

# Multi-Robot Coordination Under Physical Limitations

Tohid Kargar Tasooji, Sakineh Khodadadi

**Abstract**—Multi-robot coordination is fundamental to various applications, including autonomous exploration, search and rescue, and cooperative transportation. This paper presents an optimal consensus framework for multi-robot systems (MRSs) that ensures efficient rendezvous while minimizing energy consumption and addressing actuator constraints. A critical challenge in real-world deployments is actuator limitations, particularly wheel velocity saturation, which can significantly degrade control performance. To address this issue, we incorporate Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle (PMP) into the control design, facilitating constrained optimization while ensuring system stability and feasibility. The resulting optimal control policy effectively balances coordination efficiency and energy consumption, even in the presence of actuation constraints. The proposed framework is validated through extensive numerical simulations and real-world experiments conducted using a team of Robotarium mobile robots. The experimental results confirm that our control strategies achieve reliable and efficient coordinated rendezvous while addressing real-world challenges such as communication delays, sensor noise, and packet loss.

**Index Terms**—Multi-robot coordination, rendezvous control, multi-robot systems (MRSs), Pontryagin’s minimum principle (PMP), constrained optimal control.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**M**ULTI-ROBOT systems (MRSs) have become a fundamental element in modern robotics research, enabling tasks such as environmental monitoring, search and rescue, and cooperative exploration [1]–[8], [32]–[37], [43], [45], [46]. In these applications, effective rendezvous and coordination among robots are crucial. The rendezvous problem generally involves designing distributed control protocols that allow each robot, using only locally available information or data from nearby teammates, to converge to a common state or formation [9]. When convergence is achieved while optimizing specific performance metrics, the problem is referred to as optimal rendezvous.

A number of studies have explored optimal control strategies for robots with various dynamic models, addressing optimization objectives such as rapid convergence [10], minimal energy consumption [11], and robust performance against disturbances [12]. For instance, the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) framework has been effectively employed to address optimal control challenges in multi-robot settings [13]–[15]. While previous research has largely focused on first- and second-order dynamic models [16]–[18], [32], [33], recent investigations have extended these ideas to more complex systems. Examples include distributed LQR designs for leader-follower scenarios [21], [22] and data-driven solutions for systems with switching topologies [23]–[26].

Tohid Kargar Tasooji is with the Department of Aerospace Engineering, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, ON M5B 2K3, Canada (e-mail: tohid.kargartasooji@torontomu.ca). Sakineh Khodadadi is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, AB T6G 1H9, Canada (email: sakineh@ualberta.ca).

Practical multi-robot applications introduce additional complexities, primarily due to the inherent physical limitations of each robot. A key challenge is input saturation, where actuators are constrained in the maximum forces or torques they can generate. If not properly addressed, input saturation can lead to instability or degraded system performance. While several studies have explored the rendezvous problem under input saturation for linear systems [28]–[31], few have integrated the optimization of energy performance into their control designs.

Motivated by the aforementioned challenges, this paper develops a novel distributed optimal rendezvous framework for multi-robot systems with higher-order dynamics and input saturation constraints. The main contributions are summarized as follows:

- 1) We formulate the optimal rendezvous problem for general linear multi-robot systems and derive a closed-form solution based on algebraic Riccati equations (AREs) that decouples robot dynamics from network topology.
- 2) We incorporate input saturation constraints into the rendezvous design using Pontryagin’s minimum principle (PMP), providing rigorous stability guarantees while addressing practical limitations such as wheel velocity and acceleration bounds.
- 3) We validate the proposed distributed control strategy through real-world experiments on Robotarium robots, demonstrating robust performance under communication delays, bandwidth limitations, and packet loss.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we describe the problem statement and the necessary preliminaries. In Section III, we present the proposed optimal distributed protocols. Section IV showcases a case study of the implementation on mobile robots. Finally, Section V concludes the paper and summarizes the results.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Notation

In this work, we use standard mathematical notation. The symbol  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the set of real numbers, and  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  indicates the space of matrices with  $n$  rows and  $m$  columns. Similarly,  $\mathbb{R}^n$  represents the set of  $n$ -dimensional real vectors, and  $\|x\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm of a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . For any matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , its transpose is represented by  $X^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , and  $I_n$  stands for the  $n \times n$  identity matrix.

Given two matrices  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ , their Kronecker product, denoted by  $X \otimes Y$ , forms a block matrix of size  $pm \times qn$  defined as:

$$X \otimes Y = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11}Y & \cdots & x_{1n}Y \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{m1}Y & \cdots & x_{mn}Y \end{bmatrix}.$$

For a square matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , the notation  $X > 0$  (or  $X \geq 0$ ) is used to indicate that  $X$  is positive definite (or positive semidefinite), meaning all its eigenvalues are strictly positive (or non-negative).

We also define a saturation function,  $\text{sat}_{(u_{i,\min}, u_{i,\max})}(u_i)$ , which constrains a control input  $u_i$  within the bounds  $u_{i,\min} \leq u_i \leq u_{i,\max}$ . It is formally given by:

$$\text{sat}_{(u_{i,\min}, u_{i,\max})}(u_i) = \begin{cases} u_{i,\max}, & u_i \geq u_{i,\max}, \\ u_i, & u_{i,\min} \leq u_i \leq u_{i,\max}, \\ u_{i,\min}, & u_i \leq u_{i,\min}. \end{cases}$$

### B. Graph Theoretic Concepts

To model the interactions among  $N$  agents, we utilize concepts from graph theory. The communication network is characterized by a graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A})$ , where:

- $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$  is the set of nodes, each corresponding to a distinct agent, uniquely identified by the indices  $1, 2, \dots, N$ .
- $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of directed edges; an edge  $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$  signifies that information flows from agent  $i$  to agent  $j$ .
- $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is the adjacency matrix where  $a_{ij} = 1$  if  $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $a_{ij} = 0$  otherwise, with the convention that  $a_{ii} = 0$  for all  $i$ .

Additionally, the network structure can be further described using the graph Laplacian  $\mathcal{L} = [l_{ij}]$ . For  $i \neq j$ , the off-diagonal elements are defined as  $l_{ij} = -a_{ij}$ , and the diagonal entries are given by  $l_{ii} = \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij}$ , representing the degree of node  $i$ . This Laplacian matrix plays a critical role in analyzing the connectivity and consensus properties of the multi-agent system.

### C. Problem Formulation

We consider a fleet of  $N$  mobile robots, each operating in a two-dimensional environment. The state of robot  $i$  is defined by its position in the  $x$  and  $y$  directions, denoted as  $p_{ix}(t)$  and  $p_{iy}(t)$ . The dynamics of the  $i$ -th robot are governed by the following first-order system:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = Ax_i(t) + Bu_i(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

where the state vector for robot  $i$  is given by

$$x_i(t) = \begin{bmatrix} p_{ix}(t) \\ p_{iy}(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

representing the position of robot  $i$  in the  $x$  and  $y$  directions. The system matrices are given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this work, the objective is to design a distributed control law that ensures the robots rendezvous, i.e., all robots achieve the same position in the two-dimensional plane as time progresses. Specifically, we want the system to satisfy

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| = 0, \quad \forall i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (2)$$

This condition ensures that the robots converge to a common position in the  $x$ - $y$  plane.

To quantify the deviation from rendezvous, we define the position error between robots  $i$  and  $j$  as

$$l_{\varepsilon_{ij}}(t) = x_i(t) - x_j(t). \quad (3)$$

The global error vector for all robots can be written as

$$\varepsilon(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_1(t) \\ \varepsilon_2(t) \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_N(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The error dynamics for the system can be expressed as

$$\dot{\varepsilon}(t) = (I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon(t) + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U(t), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the Laplacian matrix representing the communi-

cation topology between the robots, and  $U(t) = \begin{bmatrix} u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \\ \vdots \\ u_N(t) \end{bmatrix}$

represents the control inputs for all robots.

The control law for robot  $i$  is designed to be distributed, relying only on the relative position information from its neighbors. The control input for robot  $i$  is given by

$$u_i(t) = -K \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (x_i(t) - x_j(t)), \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_i$  denotes the set of neighbors of robot  $i$ , and  $K$  is a positive gain matrix.

To evaluate the performance of the system, we define the global performance index (cost function) as

$$J = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon(t)^T Q \varepsilon(t) + U(t)^T R U(t)) dt, \quad (6)$$

where  $Q = Q^T \geq 0$  and  $R = R^T > 0$  are positive semi-definite and positive definite weighting matrices, respectively. The performance index  $J$  reflects a trade-off between minimizing the tracking error (rendezvous error) and controlling the effort expended by the robots.

In summary, the problem is to design a distributed control strategy that ensures the robots rendezvous at a common position, while minimizing the energy expenditure, as specified by the performance index  $J$ .

## III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we develop a global optimal control protocol for multi-robot systems (MRSs) that ensures all robots rendezvous—that is, they converge to a common position—while minimizing an energy-based cost function. We consider two scenarios as follows:

### A. Optimal Rendezvous Control without Bounded Control Input

**Theorem III.1.** Consider a multi-robot system with the global error dynamics given by

$$\dot{\varepsilon}(t) = (I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon(t) + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U(t), \quad (7)$$

where  $\varepsilon(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}$  is the stacked error vector (with  $m$  being the dimension of each robot's state),  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$

and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$  are the system matrices,  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is the Laplacian matrix corresponding to the communication topology, and  $U(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{rN}$  is the stacked control input vector. Assume that the weighting matrices  $Q = Q^T \succeq 0$  and  $R = R^T \succ 0$  are given. Then, the distributed control law

$$U^*(t) = -(\mathcal{L} \otimes K)\varepsilon(t), \quad (8)$$

with

$$K = R^{-1}B^T P, \quad (9)$$

ensures that the robots achieve rendezvous, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\varepsilon(t)\| = 0,$$

while minimizing the quadratic performance index

$$J = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon(t)^T Q \varepsilon(t) + U(t)^T R U(t)) dt. \quad (10)$$

Here,  $P \succ 0$  is the unique positive definite solution of the algebraic Riccati equation (ARE)

$$PA + A^T P + Q - PBR^{-1}B^T P = 0. \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* The proof is presented in two parts: first, we derive the necessary conditions for optimality using Pontryagin's Minimum Principle, and then we show that the proposed control law guarantees both optimality and asymptotic stability.

(i) *Necessity:* Define the Hamiltonian function for the optimal control problem as

$$H(\varepsilon, U, \lambda) = -(\varepsilon^T Q \varepsilon + U^T R U) + \lambda^T [(I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U], \quad (12)$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}$  is the costate vector. The optimality condition requires that

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial U} = -RU + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B^T)\lambda = 0, \quad (13)$$

which implies that

$$U^* = R^{-1}(\mathcal{L} \otimes B^T)\lambda. \quad (14)$$

Next, we assume a linear relation between the costate and the state error:

$$\lambda = -(I_N \otimes P)\varepsilon, \quad (15)$$

with  $P \succ 0$ . Substituting (15) into (14) yields

$$U^* = -(\mathcal{L} \otimes R^{-1}B^T P)\varepsilon = -(\mathcal{L} \otimes K)\varepsilon, \quad (16)$$

where the control gain is defined as in (9).

Differentiating the assumed costate relation (15) with respect to time, we obtain

$$\dot{\lambda} = -(I_N \otimes P)\dot{\varepsilon}. \quad (17)$$

Substituting the error dynamics (7) into (17), we have

$$\dot{\lambda} = -(I_N \otimes P)[(I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U^*]. \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, the costate dynamics provided by Pontryagin's Minimum Principle are given by

$$\dot{\lambda} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon} = (I_N \otimes A^T P + I_N \otimes Q)\varepsilon. \quad (19)$$

Equating (18) and (19) and simplifying, we obtain

$$I_N \otimes (PA + A^T P + Q - PBR^{-1}B^T P) = 0. \quad (20)$$

Since  $I_N$  is nonsingular, this condition reduces to the ARE (11), establishing the necessity of the gain  $K = R^{-1}B^T P$ .

(ii) *Sufficiency:* To prove that the control law (8) guarantees both optimality and rendezvous, consider the Lyapunov function candidate

$$V(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^T (I_N \otimes P) \varepsilon. \quad (21)$$

Differentiating  $V$  along the trajectories of the error dynamics (7) under the control law (8) gives

$$\dot{V} = \varepsilon^T (I_N \otimes P) [(I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U^*]. \quad (22)$$

Substituting  $U^* = -(\mathcal{L} \otimes K)\varepsilon$  and using the ARE (11), after straightforward algebra it follows that

$$\dot{V} = -\frac{1}{2} [\varepsilon^T (I_N \otimes Q)\varepsilon + U^{*T} R U^*] \leq 0. \quad (23)$$

Thus,  $V$  is a valid Lyapunov function, and by LaSalle's invariance principle, the error  $\varepsilon(t)$  converges to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently, the robots achieve rendezvous.

Furthermore, the performance index (10) can be expressed as

$$J = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2} [\varepsilon^T Q \varepsilon + U^{*T} R U^*] dt = V(0) - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(t) = V(0), \quad (24)$$

which is minimized by the proposed control law.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## B. Optimal Rendezvous Control with Bounded Control Input

In this part, we extend our previous results to the practically important case where the control inputs are subject to hard bounds. In particular, we consider a multi-robot system in which each robot must rendezvous (i.e., converge to a common position) while its control input is constrained within pre-specified limits. The objective is to minimize the quadratic performance index

$$J = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon^T Q \varepsilon + U^T R U) dt, \quad (25)$$

subject to the global error dynamics

$$\dot{\varepsilon}(t) = (I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon(t) + (I_N \otimes B)U(t), \quad (26)$$

and the control constraints

$$U_{min} \leq U(t) \leq U_{max}. \quad (27)$$

Here,  $\varepsilon(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}$  denotes the stacked error vector,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$  represent the dynamics of an individual robot,  $Q = Q^T \succeq 0$  and  $R = R^T \succ 0$  are weighting matrices, and  $U(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{rN}$  is the control input vector.

**Theorem III.2.** Consider the multi-robot system with dynamics given in (26) and subject to the control constraints (27). Define the unconstrained optimal control as

$$U_{unc}(t) = -(\mathcal{L} \otimes R^{-1}B^T P)\varepsilon(t), \quad (28)$$

where  $P \succ 0$  is the unique solution to the algebraic Riccati equation

$$PA + A^T P + Q - PBR^{-1}B^T P = 0. \quad (29)$$

Then, the optimal bounded control input that minimizes (25) is given by the following bang-bang structure:

$$U^*(t) = \begin{cases} U_{min}, & \text{if } U_{unc}(t) < U_{min}, \\ U_{unc}(t), & \text{if } U_{min} \leq U_{unc}(t) \leq U_{max}, \\ U_{max}, & \text{if } U_{unc}(t) > U_{max}. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Furthermore, the switching instants, denoted by  $T_{s_1}$  and  $T_{s_2}$ , which separate the saturated and unsaturated control regimes, satisfy the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)T_{s_1}\right)\bar{\varepsilon}_0 + \int_0^{T_{s_1}} \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)(T_{s_1} - \tau)\right)(\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U_{max} d\tau \\ & = \exp\left(\left[(I_N \otimes A) - (\mathcal{L} \otimes R^{-1}B^T P)\right]T_{s_1}\right)\varepsilon_0, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)T_{s_2}\right)\underline{\varepsilon}_0 + \int_0^{T_{s_2}} \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)(T_{s_2} - \tau)\right)(\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U_{min} d\tau \\ & = \exp\left(\left[(I_N \otimes A) - (\mathcal{L} \otimes R^{-1}B^T P)\right]T_{s_2}\right)\varepsilon_0. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Here,  $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$  and  $\underline{\varepsilon}_0$  denote the initial conditions corresponding to the trajectories under the extreme controls  $U_{max}$  and  $U_{min}$ , respectively.

*Proof.* The proof is based on the application of Pontryagin's Minimum Principle (PMP).

(i) *Formulation of the Hamiltonian:* Define the Hamiltonian for the optimization problem as

$$H(\varepsilon, U, \lambda) = \varepsilon^T Q \varepsilon + U^T R U + \lambda^T \left[ (I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon + (I_N \otimes B)U \right], \quad (33)$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}$  is the costate vector.

(ii) *Necessary Optimality Conditions:* The state and costate dynamics are given by

$$\dot{\varepsilon}^*(t) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \lambda} = (I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon^*(t) + (I_N \otimes B)U^*(t), \quad (34)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}^*(t) = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon} = -2Q\varepsilon^*(t) - (I_N \otimes A^T)\lambda^*(t). \quad (35)$$

In the unconstrained case, the minimization condition  $\frac{\partial H}{\partial U} = 0$  leads to

$$-2RU^*(t) + (I_N \otimes B^T)\lambda^*(t) = 0, \quad (36)$$

which implies

$$U_{unc}(t) = \frac{1}{2}R^{-1}(I_N \otimes B^T)\lambda^*(t). \quad (37)$$

A linear state-feedback ansatz is assumed for the costate:

$$\lambda^*(t) = -2(I_N \otimes P)\varepsilon^*(t), \quad (38)$$

so that the unconstrained control law becomes

$$U_{unc}(t) = -(\mathcal{L} \otimes R^{-1}B^T P)\varepsilon^*(t), \quad (39)$$

where the matrix  $P \succ 0$  satisfies the algebraic Riccati equation (29).

(iii) *Incorporation of Control Constraints:* Since the control input is bounded as in (27), the optimal control is obtained by

projecting  $U_{unc}(t)$  onto the admissible set. Hence, the optimal bounded control is given by

$$U^*(t) = \Pi_{[U_{min}, U_{max}]}(U_{unc}(t)), \quad (40)$$

which is equivalent to the bang-bang structure in (30). In other words, if  $U_{unc}(t)$  exceeds the upper bound  $U_{max}$  (or falls below the lower bound  $U_{min}$ ), the control saturates accordingly.

(iv) *Switching Conditions:* To determine the switching instants between the saturated and unsaturated regimes, we analyze the state evolution under the extreme controls. When the control is saturated at  $U_{max}$ , the error dynamics reduce to

$$\dot{\varepsilon}(t) = (I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon(t) + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U_{max}. \quad (41)$$

Its solution can be expressed as

$$\varepsilon(t) = \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)t\right)\bar{\varepsilon}_0 + \int_0^t \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)(t - \tau)\right)(\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U_{max} d\tau. \quad (42)$$

Similarly, when the control is saturated at  $U_{min}$ , we obtain

$$\varepsilon(t) = \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)t\right)\underline{\varepsilon}_0 + \int_0^t \exp\left((I_N \otimes A)(t - \tau)\right)(\mathcal{L} \otimes B)U_{min} d\tau. \quad (43)$$

In the unsaturated regime, where  $U^*(t) = U_{unc}(t)$ , the error dynamics are governed by

$$\dot{\varepsilon}(t) = \left[ (I_N \otimes A) - (\mathcal{L} \otimes R^{-1}B^T P) \right] \varepsilon(t), \quad (44)$$

with solution

$$\varepsilon(t) = \exp\left(\left[ (I_N \otimes A) - (\mathcal{L} \otimes R^{-1}B^T P) \right]t\right)\varepsilon_0. \quad (45)$$

Matching the state trajectories at the switching instants yields the equalities (31) and (32).

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** It is worth noting that due to the imposed bounded inputs, the control law in Theorem III.2 achieves a sub-optimal solution for the rendezvous problem in multi-robot systems (MRSs). The interaction topology among robots, the convexity of the performance index, and the specific input constraints jointly influence the optimization outcome. A key challenge in designing distributed optimal control strategies for MRSs is the careful selection of weighting matrices and costate variables to ensure that the optimization problem is tractable under a global interaction topology while satisfying the imposed input constraints.

**Theorem III.3.** Consider the global error dynamics given in (7) subject to input saturation. Under the distributed control protocol (27), the multi-robot system achieves optimal rendezvous; that is, the state error converges to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* We begin by proposing the following Lyapunov function candidate:

$$V(\varepsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^{\varepsilon_i} P_i \text{sat}_{(U_{i,\min}, U_{i,\max})}(K_i s) ds, \quad (46)$$

where  $P_i > 0$  and  $K_i$  are appropriately chosen matrices for each robot. By the properties of the saturation function, it follows that  $V(\varepsilon) \geq 0$  for all  $\varepsilon$ , with  $V(\varepsilon) = 0$  if and only if  $\varepsilon = 0$ .

Next, we compute the time derivative of  $V(\varepsilon)$  along the trajectories of the global error dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}(\varepsilon) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \text{sat}_{(U_{i,\min}, U_{i,\max})}^T(K_i \varepsilon_i) P_i \dot{\varepsilon}_i \\ &= \text{sat}_{(U_{\min}, U_{\max})}^T(K\varepsilon) P \dot{\varepsilon},\end{aligned}\quad (47)$$

where the stacked matrices  $P$  and  $K$  are defined appropriately, and the saturation function is applied element-wise.

Substituting the global error dynamics

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = (I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B) \text{sat}_{(U_{\min}, U_{\max})}(K\varepsilon)$$

into (47), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}(\varepsilon) &= \text{sat}_{(U_{\min}, U_{\max})}^T(K\varepsilon) P [(I_N \otimes A)\varepsilon \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{L} \otimes B) \text{sat}_{(U_{\min}, U_{\max})}(K\varepsilon)].\end{aligned}\quad (48)$$

By appropriately designing the control gain matrices and invoking the properties of the weighting matrices (as in the derivation of the unsaturated optimal control), it can be shown that

$$\dot{V}(\varepsilon) \leq -\text{sat}_{(U_{\min}, U_{\max})}^T(K\varepsilon) Q \text{sat}_{(U_{\min}, U_{\max})}(K\varepsilon) \leq 0, \quad (49)$$

where  $Q > 0$ . Note that even though the term  $P(I_N \otimes A)$  may have eigenvalues at zero (especially in high-order dynamics), the negative definiteness of the second term ensures that  $\dot{V}(\varepsilon)$  is negative semi-definite.

By invoking LaSalle's invariance principle, we conclude that the error  $\varepsilon(t)$  converges to the largest invariant set in which  $\dot{V}(\varepsilon) = 0$ . This set is characterized by  $\text{sat}_{(U_{\min}, U_{\max})}(K\varepsilon) = 0$ , which, by design, implies  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Hence, the multi-robot system achieves rendezvous under the control protocol (30).  $\square$

**Remark 2.** For the special case of first-order dynamics and given the saturation bounds, the final rendezvous error  $\varepsilon^*$  satisfies:

- 1) If  $U_{i,\min} < 0$  and  $U_{i,\max} > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , then  $\varepsilon_{\min}(0) < \varepsilon^* < \varepsilon_{\max}(0)$ .
- 2) If  $U_{i,\min} = 0$  and  $U_{i,\max} > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , then  $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon_{\max}(0)$ .
- 3) If  $U_{i,\min} < 0$  and  $U_{i,\max} = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , then  $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon_{\min}(0)$ .
- 4) If  $U_{i,\min} = U_{i,\max} = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , then  $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon(0)$ .

These conditions illustrate the effect of the saturation bounds on the final rendezvous state.

#### IV. CASE STUDY

In this section, we implement and test the consensus algorithm 1 using (i) a simulated example and (ii) application to a team of e-puck2 mobile robots. Our objective is to design and implement optimal consensus protocol such that mobile robots achieve average consensus, *i.e.*, they converge to the agreement point and optimize the energy cost performance index. We analyze the convergence speed and energy cost for the proposed consensus algorithm by choosing different

---

#### Algorithm 1 Optimal Rendezvous Protocol for Mobile Robots with First-Order Dynamics

---

**Require:**

Positions:  $x_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\{x_j(0)\}_{j \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \{i\}}$ , and tolerance  $\epsilon \ll 0.05$

**Ensure:**

Speed commands  $v_i(t)$ , positions  $x_i(t)$ , and performance indices  $J_i$

1: **while**  $\|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| > \epsilon$ ,  $\forall i, j$  **do**

2: Solve the matrix Riccati equation:

$$PA + A^T P + Q - PBR^{-1}B^T P = 0$$

3: Compute the unconstrained control (velocity):

$$v_i(t) = u_i(t) = -K \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(t) (x_i(t) - x_j(t))$$

4: Update the robot positions using:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = -K \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(t) (x_i(t) - x_j(t))$$

5: **if**  $R^{-1}B \lambda_i^*(t) > u_{i,\max}$  **then**

6: Determine the switching time  $t_{s2}$  from:

$$u_{i,\min} t_{s2} + x_i(0) = \exp(-R^{-1}B^T P t_{s2}) x_i(0)$$

7: Set

$$x_i(t) = u_{i,\min} t + x_i(0)$$

8: **else if**  $R^{-1}B \lambda_i^*(t) < u_{i,\min}$  **then**

9: Determine the switching time  $t_{s1}$  from:

$$u_{i,\max} t_{s1} + x_i(0) = \exp(-R^{-1}B^T P t_{s1}) x_i(0)$$

10: Set

$$x_i(t) = u_{i,\max} t + x_i(0)$$

11: **else if**  $u_{i,\min} < u_i(t) < u_{i,\max}$  **then**

12: Set

$$x_i(t) = \exp(-R^{-1}B^T P t) x_i(0)$$

13: **end if**

14: Compute the performance index:

$$J_i = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2} \left( \varepsilon_i^T Q \varepsilon_i + u_i^T R u_i \right) dt$$

15: **end while**

---

control gains. Note that, we consider the first-order dynamics for the consensus of mobile robots which is represented as follows:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = v_i(t) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (50)$$

where  $x_i(t)$  and  $v_i(t)$  are the position information and speed of mobile robots along x-axis, respectively.

##### A. Simulation Results

In this section, we conduct couple of simulations under MATLAB/Simulink environment to verify the effectiveness of




Fig. 1: Communication topology of the MAS




Fig. 2: Simulation results for optimal consensus algorithm 1: x positions of four mobile robots for different  $Q$  and  $R$ .

the designed optimal consensus control method for a group of mobile robots. Fig. 1 shows the communication topology of the MAS consisting of four mobile robots. The initial state of the robots are  $x_0(0) = -0.2$ ,  $x_1(0) = -0.1$ ,  $x_2(0) = 0$  and  $x_3(0) = 0.3$ . The matrix  $P$  and control gain  $K$  can be obtained using Theorem III.1 for any arbitrary choice of the matrices  $Q$  and  $R$ . Also, the mobile robot's wheel velocities are considered within the bound of  $0.5$  m/s. Fig. 2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show the simulation results of the position, velocity and performance index for different matrices  $Q$  and  $R$ . As expected, the results indicate that consensus is reached for all robots with different convergence speeds. In the case of  $Q = 3$  and  $R = 1$ , the state cost term is penalized more compared to the input cost term, which means that the position response will have faster convergence and small transient response. However, the control effort magnitude will be larger. In the case of  $Q = 1$  and  $R = 5$ , the input cost term is penalized compared to the state cost term. Therefore, the position response becomes more sluggish with larger transients and reduced control effort. When  $Q = 20$  and  $R = 1$ , the velocity of the mobile robots is saturated with  $-0.5$  m/s and  $0.5$  m/s. In this case, the LQR method is no longer effective. Therefore, we consider




Fig. 3: Simulation results for optimal consensus algorithm 1: x velocities of four mobile robots for different  $Q$  and  $R$ .




Fig. 4: Simulation results for optimal consensus algorithm 1: performance index (cost function) of four mobile robots for different  $Q$  and  $R$ .

Theorem III.2 for the optimal consensus of mobile robots where the input (velocity) is saturated. It can be seen that, whenever the speed of robots is saturated, based on the result of Theorem III.2 the optimal consensus control is maximum velocity of robots. Also, the motion of robots in this region will be linear. Once the control input satisfy within  $-0.5$  m/s and  $0.5$  m/s, the optimal consensus control will be obtained using  $u_i(t) = -R^{-1}B^T P \sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij}(x_i(t) - x_j(t))$ , which the

motion of robots exponentially converge to the the agreement position. Also, the switching time is the time that the motion of robots switch from the linear motion to exponential motion.

## B. Experimental Validation




Fig. 5: Experimental testing results for optimal consensus algorithm 1: x positions of four mobile robots for different  $Q$  and  $R$ .




Fig. 6: Experimental testing results for optimal consensus algorithm 1: x velocities of four mobile robots for different  $Q$  and  $R$ .

In this section, we validate the feasibility of the proposed optimal rendezvous algorithm by performing simulation experiments in the Robotarium platform.

In our experiments, each robot relies on odometry measurements to navigate towards the desired position. Communication among the robots is achieved over a network, which




Fig. 7: Experimental testing results for optimal consensus algorithm 1: performance index (cost function) of four mobile robots for different  $Q$  and  $R$ .

introduces inherent time delays due to limited bandwidth. Initially, the robots are positioned at distinct locations (i.e.,  $x_{\text{robot}0}(0) = -0.2$ ,  $x_{\text{robot}1}(0) = -0.1$ ,  $x_{\text{robot}2}(0) = 0$ , and  $x_{\text{robot}3}(0) = 0.3$ ) with zero initial velocities. The left and right wheel speeds of the Robotrium robots are constrained such that  $\|v_l\| \leq 11$  cm/s and  $\|v_r\| \leq 11$  cm/s.

Fig. 1 illustrates the communication topology of the multi-robot system, which plays a crucial role in determining the convergence speed of the system, as it is related to the smallest positive eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix. Based on the communication topology, the third robot has a directed path to all other robots, and consequently, it converges to the desired position faster than its counterparts.

The optimal rendezvous control is applied to update the desired position of each robot at every time instant upon receiving updated position information over the network. The control updates are transmitted periodically to the rendezvous controller with a period of approximately 0.1 s.

Figs. 5, 6, and 7 present the experimental results for position, velocity, and performance index under different choices of  $Q$  and  $R$ . As expected, when the state (i.e., position) is penalized more heavily than the control effort (i.e., speed), a faster convergence is achieved at the cost of higher control inputs. Conversely, when the control effort is penalized more heavily, the position response exhibits slower transients. In the specific case of  $Q = 6$  and  $R = 1$ , the velocities of the robots saturate at  $-11$  cm/s and  $11$  cm/s, resulting in the application of the maximum or minimum allowable speed as the optimal control input. When operating within the linear region (i.e., below the saturation limits), the robot positions converge exponentially to the agreement position.

The experimental results confirm that our optimal rendezvous algorithm offers a robust framework for distributed multi-robot cooperative control, effectively handling physical

limitations, wheel velocity constraints, packet loss, and time delays.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed an optimal rendezvous algorithm for multi-robot systems, aimed at achieving consensus in position while accounting for physical limitations, communication delays, and constraints on control inputs. Through extensive simulations and experimental validation using Robotrium platform, we demonstrated that the algorithm provides efficient convergence to a desired agreement position. The experimental results confirm that the proposed approach is robust under various conditions, such as limited communication bandwidth, time delays, and velocity constraints. Additionally, we analyzed the impact of different penalty parameters on convergence speed and control effort, highlighting the trade-off between faster convergence and higher control inputs. The results also show that the algorithm effectively handles robot physical limitations, ensuring stable and reliable multi-robot coordination in a distributed setup.

Future work will focus on extending the algorithm to handle more complex scenarios, including the presence of dynamic obstacles, variable network topologies, and more stringent time-varying constraints. Furthermore, we plan to investigate the scalability of the algorithm in larger multi-robot systems and explore its application in real-world robotic platforms for tasks such as autonomous transportation, multi-robot exploration, and cooperative manipulation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Li, H. H. T. Liu, B. Zhu, and H. Gao, "Robust second-order consensus tracking of multiple 3-DOF laboratory helicopters via output feedback," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics.*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 2538–2549, 2015.
- [2] Y. Jia and L. Wang, "Leader–follower flocking of multiple robotic fish," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 1372–1383, 2015.
- [3] S. Li, R. Kong, and Y. Guo, "Cooperative distributed source seeking by multiple robots: Algorithms and experiments," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 1810–1820, 2014.
- [4] K. D. Do, "Bounded assignment formation control of second-order dynamic agents," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 477–489, 2014.
- [5] W. Xing, Y. Zhao, and H. R. Karimi, "Convergence analysis on multi-AUV systems with leader-follower architecture," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 853–868, 2017.
- [6] B. Mu, K. Zhang, and Y. Shi, "Integral sliding mode flight controller design for a quadrotor and the application in a heterogeneous multi-agent system," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 9389–9398, 2017.
- [7] H. Li, Y. Shi, and W. Yan, "Distributed receding horizon control of constrained nonlinear vehicle formations with guaranteed  $\gamma$ -gain stability," *Automatica (Oxf.)*, vol. 68, pp. 148–154, 2016.
- [8] Y. Tang, X. Xing, H. R. Karimi, L. Kocarev, and J. Kurths, "Tracking control of networked multi-agent systems under new characterizations of impulses and its applications in robotic systems," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 1299–1307, 2016.
- [9] Q. Wang, Z. Duan, Y. Lv, Q. Wang, and G. Chen, "Linear quadratic optimal consensus of discrete-time multi-agent systems with optimal steady state: A distributed model predictive control approach," *Automatica (Oxf.)*, vol. 127, no. 109505, p. 109505, 2021.
- [10] Y. Zhao, Y. Liu, G. Wen, W. Ren, and G. Chen, "Designing distributed specified-time consensus protocols for linear multiagent systems over directed graphs," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 2945–2952, 2019.
- [11] S. Sardellitti, S. Barbarossa, and A. Swami, "Optimal topology control and power allocation for minimum energy consumption in consensus networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 383–399, 2012.
- [12] Z. Li and J. Chen, "Robust consensus of linear feedback protocols over uncertain network graphs," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 4251–4258, 2017.
- [13] H. Li, W. Yan, and Y. Shi, "Triggering and control codesign in self-triggered model predictive control of constrained systems: With guaranteed performance," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 4008–4015, 2018.
- [14] Y. Yang, "An efficient LQR design for discrete-time linear periodic system based on a novel lifting method," *Automatica (Oxf.)*, vol. 87, pp. 383–388, 2018.
- [15] H. Zhang, L. Li, J. Xu, and M. Fu, "Linear quadratic regulation and stabilization of discrete-time systems with delay and multiplicative noise," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 2599–2613, 2015.
- [16] Y. Cao and W. Ren, "Optimal linear-consensus algorithms: an LQR perspective," *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. B Cybern.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 819–830, 2010.
- [17] G. Shi, "Multi-agent systems reaching optimal consensus with time-varying communication graphs," *IFAC proc. vol.*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 5693–5699, 2011.
- [18] S. S. Kia, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez, "Distributed convex optimization via continuous-time coordination algorithms with discrete-time communication," *Automatica (Oxf.)*, vol. 55, pp. 254–264, 2015.
- [19] X. Wu, Z. Qu, and J. Lu, "A Second-Order Proximal Algorithm for Consensus Optimization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 1864–1871, 2021.
- [20] S. Rahili and W. Ren, "Distributed continuous-time convex optimization with time-varying cost functions," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1590–1605, 2017.
- [21] Z. Zhang, W. Yan, and H. Li, "Distributed optimal control for linear multiagent systems on general digraphs," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 322–328, 2021.
- [22] Z. Zhang, H. Li, Y. Shi, S. Zhang, and W. Yan, "Cooperative optimal control for Lipschitz nonlinear systems over generally directed topologies," *Automatica (Oxf.)*, vol. 122, no. 109279, p. 109279, 2020.
- [23] W. Gao, Z.-P. Jiang, F. L. Lewis, and Y. Wang, "Leader-to-formation stability of multiagent systems: An adaptive optimal control approach," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 3581–3587, 2018.
- [24] H. Zhang, T. Feng, G.-H. Yang, and H. Liang, "Distributed cooperative optimal control for multiagent systems on directed graphs: An inverse optimal approach," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 1315–1326, 2015.
- [25] K. H. Movric and F. L. Lewis, "Cooperative optimal control for multi-agent systems on directed graph topologies," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 769–774, 2014.
- [26] B. Mu and Y. Shi, "Distributed LQR consensus control for heterogeneous multiagent systems: Theory and experiments," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 434–443, 2018.
- [27] M. Athans, "On the uniqueness of the extremal controls for a class of minimum fuel problems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 660–668, 1966.
- [28] H. Su, M. Z. Q. Chen, J. Lam, and Z. Lin, "Semi-global leader-following consensus of linear multi-agent systems with input saturation via low gain feedback," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I Regul. Pap.*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 1881–1889, 2013.
- [29] J. Fu, G. Wen, W. Yu, and Z. Ding, "Finite-time consensus for second-order multi-agent systems with input saturation," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. II Express Briefs*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 1758–1762, 2018.
- [30] B. Wang, W. Chen, J. Wang, B. Zhang, and P. Shi, "Semiglobal tracking cooperative control for multiagent systems with input saturation: A multiple saturation levels framework," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1215–1222, 2021.
- [31] H. Su, M. Z. Q. Chen, X. Wang, and J. Lam, "Semiglobal observer-based leader-following consensus with input saturation," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 2842–2850, 2014.
- [32] T. Kargar Tasooji and H. J. Marquez, "Cooperative Localization in Mobile Robots Using Event-Triggered Mechanism: Theory and Experiments," in *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 3246–3258, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2021.3115770.
- [33] T. K. Tasooji and H. J. Marquez, "Event-Triggered Consensus Control for Multirobot Systems With Cooperative Localization," in *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 5982–5993, June 2023, doi: 10.1109/TIE.2022.3192673.
- [34] T. K. Tasooji, S. Khodadadi and H. J. Marquez, "Event-Based Secure Consensus Control for Multirobot Systems With Cooperative Localization Against DoS Attacks," in *IEEE/ASME Transac-*



- tions on Mechatronics, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 715-729, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1109/TMECH.2023.3270819.
- [35] T. K. Tasooji and H. J. Marquez, "Decentralized Event-Triggered Cooperative Localization in Multirobot Systems Under Random Delays: With/Without Timestamps Mechanism," in *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 555-567, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TMECH.2022.3203439.
- [36] T. Kargar Tasooji and H. J. Marquez, "A Secure Decentralized Event-Triggered Cooperative Localization in Multi-Robot Systems Under Cyber Attack," in *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 128101-128121, 2022, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3227076.
- [37] S. Khodadadi, T. K. Tasooji and H. J. Marquez, "Observer-Based Secure Control for Vehicular Platooning Under DoS Attacks," in *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 20542-20552, 2023, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3250398.
- [38] M. A. Gozukucuk et al., "Design and Simulation of an Optimal Energy Management Strategy for Plug-In Electric Vehicles," 2018 6th International Conference on Control Engineering & Information Technology (CEIT), Istanbul, Turkey, 2018, pp. 1-6, doi: 10.1109/CEIT.2018.8751923.
- [39] A. Mostafazadeh, T. K. Tasooji, M. Sahin and O. Usta, "Voltage control of PV-FC-battery-wind turbine for stand-alone hybrid system based on fuzzy logic controller," 2017 10th International Conference on Electrical and Electronics Engineering (ELECO), Bursa, Turkey, 2017, pp. 170-174.
- [40] T. K. Tasooji, A. Mostafazadeh and O. Usta, "Model predictive controller as a robust algorithm for maximum power point tracking," 2017 10th International Conference on Electrical and Electronics Engineering (ELECO), Bursa, Turkey, 2017, pp. 175-179.
- [41] T. K. Tasooji, O. Bebek, B. Ugurlu, "A Robust Torque Controller for Series Elastic Actuators: Model Predictive Control with a Disturbance Observer" Turkish National Conference on Automatic Control (TOK), Istanbul, Turkey pp. 398-402, 2017
- [42] T. K. Tasooji, "Energy consumption modeling and optimization of speed profile for plug-in electric vehicles", M.Sc. dissertation, Ozyegin Univ, Istanbul, Turkey, 2018
- [43] T. K. Tasooji, "Cooperative Localization and Control In Multi-Robot Systems With Event-Triggered Mechanism: Theory and Experiments", Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada, 2023
- [44] S. Khodadadi, "Observer-Based Secure Control of Vehicular Platooning Under DoS attacks", M.Sc. dissertation, Univ. Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada, 2022
- [45] A. Sagale, T. K. Tasooji, and R. Parasuraman, "DCL-sparse: Distributed range-only cooperative localization of multi-robots in noisy and sparse sensing graphs," arXiv [cs.RO], 2024.
- [46] T. K. Tasooji, S. Khodadadi, G. Liu, R. Wang, "Cooperative Control of Multi-Quadrotors for Transporting Cable-Suspended Payloads: Obstacle-Aware Planning and Event-Based Nonlinear Model Predictive Control", arXiv:2503.19135v1 [cs.RO]