithm was applied in the sequence $\{3-2-1-4\}$, the synthesis problem is feasible, and the designed local controllers look very similar to the ones designed when the synthesis algorithm was solved in the sequence $\{1-2-3-4\}$.

2) *Solution sequence $\{3-4-1-2\}$* : A more interesting scenario is represented in Fig. 8, where the sequence in which Algorithm 8 is applied starts from Σ_3 , and moves on to Σ_4 in the next step, to guarantee passivity of the network \mathbf{T}_2 comprised of Σ_3 and Σ_4 . Since the two subsystems, Σ_3 and Σ_4 , have no direct coupling, \mathbf{T}_2 is not fully connected.

However, the results presented in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 do not impose any restrictions on the topology of the network and can be applied regardless of the connectivity of the graph. Therefore, when the distributed synthesis algorithm is applied to Σ_4 here, it uses the dynamics of Σ_4 in \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_2 to compute controller gain $K_{4,4}$, and messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_4 and energy matrix P_4 . The messenger and energy matrices of Σ_3 are *not* communicated to Σ_4 because Σ_3 and Σ_4 are not coupled. In the next step, \mathcal{M}_4 and P_4 are communicated to Σ_1 from Σ_4 and Algorithm 2 is applied to Σ_1 . Note that at this stage, the network \mathbf{T}_3 comprised of Σ_1 , Σ_3 , and Σ_4 is still not fully connected. However, the proposed distributed synthesis approach still works to guarantee the passivity of the network \mathbf{T}_3 until this point. Similarly, Σ_2 is added to the network and Algorithm 2 is applied to Σ_2 , using its dynamics, and the messenger and energy matrices, \mathcal{M}_1 , \mathcal{M}_3 , \mathcal{M}_4 , \mathcal{P}_1 , \mathcal{P}_3 and \mathcal{P}_4 , received from its neighbors Σ_1 , Σ_3 and Σ_4 , to guarantee passivity of the networked system \mathbf{T}_4 . The steps involved in the synthesis are illustrated in Fig. 8, and the designed controller matrices are shown in Fig. 9.

Remark 8: Note that the controller gains designed at Σ_2 using this solution sequence are quite different from the ones designed in Fig. 5 and Fig. 7. This difference can be interpreted in the context of Remark 2 as follows. For the solution sequence $\{1-2-3-4\}$, when the control design process is




Fig. 8. Schematic of distributed control synthesis for networked system \mathbf{T}_4 with solution sequence $\{3-4-1-2\}$.

$K_{1,1} = [2.17 \quad -11.12]$	$K_{2,1} = [7.59 \quad 9.99] \times 10^5$
$K_{1,2} = -2.51 \times 10^5$	$K_{2,2} = [-4.99] \times 10^5$
$K_{1,4} = [0.45 \quad 0.29]$	$K_{2,3} = -9.99 \times 10^5$
	$K_{2,4} = [-9.99 \quad -7.58] \times 10^5$
$K_{3,2} = 9.99 \times 10^5$	$K_{4,1} = [0.67 \quad 0]$
$K_{3,3} = 0$	$K_{4,2} = [1.16] \times 10^5$
	$K_{4,4} = [-4.33 \quad -2.18]$

Fig. 9. Controller matrices for networked system \mathbf{T}_4 with solution sequence $\{3-4-1-2\}$.

carried out at Σ_2 , the term μ_2^c in the messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_2 corresponding to the energy flow from its neighbors only comprises of the energy flow from subsystem Σ_1 . Similarly, for the solution sequence $\{3-2-1-4\}$, the messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_2 only contains the energy flow from the neighbor Σ_3 . However, when the control synthesis algorithm is solved in the sequence $\{3-4-1-2\}$, the subsystem Σ_2 is added in the last step of the procedure, and the term μ_2^c in the messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_2 comprises of energy flows from all its neighboring subsystems, Σ_1 , Σ_2 , and Σ_3 . This results in large gains for the controllers designed at Σ_2 to ensure the positive definiteness of the messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_2 . This example highlights the trade-off involved in the proposed distributed synthesis, introduced by the sequential nature of the synthesis algorithm. In achieving distributed synthesis, Algorithm 2 introduces some conservatism, where local controllers may be designed at an intermediate step of the synthesis procedure, even if the networked system as a whole is dissipative. Intuitively, the design of redundant or unnecessary controllers will decrease with the number of subsystems into which the networked system is divided, with a purely centralized synthesis being the least conservative in this regard. However, we note that it is precisely this sequential nature of the synthesis that allows compositionality for networks that may be expanded by adding new subsystems, as described in Section IV-C.

VI. EXTENSION TO SWITCHED SYSTEMS

In many emerging applications of large-scale networked systems in infrastructure networks, the subsystem dynamics, and even the coupling matrices between subsystems can change during operation. For example, in power grids comprised of interconnected microgrids, both the dynamics of individual microgrids and the coupling between microgrids change when a new microgrid is connected to the network, and with changes in the operating point [43]. In order to synthesize local controllers in a distributed manner and guarantee compositionality for such applications, we extend the distributed synthesis presented in Section IV to networks of switched systems, where subsystem dynamics is time-varying.

Consider a networked system \mathbf{T}_N^σ comprised of N subsystems, where the dynamics of the i -th subsystem Σ_i is switching and is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_i(t) &= A_i^{\sigma_i(t)} x_i(t) + B_i^{(1)\sigma_i(t)} v_i(t) + B_i^{(2)\sigma_i(t)} w_i(t) \\
&\quad + B_i^{(3)\sigma_i(t)} u_i(t), \\
y_i(t) &= C_i^{\sigma_i(t)} x_i(t), \\
v_i(t) &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_N} H_{i,j} x_j(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $x_i(t)$, $y_i(t)$, $v_i(t)$, $u_i(t)$, and $w_i(t)$ are as described in Section III. The system matrices $A_i^{\sigma_i(t)}$, $B_i^{(1)\sigma_i(t)}$, $B_i^{(2)\sigma_i(t)}$, $B_i^{(3)\sigma_i(t)}$, and $C_i^{\sigma_i(t)}$ vary based on the value of the switching signal $\sigma_i(t) : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\eta_i}$, where η_i is the number of switching modes of Σ_i . Note that we do not place any restrictions on the sequence in which the dynamics of Σ_i switches, and do not require the switching sequence to be known a priori.

Now, the dynamics of \mathbf{T}_N^σ is described by

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}(t) &= A^{\sigma(t)} x(t) + B^{(1)\sigma(t)} v(t) + B^{(2)\sigma(t)} w(t) \\
&\quad + B^{(3)\sigma(t)} u(t) \\
y(t) &= C^{\sigma(t)} x(t) \\
v(t) &= Hx(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A^{\sigma(t)} &= \text{diag}(A_1^{\sigma_1(t)}, A_2^{\sigma_2(t)}, \dots, A_N^{\sigma_N(t)}) \\
B^{(j)\sigma(t)} &= \text{diag}(B_1^{(j)\sigma_1(t)}, B_2^{(j)\sigma_2(t)}, \dots, B_N^{(j)\sigma_N(t)}), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_3 \\
C^{\sigma(t)} &= \text{diag}(C_1^{\sigma_1(t)}, C_2^{\sigma_2(t)}, \dots, C_N^{\sigma_N(t)}) \\
H &= [H_{i,j}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}
\end{aligned}$$

and $x(t)$, $y(t)$, $v(t)$, $u(t)$, $w(t)$ and $\sigma(t)$ are the augmented system state, output, coupling input, control input, disturbance and switching signal formed by stacking $x_i(t)$, $y_i(t)$, $v_i(t)$, $u_i(t)$, $w_i(t)$ and $\sigma_i(t)$ respectively of all N subsystems.

As described in [44], the classical form of dissipativity in Definition 1 holds for switched system (24) as well. Along the lines of Section IV, we have the following result on distributed synthesis of local controllers to guarantee dissipativity of the networked switched system \mathbf{T}_N^σ .

Theorem 3: The local control inputs

$$\begin{aligned}
u_i(t) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\}} u_{i,j}(t), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \\
u_{i,j}(t) &= K_{i,j} x_j(t), \quad j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\},
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

designed by solving

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_4 : \text{Find} \quad & P_i, K_{i,i}, K_{i,j}, K_{j,i}, j \in \mathcal{E}_i \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & P_i > 0, \\
& \overline{\mathcal{M}}_i > 0, \\
& P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}, \\
& K_{i,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times n_i}, \\
& K_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times n_j}, K_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_j \times n_i},
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ and all $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{N}_{\eta_i}$, $\sigma_j \in \mathbb{N}_{\eta_j}$, $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$, where $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i$ is computed from (27), render \mathbf{T}_N^σ (24) QSR -dissipative with

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &= \text{diag}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N), \quad Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i} \\
S &= \text{diag}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N), \quad S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times l_i} \\
R &= \text{diag}(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N), \quad R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_i}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N.
\end{aligned}$$

The closed-loop messenger matrix of Σ_i is then given by $\mathcal{M}_i = \arg \min_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} \|\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i\|$.

The messenger matrix \mathcal{M}_i in the distributed synthesis result of Theorem 3 corresponds to the least dissipative mode of Σ_i . This allows for a reduction in the computational complexity of the control synthesis arising from a possibly large number of switching modes in the networked system. If the coupling matrix H is also switching, then the maximum value of the coupling term μ_{i,σ_i}^c in (27d) over all possible switching sequences of Σ_j , $j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$ can be used in (27a).

Remark 9: Note that Theorem 3 is based on using the same energy matrix P_i for all switching modes of Σ_i in (23). We can allow different energy matrices in different switching modes of the subsystem for specific switching signals that are known a priori. However, it can be shown that a dissipative switched system under arbitrary switching can not have different energy matrices in different switching modes (see Appendix for details).

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i = \begin{cases} \mu_1^s, & i = 1 \\ \mu_i^s - \mu_i^c, & i \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{1\} \end{cases} \tag{27a}$$

$$\hat{H}_{i,j}^{\sigma_i} = P_i (B_i^{(1)\sigma_i} H_{i,j} + B_i^{(3)\sigma_i} K_{i,j}), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N, j \in \mathcal{E}_i \tag{27b}$$

$$\mu_i^s = \begin{bmatrix} -(A_i^{\sigma_i'} P_i + P_i A_i^{\sigma_i'}) - (\hat{H}_{i,i}^{\sigma_i} + \hat{H}_{i,i}^{\sigma_i'}) + C_i^{\sigma_i'} Q_i C_i^{\sigma_i} & -P_i B_i^{(2)\sigma_i} + C_i^{\sigma_i'} S_i \\ -B_i^{(2)\sigma_i'} P_i + S_i' C_i^{\sigma_i} & R_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N \tag{27c}$$

$$\mu_i^c = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_{j,i}^{\sigma_j'} + \hat{H}_{i,j}^{\sigma_i} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} (\mathcal{M}_j)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_{j,i}^{\sigma_j'} + \hat{H}_{i,j}^{\sigma_i} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}', \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N \setminus \{1\} \tag{27d}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_i = \arg \min_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} \|\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i\|, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_N \tag{27e}$$

The compositionality results, as well as the verification and synthesis algorithms in Section IV can similarly be extended to networks of switched systems.

Remark 10 (Extension to nonlinear systems): In [43], it was shown that the passivity of a nonlinear switched system in a neighborhood around any operating point can be inferred from that of its linear approximation. These results were further extended in [45] to guarantee the dissipativity of a network of nonlinear switched systems through controllers designed in a centralized manner, using the network formed by linear approximations of the nonlinear switched systems. It is easy to see that similar linear approximation arguments can be used to extend the distributed synthesis procedure proposed in this paper to guarantee dissipativity of a networked system comprised of nonlinear subsystems. Additionally, recently developed notions of equilibrium-independent dissipativity (passivity) [46][47] can be explored in the context of guaranteeing dissipativity around non-trivial operating points.

VII. CASE STUDY: MICROGRID NETWORK

In this section, we consider the problem of compositional synthesis of local controllers for power networks with large-scale integration of renewables. In such networks, several small distributed generation units (DGUs) and loads are aggregated in clusters known as microgrids. In microgrids, since renewable inputs like wind speed and solar intensity vary continuously, and DGUs either participate or do not participate in the network depending on availability and requirement, switching dynamics are inherent [43]. Therefore, it is necessary to synthesize local controllers for DGUs in a compositional manner, such that the stability of the microgrid is maintained when new DGUs connect to the grid, without requiring redesign of existing DGU controllers. In this section, we demonstrate the application of our distributed synthesis framework to enable this ‘plug-and-play’ operation of DGUs in a microgrid.

We consider a microgrid network with three DGUs as shown in Fig. 10. Each DGU is modeled as a voltage source with internal voltage V_{ti} , connected to an RLC-circuit with resistance, inductance and capacitance given by $X_{R,ti}$, $X_{L,ti}$ and $X_{C,ti}$

respectively. The internal voltage at the DGU is stepped up by a transformer with turn ratio k_i to obtain a terminal voltage V_i . The line connecting the i -th and j -th DGUs is assumed to have an impedance $Z_{ij} = X_{R,ij} + \sqrt{-1}\omega_0 X_{L,ij}$, where $X_{R,ij}$ and $X_{L,ij}$ are the resistance and inductance of the line respectively, and ω_0 is the base frequency of the network.

The dynamics of the microgrid can be modeled as a networked switched system, with system matrices given by (28). The system parameters are provided in Table I [48, Appendix C]. As shown in Fig. 10, DGU-3 can either connect or disconnect to DGU-1 in the network. The dynamics of the i -th DGU switches based on the set of DGUs \mathcal{S}_{i,σ_i} , to which it is connected, as described in (28a). The states (and outputs) of each DGU comprise of the direct and quadrature axis components [49] of the terminal voltages (denoted by $V_{i,d}$ and $V_{i,q}$ respectively) and internal currents at the DGU unit (denoted by $I_{ti,d}$ and $I_{ti,q}$ respectively). The control inputs comprise of the direct and quadrature axis internal voltages of the DGU, denoted by $V_{ti,d}$ and $V_{ti,q}$ respectively. The disturbances correspond to the direct and quadrature axis line currents drawn from the DGU, denoted by $I_{Li,d}$ and $I_{Li,q}$ respectively, which vary based on fluctuations in the power sharing between DGUs.




Fig. 10. Topology of power network with three DGUs. DGU-3 can connect to and disconnect from DGU-1.

$$A_i^{\sigma_i} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{X_{C,ti}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{i,\sigma_i}} \frac{X_{R,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} \right) & \omega_0 - \frac{1}{X_{C,ti}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{i,\sigma_i}} \frac{\omega_0 X_{L,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} \right) & \frac{k_i}{X_{C,ti}} & 0 \\ -\omega_0 + \frac{1}{X_{C,ti}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{i,\sigma_i}} \frac{\omega_0 X_{L,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} \right) & -\frac{1}{X_{C,ti}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{i,\sigma_i}} \frac{X_{R,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} \right) & 0 & \frac{k_i}{X_{C,ti}} \\ -\frac{k_i}{X_{L,ti}} & 0 & \frac{X_{R,ti}}{X_{L,ti}} & \omega_0 \\ 0 & -\frac{k_i}{X_{L,ti}} & -\omega_0 & -\frac{X_{R,ti}}{X_{L,ti}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,\sigma_1} = \begin{cases} \{2\}, & \sigma_1 = 1 \\ \{2, 3\}, & \sigma_1 = 2 \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{2,\sigma_2} = \{1\}, \quad \sigma_2 = 1$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{3,\sigma_3} = \{1\}, \quad \sigma_3 = 1 \quad (28a)$$

$$B_i^{(1)\sigma_i} = \mathbf{I}, \quad B_i^{(2)\sigma_i} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{X_{C,ti}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{X_{C,ti}} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}', \quad B_i^{(3)\sigma_i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{X_{L,ti}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{X_{L,ti}} \end{bmatrix}' \quad (28b)$$

$$C_i^{\sigma_i} = \mathbf{I}, \quad H_{i,j_{1,1}} = \frac{1}{X_{C,ti}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{X_{R,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} & \frac{\omega_0 X_{L,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} \\ -\frac{\omega_0 X_{L,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} & \frac{X_{R,ij}}{Z_{ij}^2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_{i,j} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{i,j_{1,1}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (28c)$$

TABLE I
PARAMETERS OF THE MICROGRID NETWORK [48]

DGU-1	$X_{R,t1}$ ($m\Omega$)	1.2
	$X_{L,t1}$ (μH)	93.7
	$X_{C,t1}$ (μF)	62.86
DGU-2	$X_{R,t2}$ ($m\Omega$)	1.6
	$X_{L,t2}$ (μH)	94.8
	$X_{C,t2}$ (μF)	62.86
DGU-3	$X_{R,t3}$ ($m\Omega$)	1.5
	$X_{L,t3}$ (μH)	107.7
	$X_{C,t3}$ (μF)	62.86
Line parameters	$X_{R,12}$ (Ω)	1.1
	$X_{R,13}$ (Ω)	0.9
	$X_{L,12}$ (mH)	600
	$X_{L,13}$ (mH)	400
Transformer turn ratio	$k_1 = k_2 = k_3$	0.0435
Base frequency	ω_0 (Hz)	60

Using Theorem 3, we design local controllers for all DGUs to guarantee \mathcal{L}_2 stability of the network, by choosing $Q_i = -\mathbf{I}$, $S_i = 0$ and $R_i = \gamma_i^2 \mathbf{I}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_3$, where γ_i represents the \mathcal{L}_2 gain of the closed loop dynamics of Σ_i . The parameters γ_i are considered as variables in the synthesis problem \mathbb{P}_2 , and are found to be

$$\gamma_1 = 2.85$$

$$\gamma_2 = 3.21$$

$$\gamma_3 = 3.22.$$

We consider a test scenario where DGU-3 connects to the network at $t = 1s$ and disconnects at $t = 3s$, causing a transient in the system states. The terminal voltage profiles




Fig. 11. Direct (d) and quadrature (q) axis terminal voltages at (a) DGU-1, and (b) DGU-3.

(states) at DGU-1 and DGU-3 during this operation are shown in Fig. 11, clearly demonstrating that the proposed controllers maintain the stability of the network during plug-and-play operation.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We presented a distributed and compositional approach to synthesize local controllers for networked systems comprised of dynamically coupled subsystems. The proposed approach can readily be extended to guarantee local dissipativity properties for nonlinear networked systems operating close to equilibrium. Future work will involve extending the distributed synthesis approach to more general classes of nonlinear and hybrid systems.

APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 1

Consider lower triangular matrices $L_{i,i}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ and matrix

$$L = [L_{i,j}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N},$$

$$L_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & j > i \\ W_{i,j} L'_{j,j} & j \in \{2, \dots, N\}, j < i \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

$$L_{i,i} L'_{i,i} = \begin{cases} W_{i,i} & i = 1 \\ W_{i,i} - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} L_{i,j} L'_{j,j} & i \in \{2, \dots, N\} \end{cases}$$

with $W_{i,j}$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N$ being elements of W as defined in (7). Define $M_i = L_{i,i} L'_{i,i}$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N$.

A symmetric matrix M_i is positive definite if and only if there exists a lower triangular matrix $L_{i,i}$ with positive diagonal entries such that $M_i = L_{i,i} L'_{i,i}$ [50, Section 4]. Therefore, if (8) holds, $L_{i,i}$ will exist with positive diagonal entries. Invertibility of $L_{i,i}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ guarantees the existence of $L_{i,j}$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N$, $j < i$. Thus, we can always find a lower triangular matrix L of the form (29), with positive diagonal entries, such that $W = LL'$. This implies the positive definiteness of W [50, Section 4], proving the sufficiency of Lemma 1. Along similar lines, we can also prove the necessity of (9) for the positive definiteness of W . ■

Proof of Theorem 1

From Proposition 1, (2) is QSR -dissipative if

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} -\hat{A}'P - P\hat{A} + C'QC & -PB^{(2)} + C'S \\ -B^{(2)'}P + S'C & R \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (30)$$

where $\hat{A} = A + B^{(1)}H$. Consider $Q = \text{diag}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N)$, $S = \text{diag}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N)$, $R = \text{diag}(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N)$ and $P = \text{diag}(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_N)$, where $Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i}$, $S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times l_i}$, $R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_i}$ and $P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$. Consider a permutation matrix

$$\mathbb{E} = [e'_1 \quad e'_{N+1} \mid e'_2 \quad e'_{N+2} \mid \dots \mid e'_N \quad e'_{N+N}]',$$

where e_k , $k \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}$, are defined as $e_i = [e_i^a, 0_{n_i, l}]$, and $e_{N+i} = [0_{l_i, n}, e_i^b]$, where

- e_i^a is a matrix with dimension $n_i \times n$, that contains all zero elements, but an identity matrix of dimension n_i at columns $(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j) + 1 : (\sum_{j=1}^i n_j)$.
- e_i^b is a matrix with dimension $l_i \times l$, that contains all zero elements, but an identity matrix of dimension l_i at columns $(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} l_j) + 1 : (\sum_{j=1}^i l_j)$.
- $0_{r,c}$ is a matrix, with r rows and c columns, whose entries are all 0.

Right multiplication of Γ with \mathbb{E}' permutes its columns, and a left multiplication with \mathbb{E} permutes its rows.

$$\mathbb{E}\Gamma\mathbb{E}' = W = \begin{bmatrix} W_{1,1} & W_{1,2} & \dots & W_{1,N} \\ W_{2,1} & W_{2,2} & \dots & W_{2,N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ W_{N,1} & W_{N,2} & \dots & W_{N,N} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

$$W_{i,i} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} -\hat{A}'_i P_i - P_i \hat{A}'_i + C'_i Q_i C_i & -P_i B_i^{(2)} + C'_i S_i \\ \hline -B_i^{(2)'} P_i + S'_i C_i & R_i \end{array} \right], \quad (32)$$

$$W_{i,j} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} -\hat{H}_{i,j} - \hat{H}'_{j,i} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right], \quad (33)$$

for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N$, $j \neq i$, where $\hat{A}_i = A_i + B_i^{(1)} H_i$ and $\hat{H}_{i,j} = P_i B_i^{(1)} H_{i,j}$.

Note that $\Gamma \geq 0$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}\Gamma\mathbb{E}' \geq 0$. If (9) and (10) hold, then, from Lemma 1, $\mathbb{E}\Gamma\mathbb{E}' > 0$ and all conditions in Proposition 1 are satisfied with $Q = \text{diag}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N)$, $S = \text{diag}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N)$, $R = \text{diag}(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_N)$ and $P = \text{diag}(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_N)$. Therefore, the networked dynamical system \mathbf{T}_N in (2) is QSR -dissipative. ■

Proof of Theorem 2

The proof follows by applying Theorem 1 to the closed loop system,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i(t) &= A_i x_i(t) + B_i^{(1)} v_i(t) + B_i^{(2)} w_i(t) \\ &\quad + B_i^{(3)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} K_{i,j}(t) x_j(t), \\ y_i(t) &= C_i x_i(t), \\ v_i(t) &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_N} H_{i,j} x_j(t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Corollary 1

If \mathbb{P}_3 is feasible, then Theorem 2 holds for $\mathbf{T}_{N+1} = \mathbf{T}_N | \Sigma_{N+1}$, thus completing the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 3

Since Definition 1 holds for switched systems [44], along the lines of proof for Theorem 1, the networked switched system (24) with

$$u_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} K_{i,j} x_j(t),$$

$i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, is QSR -dissipative if

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} W_{1,1} & W_{1,2} & \dots & W_{1,N} \\ W_{2,1} & W_{2,2} & \dots & W_{2,N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ W_{N,1} & W_{N,2} & \dots & W_{N,N} \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (34)$$

holds, where

$$W_{i,i} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} -\hat{A}_i^{\sigma'_i} P_i - P_i \hat{A}_i^{\sigma'_i} & -P_i B_i^{(2)\sigma'_i} + C_i^{\sigma'_i} S_i \\ \hline +C_i^{\sigma'_i} Q_i C_i^{\sigma'_i} & R_i \end{array} \right], \quad (35)$$

$$W_{i,j} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \hat{H}_{i,j}^{\sigma'_j} + \hat{H}_{j,i}^{\sigma'_i} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right], \quad (36)$$

$\hat{A}_i^{\sigma'_i} = A_i^{\sigma'_i} + B_i^{(1)\sigma'_i} H_i$, $\hat{H}_{i,j}^{\sigma'_i} = P_i (B_i^{(1)\sigma'_i} H_{i,j} + B_i^{(3)\sigma'_i} K_{i,j})$ and $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N$, $j \neq i$ and $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{N}_{\eta_i}$. Clearly, if (26) and (27) hold, then, from Lemma 1, the closed loop networked switched system \mathbf{T}_N^σ is QSR -dissipative. ■

Note on Remark 9

Consider a switched system Σ

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= A^{\sigma(t)} x(t) + B^{(1)\sigma(t)} v(t) + B^{(2)\sigma(t)} w(t) + B^{(3)\sigma(t)} u(t) \\ y(t) &= C^{\sigma(t)} x(t) \end{aligned}$$

which switches arbitrarily between two modes $\sigma(t) \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose Σ is QSR -dissipative with multiple energy matrices (or multiple storage functions), that is, if $\sigma(t) = 1, \forall t_0 \leq t \leq t_1$, Σ satisfies the dissipativity inequality

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix}' \begin{bmatrix} Q & S \\ S' & R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix} d\tau \geq V_1(x(t_1)) - V_1(x(t_0)),$$

where $V_1(x) = x' P_1 x$, and if $\sigma(t) = 2, \forall t_0 \leq t \leq t_1$, Σ satisfies

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix}' \begin{bmatrix} Q & S \\ S' & R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix} d\tau \geq V_2(x(t_1)) - V_2(x(t_0)),$$

where $V_2(x) = x' P_2 x$.

If the dynamics of Σ switches from mode 1 ($\sigma = 1$) to mode 2 ($\sigma = 2$) at time t , then, $\sigma(t^-) = 1$ and $\sigma(t^+) = 2$. Then,

$$\int_{t^-}^{t^+} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix}' \begin{bmatrix} Q & S \\ S' & R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix} d\tau \geq V_2(x(t)) - V_1(x(t)) \quad (37)$$

■ must hold. Since Σ is dissipative for arbitrary switching, consider a different switching signal where Σ switches from mode 2 ($\sigma = 2$) to mode 1 ($\sigma = 1$) at time t . Then,

$$\int_{t^-}^{t^+} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix}' \begin{bmatrix} Q & S \\ S' & R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(\tau) \\ w(\tau) \end{bmatrix} d\tau \geq V_1(x(t)) - V_2(x(t)). \quad (38)$$

must hold.

Clearly, both (37) and (38) can hold if and only if $V_1(x) = V_2(x)$, that is, the energy matrices P_1 and P_2 are the same. A similar argument follows for dynamical systems with more than two switching modes. It is therefore not possible to have different energy matrices in different modes for a switched system that is dissipative for arbitrary switching.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. E. Olivares, A. Mehrizi-Sani, A. H. Etemadi, C. A. Cañizares, R. Iravani, M. Kazerani, A. H. Hajimiragha, O. Gomis-Bellmunt, M. Saeedifard, R. Palma-Behnke *et al.*, "Trends in microgrid control," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 1905–1919, 2014.
- [2] P. Varaiya, "Smart cars on smart roads: problems of control," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 195–207, 1993.
- [3] S. Sadraddini, S. Sivaranjani, V. Gupta, and C. Belta, "Provably safe cruise control of vehicular platoons," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 262–267, 2017.
- [4] G. Antonelli, "Interconnected dynamic systems: An overview on distributed control," *IEEE Control Systems*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 76–88, 2013.
- [5] S.-H. Wang and E. Davison, "On the stabilization of decentralized control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 473–478, 1973.
- [6] R. Lau, R. Persiano, and P. Varaiya, "Decentralized information and control: A network flow example," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 466–473, 1972.
- [7] M. Aoki, "Some control problems associated with decentralized dynamic systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 515–516, 1971.
- [8] R. Bellman, "Large systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 465–465, 1974.
- [9] E. J. Davison and T. N. Chang, "Decentralized stabilization and pole assignment for general proper systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 652–664, 1990.
- [10] M. Vidyasagar, "Decomposition techniques for large-scale systems with nonadditive interactions: Stability and stabilizability," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 773–779, 1980.
- [11] C. Langbort and J.-C. Delvenne, "Distributed design methods for linear quadratic control and their limitations," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 2085–2093, 2010.
- [12] F. Farokhi, "Decentralized control of networked systems: Information asymmetries and limitations," Ph.D. dissertation, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2014.
- [13] L. Bakule and J. Lunze, "Decentralized design of feedback control for large-scale systems," *Kybernetika*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1–3, 1988.
- [14] M. E. Sezer and D. Šiljak, "Nested ε -decompositions and clustering of complex systems," *Automatica*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 321–331, 1986.
- [15] S. Sethi and Q. Zhang, "Near optimization of dynamic systems by decomposition and aggregation," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 1998.
- [16] S. Sivaranjani, S. Sadraddini, V. Gupta, and C. Belta, "Distributed control policies for localization of large disturbances in urban traffic networks," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2017*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 3542–3547.
- [17] S. Sivaranjani, Y.-S. Wang, V. Gupta, and K. Savla, "Localization of disturbances in transportation systems," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2015 IEEE 54th Annual Conference on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 3439–3444.
- [18] C. Langbort, R. S. Chandra, and R. D'Andrea, "Distributed control design for systems interconnected over an arbitrary graph," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1502–1519, 2004.
- [19] C. Conte, N. R. Voellmy, M. N. Zeilinger, M. Morari, and C. N. Jones, "Distributed synthesis and control of constrained linear systems," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2012*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 6017–6022.
- [20] M. N. Zeilinger, Y. Pu, S. Rivero, G. Ferrari-Trecate, and C. N. Jones, "Plug and play distributed model predictive control based on distributed invariance and optimization," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2013 IEEE 52nd Annual Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 5770–5776.
- [21] S. Rivero, M. Farina, and G. Ferrari-Trecate, "Plug-and-play model predictive control based on robust control invariant sets," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 2179–2186, 2014.
- [22] M. Cubuktepe, M. Ahmadi, U. Topcu, and B. Hencsey, "Compositional analysis of hybrid systems defined over finite alphabets," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 16, pp. 115 – 120, 2018, 6th IFAC Conference on Analysis and Design of Hybrid Systems ADHS 2018.
- [23] P. Varutti, B. Kern, and R. Findeisen, "Dissipativity-based distributed nonlinear predictive control for cascaded systems," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 45, no. 15, pp. 439–444, 2012.
- [24] T. Ishizaki, H. Sasahara, M. Inoue, and J.-i. Imura, "Modularity-in-design of dynamical network systems: Retrofit control approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01625*, 2019.
- [25] S. Xu and J. Bao, "Distributed control of plantwide chemical processes," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 19, no. 10, pp. 1671–1687, 2009.
- [26] N. Hudon and J. Bao, "Dissipativity-based decentralized control of interconnected nonlinear chemical processes," *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 45, pp. 84–101, 2012.
- [27] X.-L. Tan and M. Ikeda, "Decentralized stabilization for expanding construction of large-scale systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 644–651, 1990.
- [28] M. J. Tippett and J. Bao, "Dissipativity based distributed control synthesis," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 755–766, 2013.
- [29] P. Wu and P. J. Antsaklis, "Passivity indices for symmetrically interconnected distributed systems," in *Control & Automation (MED), 2011 19th Mediterranean Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–6.
- [30] V. Ghanbari, P. Wu, and P. J. Antsaklis, "Large-scale dissipative and passive control systems and the role of star and cyclic symmetries," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 3676–3680, 2016.
- [31] M. Arcak, C. Meissen, and A. Packard, *Networks of Dissipative Systems: Compositional Certification of Stability, Performance, and Safety*. Springer, 2016.
- [32] M. Vidyasagar, "New passivity-type criteria for large-scale interconnected systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 575–579, 1979.
- [33] P. Moylan and D. Hill, "Tests for stability and instability of interconnected systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 574–575, 1979.
- [34] H. Pota and P. Moylan, "Stability of locally dissipative interconnected systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 308–312, 1993.
- [35] E. Agarwal, S. Sivaranjani, V. Gupta, and P. Antsaklis, "Sequential synthesis of distributed controllers for cascade interconnected systems," in *American Control Conference*, 2019, to appear. [Online]. Available: arXiv:1902.07114
- [36] H. Nijmeijer, R. Ortega, A. Ruiz, and A. Van Der Schaft, "On passive systems: from linearity to nonlinearity," in *Nonlinear Control Systems Design 1992*. Elsevier, 1993, pp. 373–378.
- [37] J. R. Forbes, "Extensions of input-output stability theory and the control of aerospace systems," Ph.D. dissertation, 2011.
- [38] A. Megretski and A. Rantzer, "System analysis via integral quadratic constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 819–830, 1997.
- [39] N. Kottenstette, M. J. McCourt, M. Xia, V. Gupta, and P. J. Antsaklis, "On relationships among passivity, positive realness, and dissipativity in linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 1003–1016, 2014.
- [40] J. G. VanAntwerp and R. D. Braatz, "A tutorial on linear and bilinear matrix inequalities," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 363–385, 2000.
- [41] C. Langbort, L. Xiao, R. D'Andrea, and S. Boyd, "A decomposition approach to distributed analysis of networked systems," in *2004 43rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)(IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37601)*, vol. 4. IEEE, 2004, pp. 3980–3985.
- [42] C. Langbort and R. D'Andrea, "Distributed control of heterogeneous systems interconnected over an arbitrary graph," in *42nd IEEE International Conference on Decision and Control (IEEE Cat. No. 03CH37475)*, vol. 3. IEEE, 2003, pp. 2835–2840.
- [43] E. Agarwal, S. Sivaranjani, and P. J. Antsaklis, "Feedback passivation of nonlinear switched systems using linear approximations," in *Control Conference (ICC), 2017 Indian*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 12–17.
- [44] J. Zhao and D. J. Hill, "Dissipativity theory for switched systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 941–953, 2008.
- [45] S. Sivaranjani, E. Agarwal, L. Xie, V. Gupta, and P. Antsaklis, "Mixed voltage angle and frequency droop control for transient stability of interconnected microgrids," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02918*, 2018.
- [46] G. H. Hines, M. Arcak, and A. K. Packard, "Equilibrium-independent passivity: A new definition and numerical certification," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1949–1956, 2011.
- [47] J. W. Simpson-Porco, "Equilibrium-independent dissipativity with quadratic supply rates," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 1440–1455, 2018.
- [48] S. Rivero, F. Sarzo, and G. Ferrari-Trecate, "Plug-and-play voltage and frequency control of islanded microgrids with meshed topology," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1176–1184, 2015.
- [49] P. M. Anderson and A. A. Fouad, *Power system control and stability*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- [50] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*. JHU Press, 2012, vol. 3.



Etika Agarwal obtained her PhD in Electrical Engineering from the University of Notre Dame in 2019. She received her Masters in Electrical Engineering from the University of Notre Dame in 2016, and her B. Tech in Avionics from the Indian Institute of Space Science and Technology in 2012. Before joining the graduate school, she worked with the Indian Space Research Organization from 2012-2014. Her research interests are in computationally efficient and scalable control of large-scale cyber-physical systems.



S Sivaranjani obtained her PhD in Electrical Engineering from the University of Notre Dame in 2019. She obtained her undergraduate and Masters degrees in Electrical Engineering from the PES Institute of Technology and the Indian Institute of Science, in 2011 and 2013, respectively. Her research interests are in the area of distributed control for large-scale infrastructure networks, with emphasis on transportation networks and power grids. She is a recipient of the Schlumberger Foundation Faculty for the Future fellowship (2015-2018), the Zonta

International Amelia Earhart fellowship (2015-2016) and the Notre Dame (NSF) Ethical Leaders in STEM fellowship (2016-2017).



Vijay Gupta is a Professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering at the University of Notre Dame, having joined the faculty in January 2008. He received his B. Tech degree at Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, and his M.S. and Ph.D. at California Institute of Technology, all in Electrical Engineering. Prior to joining Notre Dame, he also served as a research associate in the Institute for Systems Research at the University of Maryland, College Park. He received the 2018 Antonio Ruberti Award from IEEE Control Systems Society, the 2013

Donald P. Eckman Award from the American Automatic Control Council and a 2009 National Science Foundation (NSF) CAREER Award. His research and teaching interests are broadly at the interface of communication, control, distributed computation, and human decision making.



Panos Antsaklis is the H.C. & E.A. Brosey Professor of Electrical Engineering at the University of Notre Dame. He is graduate of the National Technical University of Athens, Greece, and holds MS and PhD degrees from Brown University. His research addresses problems of control and automation and examines ways to design control systems that will exhibit high degree of autonomy. His current research focuses on Cyber-Physical Systems and the interdisciplinary research area of control, computing and communication networks, and on hybrid and

discrete event dynamical systems. He is IEEE, IFAC and AAAS Fellow, President of the Mediterranean Control Association, the 2006 recipient of the Engineering Alumni Medal of Brown University and holds an Honorary Doctorate from the University of Lorraine in France. He served as the President of the IEEE Control Systems Society in 1997 and was the Editor-in-Chief of the IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control for 8 years, 2010-2017.