

Adaptive Output Synchronization for a Class of Uncertain Nonlinear Multi-Agent Systems over Switching Networks

Jie Huang, *Life Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we first study the leader-following output synchronization problem for a class of uncertain nonlinear multi-agent systems over jointly connected switching networks. Our approach integrates the output-based adaptive distributed observer, the conventional adaptive control technique, and the output regulation theory. Compared with the existing results, our control law only relies on the output of the leader instead of the state of the leader and allows the followers and the leader to have different orders. Then, we further consider the rejection of a class of bounded disturbances with unknown bounds. Our problem includes the state consensus problem as a special case if the followers and the leader have the same order.

Index Terms—Adaptive synchronization, uncertain nonlinear systems, jointly connected switching graphs, disturbance rejection.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE cooperative control for multi-agent systems has been one of the central control problems for nearly two decades. The cooperative control problems include consensus or synchronization, coverage of sensor networks, coordinated motion of robotic teams, formation flying of air vehicles, distributed optimization and so on. Fundamental to all these problems is the consensus problem. Depending on whether or not a multi-agent system has a leader, the consensus problem can be divided into two classes: leaderless and leader-following. The leaderless consensus problem aims to design a control law for each agent to make the states (or outputs) of all agents asymptotically synchronize to some trajectory, while the leader-following consensus problem is to design a control law for each follower subsystem to enable the states (or outputs) of all follower subsystems to asymptotically track a desired trajectory generated by the leader system. Regardless of the leaderless consensus problem or the leader-following consensus problem, the control law to be designed must be distributed in the sense that the control law has to satisfy some network constraints described by a communication graph.

Early results on the two consensus problems were limited to linear multi-agent systems. For example, the leaderless consensus problem was studied in [18], [19], [22], [26], while the leader-following consensus problem was considered in

[7]–[9], [17]. Both the leaderless consensus problem and the leader-following consensus problem were investigated in [11], [24]. Then, more attention has been paid to the consensus problem of nonlinear multi-agent systems. For example, in [6], [13], [23], [29], the consensus problem was studied for several classes of nonlinear systems satisfying the global Lipschitz or the global Lipschitz-like condition. In [5], [14], [25], [28], the leader-following consensus problem was studied via the output regulation theory and the nonlinear systems considered in [5], [14], [25], [28] contain both disturbances and norm bounded uncertainties. Based on the adaptive control technique, the leader-following consensus problem was studied for first-order nonlinear multi-agent systems in [4], for second-order nonlinear multi-agent systems in [5], for multiple uncertain Euler-Lagrange systems in [1], and for multiple uncertain rigid spacecraft systems in [27]. In [4], [16], [30], the neural network method was used to study uncertain nonlinear multi-agent systems subject to static networks and the designed control laws made the tracking errors uniformly ultimately bounded for initial conditions in some prescribed compact subset. In [12], the leader-following consensus problem for a class of nonlinear multi-agent systems was studied using the reinforcement learning based sliding mode control. Nevertheless, in [12], the networks are static and the disturbances are bounded functions with known bounds. Perhaps, the most general result on the leader-following consensus problem for nonlinear systems was given in [15] which has the following merits. First, the order of each follower subsystem can be any positive integer and the nonlinearity does not have to satisfy the global Lipschitz-like condition. Second, the follower subsystems contain both constant uncertain parameters and external disturbances and the uncertain parameters can take any constant value, which excludes the robust control approaches such as those in [5], [14], [28]. Third, the communication network satisfies the jointly connected condition, which is a mild condition on the communication network since it allows the network to be disconnected at any time. Finally, compared with [4], [16], [30], the result in [15] is global and the consensus can be achieved exactly.

However, little progress has been made since the publication of [15]. In this paper, we will further tackle the leader-following output synchronization problem for a class of more general nonlinear multi-agent systems than the one in [15] by integrating the recent results of the output-based adaptive distributed observer, the conventional adaptive control technique, and the output regulation technique. Comparing with

This article is a slightly updated version of [10], and the work described in this article was supported in part by the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region under grant No. 14201621 and in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Project 61973260.

The author is with the Department of Mechanical and Automation Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong (e-mail: jhuang@mae.cuhk.edu.hk.)

the state of the art of the literature such as [12], [15], we will offer the following new features. First, the leader system and all of the follower subsystems in [12], [15] must have the same order while we allow the leader system and various follower subsystems to have different orders. This feature will significantly enlarge the class of leader systems. Second, the control laws in [12], [15] rely on the state of the leader system while the control law here only needs to know the output of the leader system. Thus our control law applies to the general case where the state of the leader system is unavailable. Third, the disturbances in [15] are generated by a linear exosystem with a nonlinear output and the exosystem is assumed to be neutrally stable. In contrast, we will consider a class of disturbances that can be any bounded time functions with unknown bounds, which strictly contains the disturbances in [15]. It is also noted that the disturbances in [12] are bounded functions with known bounds.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we present some preliminaries and describe our problem. In Section III, we solve our problem in the absence of the disturbances. In Section IV, we further study our problem with the disturbances being bounded time functions with unknown bounds. Finally, in Section V, we close the paper with some concluding remarks. An example can be found in [10].

Notation. For any column vectors a_i , $i = 1, \dots, s$, denote $\text{col}(a_1, \dots, a_s) = [a_1^T, \dots, a_s^T]^T$. We use $\sigma(t)$ to denote a piecewise constant switching signal $\sigma : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{P} = \{1, 2, \dots, n_0\}$, where n_0 is a positive integer, and \mathcal{P} is called a switching index set. We assume that all switching instants $t_0 = 0 < t_1 < t_2, \dots$ satisfy $t_{i+1} - t_i \geq \tau_0 > 0$ for some constant τ_0 and all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where τ_0 is called the dwell time. A function $f : [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be piecewise continuous if there exists a sequence $\{t_j, j = 0, 1, \dots\}$ with a dwell time $\tau > 0$ such that $f(t)$ is continuous on each time interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$, $j = 0, 1, \dots$. Let $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{t \geq 0} \|f(t)\|$, which is called the infinity norm of f . f is said to be bounded if $\|f\|_\infty$ is finite.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a class of nonlinear multi-agent systems as follows:

$$y_i^{(r_i)} + f_i^T(x_i, t)\theta_i = u_i + d_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (1)$$

where $r_i \geq 1$, $u_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_i = \text{col}(y_i, \dot{y}_i, \dots, y_i^{(r_i-1)})$ are the input, output and the state of the plant, respectively, $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{r_i} \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ are known functions satisfying locally Lipschitz condition with respect to x_i uniformly in t and continuous with respect to t , $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ are unknown constant parameter vectors, $d_i : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are external disturbances. In addition, there is an exosystem of the following form:

$$\dot{v}_0 = S v_0, \quad y_0 = F v_0 \quad (2)$$

where $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ with S and F two constant matrices. The output y_0 is to be tracked by the outputs y_i of all subsystems of (1) in the presence of the persistent disturbances d_i , which can be any piecewise continuous bounded time functions with the bounds unknown, i.e., $|d_i(t)| \leq D_i$ for all

$t \geq 0$ and some unknown positive numbers D_i . When $N = 1$, the adaptive stabilization problem of (1) was considered in [21].

The system (1) and the exosystem (2) together can be viewed as a multi-agent system of $(N + 1)$ agents with (2) as the leader and the N subsystems of (1) as N followers. With respect to the plant (1), the exosystem (2), and a given switching signal $\sigma(t)$, we can define a time-varying graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma(t)} = (\bar{\mathcal{V}}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma(t)})^1$ with $\bar{\mathcal{V}} = \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma(t)} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{V}} \times \bar{\mathcal{V}}$ for all $t \geq 0$, where the node 0 is associated with the leader system (2) and the node i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, is associated with the i th subsystem of system (1). For $i = 1, \dots, N$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, N$, and $i \neq j$, $(j, i) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma(t)}$ if and only if u_i can use the information of the j th agent for control at time instant t . Let $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(t) = \{j, (j, i) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma(t)}\}$ denote the neighbor set of agent i at time t . Let $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)})$ be the subgraph of $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma(t)}$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is obtained from $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\sigma(t)}$ by removing all edges between the node 0 and the nodes in \mathcal{V} .

Define an adaptive distributed dynamic compensator as follows:

$$\dot{v}_i = S_i v_i + L_i \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(t)} F(v_j - v_i), \quad (3a)$$

$$\dot{S}_i = \mu_1 \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(t)} (S_j - S_i), \quad (3b)$$

$$\dot{L}_i = \mu_2 \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(t)} (L_j - L_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (3c)$$

where, for $i = 1, \dots, N$, $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $L_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $S_0 = S$, $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$ are design parameters, and $L_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a constant matrix such that the following system:

$$\dot{\bar{v}} = (I_N \otimes S - \mathcal{H}_{\sigma(t)} \otimes (L_0 F)) \bar{v} \quad (4)$$

is exponentially stable, where the matrix $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is obtained from the Laplace matrix $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma(t)}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma(t)}$ by removing the first row and the first column. If there exist $L_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mu_1 > 0$, $\mu_2 > 0$ such that, for any initial conditions $v_i(0), S_i(0), L_i(0), i = 1, \dots, N$ and $v_0(0)$, the solution of systems (2) and (3) exists for all $t \geq 0$ and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (v_i(t) - v_0(t)) &= 0, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (S_i(t) - S) &= 0, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (L_i(t) - L_0) &= 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

then, (3) is called the adaptive distributed observer for (2) over the graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma(t)}$ and L_0 is called the observer gain matrix.

The problem of whether or not (3) is the adaptive distributed observer for (2) over the graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma(t)}$ has been extensively studied in the literature. To summarize the main result from [2], let us first list the following assumptions:

Assumption 1. *The matrix S is marginally stable.*

Assumption 2. *The pair (F, S) is detectable.*

Assumption 3. *There exists a subsequence $\{i_k\}$ of $\{i : i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ with $t_{i_{k+1}} - t_{i_k} < \nu$ for some positive ν such that*

¹See Chapter 1 of [2] for a summary of graph.

the union graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}([t_{i_k}, t_{i_{k+1}}))$ contains a spanning tree with the node 0 as the root.

Assumption 4. $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)}$ is undirected for any $t \geq 0$.

Remark 1. Assumption 1 means none of the eigenvalues of the matrix S has positive real part and those eigenvalues of S with zero real parts are semi-simple. Assumption 2 loses no generality. Assumption 3 is called the jointly connected condition [17], [24]. It is a mild condition on the switching graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma(t)}$ as it allows the graph to be disconnected at every time instant. From Theorem 3.4 of [2], under Assumptions 1-4, there exists $L_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that (4) is exponentially stable. For the special case of Assumption 1 where S is neutrally stable, that is, all the eigenvalues of the matrix S have zero real parts and are semi-simple, there exists a symmetric and positive definite matrix R such that

$$RS + S^T R = 0. \quad (6)$$

For this case, the matrix $L_0 = \mu_0 R F^T$ with $\mu_0 > 0$ is such that (4) is exponentially stable.

The following result is a rephrasing of Theorem 4.7 of [2]:

Lemma 1. Consider systems (2) and (3). Under Assumptions 1-4, for any $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$, and any initial conditions $v_i(0), S_i(0), L_i(0), i = 1, \dots, N$, and $v_0(0)$, the solution of systems (2) and (3) exist for all $t \geq 0$ and achieves (5) exponentially.

As a direct consequence of Lemma 1, we have the following result.

Corollary 1. For any $k \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (F S_i^k v_i - y_0^{(k)}) = 0 \quad (7)$$

exponentially.

Proof: Since $S_i v_i - S v_0 = S_i(v_i - v_0) + (S_i - S)v_0$, and v_0 and S_i are bounded, noting $y_0 = F v_0$ and using (5) gives (7) for $k = 1$. For $k > 1$, first note that

$$\begin{aligned} & (S_i^k - S^k) \\ &= S_i^{k-1}(S_i - S) + S_i^{k-2}(S_i - S)S + \dots \\ &+ S_i(S_i - S)S^{k-2} + (S_i - S)S^{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since S_i are bounded, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (S_i - S) = 0$ exponentially, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (S_i^k - S^k) = 0$ exponentially. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} (S_i^k v_i - S^k v_0) &= (S_i^k v_i - S_i^k v_0 + S_i^k v_0 - S^k v_0) \\ &= S_i^k(v_i - v_0) + (S_i^k - S^k)v_0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Since v_0 and S_i are bounded, noting $y_0^{(k)} = F S^k v_0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (S_i^k - S^k) = 0$ exponentially, and using (5) and (8) show that (7) holds for $k > 1$. \square

Remark 2. Two special cases of Lemma 1 are worth mentioning. First, $y_0 = v_0$, that is, the state of the leader system is available. In this case, (3) reduces to the following form:

$$\dot{v}_i = S_i v_i + \mu_v \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(t)} (v_j - v_i), \quad (9a)$$

$$\dot{S}_i = \mu_1 \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(t)} (S_j - S_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (9b)$$

where $\mu_v > 0$. For this special case, Assumption 1 can be weakened to that none of the eigenvalues of S have positive real parts, Assumption 2 is satisfied automatically, and Assumption 4 is not needed (see Remark 4.4 of [2]). Such a special case was considered in [15]. Second, the graph is static. In this case, Assumption 3 reduces to that the graph contains a spanning tree with the node 0 as the root, and Assumptions 1 and 4 are not needed (see Theorem 4.8 of [2]). Even for this special case, the problem has not been considered.

To formulate our problem, let us first describe our control law as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &= h_i(x_i, \zeta_i) \\ \dot{\zeta}_i &= l_i(x_i, \zeta_i, x_j, \zeta_j, j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(t)), \quad i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where h_i and l_i are some nonlinear functions.

A control law of the form (10) is called a distributed control law since u_i only depends on the information of its neighbors and itself. Our problem is described as follows.

Problem 1. Given the multi-agent system composed of (1) and (2), bounded piecewise continuous disturbances $d_i(t)$, and a switching graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_{\sigma(t)}$, design a control law of the form (10), such that, for any initial states $x_i(0), \zeta_i(0)$ and $v_0(0)$, the solution of the closed-loop system exists for all $t \geq 0$, and satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (y_i^{(k)}(t) - y_0^{(k)}(t)) = 0, i = 1, \dots, N, k = 0, \dots, r_i - 1$.

Remark 3. A similar problem was considered in [15]. However, the follower system considered in [15] is a special case of (1) where $r_1 = \dots = r_N = r$ for some $r > 0$ and the leader system considered in [15] is also a special case of (2) where $n = r$ and $y_0 = v_0$. In the special case where $r_1 = \dots = r_N = n = r$, our control law actually achieves the leader-following state consensus. It is also noted that the disturbances in [15] are a function of trigonometric polynomials and are thus bounded. In contrast, the class of disturbances here strictly contains the disturbances in [15] as a subclass. It will be seen later that the class of disturbances will be treated differently from the approach in [15].

III. ADAPTIVE OUTPUT SYNCHRONIZATION

In this section, we consider the case without disturbances. To present our distributed control law, let

$$\begin{aligned} p_{ri} &= F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i - \beta_{1i} (y_i^{(r_i-2)} - F S_i^{r_i-2} v_i) - \dots \\ &- \beta_{(r_i-2)i} (y_i - F S_i v_i) - \beta_{(r_i-1)i} (y_i - F v_i) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\beta_{1i}, \dots, \beta_{(r_i-1)i}$ are some positive constants such that the polynomials $\lambda^{r_i-1} + \beta_{1i}\lambda^{r_i-2} + \dots + \beta_{(r_i-2)i}\lambda + \beta_{(r_i-1)i} = 0$ are stable. Let

$$s_i = y_i^{(r_i-1)} - p_{ri}. \quad (12)$$

Now we propose our control law as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &= f_i^T(x_i, t)\hat{\theta}_i - k_i s_i + \dot{p}_{ri} \\ \dot{\hat{\theta}}_i &= -\Lambda_i^{-1} f_i(x_i, t) s_i \\ \dot{v}_i &= S_i v_i + L_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} F(v_j - v_i) \\ \dot{S}_i &= \mu_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (S_j - S_i) \\ \dot{L}_i &= \mu_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (L_j - L_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where k_i are positive constants, $\hat{\theta}_i$ are the estimates of θ_i , $\tilde{\theta}_i = \hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i$, and $\Lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i}$ are symmetric and positive definite matrices.

Substituting the control law (13) to the plant gives the closed-loop system with $d_i = 0$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{li} &= x_{(l+1)i}, \quad l = 1, \dots, r_i - 1 \\ \dot{x}_{r_i i} &= f_i^T(x_i, t)\tilde{\theta}_i - k_i s_i + \dot{p}_{ri} \\ \dot{\tilde{\theta}}_i &= -\Lambda_i^{-1} f_i(x_i, t) s_i \\ \dot{v}_i &= S_i v_i + L_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} F(v_j - v_i) \\ \dot{S}_i &= \mu_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (S_j - S_i) \\ \dot{L}_i &= \mu_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (L_j - L_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Before presenting our main result, let us first establish the following result:

Lemma 2. *Let $e_i = y_i - y_0$. Then (11) and (12) imply*

$$e_i^{(r_i-1)} + \beta_{1i} e_i^{(r_i-2)} + \dots + \beta_{i(r_i-2)} \dot{e}_i + \beta_{(r_i-1)i} e_i = \bar{u}_i \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_i &= -(y_0^{(r_i-1)} - F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i) - \beta_{1i} (y_0^{(r_i-2)} - F S_i^{r_i-2} v_i) \\ &\quad - \dots - \beta_{(r_i-2)i} (\dot{y}_0 - F S_i v_i) - \beta_{(r_i-1)i} (y_0 - F v_i) + s_i \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_{ri} &= F S_i^{r_i} v_i - \beta_{1i} (y_i^{(r_i-1)} - F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i) - \dots - \\ &\quad \beta_{(r_i-2)i} (y_i^{(2)} - F S_i^2 v_i) - \beta_{(r_i-1)i} (\dot{y}_i - F S_i v_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{r_i-1} \beta_{ki} F e_{(r_i-1-k)i} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\beta_{0i} = 1$, $e_{0i} = e_{vi}$, and, for $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{ki} &= k S_i^{k-1} e_{S_i} v_i + S_i^k e_{vi} \\ e_{vi} &= L_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} F(v_j - v_i) \\ e_{S_i} &= \mu_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (S_j - S_i). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Proof: For any $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_i^{(k)} - F S_i^k v_i &= y_i^{(k)} - y_0^{(k)} + y_0^{(k)} - F S_i^k v_i \\ &= e_i^{(k)} + y_0^{(k)} - F S_i^k v_i. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Thus, from (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{ri} &= F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i - \beta_{1i} (y_i^{(r_i-2)} - F S_i^{r_i-2} v_i) - \dots \\ &\quad - \beta_{(r_i-2)i} (\dot{y}_i - F S_i v_i) - \beta_{(r_i-1)i} (y_i - F v_i) \\ &= F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i - \beta_{1i} e_i^{(r_i-2)} - \dots - \beta_{(r_i-2)i} \dot{e}_i - \beta_{(r_i-1)i} e_i \\ &\quad - \beta_{1i} (y_0^{(r_i-2)} - F S_i^{r_i-2} v_i) \\ &\quad - \dots - \beta_{(r_i-2)i} (\dot{y}_0 - F S_i v_i) - \beta_{(r_i-1)i} (y_0 - F v_i) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Using (12) and noting $y_i^{(r_i-1)} - F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i = e_i^{(r_i-1)} + (y_0^{(r_i-1)} - F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i)$ gives (15).

Next, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(S_i^k v_i)}{dt} &= k S_i^{k-1} \dot{S}_i v_i + S_i^k \dot{v}_i \\ &= k S_i^{k-1} e_{S_i} v_i + S_i^k (S_i v_i + e_{vi}) \\ &= S_i^{k+1} v_i + k S_i^{k-1} e_{S_i} v_i + S_i^k e_{vi} \\ &= S_i^{k+1} v_i + e_{ki}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Differentiating (11) and using (21) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_{ri} &= F (S_i^{r_i} v_i + e_{(r_i-1)i}) \\ &\quad - \beta_{1i} (y_i^{(r_i-1)} - F S_i^{r_i-1} v_i - F e_{(r_i-2)i}) \\ &\quad - \dots - \beta_{(r_i-2)i} (y_i^{(2)} - F S_i^2 v_i - F e_{1i}) \\ &\quad - \beta_{(r_i-1)i} (\dot{y}_i - F S_i v_i - F e_{0i}) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which is the same as (17). \square

Remark 4. *It is interesting to note that \dot{p}_{ri} are independent of $y_0^{(k)}$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots$, and thus can be used in the control law (13).*

Let $\xi_{1i} = e_i$, $\xi_{2i} = \dot{e}_i$, \dots , $\xi_{(r_i-1)i} = e_i^{(r_i-2)}$, and $\xi_i = \text{col}(\xi_{1i}, \dots, \xi_{(r_i-1)i})$. Then, (15) can be put into the following state space form:

$$\dot{\xi}_i = A_i \xi_i + B_i \bar{u}_i \quad (23)$$

where

$$A_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ -\beta_{(r_i-1)i} & -\beta_{(r_i-2)i} & \dots & -\beta_{1i} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Before stating our result, we need one more assumption as follows:

Assumption 5. $\|f_i(x_i, t)\| \leq \phi_i(x_i)$ for some globally defined functions $\phi_i(x_i)$.

Assumption 5 is mild since any time invariant function of x_i satisfies Assumption 5.

We now state the following result:

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1-5, the leader-following output synchronization problem for the multi-agent system composed of (1) and (2) is solvable by the control law (13).*

Proof:

Let

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N (s_i^2 + \tilde{\theta}_i^T \Lambda_i \tilde{\theta}_i). \quad (24)$$

Then, along the solution of (14), we have, noting (27),

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \sum_{i=1}^N (s_i \dot{s}_i + \tilde{\theta}_i^T \Lambda_i \dot{\tilde{\theta}}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(s_i (f_i^T(x_i, t) \tilde{\theta}_i - k_i s_i) + \tilde{\theta}_i^T \Lambda_i \dot{\tilde{\theta}}_i \right) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^N k_i s_i^2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Thus, for $i = 1, \dots, N$, s_i and $\tilde{\theta}_i$ are bounded over $[0, \infty)$. Since $V(t)$ is lower bounded by 0, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(t)$ has a finite limit. We will further resort to the Barbalat's Lemma to conclude $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{V}(t) = 0$. For this purpose, we need to show

$$\ddot{V} = - \sum_{i=1}^N 2k_i s_i \dot{s}_i \quad (26)$$

is bounded. Note that (15) can be put into the form (23). From (16), \bar{u}_i is bounded since s_i , S_i and v_i are bounded. Since A_i are all Hurwitz, both ξ_i and $\dot{\xi}_i$ are bounded, which imply $e_i^{(r_i-1)}, e_i^{(r_i-2)}, \dots, e_i$ are all bounded, and hence x_i are bounded since $y_0^{(r_i-1)}, y_0^{(r_i-2)}, \dots, y_0$ are. By Assumption 5, $f_i(x_i, t)$ are bounded since x_i are. Differentiating (12) and using the first equation of the control law (13) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s}_i &= y_i^{(r_i)} - \dot{p}_{ri} \\ &= u_i - f_i^T(x_i, t) \tilde{\theta}_i - \dot{p}_{ri} \\ &= f_i^T(x_i, t) \tilde{\theta}_i - k_i s_i. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

which implies \dot{s}_i are also bounded. Since s_i and \dot{s}_i are both bounded, it follows from (26) that \ddot{V} is bounded over $[0, \infty)$.

Thus, by the Barbalat's Lemma,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{V}(t) = 0,$$

and hence $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s_i(t) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. By Corollary 1 and the fact that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s_i(t) = 0$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_i(t) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Since A_i are Hurwitz, from (23), we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \xi_i(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\xi}_i(t) = 0$, which imply $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e_i^{(k)}(t) = 0$ for $k = 0, \dots, r_i - 1$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$. \square

By Remark 2, for the special case where the graph is static, we have the following corollary of Theorem 1.

Corollary 2. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 5 and the assumption that the graph is static and contains a spanning tree with the node 0 as the root, the leader-following output synchronization problem for the multi-agent system composed of (1) and (2) is solvable by the control law (13).*

IV. DISTURBANCE REJECTION

In this section, we further consider the disturbance rejection problem. Instead of (13), we modify the control law to the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &= f_i^T(x_i, t) \hat{\theta}_i - \text{sgn}(s_i) \hat{D}_i - k_i s_i + \dot{p}_{ri} \\ \dot{\hat{\theta}}_i &= -\Lambda_i^{-1} f_i(x_i, t) s_i \\ \dot{\hat{D}}_i &= \text{sgn}(s_i) s_i \\ \dot{v}_i &= S_i v_i + L_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} F(v_j - v_i) \\ \dot{S}_i &= \mu_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (S_j - S_i) \\ \dot{L}_i &= \mu_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (L_j - L_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where \hat{D}_i are the estimates of the upper bounds D_i of d_i , $\tilde{D}_i = \hat{D}_i - D_i$, and, for any scalar x , the function $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ is defined as follows:

$$\text{sgn}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x > 0 \\ 0, & x = 0 \\ -1, & x < 0. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Under the control law (28), the closed-loop system can be put as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s}_i &= f_i^T(x_i, t) \tilde{\theta}_i + d_i - \text{sgn}(s_i) \hat{D}_i - k_i s_i \\ \dot{\tilde{\theta}}_i &= -\Lambda_i^{-1} f_i(x_i, t) s_i \\ \dot{\tilde{D}}_i &= \text{sgn}(s_i) s_i \\ \dot{v}_i &= S_i v_i + L_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} F(v_j - v_i) \\ \dot{S}_i &= \mu_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (S_j - S_i) \\ \dot{L}_i &= \mu_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)} (L_j - L_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

It is noted that the right hand side of the closed-loop system (30) is discontinuous in s_i . Thus, the solution of the closed-loop system (30) must be defined in the Filippov sense [3], [20]. Put the first three equations of the closed-loop system (30) to the following compact form:

$$\dot{x}_c = f_c(x_c, t). \quad (31)$$

where $x_c = \text{col}(s_1, \dots, s_N, \tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_N, \tilde{D}_1, \dots, \tilde{D}_N)$. Then, the Filippov solution of (31) satisfies, for almost all $t \geq 0$,

$$\dot{x}_c \in K[f_c](x_c, t) \quad (32)$$

where $K[f_c](x_c, t)$ is the Filippov set of $f_c(x_c, t)$ [3], [20]. It is known that, for any scalar x , the Filippov set of $\text{sgn}(x)$ denoted by $K[\text{sgn}](x)$ is as follows [20]:

$$K[\text{sgn}](x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x > 0 \\ [-1, 1], & x = 0 \\ -1, & x < 0. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

Thus

$$xK[\text{sgn}](x) = |x|. \quad (34)$$

We have the following result:

Theorem 2. *Under Assumptions 1-5, the leader-following output synchronization with disturbance rejection problem for the multi-agent system composed of (1) and (2) is solvable by the distributed control law (28).*

Proof: Let

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N (s_i^2 + \tilde{\theta}_i^T \Lambda_i \tilde{\theta}_i + \tilde{D}_i^2) \quad (35)$$

whose gradient is

$$\partial V = [s_1, \dots, s_N, \tilde{\theta}_1^T \Lambda_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_N^T \Lambda_N, \tilde{D}_1, \dots, \tilde{D}_N].$$

By Theorem 2.2 of [20], \dot{V} exists almost everywhere (a.e.), and $\dot{V} \in a.e. \dot{V}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \bigcap_{\psi \in \partial V} \psi K[f](x_c, t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N (s_i \dot{s}_i + \tilde{\theta}_i^T \Lambda_i \dot{\tilde{\theta}}_i + \tilde{D}_i \dot{\tilde{D}}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(s_i (f_i^T(x_i, t) \tilde{\theta}_i + d_i - K[\text{sgn}](s_i) \hat{D}_i - k_i s_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \tilde{\theta}_i^T f_i(x_i, t) s_i + \tilde{D}_i K[\text{sgn}](s_i) s_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(s_i d_i - s_i K[\text{sgn}](s_i) D_i - k_i s_i^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Using (34) in (36) gives

$$\dot{V} = \sum_{i=1}^N (s_i d_i - |s_i| D_i - k_i s_i^2). \quad (37)$$

Thus, $\dot{V} = \dot{V}$. Noting $(s_i d_i - |s_i| D_i) \leq 0$ gives

$$\dot{V} \leq - \sum_{i=1}^N k_i s_i^2. \quad (38)$$

Thus, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(t)$ exists and is finite. Hence, for $i = 1, \dots, N$, s_i , $\tilde{\theta}_i$, and \tilde{D}_i are bounded over $[0, \infty)$. Let

$$W(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=1}^N k_i s_i^2(\tau) d\tau.$$

Then, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$W(t) \leq - \int_0^t \dot{V}(\tau) d\tau = -V(t) + V(0).$$

Since $V(t)$ is lower bounded, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} W(t)$ has a finite limit. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we will resort to the Barbalat's Lemma again. For this purpose, we need to show

$$\ddot{W} = \sum_{i=1}^N 2k_i s_i \dot{s}_i \quad (39)$$

is bounded. Consider (23) again. From (16), \bar{u}_i is bounded since s_i , S_i and v_i are bounded. Since A_i are all Hurwitz, both ξ_i and $\dot{\xi}_i$ are bounded, which imply $e_i^{(r_i-1)}, e_i^{(r_i-2)}, \dots, e_i$ are all bounded, and hence x_i are bounded since $y_0^{(r_i-1)}, y_0^{(r_i-2)}, \dots, y_0$ are. By Assumption 5, $f_i(x_i, t)$ are bounded since x_i are. Also, d_i are bounded by assumption. From the first equation of (30), we have

$$s_i \dot{s}_i = s_i f_i^T(x_i, t) \tilde{\theta}_i + s_i d_i - s_i \text{sgn}(s_i) \hat{D}_i - k_i s_i^2,$$

which implies \ddot{W} is also bounded. However, since d_i and hence \ddot{W} may be discontinuous at infinitely many time instances, we cannot invoke the Barbalat's Lemma. Nevertheless, we have shown that $W(t)$ satisfies the following three conditions:

- 1) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} W(t)$ exists;
- 2) $W(t)$ is twice differentiable on each time interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$ satisfying $t_{j+1} - t_j \geq \tau > 0$;
- 3) $\ddot{W}_i(t)$ is bounded over $[0, \infty)$ in the sense that there exists a finite positive constant K such that

$$\sup_{t_j \leq t \leq t_{j+1}, j=0,1,2,\dots} |\ddot{W}_i(t)| \leq K. \quad (40)$$

Thus, by the generalized Barbalat's Lemma as can be found in Corollary 2.5 of [2] to conclude $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{W}(t) = 0$, and hence $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s_i(t) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. By Corollary 1 and the fact that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s_i(t) = 0$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_i(t) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. From (23), we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \xi_i(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\xi}_i(t) = 0$, which implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e_i^{(k)}(t) = 0$ for $k = 0, \dots, r_i - 1$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$. \square

By Remark 2, for the special case where the graph is static, we have the following corollary of Theorem 2.

Corollary 3. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 5, and the assumption that the graph is static and contains a spanning tree with the node 0 as the root, the leader-following output synchronization with disturbance rejection problem for the multi-agent system composed of (1) and (2) is solvable by the distributed control law (28).*

Remark 5. *If d_i are discontinuous at only finitely many time instances, then it suffices to invoke Barbalat's lemma to conclude the proof.*

Remark 6. *Compared with [12], [15], this paper offers the following new features. First, the leader system and all of the follower subsystems in [12], [15] must have the same order while we allow the leader system and various follower subsystems to have different orders. This feature will significantly enlarge the class of leader systems. Second, the control laws in [12], [15] rely on the state of the leader system while the control law here only needs to know the output of the leader system. Thus our control law applies to the general case where the state of the leader system is unavailable. Third, the disturbances in [15] are generated by a neutrally stable linear exosystem with a nonlinear output while our disturbance can be any bounded function.*

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the leader-following output synchronization problem for a class of higher-order nonlin-

ear multi-agent systems subject to both constant parameter uncertainties and external disturbances over jointly connected switching networks. The class of disturbances includes any bounded piecewise continuous time function with unknown bounds. We have solved our problem by integrating the output-based adaptive distributed observer, the conventional adaptive control technique, and the adaptive disturbance rejection technique. Our problem includes the state consensus problem as a special case if the followers and the leader have the same order. The disturbances considered in this paper satisfy the matching condition.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Cai and J. Huang, "The leader-following consensus for multiple uncertain Euler-Lagrange systems with an adaptive distributed observer", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 61, No. 10, 2016, pp. 3152–3157.
- [2] H. Cai, Y. Su, and J. Huang, *Cooperative Control of Multi-agent Systems: Distributed-observer and Internal-model-approaches*, Springer Nature, Switzerland AG, 2022.
- [3] J. Cortes, "Discontinuous dynamical systems - A tutorial on solutions, nonsmooth analysis, and stability", *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 2008, pp. 36–73.
- [4] A. Das and F. L. Lewis, "Distributed adaptive control for synchronization of unknown nonlinear networked systems", *Automatica*, Vol. 46, No. 12, 2010, pp. 2014–2021.
- [5] Y. Dong, J. Chen and J. Huang, "Cooperative robust output regulation problem for second-order nonlinear multi-agent systems with an unknown exosystem", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 63, No. 10, 2018, pp. 3418–342.
- [6] G. Fiengo, D.G. Lui, A. Petrillo, and S. Santini, "Distributed leader-tracking adaptive control for high-order nonlinear Lipschitz multi-agent systems with multiple time-varying communication delays", *International Journal of Control*, Vol. 94, No. 7, 2021, pp. 1880–1892.
- [7] Y. Hong, J. Hu, and L. Gao, "Tracking control for multi-agent consensus with an active leader and variable topology", *Automatica*, Vol. 42, No. 7, 2006, pp. 1177–1182.
- [8] J. Hu and Y. Hong, "Leader-following coordination of multi-agent systems with coupling time delays", *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, Vol. 374, No. 2, 2007, pp. 853–863.
- [9] J. Hu and W. X. Zheng, "Adaptive tracking control of leader-follower systems with unknown dynamics and partial measurements", *Automatica*, Vol. 50, No. 5, 2014, pp. 1416–1423.
- [10] J. Huang, "Adaptive output synchronization for a class of uncertain nonlinear multi-agent systems over switching networks", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, April 2024, DOI 10.1109/TAC.2023.3334992
- [11] A. Jadbabaie, J. Lin, and A. S. Morse, "Coordination of groups of mobile agents using nearest neighbor rules", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 48, No. 6, 2003, pp. 988–1001.
- [12] J. Li, L. Yuan, T. Chai, and F.L. Lewis, "Consensus of nonlinear multiagent systems with uncertainties using reinforcement learning based sliding mode control", *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, Vol. 70, No. 1, 2023, pp. 424 - 434.
- [13] K. Liu, G. Xie, W. Ren, and L. Wang, "Consensus for multi-agent systems with inherent nonlinear dynamics under directed topologies", *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 62, No. 2, 2013, pp. 152–162.
- [14] W. Liu and J. Huang, "Cooperative global robust output regulation for a class of nonlinear multi-agent systems with switching network", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 60, No.7, 2015, pp. 1963–1968.
- [15] W. Liu and J. Huang, "Adaptive leader-following consensus for a class of higher-order nonlinear multi-agent systems with directed switching networks", *Automatica*, Vol. 79, No. 5, 2017, pp. 84–92.
- [16] Y. Liu and G-H Yang, "Neural learning-based fixed-time consensus tracking control for nonlinear multiagent systems with directed communication networks", *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* Vol. 32, No. 2, Feb. 2021, pp. 639 - 652.
- [17] W. Ni and D. Cheng, "Leader-following consensus of multi-agent systems under fixed and switching topologies", *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 59, No. (3-4), 2010, pp. 209–217.
- [18] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 49, No. 9, 2004, pp. 1520–1533.
- [19] W. Ren, "On consensus algorithms for double-integrator dynamics", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 53, No. 6, 2008, pp. 1503–1509.
- [20] D. Shevitz and B. Paden, "Lyapunov stability theory of nonsmooth systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*. Vol. 39, No. 9, 1994, pp. 1910–1914.
- [21] J. J. E. Slotine and W. Li, *Applied Nonlinear Control*. Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs, 1991.
- [22] J. H. Seo, H. Shim, and J. Back, "Consensus of high-order linear systems using dynamic output feedback compensator: low gain approach", *Automatica*, Vol. 45, No. 11, 2009, pp. 2659–2664.
- [23] Q. Song, J. Cao, and W. Yu, "Second-order leader-following consensus of nonlinear multi-agents via pinning control", *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 59, No. 9, 2010, pp. 553–562.
- [24] Y. Su and J. Huang, "Stability of a class of linear switching systems with applications to two consensus problems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 57, No. 6, 2012, pp. 1420–1430.
- [25] Y. Su and J. Huang, "Cooperative global robust output regulation for nonlinear uncertain multi-agent systems in lower triangular form", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 60, No. 9, 2015, pp. 2378–2389.
- [26] S. E. Tuna, "LQR-based coupling gain for synchronization of linear systems", *arXiv:0801.3390[math.OA]*, 2008.
- [27] T. Wang and J. Huang, "Leader-following adaptive consensus of multiple uncertain rigid body systems over jointly connected networks", *Unmanned Systems*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2020, pp. 2018–2025.
- [28] X. Wang, D. Xu, and Y. Hong, "Consensus control of nonlinear leader-follower multi-agent systems with actuating disturbances", *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 73, 2014, pp. 58–66.
- [29] W. Yu, G. Chen, M. Cao, and J. Kurths, "Second-order consensus for multiagent systems with directed topologies and nonlinear dynamics", *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics-Part B: Cybernetics*, 40, No. 32, 2010, pp. 881–891.
- [30] H. Zhang and F. L. Lewis, "Adaptive cooperative tracking control of higher-order nonlinear systems with unknown dynamics", *Automatica*, Vol. 48, No. 7, 2012, pp. 1432–1439.