

# Distributed Saddle-Point Dynamics in Multilayer Networks

Christian D. Rodríguez-Camargo, Andrés F. Urquijo-Rodríguez, and Eduardo Mojica-Nava

**Abstract**—Multilayer networks provide a more advanced and comprehensive framework for modeling real-world systems compared to traditional single-layer and multiplex networks. Unlike single-layer models, multilayer networks have multiple interacting layers, each with unique topological features. In this paper, we generalize previously developed results for distributed optimization in multiplex networks to the more general case of multilayer networks by employing a tensor formalism to represent multilayer networks and their tensor-Laplacian diffusion dynamics. Although multiplex networks are a special case of multilayer networks, where each layer has the same number of replica nodes connected one-to-one, this generalized framework removes the need for replica nodes, allowing variability in both topology and number of nodes across layers. This approach provides a fully generalized structure for distributed optimization in multilayer networks and enables more complex interlayer connections. We derive the multilayer combinatorial Laplacian tensor and extend the distributed gradient descent algorithm. We provide a theoretical analysis of the convergence of algorithms. Numerical examples validate our approach, and we explore the impact of heterogeneous layer topologies and complex interlayer dynamics on consensus time, underscoring their implications for real-world multilayer systems.

**Index Terms**—Distributed optimization, multilayer networks, saddle-point flow, diffusion, tensor dynamics.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE quantitative study of networks has provided deep understanding of the structure and dynamics of complex systems in diverse fields [1], [2], such as biology [3], neuroscience [4], engineering [5], [6], and social sciences [7]. However, the traditional single-layer network formalism does not capture the full complexity of real-world systems where multiple types of interaction occur simultaneously across distinct layers [8]. Multilayer networks provide a more holistic framework for representing these interconnected systems, allowing researchers to explore a broader range of dynamics and interactions that are not apparent in single-layer or multiplex network models [9].

Manuscript received MM DD, YYYY; revised MM DD, YYYY.

C. D. Rodríguez-Camargo is with The Atomic, Molecular, Optical and Positron Physics (AMOPP) group of the Department of Physics and Astronomy from the University College London and Programa de Investigación sobre Adquisición y Análisis de Señales (PAAS-UN) from Universidad Nacional de Colombia. E-mail: christian.rodriguez-camargo.21@ucl.ac.uk

A. F. Urquijo-Rodríguez is with Grupo de investigación en Ingeniería e Innovación de la Universidad ECCI (GIII-ECCI) both from the Universidad ECCI, and Grupo de Superconductividad y Nanotecnología and Grupo de Óptica e Información Cuántica both from the Department of Physics of Universidad Nacional de Colombia. E-mail: afurquijor@unal.edu.co

E. Mojica-Nava is with the Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering and Programa de Investigación sobre Adquisición y Análisis de Señales (PAAS-UN) from Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia. E-mail: eamojican@unal.edu.co

The multilayer network framework has been successfully applied in various fields. For instance, this structure has produced significant and robust results in ecological dynamics [10], brain networks [11], transport networks [12], epidemiology [13], molecular biology [14], and energy networks [15], [16]. Furthermore, multilayer networks reveal dynamical behaviors similar to those of single-layer networks, such as synchronization [17], percolation [18], and diffusion and spreading processes [19].

Given the multidimensional nature of these processes, it is worth establishing a tensorial representation for such systems. Tensors generalize scalars, vectors, and matrices [20] and provide a concise framework for modeling and solving multidimensional problems. Tensors are widely used in all fields, from linear algebra and physics to engineering [21], [22]. In [23] it is developed a tensor-based mathematical formalism that provides a general, robust, and comprehensive framework for representing multilayer networks with all their complexities, offering insights that remain hidden when using traditional adjacency matrices. This formalism has been applied explicitly to study disease localization [24], generalization of the concept of assortativity [25], spreading [26], and eigenvector multicentrality [27].

Despite the recent advances in multilayer networks, progress in generalizing distributed optimization problems from single-layer to multilayer networks has been limited. In conventional distributed optimization, each node typically has access to its own convex function, and the overall objective is defined as the sum of these individual functions [28]. To solve this, each agent seeks the optimal solution to the global convex function by exchanging information with neighboring nodes and performing local computations [29]. A variety of methods have been developed to address this problem, ranging from discrete-time gradient descent approaches [29] to more recent continuous-time techniques [30]–[32]. In particular, from a continuous-time perspective, optimization algorithms have been framed as dynamical systems [33], with methods based on saddle-point dynamics [34], [35] gaining prominence.

In a previous work [36], [37], we developed distributed optimization algorithms tailored to multiplex networks, leveraging the supra-Laplacian matrix to handle the diffusion dynamics within and across layers. Although these algorithms demonstrated success in modeling systems with distinct but fixed interlayer connections, such as in infrastructure networks, they are limited in their applicability to more complex multilayer systems. Specifically, multiplex networks assume identical sets of nodes across layers and restrict interlayer connections to counterpart nodes, a limitation when modeling systems with

heterogeneous interlayer interactions. To overcome these limitations, a more generalized framework is necessary to handle complex interactions in multilayer networks. The tensorial formalism introduced in [23] offers a powerful approach to capture both intra- and interlayer dynamics within these systems. By generalizing the network descriptors and dynamics to tensorial representations, this framework enables us to model a richer class of multilayer networks where interactions across layers are not restricted to node counterparts, but can vary in structure and strength.

In this paper, we extend our previous work on distributed optimization in multiplex networks by incorporating the tensorial framework for multilayer networks. This generalization allows us to handle a broader class of systems with complex interlayer connections. We propose novel distributed optimization algorithms based on tensorial dynamics, analyze their convergence properties, and validate them through numerical examples.

The main contributions of this work are as follows: (1) extending the consensus and diffusion equations to a tensor-based representation for multilayer networks, thereby generalizing the relationship between diffusion processes in multiplex and multilayer networks and consensus-driven distributed optimization algorithms; (2) formulating a distributed saddle-point algorithm tailored for convex optimization in general multilayer networks; and (3) proving the convergence of each node in every layer to the optimal value of the convex objective function. In addition, we examine the role of interlayer diffusion and its effect on optimization efficiency in multilayer networks, illustrating the applicability of our framework in real-world scenarios such as multi-energy systems. We further examine the occurrence of critical phenomena in consensus time by varying the diffusion constants. In addition, several numerical examples are presented to validate the proposed algorithms and investigate the influence of interlayer diffusion on the consensus time.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the fundamentals of multilayer networks are introduced. We introduce the tensor formalism given in [23], and the tensor diffusion dynamics. In Section III, the distributed optimization problem is presented for general multilayer networks. We present the main result of this paper and a convergence analysis of our theorem related to the distributed primal-dual saddle-point algorithm for general multilayer networks in Section IV. In Section V numerical examples are given to illustrate the performance of the proposed approach. Conclusions and future work are presented in Section VI.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Tensor representation of multilayer networks

1) *Single-layer networks*: Given a set of  $N$  objects  $n_i$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Each object can be associated with a state represented by a canonical vector in the vector space  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Specifically, let  $\mathbf{e}_i \equiv (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ , where  $\top$  denotes the transpose operator. The column vector  $\mathbf{e}_i$  corresponds to the object  $n_i$ , such that its  $i$ -th component is 1, while all other components are 0.

Since in a network, the objects  $n_i$  have relationships among them, the vector space for describing these relationships is given by  $\mathbb{R}^N \otimes \mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ . Consequently, the second-order (i.e., rank-2) canonical tensors are specified by  $\mathbf{E}_{ij} = \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j^\top$ , for all  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Therefore, if the relations between the objects are described by the elements of a weight matrix  $w_{ij}$ , one can define its associate tensor as

$$\mathbf{W} = \sum_{i,j=1}^N w_{ij} \mathbf{E}_{ij} = \sum_{i,j=1}^N w_{ij} \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j^\top, \quad \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}. \quad (1)$$

Following [23], we adopt the covariant notation. In this framework, a row vector  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is represented as a covariant vector  $a_\alpha$  (where  $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ), while its corresponding contravariant vector  $a^\alpha$  (i.e., its dual vector) is expressed as a column vector in Euclidean space. Latin letters  $i, j, \dots$  are used to denote vectors and tensors associated with objects (e.g., the  $i$ -th vector, the  $(ij)$ -th tensor, etc.), whereas Greek letters  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots$  indicate the components of a vector or tensor. According to this notation,  $e^\alpha(i)$  represents the  $\alpha$ -th component of the  $i$ -th contravariant canonical vector  $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , and  $e_\alpha(j)$  represents the  $\alpha$ -th component of the  $j$ -th covariant vector in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

This notation allows us to represent the tensor (1) as a linear combination of tensors in the canonical basis as follows,

$$W_\beta^\alpha = \sum_{i,j=1}^N w_{ij} e^\alpha(i) e_\beta(j) = \sum_{i,j=1}^N w_{ij} E_\beta^\alpha(ij), \quad (2)$$

where  $E_\beta^\alpha(ij) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is the tensor in the canonical basis corresponding to the tensor product of the canonical vectors assigned to nodes  $n_i$  and  $n_j$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{E}_{ij}$ ). The object (2) is called the adjacency tensor. It is noticed that this tensor is of mixed type, i.e., 1-covariant and 1-contravariant.

2) *Multilayer Networks*: In multilayer networks, a node  $n_i$  of a layer  $\tilde{h}$  can be connected to any other node  $n_j$  in any other layer  $\tilde{k}$ . The tilde symbol is introduced to distinguish indices that correspond to nodes from those that correspond to layers. A second-order interlayer adjacency tensor  $C_\beta^\alpha(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})$  is introduced to encode the information about the relationships incorporating multiple layers. This tensor is constructed from the canonical vectors  $e^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{k})$ , where  $\tilde{\mu} = 1, 2, \dots, M$  and  $\tilde{k} = 1, 2, \dots, M$ , this supposes that our multilayer network is composed by  $M$  layers. These vectors are the canonical basis in the space  $\mathbb{R}^M$ . The tilde symbol on the Greek indices helps differentiate them from the Greek indices representing nodes. Note that  $C_\beta^\alpha(\tilde{k}\tilde{k}) = W_\beta^\alpha(\tilde{k})$ , meaning that the interlayer adjacency tensor for a pair of layers representing the same layer  $\tilde{k}$  is equivalent to the intralayer adjacency tensor of that layer.

The canonical basis (rank-2 tensors) of the space  $\mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$  is then given by

$$E_{\tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) = e^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}) e_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{k}). \quad (3)$$

Following this basis, we obtain the multilayer adjacency tensor  $M_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} &= \sum_{\tilde{h}, \tilde{k}=1}^M C_{\beta}^{\alpha}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) E_{\tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{h}, \tilde{k}=1}^M \left[ \sum_{i,j=1}^{N(M)} w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) E_{\beta}^{\alpha}(ij) \right] E_{\tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{h}, \tilde{k}=1}^M \sum_{i,j=1}^{N(M)} w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \mathcal{E}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(ij\tilde{h}\tilde{k}), \quad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})$  are real numbers indicating the intensity of the relationship, which could not be symmetric, between nodes  $n_i$  in layer  $\tilde{h}$  and node  $n_j$  in layer  $\tilde{k}$ , and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(ij\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) = e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) e^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}) e_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{k}) \quad (5)$$

are the fourth-order (i.e. rank-4) tensors of the canonical basis in the space  $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N \times M \times M}$ . We have adopted the notation  $N \equiv N(M)$  to remark that the number of nodes in each layer might be different. The multilayer adjacency tensor  $M_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  is a versatile construct that can represent a wide range of complex relationships between nodes across different layers.

### B. Diffusion processes on multilayer networks

1) *Diffusion on single-layer networks:* Using the tensor notation, the diffusion processes on single-layer networks can be described as follows. Let  $x_{\alpha}(t)$  be a state vector of nodes at time  $t$ . The diffusion equation is given by

$$\frac{dx_{\beta}(t)}{dt} = D [W_{\beta}^{\alpha} x_{\alpha}(t) - W_{\gamma}^{\alpha} u_{\alpha} e^{\gamma}(\beta) x_{\beta}(t)], \quad (6)$$

where  $D$  is a diffusion constant, and  $u_{\alpha}$  is a 1-tensor whose components are all equal to 1, given by  $u^{\alpha} = (1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . The strength of a vector is obtained as  $s_{\gamma} = W_{\gamma}^{\alpha} u_{\alpha}$ , with this we have  $s_{\gamma} e^{\gamma}(\beta) x_{\beta} = s_{\gamma} e^{\gamma}(\beta) \delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} x_{\alpha}(t)$ . Thus, the diffusion equation in single-layer networks yields:

$$\frac{dx_{\beta}(t)}{dt} = -D L_{\beta}^{\alpha} x_{\alpha}(t), \quad (7)$$

where

$$L_{\beta}^{\alpha} = W_{\gamma}^{\eta} u_{\eta} e^{\gamma}(\beta) \delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} - W_{\beta}^{\alpha} \quad (8)$$

is the combinatorial Laplacian tensor. This tensor is positive semidefinite, therefore, the solution of (7) is

$$x_{\beta}(t) = x_{\alpha}(0) e^{-DL_{\beta}^{\alpha} t}. \quad (9)$$

Notice that the so-called strength tensor  $\Delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} = W_{\gamma}^{\eta} u_{\eta} e^{\gamma}(\beta) \delta_{\beta}^{\alpha}$  is related with the degree matrix, and its components could be obtained directly such that we can express  $\Delta_{\beta}^{\alpha}$  as follows:

$$\Delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} = \sum_{i,j=1}^N d_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j), \quad (10)$$

being  $d_{ij} = d_i \delta_{ij} = \sum_k w_{ki} \delta_{ij}$ . In Appendix A, we show the equivalence between these definitions.

2) *Diffusion on multilayer networks:* In this case, a diffusion equation for multilayer networks must incorporate terms that account for interlayer diffusion. Let  $X_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(t)$  denote the state tensor of nodes in each layer at time  $t$ . Thus, a diffusion equation for a multilayer network is obtained as follows,

$$\frac{dX_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}(t)}{dt} = M_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} X_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(t) - M_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} U_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} E^{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}(\beta\tilde{\nu}) X_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}(t), \quad (11)$$

being  $U_{\beta}^{\alpha} = u_{\alpha} u^{\beta}$  the second-order tensor whose elements are all equal to 1.

Similar to the single-layer case, it is presented a multilayer combinatorial Laplacian tensor as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = M_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}^{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} U_{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} E^{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}(\beta\tilde{\nu}) \delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} - M_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}, \quad (12)$$

which is used to obtain the covariant diffusion equation for multilayer networks

$$\frac{dX_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}(t)}{dt} = -\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} X_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(t). \quad (13)$$

Note that the solution of (13) is obtained as

$$X_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}(t) = X_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(0) e^{-\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} t}. \quad (14)$$

Therefore, it is possible to show that the tensor (12) is a positive semidefinite tensor.

### III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

We consider the following distributed optimization problem subject to a generalized multilayer network interaction, which might be interpreted as an interdependent infrastructure

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x) = U^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} f_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(x). \quad (15)$$

To explore the assumptions and conditions of  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let us express  $f_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(x)$  in the canonical basis as follows:

$$f_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(x) = \sum_{\tilde{h}=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N(M)} f_{i\tilde{h}}(x) e_{\alpha}(i) e_{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}), \quad (16)$$

where  $f_{i\tilde{h}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is assumed to be Lipschitz differentiable convex cost function exclusive to agent  $i$  in layer  $\tilde{h}$ . It is important to note that the cost for each agent depends on the global variable  $x$  across all layers. Note also that we have assumed that the decision variable  $x$  is in  $\mathbb{R}$ , but it can be extended to  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . The interaction among the nodes and between layers of networks can be expressed as a cyberphysical multilayer network. To guarantee there exists a unique optimal solution  $x^*$  to Problem (15), we assume the following conditions on the gradients.

**Assumption 1.** *The gradients of the multilayer cost functions  $f_{i\tilde{h}}$  are Lipschitz continuous in every layer and interlayers  $\tilde{h}$*

$$\|\nabla f_{i\tilde{h}}(x) - \nabla f_{i\tilde{h}}(x')\|_2 \leq L \|x - x'\|_2, \quad \forall i \in V(\mathcal{M}), \forall \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Where  $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, M\}$  is the set of layers of the multilayer network, and  $V(\mathcal{M}) = \{1, \dots, N(M)\}$  is the set of nodes in each layer  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ .

In the distributed multilayer optimization problem (15), we should consider the heterogeneous relationship between nodes.

If the multilayer is characterized by a multilayer adjacency tensor  $M_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$ , in each layer, the weighted interaction might be different, i.e.,  $w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \neq w_{ij}(\tilde{k}\tilde{h})$ . The heterogeneity of each layer  $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{M}$  is encoded in the object  $w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{h})$ . In addition, the generalized interlayer diffusion dynamics between layers  $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\tilde{k} \in \mathcal{M}$  can be encoded completely in the object  $w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})$ .

Let  $Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  denote the state tensor of the nodes in each layer given by

$$Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = \sum_{\tilde{h}=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N(M)} y_{i\tilde{h}} e_{\alpha}(i) e_{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}), \quad (17)$$

where  $y_{i\tilde{h}} \equiv y_{i\tilde{h}}(t)$  is the state of the node  $i$  in the layer  $\tilde{h}$ , we shall proceed with the equivalent tensor-Laplacian-based consensus-constrained problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_Y \tilde{f}(Y) &= U^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} f_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the tensor-Laplacian constraint  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = 0$  is a multilayer consensus constraint that enforces the local estimate of each agent to converge to the same consensus value.

In the next section, we propose a saddle-point dynamics algorithm to solve the generalized distributed optimization problem with tensor-Laplacian-based constraints.

#### IV. DISTRIBUTED SADDLE-POINT DYNAMICS FOR MULTILAYER NETWORKS

In this section, we introduce the distributed continuous-time optimization algorithm for multilayer networks based on saddle-point dynamics of the tensor-Lagrangian with tensor-Laplacian constraints. Considering the constrained structure of the generalized multilayer network optimization problem (18), we extend the saddle-point dynamics for continuous-time multiplex optimization to the generalized multilayer case using its distributed implementation.

For Problem (18), we propose the following augmented tensor-Lagrangian function  $\mathcal{L}_m : \mathbb{R}^{N \times M} \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathcal{L}_m(Y, \Lambda) = U^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} f_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(Y) + \Lambda^{\beta\tilde{\nu}} \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} Y^{\beta\tilde{\nu}} \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}, \quad (19)$$

we can obtain the optimal solution of (18) by solving its corresponding saddle-point problem

$$\min_Y \max_{\Lambda} \mathcal{L}_m(Y, \Lambda),$$

and the associated saddle-point dynamics yields

$$\dot{Y} = -\nabla_Y \mathcal{L}_m(Y, \Lambda) = -\nabla_Y \tilde{f}(Y) - \mathcal{L}Y - \mathcal{L}\Lambda \quad (20)$$

$$\dot{\Lambda} = \nabla_{\Lambda} \mathcal{L}_m(Y, \Lambda) = \mathcal{L}Y, \quad (21)$$

which leads to the following dynamics for each agent  $i$  on each layer  $\tilde{h}$  (remarking that  $y_{i\tilde{h}}(t)$  is the state of the node  $i$  in the layer  $\tilde{h}$  at time  $t$ ) in terms of the tensor components  $\beta$  and  $\tilde{\nu}$ , respectively,

$$\dot{Y}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}(t) = -\frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y)}{\partial Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}} - \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(t) - \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \Lambda_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(t). \quad (22)$$

Analogously, for (21) we have

$$\dot{\Lambda}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}(t) = \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(t) \quad (23)$$

The following lemma describes the optimality conditions for the tensor-Laplacian-based Lagrangian (19) and the steady-state of the multilayer saddle-point dynamics (22)-(23).

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose we have a symmetric tensor-Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = \mathcal{L}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^{\beta\tilde{\nu}}$  associated with a weighted, undirected, and connected multilayer network. Consider convexity of the function  $f_{i\tilde{h}}$  for all  $(i, \tilde{h})$ , with  $i \in V = \{1, \dots, N(M)\}$  and  $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, M\}$  in tensor-Lagrangian (19). The following conditions follow:*

- 1 *If we assume that  $(Y^*, \Lambda^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M} \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  is a saddle tensor-point of (19). Then,  $(Y^*, \Lambda^* + \gamma U)$  is also a minimax tensor-point for any  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ .*
- 2 *Assume  $(Y^*, \Lambda^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M} \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  is a saddle tensor-point of (19). Then,  $Y^* = x^* U$  is the solution of the primal problem (15) with  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$ .*
- 3 *A saddle-tensor-point  $(Y^*, \Lambda^*)$  exists for the multilayer augmented Lagrangian (19) satisfying*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \Lambda_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^* + \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y^*)}{\partial Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}} = 0.$$

*Proof:* It follows from the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions applied to the Lagrangian function (19) and the definition of a saddle-point in convex optimization [38]. ■

The convergence analysis of the proposed saddle-tensor-point dynamics for multilayer networks (22)-(23) is now presented. The key result of this analysis is summarized in the following theorem, which establishes the convergence of the proposed primal-dual saddle-tensor-point dynamics.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose we have a twice continuously differentiable convex function  $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^{N \times M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The convergence of every trajectory  $(Y(t), \Lambda(t))$  of the multilayer saddle-tensor-point dynamics (22)-(23) to a unique saddle tensor-point  $(Y^*, \Lambda^*)$  is governed by the following conditions:*

- 1  *$Y^* = x^* U$  is an optimizer of the primal optimization problem (15) with  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$ .*
- 2  *$\Lambda^* = \bar{\Lambda} + \text{average}(\Lambda_0) U$ , where  $\text{average}(\Lambda_0)$  is the average of the initial conditions for the tensor  $\Lambda(0)$ , and  $\bar{\Lambda} \perp U$  satisfies*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^* + \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y^*)}{\partial Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}} = 0.$$

*Proof:* See Appendix B. ■

#### V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

To show the consensus dynamics in generalized multilayer networks, we have to solve the system given by (22) and (23). The explicit form of the differential equations is given in Appendix C. In this section, we consider two general multilayer situations: A simple two layers network with two links between layers, and a general four layers network with different connections.




Fig. 1. Multilayer network with  $M = 2$  layers and  $N(L_1) = 3$  nodes in layer  $L_1$  and  $N(L_2) = 5$  nodes in layer  $L_2$ . The node 1 of the layer  $L_1$  has a connection with node 2 of layer  $L_2$  and the node 3 of the layer  $L_1$  has a connection with node 4 of layer  $L_2$ .




Fig. 2. Consensus dynamics for the distributed optimization problem for multilayer network with  $M = 2$  layers and  $N(L_1) = 3$  nodes in layer  $L_1$  and  $N(L_2) = 3$  nodes in layer  $L_2$ . The interlayer diffusion constant was set to  $D_x^{1 \rightarrow 2} = 0.5$ .

### A. Multilayer network with two layers

Let us start with a simple situation. We consider a multilayer network with two layers. In the first layer, we have a set of three nodes and the second layer has five nodes. In this situation, only two nodes of the first layer are connected with two nodes of the second layer. The topology is depicted in Fig. 1. We study the generalized distributed optimization problem given by Problem (18) with convex function

$$f_{\alpha\bar{\mu}}(Y_{\alpha\bar{\mu}}) = \frac{1}{2} Y_{\beta\bar{\nu}} Y^{\beta\bar{\nu}} \delta_{\alpha\bar{\mu}} + \gamma Y_{\alpha\bar{\mu}}, \quad (24)$$

being  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  a constant which depends on each node.

The results of the optimal consensus are shown in Fig. 2. We can observe how the states of each node are going to the optimal solution, showing the validity of these tensor-Laplacian-driven dynamics.

### B. Multilayer network with four layers with non-successive interlayer connections

In this case, we consider a multilayer network with four layers with different number of nodes in each layer and non-




Fig. 3. Multilayer network with  $M = 4$  layers and  $N(L_1) = 3$ ,  $N(L_2) = 4$ ,  $N(L_3) = 5$ ,  $N(L_6) = 6$ .




Fig. 4. Consensus dynamics for multilayer network with  $M = 4$  layers and  $N(L_1) = 3$ ,  $N(L_2) = 4$ ,  $N(L_3) = 5$ ,  $N(L_6) = 6$ . The interlayer diffusion coefficients were set to:  $D_x^{1 \rightarrow 2} = 0.1$ ,  $D_x^{1 \rightarrow 3} = 0.5$ ,  $D_x^{1 \rightarrow 4} = 0.2$ ,  $D_x^{2 \rightarrow 3} = 0.1$ ,  $D_x^{2 \rightarrow 4}$ , and  $D_x^{3 \rightarrow 4} = 0.3$ .

successive interlayer connections. In the first layer, we have 3 nodes. The second layer has 4 nodes. The third layer has 5 nodes. The fourth layer has 6 nodes. Each node of the first layer is connected with one node of the other three layers. Two nodes of the second layer are connected, each one, with one node of layers 3 and 4. The topology is depicted in Fig. 3. The optimization problem is the same as in the previous example. The results are shown in Fig. 4. We can observe that the states of the nodes are taking more time to reach the optimal consensus in comparison with the previous situation. The inset of Fig. 4 gives a zoom to early times. From this, we can evidence how the states of each layer search their intra-layer consensus, and after they do move forward to the global consensus.

In Fig. 5 we plot the behavior of the consensus time  $t_C$  as a function of the inter-layers diffusion constants. As was observed for multiplexes [36], [37], [39], these dynamics are exhibiting discontinuities or criticality. That is to say, the inter-layer diffusion constants may serve as control parameters for the consensus times.




Fig. 5. Consensus time as a function of inter-layer diffusion constants for multilayer network with  $M = 4$  layers and  $N(L_1) = 3$ ,  $N(L_2) = 4$ ,  $N(L_3) = 5$ ,  $N(L_6) = 6$ .




Fig. 6. Multiplex network with two layers and 5 replica nodes.

### C. Multiplex networks with two layers and five replica nodes

For completeness, since multiplexes are a particular case of multilayer networks, we run our algorithm in a known situation where we have a multiplex of two layers and 5 replica nodes. In Fig. 6 we depict the topology. The results are shown in Fig. 7. As expected, the results coincide with those obtained with the supra-Laplacian matrix defined in [39].




Fig. 7. Consensus dynamics for a multiplex network with two layers and 5 replica nodes. The interlayer diffusion constant was set to  $D_x^{1 \to 2} = 0.4$ .

## VI. CONCLUSION

Multilayer networks represent complex systems with multiple interacting layers, each with a unique topology and non-trivial interlayer connections. These networks have emerged as powerful tools for modeling such systems and understanding interactions between different networks. They offer a holistic framework that enables researchers to explore dynamics and interactions that are not visible in single-layer or multiplex models. Additionally, the tensor formalism provides a natural mathematical structure to capture the complexities inherent in the multidimensional nature of multilayer processes.

In this paper, we develop a distributed optimization algorithm tailored for generalized multilayer networks within a tensorial framework. By extending the connection between diffusion and consensus dynamics and leveraging control approaches used in multiplex networks, we propose a distributed tensorial primal-dual saddle-point algorithm that achieves fast convergence and robustness. Similar to multiplex networks, we find that intra- and interlayer diffusion constants serve as control parameters for optimal consensus time. Each layer first reaches a local consensus before achieving global consensus across layers.

We also identify a critical phenomenon related to the interlayer diffusion constant, which affects consensus time. This finding extends previous research on diffusion dynamics in multiplex networks, where a phase transition was observed, associated with the second eigenvalue of the supra-Laplacian matrix. Here, phase transitions are tied to the tensor Laplacian.

With this mathematical formulation, which simplifies the general treatment of network generalization, we anticipate that the tensorial framework will enable the design of additional algorithms for real-world complex systems such as power grids, electronic circuits, brain networks, and molecular biology complexes. This generalization paves the way for exploring network properties that remain hidden within more restricted frameworks.

Possible extensions of this work involve obtaining a diffusion operator for more general higher-order networks and the application of the multilayer optimization proposed approach [40]. A natural continuation of this work is to study hypergraphs consensus dynamics [41] and consensus in simplicial complexes [42], [43]. On the other hand, topological Dirac operators offer a generalization scenario which could be exploited to reveal new properties in complex systems, including new consensus dynamics [44]. Another potential extension involves the introduction of disorder [45], [46] and the application of graph zeta functions to analyze diffusion dynamics in higher-order networks [47].

## APPENDIX A

### EXPLICIT EUCLIDEAN COMPONENTS OF $\Delta_\beta^\alpha$ AND $\Delta_{\beta\bar{\nu}}^{\alpha\bar{\mu}}$ AND EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN DEFINITIONS

Let us start with the definition given in [40]

$$\Delta_\beta^\alpha = W_\gamma^\eta u_\eta e^\gamma(\beta) \delta_\beta^\alpha. \quad (25)$$

Notice that in the indicial notation it is possible to have

$$e^\alpha(i) = \delta_{(i)}^\alpha; \quad e_\beta(\alpha) = \delta_{\beta(\alpha)}. \quad (26)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} &= W_{\gamma}^{\eta} u_{\eta} e^{\gamma}(\beta) \delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} \\
&= W_{\gamma}^{\eta} u_{\eta} \sum_i \delta_{(i)}^{\gamma} \delta_{(i)}^{\alpha} \delta_{\beta(i)} \\
&= \sum_{i,j} W_{\gamma}^{\eta} u_{\eta} e^{\gamma}(i) \delta_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} k_{\gamma} e^{\gamma}(i) \delta_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \left[ \sum_{k,l} w_{kl} e_{\gamma}(l) \right] e^{\gamma}(i) \delta_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,l} w_{kl} \delta_{il} \delta_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \sum_k w_{ki} \delta_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} d_i \delta_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} d_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j).
\end{aligned}$$

The last line is Equation (10).

#### A. Explicit Components Definition for $\Delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$

Using a similar procedure we can obtain a relation between the components of the multistrength tensor  $\Delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$ , noted as  $d_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})$ , and the components of the multilayer adjacency tensor  $\Delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$ , given by  $w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} &= M_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}^{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} U_{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} E^{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}(\beta\tilde{\nu}) \delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \\
&= M_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}^{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} u_{\eta} u_{\tilde{\epsilon}} e^{\rho}(\beta) e^{\tilde{\sigma}}(\tilde{\nu}) \delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \\
&= M_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}^{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} u_{\eta} u_{\tilde{\epsilon}} \delta_{(\beta)}^{\rho} \delta_{(\tilde{\nu})}^{\tilde{\sigma}} \delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{h},\tilde{k}} \sum_{i,j} K_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}} e^{\rho}(i) e^{\tilde{\sigma}}(j) \delta_{ij} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) e^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}) e_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{k}) \delta_{\tilde{h}\tilde{k}} \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{h},\tilde{k}} \sum_{i,j} k_{i\tilde{h}} \delta_{ij} \delta_{\tilde{h}\tilde{k}} e^{\alpha}(i) e_{\beta}(j) e^{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}) e_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{k}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients  $k_{i\tilde{h}}$  are the elements of the multidegree tensor defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}} &= M_{\rho\tilde{\sigma}}^{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} U_{\eta\tilde{\epsilon}} \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{h}} \sum_i k_{i\tilde{h}} e_{\rho}(i) e_{\tilde{\sigma}}(\tilde{h}),
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

being

$$k_{i\tilde{h}} = \sum_{\tilde{k}} \sum_j w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}). \tag{28}$$

Therefore, the final form of the multistrength tensor yields,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} &= \sum_{\tilde{h},\tilde{k}} \sum_{i,j} d_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \mathcal{E}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(ij\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{h},\tilde{k}} \sum_{i,j} \left[ \sum_{\tilde{n}} \sum_m w_{im}(\tilde{h}\tilde{n}) \right] \delta_{ij} \delta_{\tilde{h}\tilde{k}} \mathcal{E}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(ij\tilde{h}\tilde{k}).
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

## APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 1

*Proof:* First, consider the convergence analysis to the tensor points  $(Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^*, \Lambda_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^*)$ . Let  $\tilde{Y}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}} = Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}} - Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^*$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}} = \Lambda_{\beta\tilde{\nu}} - \Lambda_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^*$ . In the new variables, the saddle-point flow (20)-(21) yields

$$\dot{\tilde{Y}}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}} = -\frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y)}{\partial Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y^*)}{\partial Y_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}} - \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} - \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}, \tag{30}$$

$$\dot{\tilde{\Lambda}}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}} = \mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}. \tag{31}$$

Consider the following quadratic candidate Lyapunov function

$$V(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\Lambda}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}. \tag{32}$$

Then, the temporal derivative of (32) along the trajectories of (20)-(21) is

$$\dot{V}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{\Lambda}) = -\tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y)}{\partial Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}} + \tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y^*)}{\partial Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}} - \tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^{\beta\tilde{\nu}} \tilde{Y}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}. \tag{33}$$

Given the property that the gradient serves as a global underestimator, we can conclude that

$$\tilde{f}(Y^*) \geq \tilde{f}(Y) + (Y^{*\alpha\tilde{\mu}} - Y^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}) \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y)}{\partial Y^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}}. \tag{34}$$

From inequality (34), and if  $\tilde{f}$  is strictly convex, we have

$$-\tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y)}{\partial Y^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}} + \tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y^*)}{\partial Y^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}} < 0.$$

Now, since the Laplacian tensor is semi-positive definite, we obtain that

$$\dot{V}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{\Lambda}) = -\tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y)}{\partial Y^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}} + \tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y^*)}{\partial Y^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}} - \tilde{Y}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^{\beta\tilde{\nu}} \tilde{Y}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}} < 0.$$

Nevertheless, note that  $\dot{V}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{\Lambda}) = 0$  in the set  $E = \{(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{\Lambda}) | \tilde{Y} = 0\}$ .

To demonstrate the global asymptotic stability of the equilibrium tensor point  $(Y^*, \Lambda^*)$ , we apply LaSalle's invariance principle, showing that there are no trajectories in  $E$  other than the equilibrium point  $\tilde{Y} = 0$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda} = 0$ . It is observed that if  $\tilde{Y} = 0$  the system (30)-(31) casts to

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\tilde{Y}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} &= -\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{\Lambda}^{\beta\tilde{\nu}} \\
\dot{\tilde{\Lambda}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that the tensor Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  is semi-positive definite and by Lemma 1 the solution is  $(0, \varsigma U_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}})$  or  $(0, 0)$ . According to Lemma 1, we can identify as  $Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^* = x^* U_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  the optimal tensor points  $(Y^*, \Lambda^*)$ . Moreover,  $\Lambda_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^* = \tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} + \varsigma U_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$ , where  $\varsigma \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \perp U_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y^*)}{\partial Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}} = 0.$$

By examining the dual dynamics (31), we can observe that  $U^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = 0$ . Therefore, we obtain  $\text{average}(\Lambda(t)) = \text{average}(\Lambda_0) \forall t \geq 0$ . As a consequence, the convergence to a single tensor saddle-point  $(Y^*, \Lambda^*)$  of the flow (30)-(31) is guaranteed, which satisfies  $Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^* = x^* U_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  and  $\Lambda_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}^* = \tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} + \text{average}(\Lambda_0) U_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$ . ■

APPENDIX C  
EXPLICIT FORM OF THE GENERALIZED CONSENSUS  
DYNAMICS

Since  $Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  denotes the state tensor of the nodes in each layer given by

$$Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = \sum_{\tilde{h}=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N(M)} y_{i\tilde{h}} e_{\alpha}(i) e_{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}), \quad (35)$$

where  $y_{i\tilde{h}} \equiv y_{i\tilde{h}}(t)$  is the state of the node  $i$  in the layer  $\tilde{h}$ , we define the temporal derivative of  $Y_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  as

$$\dot{Y}_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = \sum_{\tilde{h}=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N(M)} \dot{y}_{i\tilde{h}} e_{\alpha}(i) e_{\tilde{\mu}}(\tilde{h}). \quad (36)$$

On the other hand, the 4-rank tensor regarding the generalized gradient is defined as

$$\frac{\partial f_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}(Y)}{\partial Y^{\beta\tilde{\nu}}} = \sum_{\tilde{h}, \tilde{k}=1}^M \sum_{i, j=1}^{N(M)} \frac{\partial f_{i\tilde{h}}}{\partial y_{j\tilde{k}}} \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}}(ij\tilde{h}\tilde{k}). \quad (37)$$

Therefore, the gradient of the contraction  $\tilde{f} = U^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} f_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  is given by

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{f}(Y)}{\partial Y^{\beta\tilde{\nu}}} = \sum_{\tilde{h}, \tilde{k}=1}^M \sum_{i, j=1}^{N(M)} \frac{\partial f_{j\tilde{k}}}{\partial y_{i\tilde{h}}} e_{\beta}(i) e_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{h}). \quad (38)$$

Finally, the contraction of the Laplacian tensor and any other 2-rank tensor  $T_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}}$  yields

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\tilde{\nu}}^{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} T_{\alpha\tilde{\mu}} = \sum_{\tilde{h}, \tilde{k}=1}^M \sum_{i, j=1}^{N(M)} l_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) t_{j\tilde{k}} e_{\beta}(i) e_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{h}), \quad (39)$$

where the elements  $l_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} l_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) &= d_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) - w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \\ &= \left[ \sum_{\tilde{n}=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^{N(M)} w_{mi}(\tilde{n}\tilde{h}) \right] \delta_{ij} \delta_{\tilde{h}\tilde{k}} - w_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Putting all these elements together in the expression (22) we obtain that the system of differential equations for the evolution of the state  $y_{i\tilde{h}}(t)$  of the node  $i$  in the layer  $\tilde{h}$  is the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_{i\tilde{h}}(t) &= \sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{N(M)} \frac{\partial f_{j\tilde{k}}}{\partial y_{i\tilde{h}}} \\ &- \sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{N(M)} l_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) y_{j\tilde{k}}(t) - \sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{N(M)} l_{ij}(\tilde{h}\tilde{k}) \lambda_{j\tilde{k}}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was partially supported by Minciencias Grant number CT 542-2020, *Programa de Investigación en Tecnologías Emergentes para Microrredes Eléctricas Inteligentes con Alta Penetración de Energías Renovables* and the *VIII Convocatoria para el Desarrollo y Fortalecimiento de los Grupos de Investigación en Uniminuto* with code C119-173, the *Convocatoria de investigación para prototipado de tecnologías que promueven el cuidado o la restauración del medioambiente* with code CPT123-200-5220, and Industrial Engineering Program from the Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios (Uniminuto, Colombia). We thank the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) (Grants No. EP/R513143/1 and No. EP/T517793/1) for financial support.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Barabási, *Network Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, USA, 2016.
- [2] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. Mendes, *Evolution of networks: From biological nets to the Internet and WWW*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [3] M. Gosak, R. Markovič, J. Dolensek, M. Slak Rupnik, M. Marhl, A. Stožer, and M. Perc, "Network science of biological systems at different scales: A review," *Physics of Life Reviews*, vol. 24, pp. 118–135, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1571064517301501>
- [4] D. L. Barabási, G. Bianconi, E. Bullmore, M. Burgess, S. Chung, T. Eliassi-Rad, D. George, I. A. Kovács, H. Makse, T. E. Nichols, C. Papadimitriou, O. Sporns, K. Stachenfeld, Z. Toroczkai, E. K. Towilson, A. M. Zador, H. Zeng, A.-L. Barabási, A. Bernard, and G. Buzsáki, "Neuroscience needs network science," *Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 43, no. 34, pp. 5989–5995, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.jneurosci.org/content/43/34/5989>
- [5] H. Tu, Y. Xia, H. H.-C. Iu, and X. Chen, "Optimal robustness in power grids from a network science perspective," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 126–130, 2019.
- [6] J. Wu, C. K. Tse, F. C. M. Lau, and I. W. H. Ho, "Analysis of communication network performance from a complex network perspective," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 3303–3316, 2013.
- [7] S. P. Borgatti, A. Mehra, D. J. Brass, and G. Labianca, "Network analysis in the social sciences," *Science*, vol. 323, no. 5916, pp. 892–895, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1165821>
- [8] M. Kivela, A. Arenas, M. Barthelemy, J. P. Gleeson, Y. Moreno, and M. A. Porter, "Multilayer networks," *Journal of Complex Networks*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 203–271, 07 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnu016>
- [9] G. Bianconi, *Multilayer networks: structure and function*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2018.
- [10] S. Pilosof, M. A. Porter, M. Pascual, and S. Kéfi, "The multilayer nature of ecological networks," *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, vol. 1, no. 4, p. 0101, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0101>
- [11] M. De Domenico, "Multilayer modeling and analysis of human brain networks," *GigaScience*, vol. 6, no. 5, p. gix004, 02 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/gix004>
- [12] L. Alessandretti, L. G. N. Orozco, M. Saberi, M. Szell, and F. Battiston, "Multimodal urban mobility and multilayer transport networks," *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 2038–2070, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/23998083221108190>
- [13] K. Fujimoto, J. Kuo, G. Stott, R. Lewis, H. K. Chan, L. Lyu, G. Veytsel, M. Carr, T. Broussard, K. Short *et al.*, "Beyond scale-free networks: integrating multilayer social networks with molecular clusters in the local spread of covid-19," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 21861, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-49109-x>



- [14] Y. Zhang, J. Chen, Y. Wang, D. Wang, W. Cong, B. S. Lai, and Y. Zhao, "Multilayer network analysis of mirna and protein expression profiles in breast cancer patients," *PLoS one*, vol. 14, no. 4, p. e0202311, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0202311>
- [15] M. Kazim, H. Pirim, S. Shi, and D. Wu, "Multilayer analysis of energy networks," *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks*, vol. 39, p. 101407, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.segan.2024.101407>
- [16] V. Toro, E. Mojica-Nava, and N. Rakoto-Ravalontsalama, "Multiplex centrality measurements applied to islanded microgrids," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 449–458, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12555-019-0801-2>
- [17] X. Zhang, S. Boccaletti, S. Guan, and Z. Liu, "Explosive synchronization in adaptive and multilayer networks," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 114, p. 038701, Jan 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.038701>
- [18] Z. Mahabadi, L. Varga, and T. Dolan, "Network properties for robust multilayer infrastructure systems: A percolation theory review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 135 755–135 773, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3116868>
- [19] S. Boccaletti, G. Bianconi, R. Criado, C. del Genio, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, M. Romance, I. Sendiña-Nadal, Z. Wang, and M. Zanin, "The structure and dynamics of multilayer networks," *Physics Reports*, vol. 544, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2014, the structure and dynamics of multilayer networks. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2014.07.001>
- [20] L.-H. Lim, "Tensors and hypermatrices," *Handbook of linear algebra*, vol. 2, 2013.
- [21] P. Comon, "Tensors : A brief introduction," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 44–53, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2014.2298533>
- [22] L. Qi and Z. Luo, *Tensor analysis: spectral theory and special tensors*. SIAM, 2017.
- [23] M. De Domenico, A. Solé-Ribalta, E. Cozzo, M. Kivelä, Y. Moreno, M. A. Porter, S. Gómez, and A. Arenas, "Mathematical formulation of multilayer networks," *Phys. Rev. X*, vol. 3, p. 041022, Dec 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.3.041022>
- [24] G. F. de Arruda, E. Cozzo, T. P. Peixoto, F. A. Rodrigues, and Y. Moreno, "Disease localization in multilayer networks," *Phys. Rev. X*, vol. 7, p. 011014, Feb 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.7.011014>
- [25] G. F. de Arruda, E. Cozzo, Y. Moreno, and F. A. Rodrigues, "On degree–degree correlations in multilayer networks," *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, vol. 323–324, pp. 5–11, 2016, nonlinear Dynamics on Interconnected Networks. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physd.2015.11.004>
- [26] G. F. de Arruda, F. A. Rodrigues, and Y. Moreno, "Fundamentals of spreading processes in single and multilayer complex networks," *Physics Reports*, vol. 756, pp. 1–59, 2018, fundamentals of spreading processes in single and multilayer complex networks. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2018.06.007>
- [27] M. Wu, S. He, Y. Zhang, J. Chen, Y. Sun, Y.-Y. Liu, J. Zhang, and H. V. Poor, "A tensor-based framework for studying eigenvector multicentrality in multilayer networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 116, no. 31, pp. 15 407–15 413, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1801378116>
- [28] T. Yang, X. Yi, J. Wu, Y. Yuan, D. Wu, Z. Meng, Y. Hong, H. Wang, Z. Lin, and K. H. Johansson, "A survey of distributed optimization," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 47, pp. 278–305, 2019.
- [29] A. Nedic and J. Liu, "Distributed optimization for control," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 1, pp. 77–103, 2018.
- [30] P. Lin, W. Ren, and J. A. Farrell, "Distributed continuous-time optimization: nonuniform gradient gains, finite-time convergence, and convex constraint set," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2239–2253, 2016.
- [31] C. Wu, H. Fang, X. Zeng, Q. Yang, Y. Wei, and J. Chen, "Distributed continuous-time algorithm for time-varying optimization with affine formation constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2615–2622, 2023.
- [32] L. Ma and W. Bian, "A novel multiagent neurodynamic approach to constrained distributed convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 1322–1333, 2021.
- [33] M. Colombino, E. Dall'Anese, and A. Bernstein, "Online optimization as a feedback controller: Stability and tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 422–432, 2019.
- [34] A. Cherukuri, B. Gharesifard, and J. Cortes, "Saddle-point dynamics: conditions for asymptotic stability of saddle points," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 486–511, 2017.
- [35] D. Feijer and F. Paganini, "Stability of primal–dual gradient dynamics and applications to network optimization," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 1974–1981, 2010.
- [36] C. D. Rodríguez-Camargo, A. F. Urquijo-Rodríguez, and E. A. Mojica-Nava, "Consensus-based distributed optimization for multi-agent systems over multiplex networks," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2024, early access. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/10772699>
- [37] C. D. Rodríguez-Camargo and E. Mojica-Nava, "Consensus-based optimization in multiplex networks," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 1217–1222, 2023, 22nd IFAC World Congress.
- [38] D. Bertsekas, *Convex optimization theory*. Athena Scientific, 2009, vol. 1.
- [39] S. Gómez, A. Díaz-Guilera, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, C. J. Pérez-Vicente, Y. Moreno, and A. Arenas, "Diffusion dynamics on multiplex networks," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 110, p. 028701, Jan 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.028701>
- [40] F. Battiston, G. Cencetti, I. Iacopini, V. Latora, M. Lucas, A. Patania, J.-G. Young, and G. Petri, "Networks beyond pairwise interactions: structure and dynamics," *Physics Reports*, vol. 874, pp. 1–92, 2020.
- [41] R. Mulas, C. Kuehn, and J. Jost, "Coupled dynamics on hypergraphs: Master stability of steady states and synchronization," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 101, p. 062313, Jun 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.101.062313>
- [42] S. Majhi, M. Perc, and D. Ghosh, "Dynamics on higher-order networks: A review," *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, vol. 19, no. 188, p. 20220043, 2022.
- [43] X. Gong, D. J. Higham, K. Zygalakis, and G. Bianconi, "Higher-order connection laplacians for directed simplicial complexes," *Journal of Physics: Complexity*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 015022, mar 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2632-072X/ad353b>
- [44] T. Carletti, L. Giambagli, R. Muolo, and G. Bianconi, "Global topological dirac synchronization," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.15338>
- [45] C. D. Rodríguez-Camargo, E. A. Mojica-Nava, and N. F. Svaiter, "Sherrington-kirkpatrick model for spin glasses: Solution via the distributional zeta function method," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 104, p. 034102, Sep 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.104.034102>
- [46] C. Lucibello, F. Morone, G. Parisi, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, and T. Rizzo, "Finite-size corrections to disordered ising models on random regular graphs," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 90, p. 012146, Jul 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.90.012146>
- [47] A. Saldivar, N. F. Svaiter, and C. A. Zarro, "Functional equations for regularized zeta-functions and diffusion processes," *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 53, no. 23, p. 235205, 2020.

**Christian David Rodríguez-Camargo** Received a B.S. degree in physics from Universidad Nacional de Colombia in 2014, an M.Sc. degree in physics from the Brazilian Center for Research in Physics (CBPF) in 2016. He does research in relativistic quantum information, quantum biology, quantum field theory in curved spaces, smart grits and statistical field theory in network science within researching collaboration at The Atomic, Molecular, Optical and Positron Physics (AMOPP) group of the Department of Physics and Astronomy from the University College London and Programa de Investigación sobre Adquisición y Análisis de Señales (PAAS-UN) from Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

**Andrés F. Urquijo-Rodríguez** Received a B.S. and M.Sc. degree in physics from Universidad Nacional de Colombia, and he is currently pursuing his Ph.D. from Universidad Nacional de Colombia. He does research in network science, quantum information and condensed matter physics in low dimensional systems. He is an assistant professor at Universidad ECCI, Bogotá, Colombia.

**Eduardo Mojica-Nava** He received a B.S. degree in Electronics Engineering from Universidad Industrial de Santander in 2002, an M.Sc. degree in Electronics and Computer Science Engineering from Universidad de Los Andes, and a Ph.D. degree in Automatique et Informatique Industrielle from École des Mines de Nantes, Nantes, France and also Universidad de Los Andes in 2010. From 2011 to 2012, he was a Post-Doctoral Researcher at Universidad de Los Andes. He has been visiting professor at Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium, and Politecnico de Milano, Milan, Italy. Currently, he is a full professor at Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia.