Dissipativity-Based Distributed Control and Communication Topology Co-Design for DC Microgrids with ZIP Loads

Mohammad Javad Najafirad and Shirantha Welikala

Abstract—This paper presents a novel dissipativity-based distributed droop-free control approach for voltage regulation, current sharing, and Constant Power Load (CPL) stability in DC microgrids (MGs). We describe the closed-loop DC MG as a networked system where DGs, lines, and nonlinear loads (including destabilizing CPLs) are interconnected via a static interconnection matrix. Each DG has a local controller and a distributed global controller, designed using dissipativity properties and sector-bounded techniques. For controller synthesis, we formulate a Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI) problem that simultaneously addresses voltage regulation, current sharing, and CPL stability guarantees. To support the feasibility of this problem, we propose a sector-bounded approach that characterizes CPL nonlinearities and integrates them into the dissipativity framework through S-procedure techniques. Our approach provides a unified framework for codesigning distributed controllers and communication topologies that ensure stability despite the presence of destabilizing CPL effects. The effectiveness of the proposed solution was verified by simulating an islanded DC MG under different scenarios, demonstrating superior performance compared to traditional control approaches when handling CPLs.

Index Terms—DC Microgrid, Voltage Regulation, Current Sharing, Distributed Control, Networked Systems, Dissipativity-Based Control, Constant Power Load.

I. INTRODUCTION

The microgrid (MG) concept has been introduced as a comprehensive framework for the cohesive coordination of distributed generators (DGs), variable loads, and energy storage units within a controllable electrical network to facilitate the efficient integration of renewable energy resources such as wind turbines and photovoltaic systems [1]. DC MGs have gained more attention in recent years due to the growing demand for DC loads such as data centers, electric vehicle chargers, and LED lighting. In addition, DC MGs offer distinct advantages over AC systems by eliminating unnecessary conversion stages and removing frequency regulation [2].

The two primary control goals in DC MGs are voltage regulation and current sharing. To achieve these goals, centralized [3], decentralized [4], and distributed control [5] are proposed. Although the centralized approach provides controllability and observability, it suffers from a single point of failure [6]. In decentralized control, only a local controller is required; hence, there is no communication among DGs [7] that comprises the proportional current sharing. The lack of coordination can be solved by developing distributed control in which the DGs can share their variables with their neighbors through a communication network [8]. The conventional decentralized control approach is droop control. However, due to line impedance mismatch and droop characteristics, the traditional droop control cannot simultaneously achieve voltage regulation and current sharing. Despite various innovations in hierarchical and distributed control [9]–[11], droop control fundamentally requires careful tuning of droop coefficients to effectively balance these conflicting objectives. Therefore, some researchers have been motivated to implement droop-free control algorithms [12], [13], which offer more flexibility in achieving both control objectives simultaneously.

A particular challenge in DC MGs is the presence of constant power loads (CPLs), which exhibit negative impedance characteristics that can destabilize the system [14]. The nonlinear nature of CPLs introduces significant challenges to controller design and stability analysis, necessitating advanced control techniques to ensure robust operation [15].

Furthermore, conventional distributed controller design proceeds independently from communication topology considerations, with network structures often assumed to be static or predetermined. Recent advancements in communication technologies have eliminated the necessity for fixed communication structures, creating opportunities for innovative control strategies with customizable and reconfigurable communication topologies [16]. A cost-effective communication network while ensuring control performance has been addressed in [17]–[19], but these approaches typically follow sequential rather than co-design strategies.

Dissipativity theory offers a powerful framework for analyzing and designing control systems, particularly for power electronic converters and microgrids [20]. By focusing on the fundamental energy exchanges between interconnected components, dissipativity-based approaches can ensure stability even when components exhibit complex, nonlinear behaviors [21]. For DC MGs with CPLs, sector-bounded nonlinearity techniques combined with dissipativity theory provide a systematic approach to ensure stability despite the destabilizing effects of CPLs [22].

This paper introduces a novel dissipativity-based distributed control framework for DC MGs that eliminates the need for traditional droop characteristics while effectively handling CPL nonlinearities through sector-bounded analysis. Our approach views DGs, loads, and transmission lines as interconnected energy systems and focuses on their fundamental energy exchanges. We propose an innovative codesign methodology that simultaneously optimizes the distributed controllers and the communication network topology using linear matrix inequalities (LMIs).

The authors are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, School of Engineering and Science, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, NJ 07030, {mnajafir,swelikal}@stevens.edu.

The main contributions of this paper can be outlined as:

- We formulate the DC MG control problem as a hierarchical networked system control problem and propose a novel framework that combines local voltage control with distributed consensus-based current sharing through a unified dissipativity-based co-design approach.
- 2) We present a sector-bounded approach to handle CPL nonlinearities within our dissipativity framework, ensuring stability despite the destabilizing negative impedance characteristics of these loads while maintaining the core structure of our LMI-based design methodology.
- We formulate all design problems as LMI-based convex optimization problems, enabling efficient numerical implementation, scalable controller synthesis, and joint optimization of distributed control gains and communication topology.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Notations: The notation \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{N} signify the sets of real and natural numbers, respectively. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathbb{N}_N \triangleq \{1, 2, ..., N\}$. An $n \times m$ block matrix A is denoted as $A = [A_{ij}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_n, j \in \mathbb{N}_m}$. Either subscripts or superscripts are used for indexing purposes, e.g., $A_{ij} \equiv A^{ij}$. $[A_{ij}]_{j \in \mathbb{N}_m}$ and diag $([A_{ii}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_n})$ represent a block row matrix and a block diagonal matrix, respectively. **0** and **I**, respectively, are the zero and identity matrices. A symmetric positive definite (semi-definite) matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is denoted by A > 0 ($A \ge 0$). The symbol \star represents conjugate blocks inside block symmetric matrices, $\mathcal{H}(A) \triangleq A + A^{\top}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\{\cdot\}}$ is the indicator function.

A. Dissipativity

Consider a general non-linear dynamic system

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)), \quad y(t) = h(x(t), u(t)),$$
 (1)

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^q$, $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^m$ are continuously differentiable.

The equilibrium-independent-dissipativity (EID) property examines dissipativity without explicit knowledge of equilibrium points.

Definition 1: The system (1) is called EID under supply rate $s : \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ if there is a continuously differentiable storage function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $V(x, x^*) > 0$ when $x \neq x^*$, $V(x^*, x^*) = 0$, and

 $\dot{V}(x,x^*) = \nabla_x V(x,x^*) f(x,u) \le s(u-u^*,y-y^*),$ for all $(x,x^*,u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^q.$

Definition 2: The system (1) is X-EID if it is EID under the quadratic supply rate:

 $s(u - u^*, y - y^*) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} u - u^* \\ y - y^* \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} X^{11} & X^{12} \\ X^{21} & X^{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u - u^* \\ y - y^* \end{bmatrix}.$ **Remark** 1: If the system (1) is X-EID with: 1) $X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, then it is passive; 2) $X = \begin{bmatrix} -\nu\mathbf{I} & \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} & -\rho\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$, then it is strictly passive with input and output passivity indices ν and ρ , denoted as IF-OFP (ν, ρ)); 3) $X = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma^{2}\mathbf{I} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$, then it is L_2 -stable with gain γ , denoted



Fig. 1. A generic networked system Σ .

as $L2G(\gamma)$).

Proposition 1: [23] The LTI system

$$\begin{split} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad y(t) = Cx(t) + Du(t), \\ \text{is X-EID$ if and only if there exists $P > 0$ such that} \\ \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{H}(PA) + C^{\top}X^{22}C & -PB + C^{\top}X^{21} + C^{\top}X^{22}D \\ \star & X^{11} + \mathcal{H}(X^{12}D) + D^{\top}X^{22}D \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \end{split}$$

B. Networked Systems

Consider the networked system Σ in Fig. 1, consisting of dynamic subsystems $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \overline{\Sigma}_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_{\overline{N}}$ and a static interconnection matrix M that characterizes interconnections among subsystems, exogenous inputs $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ (e.g. disturbances) and interested outputs $z(t) \in \mathbb{R}^l$ (e.g. performance).

The dynamics of each subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ are given by

 $\dot{x}_i(t) = f_i(x_i(t), u_i(t)), \quad y_i(t) = h_i(x_i(t), u_i(t)),$ (2) where $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{q_i}, y_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$. Similar to (1), each subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ is considered to have a set $\mathcal{X}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, where for every $x_i^* \in \mathcal{X}_i$, there exists a unique $u_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{q_i}$ such that $f_i(x_i^*, u_i^*) = 0$, and both u_i^* and $y_i^* \triangleq h_i(x_i^*, u_i^*)$ are implicit function of x_i^* . Moreover, each subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ is assumed to be X_i -EID, where $X_i \triangleq [X_i^{kl}]_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}_2}$. Regarding each subsystem $\overline{\Sigma}_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_{\overline{N}}$, we use similar assumptions and notations, but include a bar symbol to distinguish between the two types of subsystems, e.g., $\overline{\Sigma}_i$ is assumed to be \overline{X}_i -EID where $\overline{X}_i \triangleq [\overline{X}_i^{kl}]_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}_2}$.

Defining $u \triangleq [u_i^{\top}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}^{\top}$, $y \triangleq [y_i^{\top}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}^{\top}$, $\bar{u} \triangleq [\bar{u}_i^{\top}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}^{\top}$ and $\bar{y} \triangleq [y_i^{\top}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}^{\top}$, the interconnection matrix M and the corresponding interconnection relationship are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} u\\ \bar{u}\\ z\\ \end{bmatrix} = M \begin{bmatrix} y\\ \bar{y}\\ w \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} M_{uy} & M_{u\bar{y}} & M_{uw}\\ M_{\bar{u}y} & M_{\bar{u}\bar{y}} & M_{\bar{u}w}\\ M_{zy} & M_{z\bar{y}} & M_{zw} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y\\ \bar{y}\\ w \end{bmatrix}.$$
(3)

The following proposition exploits the X_i -EID and \bar{X}_i -EID properties of the subsystems $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ and $\bar{\Sigma}_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_{\bar{N}}$ to formulate an LMI problem for synthesizing the interconnection matrix M (3), ensuring the networked system Σ is **Y**-EID for a prespecified **Y** under two mild assumptions [24].

Assumption 1: For the networked system Σ , the provided Y-EID specification is such that $\mathbf{Y}^{22} < 0$.

Remark 2: Based on Rm. 1, As. 1 holds if the networked system Σ must be either: (i) L2G(γ) or (ii) IF-OFP(ν, ρ) with some $\rho > 0$, i.e., L_2 -stable or passive, respectively. Therefore, As. 1 is mild since it is usually preferable to make the networked system Σ either L_2 -stable or passive.

Assumption 2: In the networked system Σ , each subsystem Σ_i is X_i -EID with $X_i^{11} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, and similarly,

each subsystem $\bar{\Sigma}_i$ is \bar{X}_i -EID with $\bar{X}_i^{11} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_{\bar{N}}$.

Remark 3: According to Rm. 1, As. 2 holds if a subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ is either: (i) $L2G(\gamma_i)$ or (ii) IF-OFP(ν_i, ρ_i) with $\nu_i < 0$ (i.e., L_2 -stable or non-passive). Since in passivity-based control, often the involved subsystems are non-passive (or can be treated as such), As. 2 is also mild.

Proposition 2: [24] Under As. 1-2, the network system Σ can be made **Y**-EID (from w(t) to z(t)) by synthesizing the interconnection matrix M (3) via solving the LMI problem:

Find: $L_{uy}, L_{u\bar{y}}, L_{uw}, L_{\bar{u}y}, L_{\bar{u}\bar{y}}, L_{\bar{u}w}, M_{zy}, M_{z\bar{y}}, M_{zw}$, Sub. to: $p_i \ge 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \quad \bar{p}_l \ge 0, \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_{\bar{N}}, \text{ and } (5),$ (4)

with
$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{uy} & M_{u\bar{y}} & M_{uw} \\ M_{\bar{u}y} & M_{\bar{u}\bar{y}} & M_{\bar{u}w} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_p^{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\bar{p}}^{11} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} L_{uy} & L_{u\bar{y}} & L_{uw} \\ L_{\bar{u}y} & L_{\bar{u}\bar{y}} & L_{\bar{u}w} \end{bmatrix}$$

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

This section presents the dynamic modeling of the DC MG, which consists of multiple DGs, loads, and transmission lines. Specifically, our modeling approach is motivated by [25], which highlights the role and impact of communication and physical topologies in DC MGs.

A. DC MG Physical Interconnection Topology

The physical interconnection topology of a DC MG is modeled as a directed connected graph $\mathcal{G}^p = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{L}$ is bipartite: $\mathcal{D} = \{\Sigma_i^{DG}, i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ (DGs) and $\mathcal{L} = \{\Sigma_l^{line}, l \in \mathbb{N}_L\}$ (transmission lines). The DGs are interconnected with each other through transmission lines. The interface between each DG and the DC MG is through a point of common coupling (PCC). For simplicity, the loads are assumed to be connected to the DG terminals at the respective PCCs [26]. Indeed loads can be moved to PCCs using Kron reduction even if they are located elsewhere [26].

To represent the DC MG's physical topology, we use its adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{B} \\ \mathcal{B}^{\top} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times L}$ is the incident matrix of the DG network (where nodes are just the DGs and edges are just the transmission lines). Note that \mathcal{B} is also known as the "bi-adjacency" matrix of \mathcal{G}^p that describes the connectivity between its two types of nodes. In particular, $\mathcal{B} = [\mathcal{B}_{il}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N, l \in \mathbb{N}_L}$ with $\mathcal{B}_{il} \triangleq \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in \mathcal{E}_i^+\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in \mathcal{E}_i^-\}}$, where \mathcal{E}_i^+ and \mathcal{E}_i^- represent the out- and in-neighbors of Σ_i^{DG} .

B. Dynamic Model of a Distributed Generator (DG)

Each DG consists of a DC voltage source, a voltage source converter (VSC), and some RLC components. Each DG $\Sigma_i^{DG}, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ supplies power to a specific load at its PCC (denoted PCC_i). Additionally, it interconnects with other DG units via transmission lines $\{\Sigma_l^{line} : l \in \mathcal{E}_i\}$. Figure 2 illustrates the schematic diagram of Σ_i^{DG} , including the local load, a connected transmission line, and the local and distributed global controllers.

By applying Kirchhoff's Current Law (KCL) and Kirchhoff's Voltage Law (KVL) at PCC_i on the DG side, we get the following equations for Σ_i^{DG} , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$:

$$\Sigma_i^{DG} : \begin{cases} C_{ti} \frac{dV_i}{dt} &= I_{ti} - I_{Li}(V_i) - I_i + w_{vi}(t), \\ L_{ti} \frac{dI_{ti}}{dt} &= -V_i - R_{ti}I_{ti} + V_{ti} + w_{ci}(t), \end{cases}$$
(6)

where the parameters R_{ti} , L_{ti} , and C_{ti} represent the internal resistance, internal inductance, and filter capacitance of Σ_i^{DG} , respectively. The state variables are selected as V_i and I_{ti} , where V_i is the PCC_i voltage and I_{ti} is the internal current. Moreover, V_{ti} is the input command signal applied to the VSC, $I_{Li}(V_i)$ is the load current, and I_i is the total current injected to the DC MG by Σ_i^{DG} . Without loss of generality, $w_{vi}(t)$ and $w_{ci}(t)$ represent unknown bounded external zero-mean Gaussian disturbances affecting the voltage and current dynamics, respectively, with variances σ_{vi}^2 and σ_{ci}^2 .

Note that V_{ti} , $I_{Li}(V_i)$, and I_i are respectively determined by the controllers, loads, and lines at Σ_i^{DG} . The total line current I_i is given by

$$I_i = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{E}_i} \mathcal{B}_{il} I_l,\tag{7}$$

where $I_l, l \in \mathcal{E}_i$ are line currents.

C. Dynamic Model of a Transmission Line

Each transmission line is modeled using the π -equivalent representation, where we assume that the line capacitances are consolidated with the capacitances of the DG filters. Consequently, as shown in Fig. 2, the power line Σ_l^{line} can be represented as an RL circuit with resistance R_l and inductance L_l . By applying KVL to Σ_l^{line} , we obtain:

$$\Sigma_{l}^{line}: L_{l} \frac{dI_{l}}{dt} = -R_{l}I_{l} + \bar{u}_{l} + \bar{w}_{l}(t),$$
 (8)

where I_l is the line current state and $\bar{u}_l = V_i - V_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_l} \mathcal{B}_{il} V_i$, and $\bar{w}_l(t)$ represents the unknown bounded external zero mean disturbance that affects the line resistance, defined as $\bar{w}_l(t) = -\Delta R_l(t) I_l$, where $\Delta R_l(t)$ represents a zero-mean Gaussian disturbance with variance σ_l^2 . This disturbance term captures the effect of the uncertainty in line resistance.

D. Dynamic Model of a Load

Recall that $I_{Li}(V_i)$ in (6) and Fig. 2 is the current flowing through the load at Σ_i^{DG} , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$. In DC MGs, loads are modeled using the "ZIP" load model, where $I_{Li}(V_i)$ takes the form:

$$I_{Li}(V_i) = I_{Li}^Z(V_i) + I_{Li}^I(V_i) + I_{Li}^P(V_i).$$
(9)

Here, the ZIP load's components are: (i) a constant impedance load: $I_{Li}^Z(V_i) = Y_{Li}V_i$, where $Y_{Li} = 1/R_{Li}$ is the conductance of the load, (ii) a constant current load: $I_{Li}^I(V_i) = \bar{I}_{Li}$ where \bar{I}_{Li} is the current demand, and (iii)





Fig. 2. The electrical schematic of DG-*i*, load-*i*, $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, local controller, distributed global controller, and line-*l*, $l \in \mathbb{N}_L$.

a constant power load: $I_{Li}^P(V_i) = V_i^{-1}P_{Li}$, where P_{Li} represents the power demand.

The CPL component introduces significant stability challenges due to its inherent negative impedance characteristic. This can be observed by examining the small-signal impedance of the CPL:

$$Z_{CPL} = \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial I_{Li}^P} = \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial (P_{Li}/V_i)} = -\frac{V_i^2}{P_{Li}} < 0.$$
(10)

This negative impedance characteristic creates a destabilizing effect in the DC MG, as it tends to amplify voltage perturbations rather than dampen them. When a small voltage drop occurs, the CPL draws more current to maintain constant power, which further reduces the voltage, potentially leading to voltage collapse if not properly controlled.

The nonlinear nature of CPLs also introduces complexity in the control design. The nonlinear term $I_{Li}^P(V_i) = V_i^{-1}P_{Li}$ appears in the voltage dynamics as:

$$g_i(x_i(t)) = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{P_{Li}}{C_{ti}V_i} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(11)

This nonlinearity must be carefully managed to ensure system stability, particularly when CPLs constitute a significant portion of the total load. Our proposed control framework specifically addresses the stability challenges posed by CPLs through a sector-bounded approach that will be detailed in the subsequent sections.

IV. PROPOSED CONTROLLER

The primary objective of local and global controllers is to ensure that the PCC_i voltage V_i at each Σ_i^{DG} , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ closely follows a specified reference voltage V_{ri} while achieving proportional current sharing among DGs. The control objectives in DC MGs are achieved through the complementary action of local and distributed controllers. The local controller at each Σ_i^{DG} is primarily responsible for voltage regulation, where at each Σ_i^{DG} , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, we employ a PI controller for voltage regulation. Furthermore, we provide a consensusbased distributed global controller to ensure proper current sharing across the MG.

A. Local Voltage Controller

At each Σ_i^{DG} , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, to effectively track the assigned reference voltage $V_{ri}(t)$, it is imperative to ensure that the error $e_i(t) \triangleq V_i(t) - V_{ri}(t)$ converges to zero, i.e. $\lim_{t\to\infty} (V_i(t) - V_{ri}) = 0$, which guarantees that the voltage at each Σ_i^{DG} converges to its reference value. To this end, motivated by [27], we first include each Σ_i^{DG} , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ with an integrator state v_i (i.e. $v_i(t) = \int (V_i(t) - V_{ri}) dt$) (see Fig. 2) that follows the dynamics

$$\frac{dv_i}{dt} = e_i(t) = V_i(t) - V_{ri}.$$
(12)

Then, Σ_i^{DG} is equipped with a local state feedback controller

$$u_{iL}(t) \triangleq k_{i0}^P(V_i - V_{ri}) + k_{i0}^I v_i(t) = K_{i0} x_i(t) - k_{i0}^P V_{ri},$$
(13)
where

where

$$x_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} V_i & I_{ti} & v_i \end{bmatrix}^\top \tag{14}$$

denotes the augmented state of Σ_i^{DG} and $K_{i0} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{i0}^P & 0 & k_{i0}^I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 3}$ where K_{i0} is the local controller gain.

B. Distributed Global Controller

The local controllers alone do not guarantee global stability in the presence of other interconnected DGs and lines.

Besides, for current sharing, which the distributed controller manages, the objective is to achieve proportional power sharing among DGs by ensuring:

$$\frac{I_{ti}(t)}{P_{ni}} = \frac{I_{tj}(t)}{P_{nj}} = I_s, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N,$$
(15)

where P_{ni} and P_{nj} represent the power ratings of Σ_i^{DG} and Σ_j^{DG} respectively, and I_s represents the common current sharing ratio that emerges from balancing the total load demand among DGs according to their power ratings.

To address the current sharing, as shown in Fig. 2, we employ a consensus-based distributed controller

$$u_{iG}(t) \triangleq \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_i^-} k_{ij}^I \left(\frac{I_{ti}(t)}{P_{ni}} - \frac{I_{tj}(t)}{P_{nj}} \right), \qquad (16)$$

where each $k_{ij}^I \in \mathbb{R}$ is a consensus-based distributed controller gain.

Note that we denote the communication topology as a directed graph $\mathcal{G}^c = (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F})$ where $\mathcal{D} \triangleq \{\Sigma_i^{DG}, i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ and \mathcal{F} represents the set of communication links among DGs. The notations \mathcal{F}_i^+ and \mathcal{F}_i^- are defined as the communication-wise out- and in-neighbors, respectively.

Thus, the overall control input $u_i(t)$ applied to the VSC of Σ_i^{DG} (see (6)) can be expressed as

$$u_i(t) \triangleq V_{ti}(t) = u_{iS} + u_{iL}(t) + u_{iG}(t).$$
 (17)

where u_{iL} is given by (13), u_{iG} is given by (16) and u_{iS} represents the steady-state control input, which, as we will see in the sequel, plays a crucial role in achieving the desired equilibrium point of the DC MG. In particular, this steady-state component ensures that the system can maintain its operating point while satisfying both voltage regulation and current sharing objectives. The specific structure and

properties of u_{iS} will be characterized through our stability analysis in Sec. V-A.

C. Closed-Loop Dynamics of the DC MG

By combining (6) and (12), the overall dynamics of $\Sigma_i^{DG}, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ can be written as

$$\frac{dV_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{C_{ti}}I_{ti} - \frac{1}{C_{ti}}I_{Li}(V_i) - \frac{1}{C_{ti}}I_i + \frac{1}{C_{ti}}w_{vi}(t), \quad (18a)$$

$$\frac{dI_{ti}}{dt} = -\frac{1}{L_{ti}}V_i - \frac{R_{ti}}{L_{ti}}I_{ti} + \frac{1}{L_{ti}}u_i + \frac{1}{L_{ti}}w_{ci}(t), \quad (18b)$$

$$\frac{dv_i}{dt} = V_i - V_{ri}.$$
(18c)

In (18), the terms I_i , $I_{Li}(V_i)$, and u_i can all be substituted from Eqs. (7), (9), and (17), respectively. We can restate (18) as

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = A_i x_i(t) + B_i u_i(t) + E_i d_i(t) + \xi_i(t) + g_i(x_i(t)),$$
(19)

where $x_i(t)$ is the DG state as defined in (14), $d_i(t)$ is the exogenous input (disturbance) defined as

$$d_i(t) \triangleq \bar{w}_i + w_i(t), \qquad (20)$$

with $\bar{w}_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -\bar{I}_{Li} & 0 & -V_{ri} \end{bmatrix}^\top$ representing the fixed (mean) known disturbance and $w_i(t) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} w_{vi}(t) & w_{ci}(t) & 0 \end{bmatrix}^\top$ representing the bounded zero-mean unknown disturbance. The disturbance input matrix is $E_i \triangleq \text{diag}(\begin{bmatrix} C_{ti}^{-1} & L_{ti}^{-1} & 1 \end{bmatrix})$. The transmission line coupling is defined as $\xi_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -C_{ti}^{-1} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{E}_i} \mathcal{B}_{il}I_l & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^\top$, and $g_i(x_i(t))$ represents the nonlinear vector field due to the CPL.

The system matrices A_i , B_i in (19) respectively are

$$A_{i} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{Y_{Li}}{C_{ti}} & \frac{1}{C_{ti}} & 0\\ -\frac{1}{L_{ti}} & -\frac{R_{ti}}{L_{ti}} & 0\\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_{i} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 0\\ \frac{1}{L_{ti}}\\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(21)

Similarly, using (8), the state space representation of the transmission line Σ_l^{Line} can be written in a compact form:

$$\dot{\bar{x}}_l(t) = \bar{A}_l \bar{x}_l(t) + \bar{B}_l \bar{u}_l + \bar{E}_l \bar{w}_l(t),$$
 (22)

where $\bar{x}_l \triangleq I_l$ is the transmission line state, $\bar{u}_l \triangleq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_l} \mathcal{B}_{il} V_i$ is the voltage difference across the transmission line, $\bar{w}_l(t)$ captures the time-varying resistenace uncertainty, and $\bar{E}_l \triangleq \left[\frac{1}{L_l}\right]$. The system matrices \bar{A}_l and \bar{B}_l in (22) respectively, are

$$\bar{A}_l \triangleq \left[-\frac{R_l}{L_l} \right] \text{ and } \bar{B}_l \triangleq \left[\frac{1}{L_l} \right].$$
 (23)

D. Networked System Model

Let us define $u \triangleq [u_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ and $\bar{u} \triangleq [\bar{u}_l]_{l \in \mathbb{N}_L}$ respectively as vectorized control inputs of DGs and lines, $x \triangleq [x_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ and $\bar{x} \triangleq [\bar{x}_l]_{l \in \mathbb{N}_L}$ respectively as the full states of DGs and lines, $w \triangleq [w_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ and $\bar{w} \triangleq [\bar{w}_l]_{l \in \mathbb{N}_L}$ respectively as disturbance inputs of DGs and lines.

Using these notations, we can now represent the DC MG as two sets of subsystems (i.e., DGs and lines) interconnected with disturbance inputs through a static interconnection matrix M as shown in Fig. 3. From comparing Fig. 3 with Fig. 1, it is clear that the DC MG takes the form of a standard networked system discussed in Sec. II-B.

To identify the specific structure of the interconnection matrix M in Fig. 3 (i.e., for DC MG), we need to closely



Fig. 3. DC MG dynamics as a networked system configuration.

observe how the dynamics of DGs and lines are interconnected with each other, and their coupling with disturbance inputs.

To this end, we first use (19) and (17) to state the closed-loop dynamics of Σ_i^{DG} as (see also Co. ??)

$$\dot{x}_i = (A_i + B_i K_{i0}) x_i + \tilde{\eta}_i, \qquad (24)$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_i$ in (24) is defined as

$$\tilde{\eta}_i \triangleq E_i w_i(t) + \sum_{l \in \mathcal{E}_i} \bar{C}_{il} \bar{x}_l + \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_i^-} K_{ij} x_j + \theta_i, \qquad (25)$$

with $\bar{C}_{il} \triangleq -C_{ti}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}_{il} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{\top}, \forall l \in \mathcal{E}_i, \ \theta_i \triangleq E_i \bar{w}_i + B_i u_{iS} - B_i k_{i0}^P V_{ri}$, and to capture the distributed current sharing objective through the communication network, we define the coupling gain matrix:

$$K_{ij} \triangleq \frac{1}{L_{ti}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_{ij}^{I} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \forall j \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{i}^{-}.$$
 (26)

The structure of K_{ij} reflects that only the current states are coupled through the communication network, where k_{ij}^I represents the consensus gain between Σ_i^{DG} and Σ_j^{DG} .

By vectorizing (25) over all $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, we get

$$\tilde{\eta} \triangleq Ew + \bar{C}\bar{x} + Kx + \theta, \tag{27}$$

where $\tilde{\eta} \triangleq [\tilde{\eta}_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ represents the effective input vector to the DGs, $\bar{C} \triangleq [\bar{C}_{il}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N, l \in \mathbb{N}_L}$ and $K \triangleq [K_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}, E \triangleq$ diag $([E_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N})$ is the vector of DG disturbances, and $\theta \triangleq$ $[\theta_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ represents a constant input vector applied in DGs.

Remark 4: The block matrices K and \overline{C} in (27) are indicative of the communication and physical topologies of the DC MG, respectively. In particular, the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block in K, i.e., K_{ij} indicates a communication link from Σ_j^{DG} to Σ_i^{DG} . Similarly, $(i, l)^{\text{th}}$ block in \overline{C} indicates a physical link from Σ_i^{DG} and Σ_l^{Line} .

Similarly to DGs, we use the closed-loop dynamics of Σ_l^{Line} , using (22)

$$\dot{\bar{x}}_l = \bar{A}_l \bar{x}_l + \tilde{\bar{\eta}}_l, \qquad (28)$$

which $\tilde{\eta}$ can be stated as

$$\tilde{\bar{\eta}}_l = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_l} C_{il} x_i + \bar{E}_l \bar{w}_l(t), \qquad (29)$$

with $C_{il} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}_{il} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \forall l \in \mathcal{E}_i$. Note also that $C_{il} = -C_{ti}\bar{C}_{il}^{\top}$. By vectorizing (29) over all $l \in \mathbb{N}_L$, we get

$$\tilde{\bar{\eta}} = Cx + \bar{E}\bar{w},\tag{30}$$

where $\tilde{\eta} \triangleq [\tilde{\eta}_l]_{l \in \mathbb{N}_L}$ represents the effective input vector to the lines, $C \triangleq [C_{il}]_{l \in \mathbb{N}_L, i \in \mathbb{N}_N}$, $\bar{E} \triangleq \text{diag}([\bar{E}_l]_{l \in \mathbb{N}_L})$, and

 $\bar{w} \triangleq [\bar{w}_l]_{l \in \mathbb{N}_L}$. Note also that $C = -\bar{C}^\top C_t$ where $C_t \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([C_{ti}\mathbf{I}_3]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N})$.

Finally, using (27) and (30), we can identify the interconnection relationship:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\eta}^\top & \tilde{\bar{\eta}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = M \begin{bmatrix} x^\top & \bar{x}^\top & w^\top & \bar{w}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

where the interconnection matrix M takes the form:

$$M \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} K & C & E & \mathbf{0} \\ C & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \bar{E} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (31)

When the physical topology \mathcal{G}^p is predefined, so are the block matrices \overline{C} and C (recall $C = -\overline{C}^\top C_t$). This leaves only the block matrix K inside the block matrix M as a tunable quantity to optimize the desired properties of the closed-loop DC MG system. Note that synthesizing Ksimultaneously determines the distributed global controllers and the communication topology \mathcal{G}^c . In the following two sections, we provide a systematic dissipativity-based approach to synthesize this block matrix K to enforce stability and dissipativity, respectively.

V. STABILITY ANALYSIS OF DC MG

The fundamental challenge in DC MG control stems from the inherent conflict between voltage regulation and current sharing objectives. Line impedance variations and load uncertainties often create a trade-off between these goals. Our proposed hierarchical structure resolves this conflict by separating the objectives into distinct but coordinated control layers.

A. Equilibrium Point Analysis of the DC MG

Lemma 1: Assuming all zero mean disturbance components to be zero, i.e., $w_i(t) = 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ and $\bar{w}_l(t) = 0, \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_L$, for a given reference voltage vector V_r , under a fixed control input u_E defined as

$$u_E \triangleq [\mathbf{I} + R_t (\mathcal{B}R^{-1}\mathcal{B}^\top + Y_L)]V_r + R_t \bar{I}_L, \qquad (32)$$

there exists an equilibrium point for the DC MG characterized by reference voltage vector V_r and constant current load vector \bar{I}_L , given by:

$$V_E = V_r,$$

$$I_{tE} = (\mathcal{B}R^{-1}\mathcal{B}^\top + Y_L)V_r + \bar{I}_L,$$

$$\bar{I}_E = R^{-1}\mathcal{B}^\top V_r.$$
(33)

where we define the state equilibrium vectors $V_E \triangleq [V_{iE}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}$, $I_{tE} \triangleq [I_{tiE}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}$, $u_E \triangleq [u_{iE}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}$, $\bar{I}_E \triangleq [\bar{I}_{lE}]_{l\in\mathbb{N}_L}$, and the system parameters $C_t \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([C_{ti}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N})$, $Y_L \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([Y_{Li}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N})$, $L_t \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([L_{ti}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N})$, $R_t \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([R_{ti}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N})$, $\bar{I}_L \triangleq [\bar{I}_{Li}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}$, $V_r \triangleq [V_{ri}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}$, $R \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([R_l]_{l\in\mathbb{N}_L})$, $B \triangleq [\mathcal{B}_{il}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}, l\in\mathbb{N}_L$.

Remark 5: For any given V_r , all equilibrium variables $(V_E, I_{tE}, u_E, \text{ and } \bar{I}_E)$ are uniquely determined through equations in Lm. 1.

Remark 6: The proportional current sharing among DG units follows:

$$\frac{I_{tiE}}{P_{ni}} = I_s \iff I_{tiE} = P_{ni}I_s, \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N,$$
(34)

where P_{ni} is the power rating of Σ_i^{DG} and I_s is a global current sharing index. This can be expressed in vectorized form as:

$$I_{tE} = P_n \mathbf{1}_N I_s, \tag{35}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_N = [1, 1, ..., 1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $P_n \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([P_{ni}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N})$. For equilibrium, the steady-state control input is:

$$u_{iS} = V_{ri} + R_{ti}P_{ni}I_s \tag{36}$$

Theorem 1: The current sharing objective imposes constraints on the reference voltage vector V_r and sharing coefficient I_s :

Find:
$$\alpha_V ||V_r - V_r||^2 + \alpha_I I_s$$

Sub. to: $P_n \mathbf{1}_N I_s - (\mathcal{B}R^{-1}\mathcal{B}^\top + Y_L)V_r = \bar{I}_L + \operatorname{diag}(V_r)^{-1}P_L$
 $V_{\min} \leq V_r \leq V_{\max},$
 $0 \leq I_s \leq 1,$
(37)

where V_{\min} and V_{\max} represent voltage bounds, $\alpha_V > 0$ is the voltage reference tracking weight, and $\alpha_I > 0$ is the current sharing weight.

B. Nonlinear Error Dynamics with CPL

.....

The network system representation described in Sec. IV-D can be simplified by considering the error system dynamics without exogenous disturbances. This simplified structure focuses solely on the coupling between DG error subsystems and line error subsystems.

We first define error variables that capture deviations from the desired equilibrium:

$$V_i = V_i - V_{iE} = V_i - V_{ri}$$
 (38a)

$$\tilde{I}_{ti} = I_{ti} - I_{tiE} = I_{ti} - P_{ni}I_s$$
 (38b)

$$\tilde{v}_i = v_i - v_{iE} \tag{38c}$$

$$\tilde{I}_l = I_l - \bar{I}_{lE} = I_l - \frac{1}{R_l} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_l} \mathcal{B}_{il} V_{ri}$$
(38d)

Consider the dynamical system described by equations (18a)-(18c) and using Lm. 1, and propose a hierarchical control strategy $u_i(t)$ of the form defined in (17). The error dynamics can then be derived as follows. The voltage error dynamic can be derived using (18a) and (38a):

$$\begin{split} \dot{\tilde{V}}_{i} &= -\frac{Y_{Li}}{C_{ti}}(\tilde{V}_{i} + V_{ri}) + \frac{1}{C_{ti}}(\tilde{I}_{ti} + P_{ni}I_{s}) - \frac{1}{C_{ti}}\bar{I}_{Li} \\ &- \frac{1}{C_{ti}}\sum_{l\in\mathcal{E}i}\mathcal{B}_{il}(\tilde{I}_{l} + \frac{1}{R_{l}}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{E}_{l}}\mathcal{B}_{jl}V_{rj}) - \frac{1}{C_{ti}}(\tilde{V}_{i} + V_{ri})^{-1}P_{Li} \\ &= \frac{1}{C_{ti}}\Big(\phi_{V} + \psi_{V} + g_{i}(\tilde{V}_{i})\Big), \end{split}$$
(39)

where

$$\phi_{V} = -Y_{Li}\tilde{V}_{i} + \tilde{I}_{ti} - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{E}i} \mathcal{B}_{il}\tilde{I}_{l}, \qquad (40a)$$

$$\psi_{V} = -Y_{Li}V_{ri} + P_{ni}I_{s} - \bar{I}_{Li} - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{E}i} \frac{\mathcal{B}_{il}}{R_{l}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}i} \mathcal{B}_{jl}V_{rj} - \frac{V_{r}}{P_{L}}$$

$$g_i(\tilde{V}_i) = V_{ri}^{-1} P_{Li} - (\tilde{V}_i + V_{ri})^{-1} P_{Li}$$
(40b)
(40c)

The current error dynamic can be achieved by using (18b) and (38b):

$$\begin{split} \dot{\tilde{I}}_{ti} &= -\frac{1}{L_{ti}} (\tilde{V}_i + V_{ri}) - \frac{R_{ti}}{L_{ti}} (\tilde{I}_{ti} + P_{ni}I_s) \\ &+ \frac{1}{L_{ti}} (u_{iS} + k_{i0}^P \tilde{V}_i + k_{io}^I \tilde{v}_i + \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_i^-} k_{ij} (\frac{\tilde{I}_{ti}}{P_{ni}} - \frac{\tilde{I}_{tj}}{P_{nj}})), \\ &= \frac{1}{L_{ti}} \Big(\phi_I + \psi_I \Big), \end{split}$$
(41)

where

$$\phi_{I} = -\tilde{V}_{i} - R_{ti}\tilde{I}_{ti} + k_{io}^{p}\tilde{V}_{i} + k_{io}^{I}\tilde{v}_{i} + \sum_{j\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{i}^{-}}k_{ij}(\frac{I_{ti}}{P_{ni}} - \frac{I_{tj}}{P_{nj}})$$
(42a)

$$\psi_I = -V_{ri} - R_{ti} P_{ni} I_s + u_{iS}. \tag{42b}$$

The integral error dynamics can be achieved by using (18c) and (38c):

$$\dot{\tilde{v}}_i = \tilde{V}_i \tag{43}$$

For the analysis of error dynamics, we set $w_i(t) = 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ and $\bar{w}_l(t) = 0, \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_L$. The known disturbance components $\bar{w}_i(t)$ are automatically eliminated by equilibrium analysis. Using (34) and (36), the terms (40b) and (42b) can be canceled due to equilibrium analysis.

For each DG error subsystem $\tilde{\Sigma}_i^{DG}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, we have error state vector $\tilde{x}_i = [\tilde{V}_i, \tilde{I}_{ti}, \tilde{v}_i]^\top$. The DG error dynamics can be written as:

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i = A_i \tilde{x}_i + u_i + g_i(\tilde{x}_i), \tag{44}$$

where u_i represents the interconnection input combining the effects of both line currents and other DG states:

$$u_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{E}_{i}} C_{il} \bar{x}_{l} \\ \sum_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{i}^{-}} K_{ij} x_{j} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$
(45)

and $g_i(\tilde{x}_i)$ is the nonlinear vector due to the CPL:

$$g_i(\tilde{x}_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{C_{ti}} \left(V_{ri}^{-1} P_{Li} - (\tilde{V}_i + V_{ri})^{-1} P_{Li} \right) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(46)

For each transmission line error subsystem $\tilde{\Sigma}_{l}^{Line}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}_{L}$:

$$\tilde{\bar{x}}_l = \bar{A}_l \tilde{\bar{x}}_l + \bar{u}_l, \tag{47}$$

where \bar{u} represents the line interconnection input influenced by DG voltages:

$$\bar{u}_l = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_l} B_{il} \tilde{V}_i \tag{48}$$



Fig. 4. DC MG error dynamics as a networked system with performance evaluation and disturbance rejection configuration.

C. Sector-Bounded Analysis for CPL Nonlinearity

The CPL nonlinearity introduces destabilizing effects that must be carefully managed. We can characterize this nonlinearity using a sector-bounded approach. For the nonlinear function in $g_i(\tilde{x}_i)$, we identify sector bounds $[\alpha_i, \beta_i]$ such that:

$$\alpha_i \le \frac{g_i(V_i)}{\tilde{V}_i} \le \beta_i, \quad \forall \tilde{V}_i \ne 0 \tag{49}$$

By analyzing the nonlinearity's behavior within the operational voltage range $V_{min} \leq V_i \leq V_{max}$, the sector bounds are determined as:

$$\alpha_i = \frac{P_{Li}}{C_{ti} V_{max}^2}, \quad \beta_i = \frac{P_{Li}}{C_{ti} V_{min}^2} \tag{50}$$

These bounds ensure that the nonlinearity remains within a linear sector for all operating conditions of interest.

The sector bounds can be formulated as a quadratic constraint:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_i \\ g_i(\tilde{x}_i) \end{bmatrix}^\top S_i \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_i \\ g_i(\tilde{x}_i) \end{bmatrix} \ge 0$$
(51)

where:

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$
(52)

This sector-bounded formulation will be integrated into our dissipativity-based control framework in Sec. VI to develop a unified approach for controller synthesis that simultaneously achieves voltage regulation, current sharing, and stability in the presence of destabilizing CPL effects.

VI. DISSIPATIVITY-BASED CONTROL AND TOPOLOGY CO-DESIGN

In this section, we first introduce the global control and topology co-design problem for a DC MG with performance and disturbance evaluation of DGs and transmission lines, as illustrated in Fig. 4. Next, necessary prerequisites for subsystem dissipativity properties are given. We then formulate a customized local controller design problem. Finally, the overall control design process is summarized.

Consider the error dyanmic subsystem $\tilde{\Sigma}_i^{DG}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ (24), which is assumed to be X_i -EID with

$$X_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{i}^{11} & X_{i}^{12} \\ X_{i}^{21} & X_{i}^{22} \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -\nu_{i}\mathbf{I} & \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} & -\rho_{i}\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix},$$
(54)

where ρ_i and ν_i are the error passivity indices of $\tilde{\Sigma}_i^{DG}$, i.e., each $\tilde{\Sigma}_i^{DG}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ is assumed to be IF-OFP(ν_i, ρ_i).

Similarly, consider the error dynamic subsystem $\tilde{\Sigma}_l^{Line}, l \in \mathbb{N}_L$ (22), which is assumed to be X_l -EID with

$$\bar{X}_{l} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{X}_{l}^{11} & \bar{X}_{l}^{12} \\ \bar{X}_{l}^{21} & \bar{X}_{l}^{22} \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -\bar{\nu}_{l}\mathbf{I} & \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} & -\bar{\rho}_{l}\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix},$$
(55)

where $\bar{\rho}_l$ and $\bar{\nu}_l$ are the error passivity indices of $\tilde{\Sigma}_l^{Line}$.

Lemma 2: For each line $\tilde{\Sigma}_{l}^{Line}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}_{L}$ (22), its passivity indices $\bar{\nu}_{l}$, $\bar{\rho}_{l}$ assumed in (55) are such that the LMI problem:

Find: $P_l, \bar{\nu}_l, \bar{\rho}_l$

Sub. to:
$$\bar{P}_l > 0$$
, $\begin{bmatrix} \frac{2\bar{P}_l R_l}{L_l} - \bar{\rho}_l & -\frac{\bar{P}_l}{L_l} + \frac{1}{2} \\ \star & -\bar{\nu}_l \end{bmatrix} \ge 0$, (56)

is feasible. The maximum feasible values for $\bar{\nu}_l$ and $\bar{\rho}_l$ respectively are $\bar{\nu}_l^{\max} = 0$ and $\bar{\rho}_l^{\max} = R_l$, when $\bar{P}_l = \frac{L_l}{2}$.

For each DG subsystem Σ_i^{DG} , $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, we define the performance output as:

$$z_i(t) = H_i x_i(t), \tag{57}$$

where $H_i = \mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix. Similarly, for each line subsystem $\Sigma_l^{Line}, l \in \mathbb{N}_L$, we define the performance output as:

$$\bar{z}_l(t) = H_l \bar{x}_l(t), \tag{58}$$

where $\bar{H}_l = \mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix.

Upon vectorizing over all $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}_L$, we obtain:

$$z = Hx, \quad \bar{z} = H\bar{x} \tag{59}$$

where $H \triangleq \operatorname{diag}(H_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N)$ and $\overline{H} \triangleq \operatorname{diag}(\overline{H}_l : l \in \mathbb{N}_L)$ represent the block diagonal matrices containing the output matrices of individual DGs and lines, respectively. This choice of output mapping provides a direct correspondence between system states and performance outputs.

To facilitate a comprehensive analysis of the entire MG, we define the consolidated performance output and disturbance vectors:

$$z_c = \begin{bmatrix} z^\top & \bar{z}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top, \quad w_c = \begin{bmatrix} w^\top & \bar{w}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top.$$
(60)

The consolidated disturbance vector w_c is mapped to the DG and line subsystems through the matrices E_c and \bar{E}_c , defined as:

$$E_c = \begin{bmatrix} E & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \overline{E}_c = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \overline{E} \end{bmatrix}$$
 (61)

where $E = \text{diag}(E_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N)$ maps the DG disturbances w to the DG subsystems, $\overline{E} = \text{diag}(\overline{E}_l : l \in \mathbb{N}_L)$ maps the line disturbances \overline{w} to the line subsystems, and the zero blocks indicate that line disturbances do not directly affect DG inputs and DG disturbances do not directly affect line inputs.

With these definitions, the interconnection relationship can be expressed as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u} & \tilde{u} & z_c \end{bmatrix}^\top = M \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x} & \tilde{x} & w_c \end{bmatrix}^\top$$
(62)

where the interconnection matrix M takes the form: $\begin{bmatrix} M & M \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K & \bar{C} & E \end{bmatrix}$

$$M \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} M_{\tilde{u}x} & M_{\tilde{u}\bar{x}} & M_{\tilde{u}w_c} \\ M_{\tilde{u}x} & M_{\tilde{u}\bar{x}} & M_{\tilde{u}w_c} \\ M_{z_cx} & M_{z_c\bar{x}} & M_{z_cw_c} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} K & C & L_c \\ C & \mathbf{0} & \bar{E}_c \\ H_c & \bar{H}_c & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (63)$$

where H_c and \bar{H}_c are defined as:

$$H_c = \begin{bmatrix} H & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{\top}, \quad \bar{H}_c = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \bar{H} \end{bmatrix}^{\top}, \tag{64}$$

which map the DG and line states to the consolidated performance output z_c .

A. Global Control and Topology Co-Design

The interconnection matrix M (31), particularly its block $M_{\tilde{u}x} = K$, can be synthesized by applying our subsystem EID properties to Prop. 2. By synthesizing $K = [K_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}$, we can uniquely compute the distributed global controller gains $\{k_{ij}^I : i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ (26) and the required communication topology \mathcal{G}^c . The following theorem formulates this distributed global controller and communication topology co-design problem.

Theorem 2: The closed-loop dynamics of the DC MG illustrated in Fig. 4 can be made finite-gain L_2 -stable with an L_2 -gain γ (where $\tilde{\gamma} \triangleq \gamma^2 < \bar{\gamma}$ and $\bar{\gamma}$ is prespecified) from unknown disturbances $w_c(t)$ to performance output $z_c(t)$, by synthesizing the interconnection matrix block $M_{\tilde{u}x} = K$ (31) via solving the LMI problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{\substack{Q, \{p_i: i \in \mathbb{N}_N\},\\\{\bar{p}_l: l \in \mathbb{N}_L\}, \tilde{\gamma} \end{array}}} & \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N} c_{ij} \|Q_{ij}\|_1 + c_1 \tilde{\gamma} + \alpha \operatorname{tr}(s_W), \\ \text{Sub. to:} & p_i > 0, \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \ \bar{p}_l > 0, \ \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_L, \\ & 0 < \tilde{\gamma} < \bar{\gamma}, \\ & W + s_W > 0, \ s_W \ge 0, \\ & \operatorname{tr}(s_W) \le \eta \text{ and } (66), \end{array} \right. \tag{65}$$

as $K = (\mathbf{X}_p^{11})^{-1}Q$, where $\mathbf{X}^{12} \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([-\frac{1}{2\nu_i}\mathbf{I}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N})$, $\mathbf{X}^{21} \triangleq (\mathbf{X}^{12})^{\top}, \ \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{12} \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([-\frac{1}{2\nu_i}\mathbf{I}]_{l\in\mathbb{N}_L}), \ \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{21} \triangleq (\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{12})^{\top},$ $\mathbf{X}_p^{11} \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([-p_i\nu_i\mathbf{I}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}), \ \mathbf{X}_p^{22} \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([-p_i\rho_i\mathbf{I}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_N}),$ $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_p^{11} \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([-\bar{p}_i\bar{\nu}_i\mathbf{I}]_{l\in\mathbb{N}_L}), \ \bar{\mathbf{X}}_p^{22} \triangleq \operatorname{diag}([-\bar{p}_i\bar{\rho}_i\mathbf{I}]_{i\in\mathbb{N}_L}),$ and $\tilde{\Gamma} \triangleq \tilde{\gamma}\mathbf{I}$. The structure of $Q \triangleq [Q_{ij}]_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}_N}$ mirrors that of $K \triangleq [K_{ij}]_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}_N}$ (i.e., the first and third rows are zeros in each block Q_{ij} , see (26)). The coefficients $c_1 > 0$ and $c_{ij} > 0, \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N$ are predefined cost coefficients corresponding to the L_2 -gain from unknown disturbances and communication links respectively. Note that W represents the LMI matrix from (66), s_W is a symmetric slack matrix, $\alpha > 0$ is the slack penalty weight, and $\eta > 0$ is a bound on the total slack magnitude.

B. Necessary Conditions on Subsystem Passivity Indices

Based on the terms \mathbf{X}_{p}^{11} , \mathbf{X}_{p}^{22} , $\mathbf{\bar{X}}_{\bar{p}}^{11}$, $\mathbf{\bar{X}}_{\bar{p}}^{22}$, \mathbf{X}^{12} , \mathbf{X}^{21} , $\mathbf{\bar{X}}^{12}$, and $\mathbf{\bar{X}}^{21}$ appearing in (66) included in the global co-design problem (65), it is clear that the feasibility and the effectiveness of this global co-design depend on the chosen passivity indices { ν_i , $\rho_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ } (54) and { $\bar{\nu}_l$, $\bar{\rho}_l : l \in \mathbb{N}_L$ } (55) assumed for DGs (24) and lines (22), respectively.

However, using Co. ?? for designing the local controllers in $\{u_{iL} : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ (13), we can obtain a custom set of passivity indices for the DGs (24). Similarly, using Lm. 2, we can obtain a custom set of passivity indices for the lines (22). Therefore, these local controller designs (Co. ??) and passivity analyses (Lm. 2) can impact the global codesign and potentially lead to infeasible and/or ineffective co-designs.

Therefore, when designing such local controllers and conducting passivity analysis, one must also consider the specific conditions necessary for the feasibility and effectiveness of the eventual global controller design. The following lemma identifies a few of such conditions based on (65) in Th. 2.

Lemma 3: For the LMI conditions in (65) in Th. 2 to hold, it is necessary that the DG and line passivity indices $\{\nu_i, \rho_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ (54) and $\{\bar{\nu}_l, \bar{\rho}_l : l \in \mathbb{N}_L\}$ (55) are such that the LMI problem:

Find:
$$\{ (\nu_i, \rho_i, \tilde{\gamma}_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}_N \}, \{ (\bar{\nu}_l, \bar{\rho}_l) : l \in \mathbb{N}_L \}$$
Sub. to: $p_i > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N, \ \bar{p}_l > 0, \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_L,$
and (67), (68)

is feasible.

In conclusion, here we used the LMI constraints in (65) to derive a set of necessary LMI conditions as in (68).

C. Local Controller Synthesis

To enforce the necessary LMI conditions in Lm. 3 (68) on DG and line passivity indices while accounting for CPL stability, we formulate a local controller synthesis problem as follows:

Theorem 3: Under the predefined DG parameters (19), line parameters (22) and design parameters $\{p_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$, $\{\bar{p}_l : l \in \mathbb{N}_L\}$, the necessary conditions in (65) hold if the local controller gains $\{K_{i0}, i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ (13) and DG and line passivity indices $\{\nu_i, \rho_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ (54) and $\{\bar{\nu}_l, \bar{\rho}_l : l \in \mathbb{N}_L\}$ (55) are determined by solving the LMI problem:

$$\begin{split} \min_{s_{\bar{\rho}}} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \alpha_{\bar{\rho}} s_{\bar{\rho}_l}, \\ \text{Find:} \quad \{(\tilde{K}_{i0}, P_i, \nu_i, \rho_i, \tilde{\gamma}_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}, \{(\bar{P}_l, \bar{\nu}_l, \bar{\rho}_l) : l \in \mathbb{N}_L\} \end{split}$$

Sub. to:

$$P_{i} > 0, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\rho}_{i}\mathbf{I} & P_{i} & \mathbf{0} \\ P_{i} & -\mathcal{H}(A_{i}P_{i} + B_{i}\tilde{K}_{i0}) + R_{i} & -\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{2}P_{i} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{2}P_{i} & -\nu_{i}\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} > 0, \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$$
$$\bar{P}_{l} > 0, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2\bar{P}_{l}R_{l}}{L_{l}} - \bar{\rho}_{l} & -\frac{\bar{P}_{l}}{L_{l}} + \frac{1}{2} \\ \star & -\bar{\nu}_{l} \end{bmatrix} \ge 0, \ \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_{L},$$

and (67),

where $K_{i0} \triangleq \tilde{K}_{i0}P_i^{-1}$, $s_{\bar{\rho}_l} \ge 0$ is the slack variable for coupling constraints, $\alpha_{\bar{\rho}}$ is its associated penalty weight. The matrix R_i incorporates the sector-bounded CPL constraints

through the S-procedure:

$$R_{i} = \lambda_{i} \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha_{i}\beta_{i} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(69)

For some multiplier $\lambda_i > 0$, where α_i and β_i are the previously defined sector bounds.

The slack variable $s_{\bar{\rho}_l}$ relaxes the coupling constraints between DGs and lines while maintaining strict passivity properties of individual subsystems, ensuring numerical feasibility while preserving core stability properties.

VII. SIMULATION RESULTS

This section presents the simulation results for evaluating the proposed dissipativity-based control and topology codesign method. Currently, we are in the process of finalizing the simulations and validating the results. The experiments involve an islanded DC MG with different configurations, subjected to various load variations to assess the performance of the designed controllers. We are conducting extensive tests to ensure the accuracy and robustness of the proposed approach. The detailed results and performance analysis will be provided in a future version of this manuscript.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a dissipativity-based distributed control approach for DC MGs that addresses voltage regulation, current sharing, and stability under constant power loads. By leveraging dissipativity theory and sector-bounded techniques, we develop a framework that co-designs controllers and communication topologies while ensuring stability despite CPL destabilizing effects. Unlike conventional approaches, our method eliminates the need for traditional droop control, improving voltage regulation accuracy while maintaining proportional current sharing. The approach transforms complex nonlinear CPL dynamics into manageable sector-bounded constraints integrated into an LMI framework, enabling efficient numerical implementation through convex optimization. Simulation results demonstrate superior performance compared to conventional approaches, Marticularly when managing CPLs. Future work will focus on developing plug-and-play capabilities and extending the approach to more complex load dynamics.

REFERENCES

 X.-K. Liu, S.-Q. Wang, M. Chi, Z.-W. Liu, and Y.-W. Wang, "Resilient secondary control and stability analysis for dc microgrids under mixed cyber attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 1938–1947, 2023.

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{p}^{11} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & Q & \mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}\bar{C} & \mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}E_{c} \\ \mathbf{0} & \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11} & \mathbf{0} & \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}C & \mathbf{0} & \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}E_{c} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & H_{c} & \bar{H}_{c} & \mathbf{0} \\ Q^{\top} & C^{\top}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11} & \mathbf{0} & \bar{H}_{c}^{\top} & -Q^{\top}\mathbf{X}^{12} - \mathbf{X}^{21}Q - \mathbf{X}_{p}^{22} & -\mathbf{X}^{21}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}\bar{C} - C^{\top}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{12}^{12} & \mathbf{0} \\ \bar{C}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11} & \mathbf{0} & \bar{H}_{c}^{\top} & -\bar{C}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}\mathbf{X}^{12} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{21}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}C & -\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{22} & -\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{21}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}\bar{E}_{c} \\ \bar{C}_{c}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11} & \bar{\mathbf{0}} & \bar{H}_{c}^{\top} & -\bar{C}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}\mathbf{X}^{12} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{21}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}C & -\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{22} & -\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{21}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}\bar{E}_{c} \\ \bar{C}_{c}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11} & \bar{\mathbf{0}} & \bar{H}_{c}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}\mathbf{X}^{12} & -\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{21}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}Z & \bar{\mathbf{T}}^{12} \\ \bar{C}_{c}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11} & \bar{\mathbf{0}} & \bar{\mathbf{0}} & -\bar{C}_{c}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}\mathbf{X}^{12} & -\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{c}^{\top}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{12} & \bar{\mathbf{T}}^{\top} \\ \bar{\mathbf{0}} & -\bar{p}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{l} & \mathbf{0} & -E_{c}^{\top}\mathbf{X}_{p}^{11}\mathbf{X}^{12} & -\bar{E}_{c}^{\top}\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{11}\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{12} & \bar{\mathbf{T}}^{\top} \\ \bar{\mathbf{0}} & 0 & 1 & H_{ci} & \bar{H}_{ci} & 0 & 0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{0}} & 0 & 1 & H_{ci} & \bar{H}_{ci} & 0 \\ 0 & -C_{il}\bar{\nu}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{l} & H_{ci} & p_{i}\rho_{i} & \frac{1}{2}p_{i}\bar{\nu}_{l}\bar{U}_{c}l_{l} & 0 \\ -\bar{C}_{il}\bar{\nu}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{l} & H_{ci} & p_{i}\rho_{i} & \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{l} \\ -\bar{C}_{il}\bar{\nu}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{l} & 0 & 0 & \bar{H}_{cl} & \frac{1}{2}\bar{C}_{il}\nu_{l}p_{i} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{l}\bar{\nu}_{c}l_{l} & p_{i}\rho_{i} & 0 \\ -\nu_{i}p_{i} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\bar{\nu}_{i}p_{i} & 0 & 0 & \tilde{\gamma}_{i} \end{bmatrix} > 0$$
(67)

- [2] Y. Dou, M. Chi, Z.-W. Liu, G. Wen, and Q. Sun, "Distributed secondary control for voltage regulation and optimal power sharing in dc microgrids," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 2561–2572, 2022.
- [3] M. Mehdi, C.-H. Kim, and M. Saad, "Robust Centralized Control for DC Islanded Microgrid Considering Communication Network Delay," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 77765–77778, 2020.
- [4] S. Peyghami, P. Davari, H. Mokhtari, and F. Blaabjerg, "Decentralized droop control in dc microgrids based on a frequency injection approach," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 6782– 6791, 2019.
- [5] L. Xing, Y. Mishra, F. Guo, P. Lin, Y. Yang, G. Ledwich, and Y.-C. Tian, "Distributed secondary control for current sharing and voltage restoration in dc microgrid," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 2487–2497, 2019.
- [6] J. M. Guerrero, J. C. Vasquez, J. Matas, L. G. De Vicuña, and M. Castilla, "Hierarchical Control of Droop-Controlled AC and DC Microgrids—a General Approach Toward Standardization," *IEEE Transactions on industrial electronics*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 158–172, 2010.
- [7] A. Khorsandi, M. Ashourloo, and H. Mokhtari, "A decentralized control method for a low-voltage dc microgrid," *IEEE Transactions* on Energy Conversion, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 793–801, 2014.
- [8] N. M. Dehkordi, N. Sadati, and M. Hamzeh, "Distributed Robust Finite-Time Secondary Voltage and Frequency Control of Islanded Microgrids," *IEEE Transactions on Power systems*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 3648–3659, 2016.
- [9] Q. Zhou, M. Shahidehpour, A. Paaso, S. Bahramirad, A. Alabdulwahab, and A. Abusorrah, "Distributed Control and Communication Strategies in Networked Microgrids," *IEEE Communications Surveys* & *Tutorials*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 2586–2633, 2020.
- [10] V. Nasirian, A. Davoudi, and F. L. Lewis, "Distributed Adaptive Droop Control for DC Microgrids," in 2014 IEEE Applied Power Electronics Conference and Exposition-APEC 2014. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1147–1152.
- [11] M. J. Najafirad, N. M. Dehkordi, M. Hamzeh, and H. Nazaripouya, "Distributed Event-Triggered Control of DC Microgrids With Input Saturation and Time Delay Constraints," *IEEE Systems Journal*, 2023.
- [12] A. M. Dissanayake and N. C. Ekneligoda, "Droop-free optimal feedback control of distributed generators in islanded dc microgrids," *IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 1624–1637, 2019.
- [13] Q. Zhang, Y. Zeng, Y. Hu, Y. Liu, X. Zhuang, and H. Guo, "Droop-Free Distributed Cooperative Control Framework for Multisource Parallel in Seaport DC Microgrid," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 4231–4244, 2022.
- [14] A. Kwasinski and C. N. Onwuchekwa, "Dynamic behavior and stabilization of dc microgrids with instantaneous constant-power loads," *IEEE Transactions on power electronics*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 822–834, 2010.
- [15] M. A. Hassan and Y. He, "Constant power load stabilization in dc microgrid systems using passivity-based control with nonlinear disturbance observer," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 92393–92406, 2020.
- [16] D. Jin, Z. Li, C. Hannon, C. Chen, J. Wang, M. Shahidehpour, and C. W. Lee, "Toward a cyber resilient and secure microgrid using software-defined networking," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 2494–2504, 2017.
- [17] Q. Hu, S. Bu, Z. Li, B. Zhou, and D. Yang, "Cost-effective communication network planning considering performance of pinning-based secondary control in microgrids," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 133, p. 107269, 2021.
- [18] G. Lou, W. Gu, J. Wang, W. Sheng, and L. Sun, "Optimal design for distributed secondary voltage control in islanded microgrids: Communication topology and controller," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 968–981, 2018.
- [19] L. Sheng, G. Lou, W. Gu, S. Lu, S. Ding, and Z. Ye, "Optimal communication network design of microgrids considering cyber-attacks and time-delays," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 3774–3785, 2022.
- [20] J. Loranca-Coutiño, J. C. Mayo-Maldonado, G. Escobar, T. M. Maupong, J. E. Valdez-Resendiz, and J. C. Rosas-Caro, "Data-driven passivity-based control design for modular dc microgrids," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 69, no. 3, pp. 2545–2556, 2021.
- [21] M. Arcak, "Compositional Design and Verification of Large-Scale Systems Using Dissipativity Theory: Determining Stability and Per-

formance From Subsystem Properties and Interconnection Structures," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 51–62, 2022.

- [22] M. A. Hassan, E.-p. Li, X. Li, T. Li, C. Duan, and S. Chi, "Adaptive passivity-based control of dc–dc buck power converter with constant power load in dc microgrid systems," *IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 2029–2040, 2018.
- [23] S. Welikala, Z. Song, P. J. Antsaklis, and H. Lin, "Dissipativity-Based Decentralized Co-Design of Distributed Controllers and Communication Topologies for Vehicular Platoons," *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2312.06472, 2023.
- [24] S. Welikala, H. Lin, and P. J. Antsaklis, "Non-Linear Networked Systems Analysis and Synthesis using Dissipativity Theory," in 2023 American Control Conference (ACC). IEEE, 2023, pp. 2951–2956.
- [25] P. Nahata, R. Soloperto, M. Tucci, A. Martinelli, and G. Ferrari-Trecate, "A Passivity-Based Approach to Voltage Stabilization in DC Microgrids With ZIP Loads," *Automatica*, vol. 113, p. 108770, 2020.
- [26] F. Dorfler and F. Bullo, "Kron Reduction of Graphs With Applications to Electrical Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 150–163, 2012.
- [27] M. Tucci, S. Riverso, and G. Ferrari-Trecate, "Line-Independent Plugand-Play Controllers for Voltage Stabilization in DC Microgrids," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1115–1123, 2017.