

# Collaborative control in multi-agent system

Irinel-Constantin Morărescu




IUT Nancy-Brabois  
constantin.morarescu@univ-lorraine.fr



# Scientific context

## Networks everywhere:

- Biological networks (genetic regulation, ecosystems...)
- Technological networks (internet, sensor networks...)
- Economical networks (production and distribution networks, financial networks...)
- Social networks (scientific collaboration networks, Facebook...)







# What we will see in this lecture

This lecture is not meant to give an exhaustive description of the area... Instead, we will provide a deeper insight on a small number of representative results.

Main references used while preparing the lecture:

- C. Godsil & G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Springer 2001.
- R. Olfati-Saber, J.A. Fax & R.M. Murray, *Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems*, Proc. IEEE, 2007.
- V.D. Blondel, J.M. Hendrickx, A. Olshevsky & J.N. Tsitsiklis, *Convergence in multiagent coordination, consensus, and flocking*, Proc. CDC, 2005.
- L. Moreau, *Stability of continuous-time distributed consensus algorithms*, Proc. CDC, 2004.
- S. Martin & A. Girard, *Sufficient conditions for flocking via graph robustness analysis*, Proc. CDC, 2010.
- C. Morarescu & A. Girard, *Opinion dynamics with decaying confidence: application to community detection in graphs*, ArXiv, 2009.

Can a group of agents reach a rendezvous point or realize a formation without a priori knowing the coordinates of their targets?



Can we explain some synchronization behaviors? [Movie](#)

# Flocking in mobile agents network

Flocking is the behavior exhibited when a group of birds are in flight:




More precisely, a flocking behavior is characterized by three properties:

- ① **Alignment**: the birds have the same velocity.
- ② **Cohesion**: the birds remain together.
- ③ **Separation**: there is a minimum distance between birds.

In the following, we focus on the first and second property.

# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Agent  $i$  is characterized by its position  $x_i$  and velocity  $v_i$ .

# Example: flocking in mobile networks

Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:




Agent  $i$  has limited communication or sensing capabilities.



# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Agent  $i$  tries to align its velocity on its neighbors:  $\dot{v}_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} (v_j - v_i)$ .

# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



The communication network is described by a (dynamic) graph.

# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Global linear dynamics with structure given by the graph:  $\dot{v} = -Lv$ .

# Example: flocking in mobile networks

Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Do the agents eventually agree on a common velocity?

# Lecture outline

- ① Algebraic graph theory
- ② Spectral graph theory
- ③ Consensus algorithms
- ④ Applications

## ① Algebraic graph theory

- Basic notions
- Adjacency matrix
- Laplacian matrix
- Normalized Laplacian matrix

# Graphs

## Definition

A **graph** is couple  $G = (V, E)$  consisting of:

- A finite set of **vertices**  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ ;
- A set of **edges**,  $E \subseteq V \times V$ .

We assume  $G$  has **no self-loops** ( $\forall i \in V, (i, i) \notin E$ ) and is **undirected** ( $\forall i, j \in V, (i, j) \in E \iff (j, i) \in E$ ).

## Definition

In an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ :

- The **neighborhood** of a vertex  $i \in V$  is the set

$$N_i = \{j \in V \mid (i, j) \in E\}.$$

- The **degree** of a vertex  $i \in V$  is  $d_i = |N_i|$ .

# Graph representation

It is often convenient, interesting, or attractive to represent a graph by a picture, with points for the vertices and lines for the edges, as in the figure below.

## Definition

Two graphs  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$  and  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$  are isomorphic iff there exists a bijection  $\varphi : V_1 \mapsto V_2$  such that  $(i, j) \in E_1 \Leftrightarrow (\varphi(i), \varphi(j)) \in E_2$ .




Figure: Two different representations for the same graph.




# Example

A simple graph:

$$V = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$$

$$E = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 4), (2, 5), (3, 5), (4, 5) \dots \\ (2, 1), (3, 1), (4, 2), (5, 2), (5, 3), (5, 4)\}$$



$$N_1 = \{2, 3\}, d_1 = 2$$

$$N_2 = \{1, 4, 5\}, d_2 = 3$$

$$N_3 = \{1, 5\}, d_3 = 2$$

$$N_4 = \{2, 5\}, d_4 = 2$$


$$N_5 = \{2, 3, 4\}, d_5 = 3$$

# Subgraphs


## Definition

A graph  $G' = (V', E')$  is a **subgraph** of  $G = (V, E)$  if  $V' \subseteq V$  and  $E' \subseteq E$ . In addition, if  $V' = V$  then  $G'$  is a **spanning subgraph** of  $G$ .


The subgraph of  $G$  **induced** by a set of vertices  $V' \subseteq V$  is the graph  $G' = (V', E')$  where  $E' = E \cap V' \times V'$ .




initial graph



subgraph



spanning subgraph



induced subgraph

# Connectivity notions

## Definition

A **path** in a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a finite sequence of edges  $(i_1, i_2), (i_2, i_3), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})$  such that  $(i_k, i_{k+1}) \in E$  for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ .

## Definition


In a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , two vertices  $i, j \in V$  are **connected** if there exists a path joining  $i$  and  $j$  (i.e.  $i_1 = i, i_{p+1} = j$ ).

$G$  is **connected** if for all  $i, j \in V$ ,  $i$  and  $j$  are connected.


A subset of vertices  $V' \subseteq V$  is a **connected component** of  $G$  if:

- 1 For all  $i, j \in V'$ ,  $i$  and  $j$  are connected;
- 2 For all  $i \in V'$ , for all  $j \in V \setminus V'$ ,  $i$  and  $j$  are not connected.


# Example




Path joining 1 and 5



Graph is connected



Graph is not connected



Connected components

# Symmetric matrices

## Definition

A matrix  $B = (b_{ij})$  is **symmetric** iff  $b_{ij} = b_{ji}$ ,  $\forall i, j$ . In other words  $B = B^\top$

## Proposition

Let  $B$  be a real symmetric matrix.

- 1 If  $u$  is a right eigenvector of  $B$  associated to the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  then  $u$  is a left eigenvector of  $B$  associated to the eigenvalue  $\lambda$ .
- 2 If  $u$  and  $v$  are eigenvectors of  $B$  with different eigenvalues, then  $u$  and  $v$  are orthogonal.
- 3 The eigenvalues of a real symmetric matrix  $B$  are real numbers.
- 4 There exist matrices  $T$  and  $\Gamma$  such that  $T^\top T = TT^\top = I$  and  $TBT^\top = \Gamma$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues of  $B$ .

# Positive semidefinite matrices

## Definition

A matrix  $B$  is **positive semidefinite** if  $u^\top B u \geq 0$  for all vectors  $u$ . It is **positive definite** if it is positive semidefinite and  $u^\top B u = 0$  iff  $u = 0$ .

In the sequel these terms are used only for symmetric matrices.

## Proposition

*The matrix  $B$  is positive semidefinite iff all its eigenvalues are nonnegative.*

## Proposition

*If  $B$  is a positive semidefinite matrix, then there is a matrix  $F$  such that  $B = F^\top F$ .*

# Adjacency and degree matrices

## Definition

The **adjacency matrix** of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is the  $n \times n$  symmetric matrix  $A = (a_{ij})$  given for all  $i, j \in V$  by:


$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i, j) \in E, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

## Definition

The **degree matrix** of  $G$  is the  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix  $D = (d_{ij})$  given for all  $i, j \in V$  by:

$$d_{ij} = \begin{cases} d_i & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

# Example



$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$



# Properties

## Remark

*The adjacency matrix  $A(G)$  is not unique.*

## Lemma

*Let  $A(G_1)$  and  $A(G_2)$  the adjacency matrices associated to the graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . If the eigenvalues of  $A(G_1)$  and  $A(G_2)$  do not match, then the graphs are not isomorphic.*

The converse is not true. Compute for instance the eigenvalues of the graphs represented below.





Figure: The spectrum is  $\{-2, 0, 0, 0, 2\}$

# Incidence matrix

## Definition

The **incidence matrix** of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is the  $n \times |E|$  matrix  $C = (c_{ij})$  defined as follows: each edge  $f = (i, j) \in E$  defines a column with  $n$  entries, all of them are 0 except the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  which are 1.


## Definition

An orientation of a graph  $G$  is an assignment of a direction to each edge.

## Definition

The **incidence matrix** of an oriented graph  $G = (V, E)$  is the  $n \times |E|$  matrix  $C = (c_{ij})$  defined as follows: each edge  $f = (i, j) \in E$  with the tail  $i$  and the head  $j$  defines a column with  $n$  entries, all of them are 0 except the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  which are  $-1$  and  $1$  respectively.

# Example



$$C = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

# Properties

## Theorem

*Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with  $n$  vertices and  $c$  connected components. If  $\sigma$  is an orientation of  $G$  and  $C$  is the incidence matrix of the oriented graph  $G^\sigma$ , then  $\text{rank}(C) = n - c$ .*

## Proof.

Let us define the following subspace  $K := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid z^\top C = 0\}$ .

- ❶ For  $(i, j) \in E$  and  $z \in K$  prove that  $z_i = z_j$ .
- ❷ Let us consider the connected components of  $G$  given by  $V_1 = \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{n_1 + 1, n_2\}, \dots$ ,  $V_c = \{n_{c-1} + 1, \dots, n_c = n\}$ . Give an explicit description of  $K$ , derive a basis of  $K$ , compute  $\dim K$ .
- ❸ Recall that  $\text{rank}(C) = n - \dim K$ .



## Proposition

*If  $\sigma$  is an orientation of  $G = (V, E)$  and  $C$  is the incidence matrix of  $G^\sigma$ , then  $CC^\top = D(G) - A(G)$ .*

## Proof.

- 1 Let  $(i, j) \in E$  and consider  $(i, j)$  the  $k^{\text{th}}$  edge of  $G$ . Compute  $C_{h,k}$  for all  $h = 1, \dots, n$ .
- 2 Compute  $(CC^\top)_{ij}$
- 3 Compute  $(D(G) - A(G))_{ij}$ .




# Laplacian matrix

## Definition

The **Laplacian matrix** of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is the  $n \times n$  symmetric matrix  $L = (l_{ij})$  given for all  $i, j \in V$  by:

$$l_{ij} = \begin{cases} d_i & \text{if } i = j, \\ -1 & \text{if } (i, j) \in E, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We have  $L = D - A$ .



$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$


# Normalized Laplacian matrix

## Definition

The **normalized Laplacian matrix** of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is the  $n \times n$  symmetric matrix  $\mathcal{L} = (\ell_{ij})$  given for all  $i, j \in V$  by:

$$\ell_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } d_i \neq 0, \\ -1/\sqrt{d_i d_j} & \text{if } (i, j) \in E, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $d_i > 0$  for all  $i \in V$ , then  $\mathcal{L} = I - D^{-1/2} A D^{-1/2} = D^{-1/2} L D^{-1/2}$ .



$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & 1 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{3} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & 0 & 1 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

# Fundamental property of the Laplacian matrix

## Theorem (Sum of squares property)

Let  $L$  be the Laplacian matrix of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  then, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$x^T L x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j)^2.$$

*Proof.* For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} x^T L x &= \sum_{i \in V} x_i \sum_{j \in V} l_{ij} x_j = \sum_{i \in V} x_i (d_i x_i - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_j) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V} x_i \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j) = \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i^2 - x_i x_j) \\ &= \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i^2 - x_i x_j) \end{aligned}$$



# Fundamental property of the Laplacian matrix

## Theorem (Sum of squares property)

Let  $L$  be the Laplacian matrix of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  then, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$x^T L x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j)^2.$$

*Proof:* Since whenever  $(i, j) \in E$ ,  $(j, i) \in E$  we have

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i^2 - x_i x_j) = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_j^2 - x_i x_j).$$

It follows that

$$x^T L x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i^2 - 2x_i x_j + x_j^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j)^2.$$

# Laplacian matrix of a subgraph

## Corollary

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and  $L$  its Laplacian matrix, let  $G' = (V, E')$  be a spanning subgraph of  $G$  and  $L'$  its Laplacian matrix. Then, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$x^\top Lx \geq x^\top L'x$$

*Proof:* By the SOS property,

$$\begin{aligned} x^\top Lx &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E'} (x_i - x_j)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E \setminus E'} (x_i - x_j)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E'} (x_i - x_j)^2 = x^\top L'x. \end{aligned}$$

- ① Algebraic graph theory
- ② Spectral graph theory
  - Courant-Fischer theorem
  - Spectrum of the graph-laplacian
  - Interlacing

# Eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix

## Proposition

*The Laplacian matrix  $L$  of an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  is symmetric positive.  $0$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$  with associated eigenvector  $\mathbf{1}_n$ .*

*Proof:* Symmetry is consequence of  $G$  being undirected. By the SOS property,

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x^T L x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j)^2 \geq 0$$

which gives  $L$  positive.

Let  $y = L\mathbf{1}_n$ , then

$$y_i = \sum_{j \in V} l_{ij} = d_i + \sum_{(i,j) \in E} -1 = d_i - d_i = 0.$$

# Eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix

## Proposition

*0 is a simple eigenvalue of  $L$  if and only if the graph  $G$  is connected.*

*Proof:* ( $\implies$ ) Assume the graph is not connected, then there exists a connected component of  $G$ ,  $V' \subsetneq V$ .

Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , such that  $x_i = 1$  if  $i \in V'$  and  $x_i = 0$  otherwise, let  $y = Lx$ . Then,

$$\forall i \in V', \quad y_i = \sum_{j \in V} l_{ij} x_j = \sum_{j \in V'} l_{ij} = \sum_{j \in V} l_{ij} - \sum_{j \in V \setminus V'} l_{ij} = 0$$

$$\forall i \in V \setminus V', \quad y_i = \sum_{j \in V} l_{ij} x_j = \sum_{j \in V'} l_{ij} = 0.$$

Then  $x \neq \alpha \mathbf{1}_n$  is an eigenvector of  $L$  for eigenvalue 0. 0 is not simple.

# Eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix

## Proposition

*0 is a simple eigenvalue of  $L$  if and only if the graph  $G$  is connected.*

*Proof:* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume the graph is connected. Let  $x$  such that  $Lx = 0$ . Then the SOS property gives:

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j)^2 = x^\top Lx = 0.$$

Thus, for all  $(i,j) \in E$ ,  $x_i = x_j$ . Let  $i \neq 1$ , since  $G$  is connected there exists a path  $(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})$  joining 1 and  $i$ . It follows that

$$x_1 = x_{i_1} = x_{i_2} = \dots = x_{i_{p+1}} = x_i.$$

The eigenvector  $x$  is of the form  $\alpha \mathbf{1}_n$ . 0 is simple.

# Eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix

## Proposition

We denote the eigenvalues of  $L$  by  $0 = \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ .

Let  $\Delta = \max_{i \in V} d_i$ , then, for all  $k$ ,  $\lambda_k \leq 2\Delta$ .

*Proof:* Let  $\lambda$  be an eigenvalue of  $L$  and  $x$  an associated eigenvector. Let  $i \in V$ , such that for all  $j \in V$ ,  $|x_i| \geq |x_j|$ . Then,

$$\lambda x_i = \sum_{j \in V} l_{ij} x_j = \sum_{j \in V \setminus \{i\}} l_{ij} x_j + d_i x_i.$$

It follows that

$$|\lambda - d_i| \leq \sum_{j \in V \setminus \{i\}} |l_{ij}| \frac{|x_j|}{|x_i|} \leq \sum_{j \in V \setminus \{i\}} |l_{ij}| = d_i.$$

Then  $\lambda \leq 2d_i \leq 2\Delta$ .

# Algebraic connectivity

## Definition

The second smallest eigenvalue  $\lambda_2$  of  $L$  is referred to as the **algebraic connectivity** of the graph  $G$ .

## Theorem

$\lambda_2 > 0$  if and only if  $G$  is connected. It satisfies:

$$\lambda_2 = \min_{x \perp \mathbf{1}_n} \frac{x^\top L x}{x^\top x}.$$

*Proof:* Let  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors. Then

$$\forall x \perp \mathbf{1}_n, \quad x^\top L x = \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k (v_k^\top x)^2 \geq \lambda_2 \sum_{k=2}^n (v_k^\top x)^2 = \lambda_2 x^\top x.$$

Moreover, for  $x = v_2$ ,  $v_2^\top L v_2 = \lambda_2$ .



# Algebraic connectivity of a subgraph

## Theorem

*Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and  $\lambda_2$  its algebraic connectivity, let  $G' = (V, E')$  be a spanning subgraph of  $G$  and  $\lambda'_2$  its algebraic connectivity. Then,  $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda'_2$ .*

*Proof:* Since for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $x^\top Lx \geq x^\top L'x$ , we have

$$\min_{x \perp \mathbf{1}_n} \frac{x^\top Lx}{x^\top x} \geq \min_{x \perp \mathbf{1}_n} \frac{x^\top L'x}{x^\top x}$$

from which follows  $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda'_2$ .

## Remark

*Removing (adding) edges to graph can only make the algebraic connectivity decrease (increase).*

# Normalized Laplacian matrix

Using the fact the  $\mathcal{L} = D^{-1/2}LD^{-1/2}$  we can obtain similar results.

## Theorem (Sum of squares property)

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the normalized Laplacian matrix of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  then, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$x^\top \mathcal{L} x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \left( \frac{x_i}{\sqrt{d_i}} - \frac{x_j}{\sqrt{d_j}} \right)^2.$$

## Proposition

The normalized Laplacian matrix  $L$  of an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  is symmetric positive. 0 is an eigenvalue of  $L$  with associated eigenvector  $D^{1/2}\mathbf{1}_n$ .

# Normalized Laplacian matrix

## Proposition

*0 is a simple eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}$  if and only if the graph  $G$  is connected.*

## Proposition

*We denote the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}$  by  $0 = \tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq \tilde{\lambda}_2 \leq \dots \leq \tilde{\lambda}_n$ .  
Then, for all  $k$ ,  $\tilde{\lambda}_k \leq 2$ .*


## Theorem

*$\tilde{\lambda}_2 > 0$  if and only if  $G$  is connected. It satisfies:*


$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 = \min_{x \perp D^{1/2} \mathbf{1}_n} \frac{x^\top \mathcal{L} x}{x^\top x} = \min_{x \perp D \mathbf{1}_n} \frac{x^\top L x}{x^\top D x}.$$

# Example


Second smallest eigenvalues of  $L$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  for a graph and 2 subgraphs:



$$\lambda_2 = 1.38$$
$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 = 0.67$$



$$\lambda_2 = 0.83$$
$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 = 0.59$$



$$\lambda_2 = 1.38$$
$$\tilde{\lambda}_2 = 0.69$$

# Summary

- We have defined fundamental notions such as **graphs**, **subgraphs**, **paths**, **connectivity**...
- We have introduced **Laplacian** and **normalized Laplacian** matrices:
  - We have shown the **SOS property** for both types of matrices.
  - We have shown that the connectivity of a graph can be determined by **second smallest eigenvalue** of these matrices ( $\lambda_2$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ ).
- Some results that are valid for the Laplacian matrix cannot be extended to the normalized Laplacian matrix e.g.:

*If  $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G$  then  $\lambda'_2 \leq \lambda_2$ .*
- Though, in practice, the eigenvalue  $\tilde{\lambda}_2$  is often a good measure of the connectivity of the graph (less dependent to the size of the graph).

- ① Algebraic graph theory
- ② Spectral graph theory
- ③ Consensus algorithms
  - Discrete time and continuous time
  - Agreement in networks with fixed topology
  - Agreement in networks with dynamic topology
  - Performance of consensus algorithms
  - Consensus under communication time-delays

# Consensus algorithms

Consider a set of agents  $V$  organized in a network with (possibly dynamic) topology described by an undirected graph  $G(t) = (V, E(t))$ .

Each agent  $i \in V$  has a state  $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  which is updated according to a simple local rule, e.g.

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t)),$$

or in matrix form

$$\dot{x}(t) = -L(t)x(t).$$

We say that the agents achieve a **consensus** if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} x_1(t) = \dots = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} x_n(t).$$

# Various types of consensus algorithms

We will consider the following consensus algorithms:

continuous time	discrete time
$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$	$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$
$\dot{x}_i(t) = \frac{1}{d_i(t)} \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$	$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \frac{\varepsilon}{d_i(t)} \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$


Equivalent algorithms in matrix form:

continuous time	discrete time
$\dot{x}(t) = -L(t)x(t)$	$x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon L(t))x(t)$
$\dot{x}(t) = -D^{-1}(t)L(t)x(t)$	$x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon D^{-1}(t)L(t))x(t)$



# Example


Consider the following network with fixed topology:



We run continuous time consensus algorithms over this network.


Standard consensus algorithm:

$$\dot{x}(t) = -Lx(t)$$



Normalized consensus algorithm:

$$\dot{x}(t) = -D^{-1}Lx(t)$$



# Consensus in networks with fixed topology

We assume that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $G(t) = (V, E)$  and consider the following consensus algorithm:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

or in matrix form:  $\dot{x}(t) = -Lx(t)$ .

## Lemma

*The quantity  $\mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) = \sum_{i \in V} x_i(t)$  is invariant.*

*Proof:* Let us compute the derivative

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) \right) &= \mathbf{1}_n^\top \dot{x}(t) \\ &= -\mathbf{1}_n^\top (Lx(t)) = -(\mathbf{1}_n^\top L)x(t) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

# Consensus value

## Proposition

Let  $x^* = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(0)$ , if a consensus is achieved, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} x(t) = x^* \mathbf{1}_n.$$

*Proof:* If a consensus is achieved, then for all  $i \in V$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} x_i(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(0) = x^*.$$

## Remark

*The consensus value is the average of the initial values. It is independent of the topology of the graph  $G = (V, E)$ .*

## Theorem

*If the graph  $G$  is connected, then the consensus is achieved. Moreover,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\| \leq e^{-\lambda_2 t} \|x(0) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|.$$

*Proof:* Let  $V(t) = \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} V(t) &= 2(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)^\top \dot{x}(t) = -2(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)^\top Lx(t) \\ &= -2(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)^\top L(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n). \end{aligned}$$

Let us remark that

$$\mathbf{1}_n^\top (x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n) = \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(0) - x^* n = 0$$

which gives  $(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n) \perp \mathbf{1}_n$ .

## Theorem

*If the graph  $G$  is connected, then the consensus is achieved. Moreover,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\| \leq e^{-\lambda_2 t} \|x(0) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|.$$

*Proof:* Therefore,

$$(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)^\top L (x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n) \geq \lambda_2 \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2$$

which gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} V(t) \leq -2\lambda_2 \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2 = -2\lambda_2 V(t).$$

Thus,  $V(t) \leq V(0)e^{-2\lambda_2 t}$ . If the graph  $G$  is connected then  $\lambda_2 > 0$  and the consensus is achieved.

# Consensus in discrete time

We assume that for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $G(t) = (V, E)$ , let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2\Delta})$ , we consider the consensus algorithm:

$$\forall i \in V, x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j \in N_i} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

or in matrix form:  $x(t+1) = Px(t)$  where  $P = I - \varepsilon L$ .

## Proposition

*The quantity  $\mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) = \sum_{i \in V} x_i(t)$  is invariant. Let  $x^* = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(0)$ , if a consensus is achieved, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} x(t) = x^* \mathbf{1}_n.$$

*Proof:* Let us remark that

$$\mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t+1) = \mathbf{1}_n^\top (I - \varepsilon L)x(t) = \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) - \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_n^\top Lx(t) = \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t).$$

# Convergence

## Lemma

We have  $P\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n$  and for all  $x \perp \mathbf{1}_n$ ,  $\|Px\| \leq (1 - \varepsilon\lambda_2)\|x\|$ .

*Proof.* First,  $P\mathbf{1}_n = (I - \varepsilon L)\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n - \varepsilon L\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n$ .

Let  $x \perp \mathbf{1}_n$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of  $L$ . Then,

$$x = \sum_{k=2}^n (v_k^\top x) v_k \text{ and } Px = \sum_{k=2}^n (v_k^\top x) (1 - \varepsilon\lambda_k) v_k.$$

Thus

$$\|Px\|^2 = \sum_{k=2}^n (v_k^\top x)^2 (1 - \varepsilon\lambda_k)^2 \leq \max_{k=2}^n (1 - \varepsilon\lambda_k)^2 \|x\|^2.$$

Moreover, from  $0 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n \leq 2\Delta$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2\Delta})$ , we obtain

$$\max_{k=2}^n (1 - \varepsilon\lambda_k)^2 = (1 - \varepsilon\lambda_2)^2 < 1.$$

# Convergence

## Theorem

*If the graph  $G$  is connected, then the consensus is achieved. Moreover,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\| \leq (1 - \varepsilon \lambda_2)^t \|x(0) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|.$$

*Proof:* Let  $V(t) = \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2$ . Then,

$$V(t+1) = \|Px(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2 = \|P(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)\|^2$$

Let us remark that

$$\mathbf{1}_n^\top (x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n) = \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(0) - x^* n = 0$$

which gives  $(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n) \perp \mathbf{1}_n$ . Then,

$$V(t+1) \leq (1 - \varepsilon \lambda_2)^2 \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2 = (1 - \varepsilon \lambda_2)^2 V(t).$$



## Other consensus algorithms

Using the fact the  $D^{-1}L = D^{-1/2}\mathcal{L}D^{1/2}$  we obtain similar results for the consensus algorithm:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \frac{1}{d_i} \sum_{j \in N_i} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

or in matrix form:  $\dot{x}(t) = -D^{-1}Lx(t)$ .

### Theorem

*If the graph  $G$  is connected, then the consensus is achieved. The consensus value is*

$$x^* = \frac{\sum_{i \in V} d_i x_i(0)}{\sum_{i \in V} d_i}.$$

*Moreover,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|_D \leq e^{-\tilde{\lambda}_2 t} \|x(0) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|_D.$$

# Other consensus algorithms

For the discrete time case, let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and consider the consensus algorithm:

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \frac{\varepsilon}{d_i} \sum_{j \in N_i} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

or in matrix form:  $x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon D^{-1}L)x(t)$ .

## Theorem

*If the graph  $G$  is connected, then the consensus is achieved. The consensus value is*

$$x^* = \frac{\sum_{i \in V} d_i x_i(0)}{\sum_{i \in V} d_i}.$$

*Moreover,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|_D \leq (1 - \varepsilon \tilde{\lambda}_2)^t \|x(0) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|_D.$$

# Summary

- We have considered several consensus algorithms in continuous or discrete time for networks with fixed topology.
- For the standard consensus algorithm, the consensus value is independent of the network topology (average of initial values) whereas for the normalized consensus algorithm, it depends on the network topology (weighted average where the weights are the degrees of the vertices of the network).
- Consensus is achieved if the network is connected. The consensus is approached at exponential speed. Moreover, the convergence speed is determined by the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian or normalized Laplacian matrix: the more connected the network the faster the consensus.

# Consensus in networks with dynamic topology

We now assume that the graph is time-varying  $G(t) = (V, E(t))$  and consider the following consensus algorithm:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

or in matrix form:  $\dot{x}(t) = -L(t)x(t)$ .

A lot of results are actually similar to the fixed topology case:

## Proposition

*The quantity  $\mathbf{1}_n^\top x(t) = \sum_{i \in V} x_i(t)$  is invariant. Let  $x^* = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(0)$ , if a consensus is achieved, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} x(t) = x^* \mathbf{1}_n.$$

# Convergence

## Theorem

*If the graph  $G(t)$  is connected for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the consensus is achieved. Moreover, for  $\underline{\lambda}_2 \leq \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \lambda_2(t)$ ,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\| \leq e^{-\underline{\lambda}_2 t} \|x(0) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|.$$

*Proof.* Let  $V(t) = \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} V(t) &= 2(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)^\top \dot{x}(t) = -2(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)^\top Lx(t) \\ &= -2(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n)^\top L(t)(x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n) \\ &\leq -2\underline{\lambda}_2(t) \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|^2 \leq -2\underline{\lambda}_2 V(t) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $V(t) \leq V(0)e^{-2\underline{\lambda}_2 t}$ . If the graph  $G$  is connected, we can choose  $\underline{\lambda}_2 > 0$  and the consensus is achieved.

# Discrete time algorithm

For the discrete time case, let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2(n-1)})$  and consider the consensus algorithm:

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j \in N_i} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

or in matrix form:  $x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon L)x(t)$ .

## Theorem

*If the graph  $G(t)$  is connected for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the consensus is achieved. The consensus value is  $x^* = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n^\top x(0)$ .*

*Moreover, for  $\underline{\lambda}_2 \leq \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \lambda_2(t)$ ,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|x(t) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\| \leq (1 - \varepsilon \underline{\lambda}_2)^t \|x(0) - x^* \mathbf{1}_n\|.$$

# Some remarks

- For the standard Laplacian consensus algorithm, it is straightforward to extend the results from fixed topology to dynamic topology under the assumption that the graph  $G(t)$  remains connected for all  $t$ .
- For the normalized Laplacian consensus algorithm, the results cannot be extended in a straightforward manner. Indeed, even the consensus value is dependent on the graph sequence... Another approach is needed!
- The assumption that the graph remains connected for all time is actually quite strong. Is it possible to relax this assumption ?

# A general consensus algorithm

Let us assume that the graph is time-varying  $G(t) = (V, E(t))$  and consider the following discrete time consensus algorithm:

$$x_i(t+1) = \sum_{j \in V} p_{ij}(t) x_j(t)$$

under the following assumptions (for some  $\alpha > 0$ ):

## Assumption

- $p_{ii}(t) \geq \alpha, \forall i \in V, t \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- $p_{ij}(t) \neq 0$  if and only if  $(i, j) \in E(t), \forall i, j \in V, i \neq j, t \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- $p_{ij}(t) \in \{0\} \cup [\alpha, 1], \forall i, j \in V, i \neq j, t \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- $\sum_{j \in V} p_{ij}(t) = 1, \forall i \in V, t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let us remark that the previous discrete time consensus algorithms satisfy these assumptions.



# Convergence analysis

For a subset of agents  $V' \subseteq V$ , let  $m_{V'}(t) = \min_{i \in V'} x_i(t)$  and  $M_{V'}(t) = \max_{i \in V'} x_i(t)$ .

## Proposition

*Let  $V' \subseteq V$  such that for all  $i \in V$ , for all  $j \in V \setminus V'$ ,  $(i, j) \notin E(t)$ . Then,*

$$m_{V'}(t+1) \geq m_{V'}(t) \text{ and } M_{V'}(t+1) \leq M_{V'}(t).$$

*Proof:* Let  $i \in V'$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(t+1) &= \sum_{j \in V} p_{ij}(t) x_j(t) = \sum_{j \in V'} p_{ij}(t) x_j(t) \\ &\geq m'_{V'}(t) \sum_{j \in V'} p_{ij}(t) = m_{V'}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Then,  $m_{V'}(t+1) \geq m_{V'}(t)$ . Similarly,  $M_{V'}(t+1) \leq M_{V'}(t)$ .

# Convergence analysis

## Remark

*The sequences  $M_V(t)$  and  $m_V(t)$  are monotonic and bounded, therefore convergent.*

The consensus is achieved if and only if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} M_V(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} m_V(t)$$

or equivalently

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} M_V(t) - m_V(t) = 0.$$

We will prove this under an assumption of [asymptotic connectivity](#):

## Assumption

*For all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , the graph  $(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$  is connected.*

# Convergence analysis

## Lemma

For all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $T \geq t$  such that

$$M_V(T) - m_V(T) \leq (1 - \alpha^n)(M_V(t) - m_V(t)).$$

*Proof.* Let us remark that for all  $s \geq t$ ,  $i \in V$ ,  $m_V(t) \leq x_i(s) \leq M_V(t)$ . Consider the following property for  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ :

$$P_k : \begin{cases} \exists t_k \geq t, V_k \subseteq V, \text{ such that } |V_k| = k \text{ and} \\ m_{V_k}(t) \geq m_V(t) + \alpha^k(M_V(t) - m_V(t)). \end{cases}$$

If  $P_n$  is true then necessarily  $V_n = V$  and since  $M_V(t_n) \leq M_V(t)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} M_V(t_n) - m_V(t_n) &\leq M_V(t) - m_V(t) - \alpha^n(M_V(t) - m_V(t)) \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha^n)(M_V(t) - m_V(t)). \end{aligned}$$

# Convergence analysis

*Proof:* Let  $i_1 \in V$  such that  $x_{i_1}(t) = M_V(t)$ . Let  $t_1 = t$  and  $V_1 = \{i_1\}$ , then

$$m_{V_1}(t_1) = x_{i_1}(t) = M_V(t) \geq m_V(t) + \alpha(M_V(t) - m_V(t)).$$

Thus,  $P_1$  is true. Assume  $P_k$  is true for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ .

Let  $T_k \geq t_k$  be the first time such that

$$\exists (i_{k+1}, j_{k+1}) \in E(T_k), \text{ for some } i_{k+1} \in V \setminus V_k, j_{k+1} \in V_k.$$

For all  $t_k \leq s \leq T_k - 1$ ,  $i \in V_k$ ,  $j \in V \setminus V_k$ ,  $(i, j) \notin E(s)$ . Then,

$$\forall i \in V_k, x_i(T_k) \geq m_{V_k}(T_k) \geq m_{V_k}(t_k) \geq m_V(t) + \alpha^k(M_V(t) - m_V(t)).$$

# Convergence analysis

*Proof:* Then, for all  $i \in V_k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}x_i(T_k + 1) - m_V(t) &= \left( \sum_{j \in V} p_{ij}(T_k) x_j(T_k) \right) - m_V(t) \\&= \sum_{j \in V} p_{ij}(T_k) (x_j(T_k) - m_V(t)) \\&\geq p_{ii}(T_k) (x_i(T_k) - m_V(t)) \\&\geq \alpha (x_i(T_k) - m_V(t)) \\&\geq \alpha \left( m_V(t) + \alpha^k (M_V(t) - m_V(t)) - m_V(t) \right) \\&\geq \alpha^{k+1} (M_V(t) - m_V(t)).\end{aligned}$$

# Convergence analysis

*Proof.* Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}x_{i_{k+1}}(T_k + 1) - m_V(t) &= \left( \sum_{j \in V} p_{i_{k+1}j}(T_k) x_j(T_k) \right) - m_V(t) \\&= \sum_{j \in V} p_{i_{k+1}j}(T_k) (x_j(T_k) - m_V(t)) \\&\geq p_{i_{k+1}j_{k+1}}(T_k) (x_{j_{k+1}}(T_k) - m_V(t)) \\&\geq \alpha (x_{j_{k+1}}(T_k) - m_V(t)) \\&\geq \alpha (m_V(t) + \alpha^k (M_V(t) - m_V(t)) - m_V(t)) \\&\geq \alpha^{k+1} (M_V(t) - m_V(t)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $P_{k+1}$  holds for  $t_{k+1} = T_k + 1$  and  $V_{k+1} = V_k \cup \{i_{k+1}\}$ .  
Then,  $P_n$  holds.

# Convergence analysis

## Theorem

*If, for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , the graph  $(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$  is connected, then the consensus is achieved.*

*Proof:* From the previous lemma, there exists an increasing sequence  $T_k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $T_0 = 0$  and

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq M_V(T_k) - m_V(T_k) \leq (1 - \alpha^n)^k (M_V(0) - m_V(0)).$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} M_V(T_k) - m_V(T_k) = 0.$$

Since in addition  $M_V(t)$  and  $m_V(t)$  are convergent it necessarily follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} M_V(t) - m_V(t) = 0.$$

# Continuous time consensus

The previous result is **not valid for continuous time algorithms**.

Consider e.g.:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t)),$$

in a network of two agents with dynamic topology  $G(t) = (V, E(t))$  where

$$V = \{1, 2\}, \quad E(t) = \begin{cases} \{(1, 2), (2, 1)\}, & \text{if } t \in [k, k + 1/2^k) \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } t \in [k + 1/2^k, k + 1) \end{cases}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let us remark that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the graph  $(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$  is connected.



# Continuous time consensus

It follows that,

$$\dot{x}_2(t) - \dot{x}_1(t) = \begin{cases} -2(x_2(t) - x_1(t)), & \text{if } t \in [k, k + 1/2^k) \\ 0, & \text{if } t \in [k + 1/2^k, k + 1) \end{cases}$$

Then, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_2(k+1) - x_1(k+1) &= x_2(k + 1/2^k) - x_1(k + 1/2^k) \\ &= (x_2(k) - x_1(k))e^{-2/2^k} \\ &= (x_2(0) - x_1(0))e^{-2}e^{-2/2}e^{-2/2^2} \dots e^{-2/2^k} \\ &= (x_2(0) - x_1(0))e^{-2(1+1/2+1/2^2+\dots+1/2^k)} \\ &= (x_2(0) - x_1(0))e^{-4(1-1/2^{k+1})}. \end{aligned}$$

# Continuous time consensus

It follows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} x_2(k+1) - x_1(k+1) = (x_2(0) - x_1(0))e^{-4} \neq 0.$$

- The consensus is not achieved despite the fact that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the graph  $(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$  is connected.
- The key observation is that even though the edge  $(1, 2)$  appears infinitely often, it is present only for a finite time...
- If one impose a dwell time (when an edge appears it remains present for a duration at least  $\tau > 0$ ), one can avoid this kind of phenomenom.

# A general consensus algorithm

Let us assume that the graph is time-varying  $G(t) = (V, E(t))$  and consider the following continuous time consensus algorithm:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in V \setminus \{i\}} p_{ij}(t)(x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

under the following assumptions (for some  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta > 0$ ):

## Assumption

- $p_{ij}(t) \neq 0$  if and only if  $(i, j) \in E(t)$ ,  $\forall i, j \in V$ ,  $i \neq j$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- $p_{ij}(t) \in \{0\} \cup [\alpha, \beta]$ ,  $\forall i, j \in V$ ,  $i \neq j$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- $\sum_{j \in V \setminus \{i\}} p_{ij}(t) \leq \beta$ ,  $\forall i \in V$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Let us remark that the previous continuous time consensus algorithms satisfy these assumptions.

# A general consensus algorithm

We add the following dwell time assumption:

## Assumption

*For all  $i, j \in V$ , if the edge  $(i, j)$  appears at time  $t$ , i.e.:*

$$(i, j) \in E(t) \text{ and } \exists \varepsilon > 0, \forall s \in [t - \varepsilon, t), (i, j) \notin E(s)$$

*then  $(i, j)$  remains at for a duration  $\tau$ , i.e.:*

$$\forall s \in [t, t + \tau], (i, j) \in E(s).$$

Then, we have the convergence result:

## Theorem

*If, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the graph  $(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$  is connected, then the consensus is achieved.*

# Summary

## Discrete time consensus algorithms:

Algorithm	Topology	Consensus if	Convergence rate
$x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon L)x(t)$	fixed	$G$ is connected	$(1 - \varepsilon \lambda_2)^t$
$x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon D^{-1}L)x(t)$	fixed	$G$ is connected	$(1 - \varepsilon \tilde{\lambda}_2)^t$
$x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon L)x(t)$	dynamic	$G(t)$ is connected for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$	$(1 - \varepsilon \lambda_2)^t$ with $\lambda_2 \leq \min_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_2(t)$
$x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon L)x(t)$	dynamic	$(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$ is connected for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$	-
$x(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon D^{-1}L)x(t)$	dynamic	$(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$ is connected for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$	-

- Connectivity properties are crucial for convergence of consensus algorithms.
- Some convergence rates are determined by the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian or normalized Laplacian matrix: the more connected the network the faster the consensus.

# Summary

Continuous time consensus algorithms:

Algorithm	Topology	Consensus if	Convergence rate
$\dot{x}(t) = -Lx(t)$	fixed	$G$ is connected	$e^{-\lambda_2 t}$
$\dot{x}(t) = -D^{-1}Lx(t)$	fixed	$G$ is connected	$e^{-\lambda_2 t}$
$\dot{x}(t) = -Lx(t)$	dynamic	$G(t)$ is connected for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$	$e^{-\lambda_2 t}$ with $\lambda_2 \leq \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \lambda_2(t)$
$\dot{x}(t) = -Lx(t)$	dynamic	Dwell time and $(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$ is connected for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$	-
$\dot{x}(t) = -D^{-1}Lx(t)$	dynamic	Dwell time and $(V, \cup_{s \geq t} E(s))$ is connected for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$	-

- Results are very similar to those for discrete time algorithms.
- For dynamic topologies, a supplementary dwell time assumption is needed in order to prove that the consensus is achieved.

# Lecture outline

- ① Algebraic graph theory
- ② Spectral graph theory
- ③ Consensus algorithms
- ④ Applications
  - Rendez-vous in space
  - Flocking in mobile networks
  - Opinion dynamics and community detection in social networks

# Rendez-vous problem

The *multi-agent rendez-vous problem* is to design local control strategies, one for each agent, which cause all members of the group to meet at single unspecified location.



The problem may be reformulated in order to obtain a specified formation or a uniform distribution in a specified formation.

Different formulations:

- Fixed communication topology (an agent is able to continuously track the position of specified agents in the network).
- Dynamic topology (an agent is able to track the position of agents in a sensing range)



# Rendez-vous problem



# Synchronous case

The maneuvering times for all agents are all the same length positive value  $\tau_M$ . The real time axis can be partitioned into a sequence of time intervals  $[0, t_1)$ ,  $[t_1, t_2)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $[t_k, t_{k+1})$ ,  $\dots$ , each of length at least  $\tau_M$ . During each interval one has a sensing period followed by a maneuvering period of fixed length  $\tau_M$ . The agents are synchronized in that all are locked during sensing period and all can move only during maneuvering periods. During the time interval  $[t_k, t_{k+1})$  each agent moves taking into account the information obtained during the corresponding sensing period. In other words, the algorithm may be discretized as:

$$x_i(t_{k+1}) = x_i(t_k) + \sum_{j \in N_i(t_k)} u_{i,j}(t_k)$$

where  $x_i(t)$  is a vector describing the position of the agent  $i$  at the moment  $t$  and  $u_{i,j}(t)$  is the component of the local control input defining the influence of the position of agent  $j$  on the decision of agent  $i$  at moment  $t$ .

As seen in the previous chapter, considering the communication graph is fixed and connected at time 0, a necessary and sufficient condition to assure the rendez-vous is to define the local control input at time  $t_k$  by:

$$u_{i,j}(t_k) = \epsilon(x_j(t_k) - x_i(t_k)), \epsilon \in (0, 1/d_{\max})$$

This leads to the collective dynamics:

$$x(t_{k+1}) = (Id - \epsilon L)x(t_k) \triangleq Px(t_k)$$

where  $x(t) \triangleq (x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_n(t))$

# Implementation

Often (as in the case of SAMI platform), we can control the position of agents via their velocities. Therefore, the above computations are done during the sensing period while during the maneuvering period each agent is driven by the following dynamics:

$$x_i(t_{k+1}) = x_i(t_k) + v_i(k) \cdot \tau_M$$

where  $v_i(k)$  is a constant velocity with  $|v_i(k)| = \frac{\|Px(t_k) - x(t_k)\|}{\tau_M}$ , having the same orientation as the vector  $Px(t_k) - x(t_k)$

## Remark

*The algorithm and the implementation previously presented assure the rendez-vous even if the communication network is not fixed but  $(V, \bigcup_{s>t} E(s))$  is connected for all  $t \geq 0$ .*

# Formation problem

Let  $\mathcal{F} = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n)$  a formation. Denoting by  $y(t)$  the vector  $x(t) - \mathcal{F}$  and applying the previous rendez-vous algorithm to  $y$ , one obtains  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y(t) = y^* \cdot \mathbf{1}$ , where  $y^*$  is the rendez-vous point.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) = y^* + f_i \Leftrightarrow \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |(x_i(t) - f_i) - (x_j(t) - f_j)| = 0$$

which means the formation is achieved asymptotically.

# Asynchronous case

The real time axis can be partitioned for each agent into a sequence of time intervals  $[0, t_{i,1})$ ,  $[t_{i,1}, t_{i,2})$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $[t_{i,k}, t_{i,k+1})$ ,  $\dots$ , each of length at most  $\tau_D + \tau_M$ , where  $\tau_D$  is greater than  $\tau_M$ , called *dwell time*.

Each interval  $[t_{i,k}, t_{i,k+1})$  consists of a sensing period of fixed length  $\tau_D$ , during which the agent  $i$  is stationary, followed by a maneuvering period of length at most  $\tau_M$ .

The agents operate asynchronously in the sense that the sequences  $t_{i,k}$ ,  $i \geq 1$  are uncorrelated.

The rendez-vous problem is solved under some supplementary conditions concerning the overlapping of the sensing periods and the registration of neighbors.

# Flocking in mobile agents network

Flocking is the behavior exhibited when a group of birds are in flight:




More precisely, a flocking behavior is characterized by three properties:

- ① **Alignment**: the birds have the same velocity.
- ② **Cohesion**: the birds remain together.
- ③ **Separation**: there is a minimum distance between birds.

In the following, we focus on the first and second property.

# Example: flocking in mobile networks

Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:




Agent  $i$  is characterized by its position  $x_i$  and velocity  $v_i$ .



# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Agent  $i$  has limited communication or sensing capabilities.

# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Agent  $i$  tries to align its velocity on its neighbors:  $\dot{v}_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} (v_j - v_i)$ .

# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



The communication network is described by a (dynamic) graph.

# Example: flocking in mobile networks


Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Global linear dynamics with structure given by the graph:  $\dot{v} = -Lv$ .

# Example: flocking in mobile networks

Consider a set of agents willing to move in a common direction:



Do the agents eventually agree on a common velocity?

# A flocking model

- We consider a set of mobile agents  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ : for each  $i \in V$ ,  $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $v_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denote its position and its velocity.
- An agent can communicate only with agents that are sufficiently close: the interaction graph  $G(t) = (V, E(t))$  is given by

$$E(t) = \{(i, j) \in V \times V \mid i \neq j \text{ and } \|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| \leq R\}.$$

- The agents try to agree on their velocity using the continuous time consensus algorithm:

$$\dot{v}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (v_j(t) - v_i(t)).$$

# A flocking model

The considered model is then:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i(t) &= v_i(t) \\ \dot{v}_i(t) &= \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (v_j(t) - v_i(t)) \end{cases}$$

We want to determine a set of initial conditions ensuring that a flocking behavior is achieved.

We have already shown the following result:

## Theorem

*If the graph  $G(t)$  is connected for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the consensus is achieved. Moreover, for  $\underline{\lambda}_2 \leq \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \lambda_2(t)$ ,*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|v(t) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\| \leq e^{-\underline{\lambda}_2 t} \|v(0) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\|$$

*with  $v^* = \sum_{i \in V} v_i(0)$ .*

# Graph robustness analysis

- We define a notion of robustness for interaction graphs.
- For  $i \in V$ , let  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be the position of agent  $i$ , let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , we define the associated graph  $G_x = (V, E_x)$  with

$$E_x = \{(i, j) \in V \times V \mid i \neq j \text{ and } \|x_i - x_j\| \leq R\}.$$

- Let  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$  be a reference configuration. Assuming that  $G_{x^0}$  is a connected graph, we are interested in characterizing a neighborhood of  $x^0$  such that for any perturbed configuration  $y$  in this neighborhood the graph  $G_y$  is connected.
- We introduce a measure of robustness for  $G_{x^0}$  which allows us to identify such a neighborhood.



# Graph robustness analysis

- Let  $(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})$  be a path of  $G_{x^0}$ , we define the **slackening** of the path:

$$s((i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})) = \min_{k=1}^p (R - \|x_{i_k}^0 - x_{i_{k+1}}^0\|).$$

If the distances between agents do not change more than  $s((i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1}))$  then the path is preserved.

- The **path-robustness**  $\rho_{ij}$  between two agents  $i, j \in V$  with  $i \neq j$ , is the maximal slackening of all paths between  $i$  and  $j$ :

$$\rho_{ij} = \max_{(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1}) \in \text{Paths}(i, j)} s((i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})).$$

If the distances between agents do not change more than  $\rho_{ij}$  there remains a path between  $i$  and  $j$ . We set  $\rho_{ii} = R$ .

# Graph robustness analysis

- The **robustness** of the graph  $\rho_{G_{x_0}}$  is the minimal path-robustness between all pair of nodes:

$$\rho_{G_{x_0}} = \min_{(i,j) \in V^2} \rho_{ij}$$

If the distances between agents do not change more than  $\rho_{G_{x_0}}$  then the graph remains connected.


- The **core robust subgraph** of  $G_{x_0}$  is the graph  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x_0}) = (V, \mathcal{M}(E_{x_0}))$  where

$$\mathcal{M}(E_{x_0}) = \left\{ (i,j) \in V \times V \mid i \neq j \text{ and } \|x_i - x_j\| \leq R - \rho_{G_{x_0}} \right\}.$$

Since  $\rho_{G_{x_0}} \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x_0})$  is clearly a subgraph of  $G_{x_0}$ .

# Graph robustness analysis

Example of a core robust subgraph:



# Graph robustness analysis

## Lemma

Let  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$  be a reference configuration such that the graph  $G_{x^0}$  is connected. Then, the core robust subgraph  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$  is connected.

*Proof:* Let  $i, j \in V$ , then  $\rho_{ij} \geq \rho_{G_{x^0}}$ . Let  $(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})$  be a path of  $G_{x^0}$  between  $i$  and  $j$  with maximal slackening, then

$$s((i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})) = \rho_{ij}.$$

Then, for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,

$$R - \|x_{i_k}^0 - x_{i_{k+1}}^0\| \geq s((i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})) \geq \rho_{G_{x^0}}.$$

Therefore, for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,  $(i_k, i_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{M}(E_{x^0})$ .

Then,  $(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_p, i_{p+1})$  is a path of  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$  between  $i$  and  $j$ .

Thus,  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$  is connected.

# Graph robustness analysis

## Proposition

*Let  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be a reference configuration such that the associated graph  $G_{x^0}$  is connected. Let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be a perturbed configuration such that*

$$\|y - x^0\| \leq \frac{\rho_{G_{x^0}}}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

*Then,  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$  is a subgraph of  $G_y$  and  $G_y$  is connected.*

*Proof:* Let  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$  such that  $z = y - x^0$ .

For all  $i, j \in V$ , we have  $-2z_i^\top z_j \leq \|z_i\|^2 + \|z_j\|^2$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_i - z_j\|^2 &= \|z_i\|^2 + \|z_j\|^2 - 2z_i^\top z_j \leq 2(\|z_i\|^2 + \|z_j\|^2) \\ &\leq 2\|z\|^2 = 2\|y - x^0\|^2 \leq \rho_{G_{x^0}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then,  $\|z_i - z_j\| \leq \rho_{G_{x^0}}$ .

# Graph robustness analysis

## Proposition

*Let  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be a reference configuration such that the associated graph  $G_{x^0}$  is connected. Let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be a perturbed configuration such that*

$$\|y - x^0\| \leq \frac{\rho_{G_{x^0}}}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

*Then,  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$  is a subgraph of  $G_y$  and  $G_y$  is connected.*

*Proof:* Let  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$ , then  $\|x_i^0 - x_j^0\| \leq R - \rho_{G_{x^0}}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_i - y_j\| &= \|x_i^0 - x_j^0 + z_i - z_j\| \leq \|x_i^0 - x_j^0\| + \|z_i - z_j\| \\ &\leq R - \rho_{G_{x^0}} + \rho_{G_{x^0}} = R. \end{aligned}$$

Then,  $(i, j) \in E_y$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$  is a subgraph of  $G_y$ .  
Since  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x^0})$  is connected, so is  $G_y$ .

# Graph robustness computation

## Algorithm (Computation of the robustness $\rho_{G_{x^0}}$ )

// Initialization:

$\forall (i, j) \in V^2, \rho_{ij}^0 \leftarrow R - \|x_i^0 - x_j^0\|;$

// Main loop:

**for**  $k \in V$  **do**

**for**  $i \in V$  **do**

**for**  $j \in V$  **do**

$\rho_{ij}^k \leftarrow \max \left( \rho_{ij}^{k-1}, \min \left( \rho_{ik}^{k-1}, \rho_{kj}^{k-1} \right) \right);$

**end for**

**end for**

**end for**

// Computation of robustness:

$\rho_{G_{x^0}} = \min_{(i,j) \in V^2} \rho_{ij}^n;$

# Sufficient conditions for flocking

## Theorem

Let  $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$  be a vector of initial positions of the agents such that the associated graph  $G_{x(0)}$  is connected and its robustness  $\rho_{G_{x(0)}} > 0$ .

Let  $v(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$  be a vector of initial velocities such that

$$\|v(0) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\| \leq \frac{\lambda_2^* \rho_{G_{x(0)}}}{\sqrt{2}}$$

where  $\lambda_2^*$  is the algebraic connectivity of  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)})$ .

Then, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)})$  is a subgraph of  $G(t)$ . Moreover,

$$\|v(t) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\| \leq e^{-\lambda_2^* t} \|v(0) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\|.$$



# Sufficient conditions for flocking

*Proof:* Let  $\Pi$  be the set of graphs with  $n$  nodes which have  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)})$  as a subgraph. Since  $G_{x(0)}$  is connected, we have that  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)})$  is connected. Therefore, all graphs in  $\Pi$  are connected and since  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)}) \in \Pi$ ,

$$\min_{G \in \Pi} \lambda_2(G) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)})) = \lambda_2^* > 0.$$

Let us assume that there exists  $t > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)})$  is not a subgraph of  $G(t)$  (i.e.  $G(t) \notin \Pi$ ). Let

$$t^* = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}^+; G(t) \notin \Pi\}.$$

For  $i \in V$ , let  $y_i(t) = x_i(t) - v^*t$ . Let us remark that for all  $i, j \in V$ ,  $y_i(t) - y_j(t) = x_i(t) - x_j(t)$ . Therefore, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $G(t) = G_y(t)$ .

# Sufficient conditions for flocking

*Proof:* If  $t^* > 0$ , it follows that for all  $t \in [0, t^*)$

$$\|v(t) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\| \leq e^{-\lambda_2^* t} \|v(0) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\| \leq e^{-\lambda_2^* t} \frac{\lambda_2^* \rho_{G_{x(0)}}}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

By remarking that

$$y(t) = x^0 + \int_0^t (v(s) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*) ds$$

we have for all  $t \in [0, t^*)$

$$\|y(t) - x^0\| \leq \frac{\lambda_2^* \rho_{G_{x^0}}}{\sqrt{2}} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_2^* s} ds < \frac{\rho_{G_{x^0}}}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Then, by continuity of  $y$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for all  $t \in [0, t^* + \varepsilon]$ ,

$$\|y(t) - x^0\| \leq \frac{\rho_{G_{x^0}}}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

# Sufficient conditions for flocking

*Proof.* If  $t^* = 0$ , since  $y(0) = x^0$  and by continuity of  $y$ , the same kind of property holds.


Then, we have for all  $t \in [0, t^* + \varepsilon]$ ,  $G(t) = G_{y(t)} \in \Pi$ . This contradicts the definition of  $t^*$ . Therefore, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $G(t) \in \Pi$ . Thus for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(G_{x(0)})$  as a subgraph of  $G(t)$ . This proves the first part of the theorem.

Moreover, it follows that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\lambda_2(t) \geq \lambda_2^*$ , and then

$$\|v(t) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\| \leq e^{-\lambda_2^* t} \|v(0) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v^*\|.$$

# Example

Example in a network of 6 agents with communication radius  $R = 3.2$ :




- The bound that we compute is often conservative as shown on the example above.
- However, we can find examples where the bound is tight.

# Summary

- We have considered a model of flocking behavior based on communication graphs given by a proximity rule.
- We have established a set of initial conditions for which the flocking behavior is achieved.
- The conditions are only sufficient but can be checked algorithmically.
- The main concepts are those of graph robustness and the associated core robust subgraph that remains for all time ensuring that the communication graph remains connected for all time.

# Opinion dynamics in social networks

Opinion dynamics studies the emergence of consensus in social networks:



- In real social networks, it is often the case that a global consensus cannot be reached. Instead, several consensus are reached locally by subsets of agents forming **communities**.
- Can we propose a model of opinion dynamics reproducing this phenomenon ? Can we learn something on real social networks using this model ?

# A model of opinion dynamics

We consider a set of agents  $i \in V$  in a network  $G = (V, E)$ .

Each agent  $i \in V$  has an opinion  $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ .

We propose a discrete time model of opinion dynamics as follows:

- At each time step, agent  $i$  receives the opinion of its neighbors in  $G$ .
- Agent  $i$  gives **confidence** only to his neighbor that have an opinion close from its own. Agent  $i$  updates its opinion accordingly to its confidence neighborhood.
- Due to loss of patience, **the confidence of each agent decreases** at each time step: agent  $i$  requires that, at each negotiation round, the opinion of agent  $j$  moves significantly towards its opinion in order to keep negotiating with  $j$ .

# A model of opinion dynamics

Formally, the opinion dynamics model is described as follows:

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \frac{\varepsilon}{d_i(t)} \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t))$$

where the interaction graph at time  $t$  is  $G(t) = (V, E(t))$  with

$$E(t) = \{(i, j) \in E \mid (|x_i(t) - x_j(t)| \leq R\rho^t)\}$$

where  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $R \geq 0$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  are model parameters.

The parameter  $\rho$  characterizes the **confidence decay** of the agents.



# Convergence analysis

## Proposition

*For all  $i \in V$ , the sequence  $(x_i(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is convergent. We denote  $x_i^*$  its limit. Furthermore, we have for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$|x_i(t) - x_i^*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon R}{1 - \rho} \rho^t.$$

*Proof.* Let  $i \in V$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_i(t+1) - x_i(t)| &= \left| \frac{\varepsilon}{d_i(t)} \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} (x_j(t) - x_i(t)) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{d_i(t)} \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} |x_j(t) - x_i(t)| \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{d_i(t)} \sum_{j \in N_i(t)} R \rho^t = \varepsilon R \rho^t. \end{aligned}$$

# Convergence analysis

## Proposition

*For all  $i \in V$ , the sequence  $(x_i(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is convergent. We denote  $x_i^*$  its limit. Furthermore, we have for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$|x_i(t) - x_i^*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon R}{1 - \rho} \rho^t.$$

*Proof:* Let  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |x_i(t + \tau) - x_i(t)| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} |x_i(t + k + 1) - x_i(t + k)| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} \varepsilon R \rho^{t+k} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon R}{1 - \rho} \rho^t \end{aligned}$$

which shows, since  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , that the sequence  $(x_i(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, it is convergent. The inequality of the proposition is obtained by letting  $\tau$  go to  $+\infty$ .

## Definition

A community is subset of agent  $C \subseteq V$  such that for all  $i, j \in C$ ,  $x_i^* = x_j^*$ .  
The graph of a community  $C$  is  $G_C = (C, E_C)$  where

$$E_C = \{(i, j) \in E \mid i \in C, j \in C\}.$$

The set of communities is  $\mathcal{C}$ , it is a partition of  $V$ . The graph of communities is  $G_{\mathcal{C}} = (V, E_{\mathcal{C}})$  where

$$E_{\mathcal{C}} = \{(i, j) \in E \mid x_i^* = x_j^*\}.$$

Let us remark that

$$E_{\mathcal{C}} = \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} E_C.$$

# Characterization of communities

Before giving an algebraic characterization of communities, we need to make a supplementary assumption.

- We have seen that the opinions converge at a speed  $O(\rho^t)$ .
- In practice, we observe that the convergence is often slightly faster and this motivates the following assumption:

## Assumption (Fast convergence)

*There exists  $\underline{\rho} < \rho$  and  $M \geq 0$  such that for all  $i \in V$ , for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$|x_i(t) - x_i^*| \leq M \underline{\rho}^t.$$

# Characterization of communities

## Proposition

*There exists  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for all  $t \geq T$ ,  $E(t) = E_{\mathcal{C}}$ .*

*Proof:*  $(E(t) \subseteq E_{\mathcal{C}})$

$E$  can be splitted into two subsets:  $E^f$  consists of edges that disappear in finite time,  $E^\infty$  consists of edges that appear infinitely often.

Then, there exists  $T_1$  such that for all  $t \geq T_1$ ,  $E(t) \subseteq E^\infty$ .

Let  $(i, j) \in E^\infty$  then there exists an unbounded sequence of times  $\tau_k$  such that  $(i, j) \in E(\tau_k)$ . This gives

$$|x_i(\tau_k) - x_j(\tau_k)| \leq R\rho^t$$

and  $x_i^* = x_j^*$ . Therefore  $(i, j) \in E_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

Hence, for all  $t \geq T_1$ ,  $E(t) \subseteq E^\infty \subseteq E_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

# Characterization of communities

## Proposition

*There exists  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for all  $t \geq T$ ,  $E(t) = E_{\mathcal{C}}$ .*

*Proof:* ( $E_{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq E(t)$ )

Let  $(i, j) \in E_{\mathcal{C}}$ , then for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} |x_i(t) - x_j(t)| &\leq |x_i(t) - x_i^*| + |x_i^* - x_j^*| + |x_j^* - x_j(t)| \\ &\leq |x_i(t) - x_i^*| + |x_j^* - x_j(t)| \leq 2M_{\underline{\rho}}^t. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\underline{\rho} < \rho$ , there exists  $T_2$  such that for all  $t \geq T_2$ ,  $2M_{\underline{\rho}}^t \leq R\rho^t$ . This implies that for all  $t \geq T_2$ ,  $(i, j) \in E(t)$ .

Hence, for all  $t \geq T_2$ ,  $E_{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq E(t)$ .

## Remark

*We have shown that after a finite time, the graph  $G(t)$  is fixed.*

# Characterization of communities

## Theorem

*For almost all vectors of initial opinions, for all communities  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ , such that  $|C| \geq 2$ ,*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) > (1 - \rho)/\varepsilon.$$

*Main ideas of the proof:*

Let  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  and let us assume that  $\tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) \leq (1 - \rho)/\varepsilon$ .

Let  $x_C(t)$  denote the vector of opinions of agents in  $C$ . For all  $t \geq T$ , since  $G(t) = G_{\mathcal{C}}$ , we have

$$x_C(t+1) = (I - \varepsilon D(G_C)^{-1} L(G_C)) x_C(t).$$

We have seen that the rate of convergence of  $x_C(t)$  is  $1 - \varepsilon \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) \geq \rho$  except if  $x_C(T)$  and thus  $x(T)$  belongs to a specific subspace of zero measure  $H_C$ .

# Characterization of communities

## Theorem

*For almost all vectors of initial opinions, for all communities  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ , such that  $|C| \geq 2$ ,*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) > (1 - \rho)/\varepsilon.$$

*Main ideas of the proof:*


By assumption the rate of convergence of  $x_C(t)$  is smaller than  $\underline{\rho} < \rho$ . Thus  $x(T)$  necessarily belongs to  $H_C$ .

Then, by remarking that all matrices  $(I - \varepsilon D(t)^{-1}L(t))$  are invertible, we can move backward in time and show that the initial conditions leading to  $H_C$  at time  $T$  are included in a set of zero measure (consisting of a countable union of subspaces) that is independent of  $C$  and  $T$ .




# Example: karate club network


A social network of 34 agents:




$$(1 - \rho)/\varepsilon = 0.1$$
$$\min_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) = 0.12$$



$$(1 - \rho)/\varepsilon = 0.2$$
$$\min_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) = 0.25$$



$$(1 - \rho)/\varepsilon = 0.3$$
$$\min_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) = 0.33$$




$$(1 - \rho)/\varepsilon = 0.4$$
$$\min_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) = 0.57$$


The second partition is almost that observed by Zachary in its original study (1973).

# Example: book network


A network of 105 books on American politics:




Original  
network



$(1 - \rho)/\varepsilon = 0.1$   
 $\min_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) = 0.13$



$(1 - \rho)/\varepsilon = 0.15$   
 $\min_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) = 0.18$



$(1 - \rho)/\varepsilon = 0.2$   
 $\min_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\lambda}_2(G_C) = 0.27$

One recovers the information on the political alignment (democrat, republican, centrist) of the books.

# Summary

- We have introduced a model of opinion dynamics with decaying confidence.
- In this model, a global consensus may not be achieved and only local agreements can be reached. The agents organize themselves in communities.
- The analysis of the model provided an algebraic characterization of the communities under a fast convergence assumption.
- The experimental results tend to confirm the validity of the algebraic characterization. Moreover, the communities that are obtained on real examples are meaningful and allows to uncover information hidden in the network structure.