

Distributed Fault-Tolerant Control of Multiagent Systems: An Adaptive Learning Approach

Mohsen Khalili¹, Xiaodong Zhang², Yongcan Cao³, Marios M. Polycarpou⁴, *Fellow, IEEE*,
and Thomas Parisini⁵, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper focuses on developing a distributed leader-following fault-tolerant tracking control scheme for a class of high-order nonlinear uncertain multiagent systems. Neural network-based adaptive learning algorithms are developed to learn unknown fault functions, guaranteeing the system stability and cooperative tracking even in the presence of multiple simultaneous process and actuator faults in the distributed agents. The time-varying leader’s command is only communicated to a small portion of follower agents through directed links, and each follower agent exchanges local measurement information only with its neighbors through a bidirectional but asymmetric topology. Adaptive fault-tolerant algorithms are developed for two cases, i.e., with full-state measurement and with only limited output measurement, respectively. Under certain assumptions, the closed-loop stability and asymptotic leader-follower tracking properties are rigorously established.

Index Terms—Cooperative tracking, fault-tolerant control (FTC), learning systems, multiagent systems (MASs), nonlinear uncertain systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

COOPERATIVE control of multiagent systems (MASs) using distributed consensus algorithms has recently received significant attention (see [1]–[3] and references therein). Two types of control problem have been considered, i.e., the cooperative regulator problem (also known as leaderless consensus) and the cooperative tracking problem. For the regulator problem, all the agents/nodes are driven

Manuscript received November 1, 2017; revised October 2, 2018 and February 7, 2019; accepted February 14, 2019. This work was supported in part by the KIOS Research and Innovation Center of Excellence through the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant 739551 and in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant EEC-1659813. (*Corresponding author: Thomas Parisini.*)

M. Khalili and X. Zhang are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435 USA (e-mail: khalili.4@wright.edu; xiaodong.zhang@wright.edu).

Y. Cao is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX 78249 USA (e-mail: yongcan.cao@utsa.edu).

M. M. Polycarpou is with the KIOS Research and Innovation Center of Excellence, University of Cyprus, Nicosia 1678, Cyprus, and also with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Cyprus, Nicosia 1678, Cyprus (e-mail: mpolycar@ucy.ac.cy).

T. Parisini is with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, U.K., with the KIOS Research and Innovation Center of Excellence, University of Cyprus, Nicosia 1678, Cyprus, and also with the Department of Engineering and Architecture, University of Trieste, 34148 Trieste, Italy (e-mail: t.parisini@gmail.com).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TNNLS.2019.2904277

to the consensus equilibrium that is dependent on the initial conditions of the agents. For the tracking problem, there is a leader agent acting as a command generator, and all follower agents are synchronized to track the leader, despite the leader’s command being received only by a small portion of followers. Since such distributed MAS need to operate reliably even in the presence of faults in some agents, the development of fault-tolerant control (FTC) schemes is a crucial step in achieving dependable and safe operations.

Adaptive approximators such as neural networks combined with learning estimation algorithms are suitable for approximating unknown nonlinear dynamics or fault functions in the FTC design, thereby enhancing the robustness and detectability of the fault diagnosis scheme, as well as improving the capability for fault accommodation. So far, considerable effort has focused on the development of adaptive-approximator-based leader-following tracking algorithms for MAS with the first-order agent dynamics [4], [5], second-order dynamics [6]–[8], and high-order dynamics in the Brunovsky form [9], [10]. On the other hand, limited results are available on leader-following FTC design for MAS with more general dynamics. For instance, leader-following tracking algorithms for MAS with general linear and Lipschitz nonlinear dynamics have been developed by assuming the absence of faults [11] or by considering actuator faults [12]–[14]. However, the agent models in [12]–[14] do not consider process faults, which are crucial for the safe operation of MAS. Furthermore, the results in [11]–[14] are based on a critical assumption that the Laplacian matrix of the communication graph is symmetric. In practice, the distributed leader-follower FTC problem naturally requires the consideration of graphs with an *asymmetric* Laplacian matrix, which is significantly more challenging.

This paper presents a distributed adaptive cooperative tracking FTC method for accommodating both process and actuator faults in a class of high-order nonlinear uncertain MASs. Neural network-based adaptive approximators are employed in the FTC design to learn the unknown fault function and to guarantee the system stability and leader-following performance in the presence of faults by modifying the feedback control law via parameter adaptation. In the leader-following topology under consideration, the time-varying leader’s command is only communicated to a small subset of follower agents, and each follower agent exchanges measurement information only with its neighbors through a bidirectional but

a time-varying function that is zero before fault occurrence (i.e., $t < T_{if}$ for process faults or $t < T_{iu}$ for actuator faults), and satisfies $0 < \beta_i \leq 1$ after fault occurrence (i.e., $t \geq T_{if}$ for process faults or $t \geq T_{iu}$ for actuator faults). For instance, the time profile of abrupt faults can be modeled as a step function, and the time profile of incipient (slowly developing) faults can be modeled as a drift-type fault or an exponential term with an unknown fault-evolution rate [20]. Therefore, both incipient and abrupt faults are considered in this paper. Note that the system model (1) allows the occurrence of multiple simultaneous faults in multiple agents.

Without loss of generality, let the leader be identified as agent number 0 with a reference state $x_0 \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ satisfying $\dot{x}_0(t) = Ax_0 + Bu_0 + g(x_0)$, where $u_0 \in \mathfrak{R}^m$ is the control input. Then, the following assumptions are made.

Assumption 1: The leader's state x_0 follows a bounded unknown reference trajectory, and the control input u_0 is bounded by an unknown constant.

Assumption 2: The modeling uncertainty of the "healthy" agents, represented by $\eta_i(x_i, t)$ in (1) satisfies

$$|\eta_i(x_i, t)| \leq \omega_i \bar{\eta}_i(x_i, t), \quad \forall x_i \in \mathfrak{R}^n \quad (2)$$

where ω_i is an unknown positive constant, and $\bar{\eta}_i$ is a known bounding function.

Assumption 3: The nominal nonlinearity $g(x_i)$ in (1) satisfies the following condition: for all $x_i \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ and $\hat{x}_i \in \mathfrak{R}^n$

$$|g(x_i) - g(\hat{x}_i)| \leq \sigma |x_i - \hat{x}_i| \quad (3)$$

where σ is a known constant.

Assumption 4: The matrices D and F lie within the range space of the matrix B , which implies there exist matrices \bar{D} and \bar{F} with appropriate dimensions such that

$$B\bar{D} = D \text{ and } B\bar{F} = F. \quad (4)$$

As in [9] and [21], Assumption 1 is needed to achieve cooperative tracking control for a time-varying leader. It is worth noting that the bound on the uncertainty given in Assumption 2 is allowed to be a function of the agent state x_i , which is less restrictive than the constant bounds assumed in [8]–[10]. The condition given in Assumption 3 on the nominal nonlinearity $g(x_i)$ is needed for FTC design as in [11], [12], and [22]. Note that $\eta_i(x_i, t)$ and $f_i(x_i)$ are unknown. Assumption 4 provides the so-called *matched uncertainty* condition [23], required to ensure the robustness of the FTC algorithms with respect to faults and modeling uncertainties.

Remark 1: The distributed nonlinear agent model described by (1) is more general than the high-order agent models considered in the literature. For instance, a class of Lipschitz nonlinear agents was considered in [12], where the absence of modeling uncertainty and process faults was assumed. The agent model considered in [9] and [10] is assumed to be in the Brunovsky form, where $g(x_i) = 0$ and $B = D = F = [0, \dots, 0, 1]^T$. In addition, agents with linear dynamics and matching uncertainties (i.e., $g = 0$, $D = F = B$) were considered in [13] under the assumption of undirected graphs, whereas unbalanced graphs are

considered in this paper. It is worth noting that all these aforementioned high-order agent models in the literature satisfy Assumptions 1–4 described above.

B. Distributed Fault-Tolerant Control Design

Adaptive approximators such as neural-network models can be used to approximate the unknown process fault function $f_i(x_i)$. Specifically, we consider linearly parametrized network (e.g., radial-basis-function networks with fixed centers and variances) described as follows:

$$\hat{f}_i(x_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i) = \hat{\vartheta}_i^T \varphi_i(x_i) \quad (5)$$

where $\varphi_i(\cdot)$ represents the collective vector of fixed basis functions, and $\hat{\vartheta}_i$ are the adjustable weights of the nonlinear approximator. In the presence of a process fault, \hat{f}_i provides the adaptive structure for approximating the unknown fault function $f_i(x_i)$ by adapting the weight vector $\hat{\vartheta}_i(t)$.

In the presence of process and actuator faults, by adding and subtracting the term $\hat{f}_i(x_i, \vartheta_i)$, the system dynamics described by (1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i = & Ax_i + g(x_i) + Bu_i + B\beta_i\theta_i u_i + D\eta_i(x_i, t) \\ & + F[\hat{f}_i(x_i, \vartheta_i) + \beta_i f_i(x_i) - \hat{f}_i(x_i, \vartheta_i)] \end{aligned}$$

where ϑ_i is the *unknown* optimal weight matrix [24]. By defining the residual approximation error for the i th agent as $\delta_i \triangleq f_i(x_i) - \hat{f}_i(x_i, \vartheta_i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i = & Ax_i + g(x_i) + Bu_i + B\beta_i\theta_i u_i + D\eta_i(x_i, t) \\ & + F[\hat{f}_i(x_i, \vartheta_i) + (\beta_i - 1)\hat{f}_i(x_i, \vartheta_i) + \beta_i\delta_i(x_i)]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For each network, the following assumption is made:

Assumption 5: For each $i = 1, \dots, M$, the neural network residual approximation error satisfies

$$|\delta_i(x_i)| \leq \alpha_i \bar{\delta}_i(x_i), \quad \forall x_i \in \mathfrak{R}^n \quad (7)$$

where $\bar{\delta}_i$ is a known bounding function, and α_i is an unknown positive constant.

Remark 2: It is worth noting that the bound on the residual approximation error in the above-mentioned assumption is allowed to be a function of the agent state, which is less restrictive than the constant bound assumed in [9], [10], [13], and [22]. The bounding functions $\bar{\delta}_i$ can possibly be obtained by making use of certain limited knowledge on the fault. In the worst case scenario when there is no information about the bound on the residual approximation error, the bound can be considered as an unknown constant (i.e., $\bar{\delta}_i = 1$). Furthermore, based on the above-mentioned assumption, the residual error (which may grow unbounded as x_i goes to infinity) is bounded by a known function $\bar{\delta}_i$, which, in general, will grow unbounded as x_i becomes very large (e.g., the known function $\bar{\delta}_i$ may have terms like x_i^2). The term will appear in the FTC and will not allow the trajectory to become unbounded due to the high gain. On the other hand, as x_i becomes quite large, the controller output will also become very large possibly reaching saturation or it may encounter other problems in the presence of measurement noise.

We let α_i^0 and κ_i represent the unknown constants defined as

$$\alpha_i^0 \triangleq \sup_{t \geq T_{if}} \max \{ |\beta_i(t - T_{if}) \alpha_i|, |[\beta_i(t - T_{if}) - 1] \vartheta_i| \} \quad (8)$$

$$\kappa_i \triangleq \sup_{t \geq 0} \max \{ |u_0 + Kx_0|, |[\beta_i(t - T_{iu}) - 1] \theta_i| \} \quad (9)$$

where $K \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times n}$ is a design gain matrix. Note that the fault time profile β_i satisfies $0 \leq \beta_i \leq 1$. Then, based on Assumptions 1 and 5, the finite constants α_i^0 and κ_i , defined, respectively, by (8) and (9) always exist.

Let N_i denote the set of neighbors of agent i . Based on the system model (6) and the neural network model (5), the following fault-tolerant controller for the i th agent is chosen:

$$u_i = (I_m + \hat{\theta}_i)^{-1} \bar{u}_i \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_i \triangleq & -\rho_i B^T P \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij} - \hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \\ & - Kx_i - \bar{D} \hat{\omega}_i \bar{\eta}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \\ & - \bar{F} \left[\hat{\alpha}_i \bar{\Delta}_i(x_i) \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) + \hat{f}_i(x_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_i = \bar{\Lambda}_i \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \quad (12)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\vartheta}}_{ih} = \Gamma_i \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F_h^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \varphi_i(x_i) \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\alpha}}_i = \Upsilon_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right| \bar{\Delta}_i(x_i) \quad (14)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}}_{id} = \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\theta}_{id}} \left\{ \bar{\Gamma}_i \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B_d^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} u_{id} \right\} \quad (15)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\kappa}}_i = \bar{\Upsilon}_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right| \bar{U}_i \quad (16)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\omega}}_i = \Lambda_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right| \bar{\eta}_i \quad (17)$$

where $\rho_i(t)$ is a time-varying coupling gain, $\hat{\theta}_i \triangleq \operatorname{diag}\{\hat{\theta}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{im}\}$ with $\hat{\theta}_{id}$ in (15) being an estimation of the actuator fault parameter θ_{id} , for $d = 1, \dots, m$, the projection operator \mathcal{P} restricts $\hat{\theta}_{id}$ to the corresponding set $[\hat{\theta}_{id}, 0]$, B_d is the d th column of matrix B , u_{id} is the d th component of control input u_i , I_m is a $m \times m$ identity matrix, $\tilde{x}_{ij} \triangleq x_i - x_j$, for $j \in N_i$, b_{ij} are the constant design gains defined later in (23), $K \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times n}$ is a design gain matrix chosen to make $\bar{A} \triangleq A - BK$ Hurwitz, $\hat{\kappa}_i$ is an estimation of the unknown positive constant bound κ_i described in (9), \bar{D} and \bar{F} are given in Assumption 4, \hat{f}_i provides the adaptive approximation of

unknown process fault functions [see (5)], $\hat{\vartheta}_{ih}$ is an estimation of the h th column of the neural network optimal weight matrix ϑ_i , for $h = 1, \dots, s$, F_h is the h th column of matrix F , $\bar{\Delta}_i(x_i) \triangleq \bar{\delta}_i(x_i) + |\varphi_i(x_i)|$, $\bar{U}_i \triangleq 1 + |u_i|$, $\hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\hat{\omega}_i$ are the estimates of the unknown bounding constants α_i^0 described in (8) and ω_i in (2), respectively, Γ_i is a positive definite learning rate matrix, $\bar{\Lambda}_i$, Υ_i , $\bar{\Gamma}_i$, $\bar{\Upsilon}_i$, and Λ_i are the positive learning rate constants, and $\operatorname{sgn}(\cdot)$ is the sign function defined to take zero value at zero. Furthermore, P is a positive definite design matrix, which will be defined in Theorem 1.

Remark 3: In the control law (10) and (11), the term $-\rho_i B^T P \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij}$ guarantees the convergence of cooperative tracking error for the ideal case of the autonomous leader (i.e., $u_0 = 0$) and the absence of faults and modeling uncertainty. The term $-\hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \operatorname{sgn}(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij})$ with the adaptive law (16) is designed to guarantee the robustness of leader-follower tracking with respect to a time-varying leader with an unknown input, and the term $-\bar{D} \hat{\omega}_i \bar{\eta}_i \operatorname{sgn}(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij})$ with the adaptive law (17) is designed to achieve the robustness to modeling uncertainty η_i . The adaptive term $(I_m + \hat{\theta}_i)^{-1}$ in the control law (10) and the adaptive law (15) is used to compensate for the effect of actuator faults. The term $-\bar{F} \hat{\alpha}_i \bar{\Delta}_i \operatorname{sgn}(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij})$ in (11) and the adaptive law (14) is designed to deal with the neural network residual approximation error. Finally, the term $\hat{f}_i(x_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i)$ in (11) is the neural-network approximator with the adaptive law (13) designed to approximate unknown process fault functions.

C. Stability Analysis

The following Lemmas are needed for the design and analysis of the distributed FTC algorithms:

Lemma 1: [18, Lemma 1] Suppose $\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{R}^{(M+1) \times (M+1)}$ is the Laplacian matrix of intercommunication graph as if the communication between the leader and followers is bidirectional. Then, the matrix

$$\Omega \triangleq \chi \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}^T \chi \quad (18)$$

is positive semidefinite and has a simple zero eigenvalue with $\mathbf{1}_{M+1}$ as its corresponding right eigenvector, where $\chi = \operatorname{diag}\{\chi_0, \chi_1, \chi_2, \dots, \chi_M\}$ is a diagonal matrix consisting of the elements of the left eigenvector of \mathcal{H} associated with the eigenvalue zero, i.e., $\mathcal{H}^T \bar{\chi} = 0$, $\bar{\chi} = [\chi_0, \chi_1, \chi_2, \dots, \chi_M]^T$, and $\mathbf{1}_{M+1}$ is a $(M+1) \times 1$ column vector of ones.

Lemma 2: [18, Lemma 2] Suppose the Laplacian matrix \mathcal{H} and the diagonal matrix χ , defined in Lemma 1, have the following decomposition:

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_0 & \mathcal{H}_{12} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21} & \hat{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \chi = \begin{bmatrix} \chi_0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_M & \hat{\chi} \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_0 \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\mathcal{H}_{12} \in \mathfrak{R}^{1 \times M}$, $\mathcal{H}_{21} \in \mathfrak{R}^{M \times 1}$, $\hat{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathfrak{R}^{M \times M}$, $\chi_0 \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\hat{\chi} \in \mathfrak{R}^{M \times M}$, and $\mathbf{0}_M$ is a $M \times 1$ column vector of zeros. Then, the matrix

$$\Psi \triangleq \hat{\chi} \hat{\mathcal{H}} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}^T \hat{\chi} \quad (20)$$

is positive definite.

Let us define $\gamma \triangleq \lambda_{\min}(\Psi)$ and $\varrho \triangleq \lambda_{\max}(\Psi)$, where $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalues, respectively. Note that based on Lemma 2, γ and ϱ are both positive.

Theorem 1: If there exist a symmetric positive definite matrix $P \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times n}$, and positive constant μ , such that

$$\tilde{A}^T P + P \tilde{A} + \mu P^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} I_n - 2PBB^T P < 0 \quad (21)$$

where I_n is the identity matrix, and σ is the constant defined in (3). Then, in the presence of actuator and process faults, the distributed adaptive-approximation-based fault-tolerant controller (10) with controller gains (23) and adaptive laws (12)–(17) guarantees the following properties.

- 1) All the signals are uniformly bounded.
- 2) The leader-follower consensus is achieved asymptotically, i.e., $x_i(t) \rightarrow x_0(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: Using some algebraic manipulations, we can rewrite (10) as $u_i = \bar{u}_i - \hat{\theta}_i u_i$. Note that $(I_m + \beta_i \theta_i) u_i = u_i + \beta_i \theta_i u_i = \bar{u}_i - \hat{\theta}_i u_i + \beta_i \theta_i u_i$. By using (11) and substituting u_i into (6), and by using the leader's dynamics (i.e., $\dot{x}_0(t) = g(x_0) + Ax_0 + Bu_0$), the tracking error dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}_i &= \tilde{A} \tilde{x}_i - \rho_i BB^T P \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij} + g(x_i) - g(x_0) + D\eta_i \\ &\quad - B\bar{D}\hat{\omega}_i \bar{\eta}_i \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) + B\bar{\theta}_i u_i - Bu_0 \\ &\quad - BKx_0 - B\hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) + F\tilde{\vartheta}_i^T \varphi_i \\ &\quad + F\beta_i \delta_i - B\bar{F}\hat{\alpha}_i \bar{\Delta}_i(x_i) \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \\ &\quad + (\beta_i - 1)F\hat{f}_i(x_i, \vartheta_i) + (\beta_i - 1)B\theta_i u_i \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{x}_i = \tilde{x}_{i0} \triangleq x_i - x_0$, $\tilde{\vartheta}_i \triangleq \vartheta_i - \hat{\vartheta}_i$ is the network parameter estimation error associated with the i th agent, and $\theta_i \triangleq \theta_i - \hat{\theta}_i$ is the actuator fault parameter estimation error.

We choose the following distributed controller gains: for $i = 1, \dots, M$, and $j \in N_i$

$$b_{ij} = \begin{cases} \chi_i k_{ij} + \chi_j k_{ji}, & \text{for } j \neq 0 \\ \chi_i k_{i0} + \chi_0 \bar{k}_i, & \text{for } j = 0 \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where χ_i is defined in Lemma 1, \bar{k}_i is defined in the proof of Lemma 1, and k_{ij} and k_{ji} are the positive constants denoting the weights on the intercommunication graph \mathcal{G} . Note that the distributed gains b_{ij} given in (23) are the i th row and j th column entries of Ψ defined in Lemma 2. Therefore, using (22) and (23) and the definition of Ψ in Lemma 2, we can represent the collective closed-loop state dynamics as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}} &= (I_M \otimes \tilde{A}) \tilde{x} - (\bar{\rho} \Psi \otimes BB^T P) \tilde{x} + \tilde{g} + \tilde{\zeta} - \tilde{\xi} \\ &\quad + U + \Delta + \tilde{f} + \varpi \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where \otimes represents the kronecker product, $\tilde{x} \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$ is the column stack vector of \tilde{x}_i , $\bar{\rho} = \text{diag}\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_M\}$, and the

vectors $\tilde{\zeta} \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$, $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$, $\tilde{g} \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$, $U \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$, $\Delta \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$, $\tilde{f} \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$, and $\varpi \in \mathfrak{R}^{nM}$ are defined as

$$\tilde{\zeta} \triangleq [(D\eta_1)^T, \dots, (D\eta_M)^T]^T \quad (25)$$

$$\tilde{g} \triangleq [(g(x_1) - g(x_0))^T, \dots, (g(x_M) - g(x_0))^T]^T \quad (26)$$

$$U \triangleq [(BU_1)^T, \dots, (BU_M)^T]^T \quad (27)$$

$$\Delta \triangleq [(F\Delta_1)^T, \dots, (F\Delta_M)^T]^T \quad (28)$$

$$\tilde{f} \triangleq [(F\tilde{\vartheta}_1^T \varphi_1)^T, \dots, (F\tilde{\vartheta}_M^T \varphi_M)^T]^T \quad (29)$$

$$\varpi \triangleq [(B\tilde{\theta}_1 u_1)^T, \dots, (B\tilde{\theta}_M u_M)^T]^T \quad (30)$$

$$\tilde{\xi} \triangleq [(\tilde{\xi}_1)^T, \dots, (\tilde{\xi}_M)^T]^T \quad (31)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_i \triangleq D\hat{\omega}_i \bar{\eta}_i \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) + B\hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i$$

$$\cdot \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)$$

$$+ F\hat{\alpha}_i \bar{\Delta}_i \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, M$, $U_i \triangleq -(u_0 + Kx_0) + (\beta_i - 1)\theta_i u_i$, and $\Delta_i \triangleq \beta_i \delta_i + (\beta_i - 1)\hat{f}_i$. We consider the following Lyapunov function candidate:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P) \tilde{x} + \tilde{\vartheta}^T (I_s \otimes \Gamma)^{-1} \tilde{\vartheta} + \tilde{\omega}^T (\Lambda)^{-1} \tilde{\omega} \\ &\quad + \tilde{\alpha}^T (\Upsilon)^{-1} \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\theta}^T (I_m \otimes \bar{\Gamma})^{-1} \tilde{\theta} + \tilde{\kappa}^T \bar{\Upsilon}^{-1} \tilde{\kappa} \\ &\quad + \tilde{\rho}^T (\bar{\Lambda})^{-1} \tilde{\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where P is a positive definite matrix, $\tilde{\vartheta} = [\tilde{\vartheta}_1^T, \dots, \tilde{\vartheta}_M^T]^T$ is the collective neural network parameter estimation errors represented by $\tilde{\vartheta}_i = [\tilde{\vartheta}_{i1}^T, \dots, \tilde{\vartheta}_{is}^T]^T$ with $\tilde{\vartheta}_{ih} = \vartheta_{ih} - \hat{\vartheta}_{ih}$ for $h = 1, \dots, s$, $\tilde{\alpha} = [\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_M]^T$, $\tilde{\kappa} = [\tilde{\kappa}_1, \dots, \tilde{\kappa}_M]^T$, and $\tilde{\omega} = [\tilde{\omega}_1, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_M]^T$ are the collective bounding parameter estimation errors defined as $\tilde{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i^0 - \hat{\alpha}_i$, $\tilde{\kappa}_i = \kappa_i - \hat{\kappa}_i$, and $\tilde{\omega}_i = \omega_i - \hat{\omega}_i$, respectively, $\tilde{\theta} = [\tilde{\theta}_1^T, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_M^T]^T$ is the collective actuator fault parameter estimation errors represented by $\tilde{\theta}_i = [\tilde{\theta}_{i1}, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_{im}]^T$ with $\tilde{\theta}_{id} = \theta_{id} - \hat{\theta}_{id}$, for $d = 1, \dots, m$, $\tilde{\rho} = [\rho_1 - \rho, \dots, \rho_M - \rho]^T$ is the collective coupling gain estimation errors, ρ is a positive constant, and $\Gamma = \text{diag}\{\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_M\}$, $\bar{\Gamma} = \text{diag}\{\bar{\Gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\Gamma}_M\}$, $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_M\}$, $\Upsilon = \text{diag}\{\Upsilon_1, \dots, \Upsilon_M\}$, $\bar{\Upsilon} = \text{diag}\{\bar{\Upsilon}_1, \dots, \bar{\Upsilon}_M\}$, and $\bar{\Lambda} = \text{diag}\{\bar{\Lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\Lambda}_M\}$, are constant learning rate matrices. Then, the time derivative of the Lyapunov function (32) along the solution of (24) is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \tilde{x}^T [(\Psi \otimes P)(I_M \otimes \tilde{A}) + (I_M \otimes \tilde{A})^T (\Psi \otimes P)] \tilde{x} \\ &\quad - \tilde{x}^T [(\Psi \otimes P)(\bar{\rho} \Psi \otimes \bar{P}) + (\bar{\rho} \Psi \otimes \bar{P})^T (\Psi \otimes P)] \tilde{x} \\ &\quad + 2\{\tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P)[\tilde{\zeta} - \tilde{\xi} + U + \Delta + \tilde{g} + \tilde{f} + \varpi] \\ &\quad + \tilde{\vartheta}^T (I_s \otimes \Gamma)^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\vartheta}} + \tilde{\omega}^T (\Lambda)^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\omega}} + \tilde{\alpha}^T (\Upsilon)^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\alpha}} \\ &\quad + \tilde{\theta}^T (I_m \otimes \bar{\Gamma})^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\theta}} + \tilde{\kappa}^T (\bar{\Upsilon})^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\kappa}} + \tilde{\rho}^T (\bar{\Lambda})^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\rho}}\} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $\bar{P} \triangleq BB^T P$. By using the properties that $(\tilde{A} \otimes \tilde{B})^T = \tilde{A}^T \otimes \tilde{B}^T$, $(\tilde{A} \otimes \tilde{C})(\tilde{B} \otimes \tilde{D}) = \tilde{A}\tilde{B} \otimes \tilde{C}\tilde{D}$, and $\tilde{A} \otimes \tilde{B} + \tilde{A} \otimes \tilde{C} = \tilde{A} \otimes (\tilde{B} + \tilde{C})$ for matrices \tilde{A} , \tilde{B} , \tilde{C} , and \tilde{D} of appropriate dimensions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}^T [(\Psi \otimes P)(I_M \otimes \tilde{A}) + (I_M \otimes \tilde{A})^T (\Psi \otimes P)] \tilde{x} \\ = \tilde{x}^T [\Psi \otimes (P\tilde{A} + \tilde{A}^T P)] \tilde{x} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In addition, as shown in the proof of [21, Th. 2], we can easily show that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\tilde{x}^T [(\Psi \otimes P)(\bar{\rho}\Psi \otimes \bar{P}) + (\bar{\rho}\Psi \otimes \bar{P})^T(\Psi \otimes P)]\tilde{x} \\ & = -2\tilde{x}^T (\Psi \bar{\rho}\Psi \otimes P B B^T P) \tilde{x} \\ & = -2 \sum_{i=1}^M \rho_i \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Note that based on Lemma 2, $\Psi^T = \Psi$. Furthermore, by using the property that $2\hat{a}^T \hat{b} \leq \bar{c} \hat{a}^T \hat{a} + \frac{1}{\bar{c}} \hat{b}^T \hat{b}$ for any positive constant \bar{c} and vectors \hat{a} and \hat{b} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P) \tilde{g} & = 2\tilde{x}^T (\Psi^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes P) (\Psi^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes I_n) \tilde{g} \\ & \leq \mu \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P^2) \tilde{x} + \frac{1}{\mu} \tilde{g}^T (\Psi \otimes I_n) \tilde{g} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where $\Psi^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a positive definite matrix such that $(\Psi^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 = \Psi$, and μ is a positive constant. Based on (3) given in Assumption 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}^T (\Psi \otimes I_n) \tilde{g} & = \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{g}_i^T \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} (\tilde{g}_i - \tilde{g}_j) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} (\tilde{g}_i - \tilde{g}_j)^T (\tilde{g}_i - \tilde{g}_j) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} |\tilde{g}_i - \tilde{g}_j|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^M \sigma^2 \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} |\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{x}_j|^2 = \sigma^2 \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes I_n) \tilde{x} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where $\tilde{g}_i \triangleq g(x_i) - g(x_0)$ as defined in (26). Therefore, by substituting (37) into (36), we have

$$2\tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P) \tilde{g} \leq \mu \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P^2) \tilde{x} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes I_n) \tilde{x}. \quad (38)$$

Based on (29) and (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P) (\tilde{f} + \varpi) & = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij}^T P F \tilde{\vartheta}_i^T \varphi_i \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij}^T P B \tilde{\theta}_i u_i \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

By using (25), (27), (28), and (31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P) (\zeta - \bar{\zeta} + U + \Delta) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij}^T P (D\eta_i + B U_i + F \Delta_i - \bar{\zeta}_i) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \eta_i - \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \hat{\omega}_i \bar{\eta}_i \right. \\ & \quad \left. \cdot \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) + \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T U_i \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \\ & + \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \Delta_i - \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \\ & \cdot \hat{\alpha}_i \bar{\Delta}_i \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \Big]. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Based on Assumption 1, by using (2) and (7) given in Assumptions 2 and 5, respectively, and the property that $(\hat{a})^T \text{sgn}(\hat{a}) \geq |\hat{a}|$, it follows from (40) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P) (\zeta - \bar{\zeta} + U + \Delta) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\tilde{\omega}_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} D^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right| \bar{\eta}_i + \tilde{\kappa}_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right| \bar{U}_i \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \tilde{\alpha}_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} F^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right| \bar{\Delta}_i \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

By using the adaptive law (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\tilde{\rho}^T (\bar{\Lambda})^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\rho}} \\ & = 2 \sum_{i=1}^M (\rho_i - \rho) \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \\ & = 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \rho_i \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right)^T \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} B^T P \tilde{x}_{ij} \right) \\ & \quad - 2\rho \tilde{x}^T (\Psi^2 \otimes P \bar{P}) \tilde{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

In addition, using the eigenvalue properties of functions of a square matrix [25], it can be shown that for the positive definite matrix Ψ , $\Psi^2 - \gamma \Psi$ is positive semidefinite (i.e., $\Psi^2 - \gamma \Psi \geq 0$), where γ is the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix Ψ defined in Theorem 1. Also, for matrices \check{E} and \check{F} , eigenvalues of the matrix $\check{E} \otimes \check{F}$ are the products of eigenvalues of \check{E} and \check{F} [26, Th. 6]. Thus, for the positive semidefinite matrix $P\bar{P}$, it can be obtained that $\tilde{x}^T [(\Psi^2 - \gamma \Psi) \otimes P\bar{P}] \tilde{x} \geq 0$ or equivalently $\tilde{x}^T (\Psi^2 \otimes P\bar{P}) \tilde{x} \geq \gamma \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P\bar{P}) \tilde{x}$. Therefore, we have

$$-2\rho \tilde{x}^T (\Psi^2 \otimes P\bar{P}) \tilde{x} \leq -2\rho \gamma \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes P B B^T P) \tilde{x}. \quad (43)$$

Let us define

$$Q^c \triangleq \tilde{A}^T P + P \tilde{A} + \mu P^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} I_n - 2\rho \gamma P B B^T P. \quad (44)$$

Therefore, by substituting (34)–(43) into (33), and by using the adaptive laws given by (13)–(17), we obtain

$$\dot{V} \leq \tilde{x}^T (\Psi \otimes Q^c) \tilde{x}. \quad (45)$$

Note that since the parameter projection modification can only make the Lyapunov function derivative more negative, the stability properties derived for the standard algorithm still hold [24]. By selecting ρ sufficiently large such that $\rho \gamma \geq 1$, using (21), positive definiteness of Ψ due to Lemma 2, and the property that eigenvalues of the matrix $\Psi \otimes Q^c$ are products of eigenvalues of Ψ and Q^c [26, Th. 6], we know \dot{V} is the

negative semidefinite. Thus, we conclude that \tilde{x}_i , ρ_i , $\hat{\vartheta}_i$, $\hat{\theta}_i$, $\hat{\kappa}_i$, $\hat{\omega}_i$, and $\hat{\alpha}_i$ are uniformly bounded. By integrating both sides of (45), it can be shown that $\tilde{x}_i \in L_2$. In addition, x_i is bounded because \tilde{x}_i and the leader's state x_0 are bounded. Therefore, based on (10), (6), and the smoothness of the function g_i , we have $u_i \in L_\infty$ and $\dot{x}_i \in L_\infty$. Since $\tilde{x}_i \in L_\infty \cap L_2$, $\dot{\tilde{x}}_i \in L_\infty$, using Barbalat's Lemma [27], $\tilde{x} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, hence concluding the proof. \square

Remark 4: The condition (21) can be transformed into standard linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). Then, a feasible solution to (21) can be possibly found by using LMI tools. Furthermore, the sign function used in this paper may possibly create chattering problems, which could be remedied by using a smooth approximation of the sign function, for instance, the hyperbolic tangent function [24, p. 397]. In [19] and [28], a continuous adaptive FTC scheme utilizing the hyperbolic function is presented, guaranteeing the cooperative tracking error converges to a small neighborhood around zero, which can be made as small as possible by using suitable design parameters. Interested readers can refer to [28, Sec. 5.2] for more details.

III. DISTRIBUTED FTC: INPUT-OUTPUT AGENT SYSTEMS

In this section, the results in Section II are extended to a class of input-output MASs where only partial state measurements are available.

A. Distributed Multiagent System Model

Consider a set of M agents where the dynamics of the i th agent, $i = 1, \dots, M$, is described by the following differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= Ax_i + g(x_i) + Bu_i + \beta_i(t - T_{iu})B\theta_i u_i \\ &\quad + D\eta_i(x_i, t) + \beta_i(t - T_{if})Ff_i(y_i) \\ y_i &= Cx_i \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $x_i \in \mathfrak{R}^n$, $u_i \in \mathfrak{R}^m$, and $y_i \in \mathfrak{R}^l$ are the state, input, and output vector of the i th agent, respectively. In addition, $g : \mathfrak{R}^n \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^n$, $\eta_i : \mathfrak{R}^n \times \mathfrak{R}^+ \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^n$, and $f_i : \mathfrak{R}^l \mapsto \mathfrak{R}^s$ are the smooth vector fields representing the known nonlinearity, unknown modeling uncertainty, and process fault in the state dynamics of the i th agent, respectively, A , B , C , D , and F are matrices with appropriate dimensions, and the pairs (A, B) and (A, C) are stabilizable and detectable, respectively. The changes in the dynamics of i th agent due to the occurrence of process and actuator faults in (46) are represented by $\beta_i(t - T_{if})Ff_i(y_i)$ and $\beta_i(t - T_{iu})B\theta_i u_i$, which occur at some unknown time T_{if} and T_{iu} , respectively.

Without loss of generality, let the leader be identified as agent number 0 with unknown state x_0 and a reference output y_0 , where $\dot{x}_0(t) = g(x_0) + Ax_0 + Bu_0$, and $y_0 = Cx_0$. The objective of this section is to design a distributed FTC scheme which guarantees that the state of i th agent [i.e., $x_i(t)$] should track the state of the time-varying leader [i.e., $x_0(t)$] by utilizing only local output measurements and state estimation information exchanged between neighboring agents, even in the presence of process and actuator faults.

Analogously, the linearly parametrized neural network model used to estimate the unknown process fault function $f_i(y_i)$ is described as follows:

$$\hat{f}_i(y_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i) = \hat{\vartheta}_i^T \varphi_i(y_i). \quad (47)$$

Let us denote the residual approximation error as $\delta_i(y_i)$. Assumptions 2 and 5 will be modified as follows:

Assumption 6: The modeling uncertainty in each local agent, represented by $\eta_i(x_i, t)$ in (46), satisfies

$$|\eta_i(x_i, t)| \leq \omega_i \bar{\eta}_i(y_i, t), \quad \forall x_i \in \mathfrak{R}^n, \quad \forall y_i \in \mathfrak{R}^l \quad (48)$$

where $\bar{\eta}_i$ is a known positive bounding function and ω_i is an unknown constant.

Assumption 7: For each $i = 1, \dots, M$, the network residual approximation error satisfies

$$|\delta_i(y_i)| \leq \alpha_i \bar{\delta}_i(y_i), \quad \forall y_i \in \mathfrak{R}^l \quad (49)$$

where $\bar{\delta}_i$ is a known positive bounding function, and α_i is an unknown constant.

Note that in Assumptions 6 and 7, the bounds on modeling uncertainty and network approximation error are allowed to be a function of agent outputs, which is less restrictive than the constant bound considered in [9] and [10].

B. Distributed FTC Design

Since the agent state is not available for control design, a state estimator is needed for estimating the state. Let θ_i^e represent an unknown constant defined as

$$\theta_i^e \triangleq \sup_{t \geq T_{iu}} \max \{ \|\beta_i(t - T_{iu})\theta_i\| \}. \quad (50)$$

Note that the fault time profile $\beta_i(t - T_{iu})$ satisfies $0 < \beta_i \leq 1$ for $t \geq T_{iu}$. Therefore, the finite constant θ_i^e defined by (50) always exists. Then, by using (46), the following state estimator is chosen:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= A\hat{x}_i + g(\hat{x}_i) + Bu_i + L\tilde{y}_i^e - B\hat{\theta}_i^e |u_i| \operatorname{sgn}(G_B \tilde{y}_i^e) \\ &\quad - F[\hat{\alpha}_i^e \bar{\Delta}_i(y_i) \operatorname{sgn}(\bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e) + \hat{f}_i^e(y_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i^e)] \\ &\quad - D\hat{\omega}_i^e \bar{\eta}_i \operatorname{sgn}(\bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\hat{y}_i = C\hat{x}_i \quad (52)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\vartheta}}_{ih}^e = \Upsilon_i |\bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e| \bar{\Delta}_i(y_i) \quad (53)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\omega}}_i^e = \Lambda_i |\bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e| \bar{\eta}_i(y_i, t) \quad (54)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}}_i^e = \bar{\Gamma}_i |G_B \tilde{y}_i^e| \cdot |u_i| \quad (55)$$

where \hat{x}_i and \hat{y}_i represent the estimated local state and output variables of the i th agent, respectively, $\tilde{y}_i^e \triangleq y_i - \hat{y}_i$ denotes the output estimation error of the i th agent, \bar{D} and \bar{F} are given in (4), $L \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times l}$ is a design gain matrix chosen such that the matrix $\bar{A} \triangleq A - LC$ is Hurwitz, $\hat{\theta}_i^e$ is an estimation of the actuator fault magnitude parameter θ_i^e defined in (50), $\hat{f}_i^e = (\hat{\vartheta}_i^e)^T \varphi_i^e(y_i)$ provides the adaptive online approximation of the unknown process fault for the state estimator, $\hat{\vartheta}_i^e$ is an estimation of the neural network parameter matrix ϑ_i , $\hat{\vartheta}_{ih}^e$ is the h th row of $\hat{\vartheta}_i^e$, for $h = 1, \dots, s$, φ_i^e is the collective vector of fixed basis functions, \bar{F}_h is the h th column of matrix

\bar{F} , $\hat{\alpha}_i^e$ is an estimation of the unknown bounding constant α_i^0 described in (8), $\hat{\omega}_i^e$ is an estimation of the unknown bounding constant ω_i , $\bar{\Delta}_i(y_i) \triangleq \bar{\delta}_i(y_i) + |\varphi_i(y_i)|$, $\bar{U}_i \triangleq 1 + |u_i|$, Γ_i is a positive definite learning rate matrix, $\bar{\Gamma}_i$, Υ_i , and Λ_i are positive learning rate constants, G_B is a design matrix satisfying

$$PB = C^T G_B^T \quad (56)$$

and P is a positive definite design matrix to be defined in Theorem 2.

In the presence of process and actuator faults, by adding and subtracting the term $\hat{f}_i(y_i, \vartheta_i)$, and defining the residual approximation error for the i th agent as $\delta_i \triangleq f_i(y_i) - \hat{f}_i(y_i, \vartheta_i)$, the system dynamics described by (46) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= Ax_i + g(x_i) + B(I_m + \beta_i \theta_i)u_i + D\eta_i(x_i, t) \\ &\quad + F[\hat{f}_i(y_i, \vartheta_i) + (\beta_i - 1)\hat{f}_i(y_i, \vartheta_i) + \beta_i \delta_i(y_i)] \\ y_i &= Cx_i. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Then, based on the system model (57), the neural network model (47), and Assumption 7, the adaptive neural controller (10)–(17) for input–output systems are adjusted as follows:

$$u_i = (I_m + \hat{\theta}_i^c)^{-1} \tau_i \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &\triangleq -\rho B^T P \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} (\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j) - \hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \\ &\quad - K \hat{x}_i - \bar{\eta}_i \bar{D} \hat{\omega}_i^c \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \\ &\quad - \bar{F} \left[\hat{\alpha}_i^c \bar{\Delta}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) + \hat{f}_i^c(y_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i^c) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\vartheta}}_{ih}^c = \Gamma_i \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}_h^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \varphi_i^c(y_i) \quad (60)$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^c = \Upsilon_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_F \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right| \bar{\Delta}_i(y_i) \quad (61)$$

$$\hat{\theta}_{id}^c = \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\theta}_{id}} \left\{ \bar{\Gamma}_i \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} (G_{Bd} \tilde{y}_{ij}^c)^T u_{id} \right\} \quad (62)$$

$$\hat{\kappa}_i = \bar{\Upsilon}_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right| \bar{U}_i \quad (63)$$

$$\hat{\omega}_i^c = \Lambda_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right| \bar{\eta}_i(y_i, t) \quad (64)$$

where $\tilde{y}_{ij}^c \triangleq y_i - y_j$, $\hat{\theta}_i^c = \operatorname{diag}\{\hat{\theta}_{i1}^c, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{im}^c\}$ with each component $\hat{\theta}_{id}^c$ in (62) being an estimation of the actuator fault magnitude parameter θ_{id} , ρ is a positive design constant, $\hat{f}_i^c = (\hat{\vartheta}_i^c)^T \varphi_i^c(y_i)$ provides the adaptive online approximation of the unknown process fault for the designed FTC algorithm, $\hat{\vartheta}_i^c$ is an estimation of the neural network parameter matrix

ϑ_i , $\hat{\vartheta}_{ih}^c$ is the h th row of $\hat{\vartheta}_i^c$, for $h = 1, \dots, s$, φ_i^c is the collective vector of fixed basis functions, $\hat{\kappa}_i$ is an estimation of the unknown positive constant bound κ_i described in (9), $\hat{\omega}_i^c$ is an estimation of the unknown positive bounding constant ω_i , G_{Bd} is the d th row of matrix G_B , and $\hat{\alpha}_i^c$ is an estimation of the unknown bounding constant α_i^0 described in (8).

C. Stability Analysis

For each agent, by using (57) and (51), the collective state estimation error dynamics are

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}^e = (I_M \otimes \bar{A}) \tilde{x}^e + \tilde{g}^e + \zeta - \bar{\zeta}^e + \tilde{f}^e + \Delta + U^e \quad (65)$$

where \tilde{x}^e is the column stack vector of the state estimation errors $\tilde{x}_i^e \triangleq x_i - \hat{x}_i$, the vectors ζ and Δ are defined in (25) and (28), and the vectors $\tilde{g}^e \in \mathfrak{R}^{Mn}$, $\tilde{f}^e \in \mathfrak{R}^{Mn}$, $U^e \in \mathfrak{R}^{Mn}$, and $\bar{\zeta}^e \in \mathfrak{R}^{Mn}$ are defined as

$$\tilde{g}^e \triangleq [(g(x_1) - g(\hat{x}_1))^T, \dots, (g(x_M) - g(\hat{x}_M))^T]^T \quad (66)$$

$$\tilde{f}^e \triangleq [(F(\tilde{\vartheta}_1^e)^T \varphi_1^e)^T, \dots, (F(\tilde{\vartheta}_M^e)^T \varphi_M^e)^T]^T \quad (67)$$

$$U^e \triangleq [(B \beta_1 \theta_1 u_1)^T, \dots, (B \beta_M \theta_M u_M)^T]^T \quad (68)$$

$$\bar{\zeta}^e \triangleq [(\bar{\zeta}_1^e)^T, \dots, (\bar{\zeta}_M^e)^T]^T \quad (69)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\zeta}_i^e &\triangleq D \hat{\omega}_i^e \bar{\eta}_i \operatorname{sgn}(\bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e) + F \hat{\alpha}_i^e \bar{\Delta}_i(y_i) \operatorname{sgn}(\bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e) \\ &\quad + B \hat{\theta}_i^e |u_i| \operatorname{sgn}(G_B \tilde{y}_i^e) \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, M$, where $\tilde{\vartheta}_i^e = \vartheta_i - \hat{\vartheta}_i^e$ is the network parameter estimation error associated with the i th agent.

In addition, using some algebraic manipulations, we can rewrite (58) as $u_i = \tau_i - \hat{\theta}_i u_i$. Therefore, by using (59) and (4), and substituting u_i into (57), the closed-loop dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= g(x_i) + \bar{A}x_i + BK\tilde{x}_i^e + D\eta_i - D\hat{\omega}_i^c \bar{\eta}_i \\ &\quad \times \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \\ &\quad - \rho B B^T P \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} (\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j) - B \hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \\ &\quad \times \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \\ &\quad + F \left[(\tilde{\vartheta}_i^c)^T \varphi_i^c + \beta_i \delta_i - \hat{\alpha}_i^c \bar{\Delta}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \right] \\ &\quad + (\beta_i - 1) F \hat{f}_i^c(y_i, \vartheta_i) + B \tilde{\theta}_i^c u_i + (\beta_i - 1) B \theta_i u_i \\ y_i &= Cx_i \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where $\tilde{\vartheta}_i^c = \vartheta_i - \hat{\vartheta}_i^c$ is the network parameter estimation error associated with the i th agent, and $\tilde{\theta}_i^c = \theta_i - \hat{\theta}_i^c$ is the actuator fault parameter estimation error corresponding to the i th agent.

Note that the term $\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_j$ in (70) can be rewritten as $(\hat{x}_i - x_i) + (x_i - x_0) - (\hat{x}_j - x_j) - (x_j - x_0)$. Therefore, by using (23) and the definition of Ψ in Lemma 2, the collective tracking error dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}^c &= (I_M \otimes \bar{A}) \tilde{x}^c + \rho(\Psi \otimes B B^T P) \tilde{x}^e - \rho(\Psi \otimes B B^T P) \tilde{x}^c + \tilde{g} \\ &\quad + (I_M \otimes BK) \tilde{x}^e + \zeta - \bar{\zeta}^c + U + \tilde{f}^c + \Delta + \varpi^c \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where \tilde{x}^c is the column stack vector of tracking errors $\tilde{x}_i^c \triangleq x_i - x_0$, the vectors ζ , \tilde{g} , U , and Δ are defined in [25]–[28], and the vectors $\tilde{f}^c \in \mathfrak{R}^{Mn}$, $\varpi^c \in \mathfrak{R}^{Mn}$, and $\tilde{\xi}^c \in \mathfrak{R}^{Mn}$ are defined as

$$\tilde{f}^c \triangleq [(F(\tilde{\vartheta}_1^c)^T \varphi_1^c)^T, \dots, (F(\tilde{\vartheta}_M^c)^T \varphi_M^c)^T]^T \quad (72)$$

$$\varpi^c \triangleq [(B\tilde{\theta}_1^c u_1)^T, \dots, (B\tilde{\theta}_M^c u_M)^T]^T \quad (73)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}^c \triangleq [(\tilde{\xi}_1^c)^T, \dots, (\tilde{\xi}_M^c)^T]^T \quad (74)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi}_i^c \triangleq & D\hat{\omega}_i^c \tilde{\eta}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) + B\hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \\ & \cdot \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) + F\hat{\alpha}_i^c \bar{\Delta}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, M$.

To derive the adaptive algorithm and to investigate analytically, the stability properties of the closed-loop system, we consider the following Lyapunov function candidate:

$$\begin{aligned} V = & (\tilde{x}^c)^T (\Psi \otimes P) \tilde{x}^c + (\tilde{x}^e)^T (I_M \otimes P) \tilde{x}^e + (\tilde{\alpha}^c)^T (\Upsilon)^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}^c \\ & + (\tilde{\vartheta}^c)^T (I_s \otimes \Gamma)^{-1} \tilde{\vartheta}^c + (\tilde{\theta}^c)^T (I_m \otimes \bar{\Gamma})^{-1} \tilde{\theta}^c + (\tilde{\omega}^c)^T \\ & \cdot (\Lambda)^{-1} \tilde{\omega}^c + (\tilde{\varrho}^e)^T (I_s \otimes \Gamma)^{-1} \tilde{\varrho}^e + (\tilde{\alpha}^e)^T (\Upsilon)^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}^e \\ & + (\tilde{\theta}^e)^T (\bar{\Gamma})^{-1} \tilde{\theta}^e + (\tilde{\omega}^e)^T (\Lambda)^{-1} \tilde{\omega}^e + \tilde{\kappa}^T (\bar{\Upsilon})^{-1} \tilde{\kappa} \quad (75) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\vartheta}^c = [(\tilde{\vartheta}_1^c)^T, \dots, (\tilde{\vartheta}_M^c)^T]^T$ and $\tilde{\vartheta}^e = [(\tilde{\vartheta}_1^e)^T, \dots, (\tilde{\vartheta}_M^e)^T]^T$ are the collective neural network parameter estimation errors represented by $\tilde{\vartheta}_i^c = [(\vartheta_{i1} - \hat{\vartheta}_{i1}^c)^T, \dots, (\vartheta_{is} - \hat{\vartheta}_{is}^c)^T]^T$ and $\tilde{\vartheta}_i^e = [(\vartheta_{i1} - \hat{\vartheta}_{i1}^e)^T, \dots, (\vartheta_{is} - \hat{\vartheta}_{is}^e)^T]^T$, respectively, $\tilde{\alpha}^c = [\tilde{\alpha}_1^c, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_M^c]^T$, $\tilde{\alpha}^e = [\tilde{\alpha}_1^e, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_M^e]^T$, $\tilde{\omega}^c = [\tilde{\omega}_1^c, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_M^c]^T$, $\tilde{\omega}^e = [\tilde{\omega}_1^e, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_M^e]^T$, and $\tilde{\kappa} = [\tilde{\kappa}_1, \dots, \tilde{\kappa}_M]^T$ are the collective bounding parameter estimation errors defined as $\tilde{\alpha}_i^c = \alpha_i^0 - \hat{\alpha}_i^c$, $\tilde{\alpha}_i^e = \alpha_i^0 - \hat{\alpha}_i^e$, $\tilde{\omega}_i^c = \omega_i - \hat{\omega}_i^c$, $\tilde{\omega}_i^e = \omega_i - \hat{\omega}_i^e$, and $\tilde{\kappa}_i = \kappa_i - \hat{\kappa}_i$, respectively, $\tilde{\theta}^c = [\tilde{\theta}_1^c, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_M^c]^T$ and $\tilde{\theta}^e$ are the collective actuator fault parameter estimation errors represented by $\tilde{\theta}_i^c = [\theta_{i1} - \hat{\theta}_{i1}^c, \dots, \theta_{im} - \hat{\theta}_{im}^c]^T$ and $\tilde{\theta}_i^e = \theta_i^e - \hat{\theta}_i^e$, respectively, and Γ , $\bar{\Gamma}$, Υ , $\bar{\Upsilon}$, and Λ are the constant learning rate matrices defined in (32).

Then, the time derivative of the Lyapunov function (75) along the solution of (71) and (65) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} = & (\tilde{x}^c)^T [(\Psi \otimes P)(I_M \otimes \bar{A}) + (I_M \otimes \bar{A})^T (\Psi \otimes P)] \tilde{x}^c \\ & - \rho (\tilde{x}^c)^T [(\Psi \otimes P)(\Psi \otimes \bar{P}) + (\Psi \otimes \bar{P})^T (\Psi \otimes P)] \tilde{x}^c \\ & + (\tilde{x}^e)^T [(I_M \otimes P)(I_M \otimes \bar{A}) + (I_M \otimes \bar{A})^T (I_M \otimes P)] \tilde{x}^e \\ & + 2\{(\tilde{x}^c)^T (\Psi \otimes P)(\rho (\Psi \otimes \bar{P}) \tilde{x}^e + (I_M \otimes BK) \tilde{x}^e) \\ & + (\tilde{x}^c)^T (\Psi \otimes P)[\tilde{g} + \tilde{f}^c + \varpi^c + \zeta - \tilde{\xi}^c + U + \Delta] \\ & + (\tilde{x}^e)^T (I_M \otimes P)[\tilde{g}^e + \varpi^e + \tilde{f}^e + \zeta - \tilde{\xi}^e + \Delta + U^e] \\ & + (\tilde{\vartheta}^c)^T (I_s \otimes \Gamma)^{-1} \tilde{\vartheta}^c + (\tilde{\theta}^c)^T (I_m \otimes \bar{\Gamma})^{-1} \tilde{\theta}^c \\ & + (\tilde{\alpha}^c)^T (\Upsilon)^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}^c + (\tilde{\omega}^c)^T (\Lambda)^{-1} \tilde{\omega}^c + (\tilde{\alpha}^e)^T (\Upsilon)^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}^e \\ & + (\tilde{\theta}^e)^T (\bar{\Gamma})^{-1} \tilde{\theta}^e + (\tilde{\omega}^e)^T (\Lambda)^{-1} \tilde{\omega}^e + \tilde{\kappa}^T (\bar{\Upsilon})^{-1} \tilde{\kappa} \\ & + (\tilde{\varrho}^e)^T (I_s \otimes \Gamma)^{-1} \tilde{\varrho}^e \} \quad (76) \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{x}^e)^T [(I_M \otimes P)(I_M \otimes \bar{A}) + (I_M \otimes \bar{A})^T (I_M \otimes P)] \tilde{x}^e \\ = (\tilde{x}^e)^T [I_M \otimes (P\bar{A} + \bar{A}^T P)] \tilde{x}^e \quad (77) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(\tilde{x}^c)^T (\Psi \otimes P)[\rho (\Psi \otimes \bar{P}) + I_M \otimes BK] \tilde{x}^e = (\tilde{x}^c)^T Q \tilde{x}^e \quad (78)$$

where $Q \triangleq \rho (\Psi^2 \otimes P\bar{P}) + \Psi \otimes PBK$. Furthermore, similar to (38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\tilde{x}^e)^T (I_M \otimes P) \tilde{g}^e \\ \leq \mu (\tilde{x}^e)^T (I_M \otimes P^2) \tilde{x}^e + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} (\tilde{x}^e)^T (I_M \otimes I_n) \tilde{x}^e. \quad (79) \end{aligned}$$

By using (4), (48), and (49) given in Assumptions 4, 6, and 7, respectively, using (56), and the property that $(\hat{a})^T \operatorname{sgn}(\hat{a}) \geq |\hat{a}|$, it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{x}^c)^T (\Psi \otimes P)(\zeta - \tilde{\xi}^c + U + \Delta) \\ = & \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B C \tilde{x}_{ij}^c \right)^T \eta_i \right. \\ & - \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B C \tilde{x}_{ij}^c \right)^T \hat{\omega}_i^c \tilde{\eta}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \\ & - \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B C \tilde{x}_{ij}^c \right)^T U_i - \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B C \tilde{x}_{ij}^c \right)^T \\ & \cdot \hat{\kappa}_i \bar{U}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) + \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}^T G_B C \tilde{x}_{ij}^c \right)^T \Delta_i \\ & \left. - \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}^T G_B C \tilde{x}_{ij}^c \right)^T \hat{\alpha}^c \bar{\Delta}_i \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right) \right] \\ \leq & \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\tilde{\omega}_i^c \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right| \tilde{\eta}_i + \tilde{\kappa}_i \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right| \bar{U}_i \right. \\ & \left. + \tilde{\alpha}_i^c \left| \sum_{j \in N_i} b_{ij} \bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_{ij}^c \right| \bar{\Delta}_i \right] \quad (80) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{x}_{ij}^c = \tilde{x}_i^c - \tilde{x}_j^c = x_i - x_j$. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{x}^e)^T (I_M \otimes P)(\zeta - \tilde{\xi}^e + U^e + \Delta) \\ \leq & \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\tilde{\omega}_i^e \left| \bar{D}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e \right| \tilde{\eta}_i + \tilde{\theta}_i^e \left| G_B \tilde{y}_i^e \right| \cdot |u_i| \right. \\ & \left. + \tilde{\alpha}_i^e \left| \bar{F}^T G_B \tilde{y}_i^e \right| \bar{\Delta}_i \right]. \quad (81) \end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$Q^e \triangleq \bar{A}^T P + P\bar{A} + \mu P^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} I_n. \quad (82)$$

Therefore, by applying (34)–(38), and the above-mentioned inequalities in (76), and using adaptive laws (60)–(64) and (52)–(55), the Lyapunov function derivative \dot{V} satisfies

$$\dot{V} \leq \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}^c \\ \tilde{x}^e \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \otimes Q^c & Q \\ 0 & I_M \otimes Q^e \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}^c \\ \tilde{x}^e \end{bmatrix} \quad (83)$$

where Q^c and Q are defined in (44) and (78), respectively. By using positive definiteness of Ψ due to Lemma 2, and the property that eigenvalues of the matrix $\Psi \otimes Q^c$ are the products of eigenvalues of Ψ and Q^c [26, Th. 6], we know \tilde{V} is the negative semidefinite if the matrices Q^c and Q^e are negative definite [see (84) and (85)]. Thus, we conclude that \tilde{x}_i^c , \tilde{x}_i^e , $\hat{\vartheta}_i^c$, $\hat{\theta}_i^c$, $\hat{\alpha}_i^c$, $\hat{\omega}_i^c$, $\hat{\vartheta}_i^e$, $\hat{\theta}_i^e$, $\hat{\alpha}_i^e$, $\hat{\omega}_i^e$, and $\hat{\kappa}_i$ are uniformly bounded. Then, the proof can be concluded by using a similar reasoning logic as reported in the analysis of Theorem 1.

The aforementioned design and analysis procedure is summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 2: If there exists a symmetric positive definite matrix $P \in \mathfrak{N}^{n \times n}$, a matrix $G_B \in \mathfrak{N}^{m \times l}$, positive constants ρ and μ such that (56) and the following LMIs are satisfied:

$$\tilde{A}^T P + P \tilde{A} + \mu P^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} I_n - 2\rho \gamma P B B^T P < 0 \quad (84)$$

$$\tilde{A}^T P + P \tilde{A} + \mu P^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} I_n < 0 \quad (85)$$

where I_n is the identity matrix, and σ is the Lipschitz constant defined in (3). Then, the state estimator (51)–(55) and the adaptive control law (58)–(64) with distributed controller gains given by (23) guarantee the following properties.

- 1) All the signals are uniformly bounded.
- 2) The leader-follower consensus is achieved asymptotically with a time-varying leader state, i.e., $x_i(t) - x_0(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.
- 3) The state estimation error for each distributed agent converges to zero asymptotically, i.e., $\hat{x}_i(t) - x_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 5: Two neural network-based adaptive approximators are employed in the FTC method, including $\hat{f}_i^e(y_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i^e(t))$ in the state estimator (51) and $\hat{f}_i^c(y_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i^c(t))$ in the control law (59). Note that the objective of the approximator \hat{f}_i^e is to learn the unknown fault function, whereas the objective of \hat{f}_i^c is to modify the feedback control law via parameter adaptation so as to stabilize the system and guarantee leader-following performance in the presence of faults. Hence, the adaptive designs are different [see (52) and (60)]. Furthermore, conditions (84), (85), and (56) can be transformed into standard LMIs. Then, a feasible solution to (56), (84), and (85) can be possibly found by using LMI tools.

IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, a simulation example of a networked MAS consisting of five flexible link robotic arms is considered to illustrate the effectiveness of the distributed FTC method developed for two cases, i.e., with only limited output measurement and with full-state measurement, respectively.

A. Case 1: Input–Output Agents

The dynamics of each agent given in [11] and [29] can be easily put into the general form (46), where the state of the i th agent $x_i \in \mathfrak{N}^4$, for $i = 1, \dots, 5$, is consisting of the motor position, motor velocity, link position, and link velocity, respectively, and u_i is the input of the i th agent representing

the motor torque. Specifically, we have

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -48.6 & -1.25 & 48.6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 10 \\ 19.5 & 0 & -19.5 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$B = [0, 21.6, 0, 0]^T$, $D = F = [0, 1, 0, 0]^T$, and the nominal nonlinear term $g(x_i) = [0, 0, 0, -0.333 \sin(x_{i3})]^T$. The modeling uncertainty in the dynamics is assumed to be an unmodeled Coulomb friction in the motor given by $\eta_i = -1.5 \operatorname{sgn}(x_{i2})$, which is bounded by unknown constant ω_i [i.e., $\bar{\eta}_i = 1$ in (48)]. By using the LMI toolbox, we obtain

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 515 & 18.2 & -442 & 59.2 \\ 18.2 & 1.24 & -16.1 & 0 \\ -442 & -16.1 & 410.5 & -39 \\ 59.2 & 0 & -39 & 101.8 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \rho = 0.1$$

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 432 & 41 & -368 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K = [20, 1.9, -17, -8.4]$$

$$G_B = [393.12, 26.78, -347.76], \quad \mu = 0.01.$$

The objective is to have each agent follow a virtual leader given by $\dot{x}_0 = g(x_0) + Ax_0 + Bu_0$ with zero initial condition and the input $u_0 = \sin(0.1 t)$. The intercommunication graph of agents is shown in Fig. 1. As can be seen, the virtual leader's command is only communicated with the second agent (i.e., $k_{20} = 1$). We choose $\bar{k}_2 = 0.5$. Then, the left eigenvector of Ψ associated with the zero eigenvalue is $\bar{\chi} = [0.425, 0.142, 0.212, 0.402, 0.521, 0.566]^T$. The matrix Ψ defined in Lemma 2 has the minimum eigenvalue of $\gamma = 0.072$ and the maximum eigenvalue of $\rho = 10.84$.

The two adaptive approximators [i.e., $\hat{f}_i^e(y_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i^e(t))$ in the state estimator (51) and $\hat{f}_i^c(y_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i^c(t))$ in the control law (58)] are both implemented as radial basis function (RBF) neural networks. Each RBF network consists of five neurons with five adjustable parameters. The center of RBFs is equally distributed on interval $[-3, 3]$ with a variance of 1. The initial values of the parameter vector are set to zero. We set the learning rates as $\Gamma_i = 3$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_i = 0.2$ and consider an unknown constant bound on the network approximation error, i.e., $\bar{\delta}_i = 1$. The learning rates are chosen as $\Upsilon_i = 1.5$, $\bar{\Upsilon}_i = 3$, and $\Lambda_i = 0.5$.

We consider an actuator fault with a magnitude of $\theta_1 = -0.65$ and a process fault leading to extra abnormal viscous friction in the motor [i.e., $f_i(x_i) = -1.5 x_{i2}$] that occur abruptly (i.e., β_i is a step function) to agent 1 at $T_{iu} = 10$ s and $T_{if} = 20$ s, respectively. Note that for $t \geq 20$ s, both faults are simultaneously affecting the local agent dynamics. Regarding the performance of the FTC schemes, as can be seen in Fig. 2, the leader-following consensus is achieved using the proposed adaptive FTC even in the presence of faults, whereas the agents cannot achieve the leader-following consensus without the FTC controller (see Fig. 3).

B. Case 2: Full-State Measurements

The dynamics of each agent given in [11] can be easily put into the general form (1), where the matrices A , B , D , F ,




Fig. 2. Tracking errors with distributed adaptive FTC: input-output agents.




Fig. 3. Tracking errors without distributed adaptive FTC: input-output agents.

the nominal nonlinear term $g(x_i)$, the unmodeled Coulomb friction in the motor given by η_i , the design matrices P and K , and the design constant μ are given in Section IV-A.

The virtual leader is given by $\dot{x}_0 = g(x_0) + Ax_0 + Bu_0$ with zero initial condition and the input $u_0 = \sin(0.1t)$, and the intercommunication graph of agents is shown in Fig. 1. The adaptive approximator $\hat{f}_i(x_i, \hat{\vartheta}_i(t))$ in the control law (10) is implemented as RBF neural networks, where each RBF network consists of five neurons with five adjustable parameters. The center of RBFs is equally distributed on interval $[-3, 3]$ with a variance of 1. The initial values of the parameter vector are set to zero. We use the same learning rates as given in Section IV-A. The learning rate $\bar{\Lambda}_i = 0.5$ is also chosen.

We consider an actuator fault with a magnitude of $\theta_1 = -0.65$ and a process fault leading to extra abnormal viscous friction in the motor [i.e., $f_i(x_i) = -1.5x_{i2}$] that occur abruptly (i.e., β_i is a step function) to agent 1 at $T_{iu} = 10$ s and $T_{if} = 20$ s, respectively. As can be seen in Fig. 4, the leader-following consensus is achieved using the proposed adaptive FTC even in the presence of faults, whereas the agents cannot achieve the leader-following consensus without the FTC controller (see Fig. 5).




Fig. 4. Tracking errors with distributed adaptive FTC: full-state measurements.




Fig. 5. Tracking errors without distributed adaptive FTC: full-state measurements.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the problem of distributed FTC design for a class of high-order nonlinear uncertain MASs under a bidirectional intercommunication topology with asymmetric weights is investigated. The FTC schemes are developed for two cases, i.e., with full-state measurement and with only limited output measurement, respectively. Adaptive learning algorithms are developed to maintain leader-following consensus with a time-varying leader, even in the presence of process and actuator faults. For the case of partial state measurement, the minimum eigenvalue of the matrix associated with the communication topology is needed, which is considered topology global information. The extensions to directed communication links among the followers, more general agent models, and removing the topology global information in the case of partial state measurement are interesting topics for the future research.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Ren and R. Beard, *Distributed Consensus in Multi-Vehicle Cooperative Control: Theory and Applications*. London, U.K.: Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [2] M. Mesbahi and M. Egerstedt, *Graph Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton Univ. Press, 2010.
- [3] Z. Qu, *Cooperative Control of Dynamical Systems: Applications to Autonomous Vehicles*. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [4] L. Cheng, Z. Hou, M. Tan, Y. Lin, and W. Zhang, "Neural-network-based adaptive leader-following control for multiagent systems with uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, vol. 21, no. 8, pp. 1351–1358, Jul. 2010.

- [5] A. Das and F. L. Lewis, "Distributed adaptive control for synchronization of unknown nonlinear networked systems," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 2014–2021, 2010.
- [6] G. Chen and Y. D. Song, "Cooperative tracking control of nonlinear multiagent systems using self-structuring neural networks," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 1496–1507, Aug. 2014.
- [7] A. Das and F. L. Lewis, "Cooperative adaptive control for synchronization of second-order systems with unknown nonlinearities," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 21, no. 13, pp. 1509–1524, 2011.
- [8] W. Liu and J. Huang, "Cooperative adaptive output regulation for second-order nonlinear multiagent systems with jointly connected switching networks," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 695–705, Jan. 2017.
- [9] H. Zhang and F. L. Lewis, "Adaptive cooperative tracking control of higher-order nonlinear systems with unknown dynamics," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 1432–1439, 2012.
- [10] Q. Shen, B. Jiang, P. Shi, and J. Zhao, "Cooperative adaptive fuzzy tracking control for networked unknown nonlinear multiagent systems with time-varying actuator faults," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 494–504, Apr. 2013.
- [11] Z. Li, W. Ren, X. Liu, and M. Fu, "Consensus of multi-agent systems with general linear and Lipschitz nonlinear dynamics using distributed adaptive protocols," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 1786–1791, Jul. 2013.
- [12] Z. Zuo, J. Zhang, and Y. Wang, "Adaptive fault-tolerant tracking control for linear and Lipschitz nonlinear multi-agent systems," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3923–3931, Jun. 2015.
- [13] C. Deng and G. Yang, "Distributed adaptive fault-tolerant containment control for a class of multi-agent systems with non-identical matching non-linear functions," *IET Control Theory Appl.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 273–281, Jan. 2016.
- [14] D. Ye, X. Zhao, and B. Cao, "Distributed adaptive fault-tolerant consensus tracking of multi-agent systems against time-varying actuator faults," *IET Control Theory Appl.*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 554–563, Mar. 2016.
- [15] G. Chen, F. L. Lewis, and L. Xie, "Finite-time distributed consensus via binary control protocols," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1962–1968, 2011.
- [16] Y. Zhang, Y. Yang, Y. Zhao, and G. Wen, "Distributed finite-time tracking control for nonlinear multi-agent systems subject to external disturbances," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 29–40, Aug. 2013.
- [17] M. Khalili, X. Zhang, M. M. Polycarpou, T. Parisini, and Y. Cao, "Distributed adaptive fault-tolerant control of uncertain multi-agent systems," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 21, pp. 66–71, Sep. 2015.
- [18] M. Khalili, X. Zhang, Y. Cao, M. M. Polycarpou, and T. Parisini, "Distributed adaptive fault-tolerant leader-following formation control of nonlinear uncertain second-order multi-agent systems," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 28, no. 15, pp. 4287–4308, Jun. 2018.
- [19] M. Khalili, X. Zhang, Y. Cao, M. M. Polycarpou, and T. Parisini, "Distributed adaptive fault-tolerant control of a class of high-order nonlinear uncertain multi-agent systems," in *Proc. 56th IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, Dec. 2017, pp. 6352–6357.
- [20] X. Zhang, M. M. Polycarpou, and T. Parisini, "A robust detection and isolation scheme for abrupt and incipient faults in nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 576–593, Aug. 2002.
- [21] Z. Li, X. Liu, W. Ren, and L. Xie, "Distributed tracking control for linear multi-agent systems with a leader of bounded unknown input," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 518–523, Feb. 2013.
- [22] X. Li and G. Yang, "Adaptive fault-tolerant synchronization control of a class of complex dynamical networks with general input distribution matrices and actuator faults," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 559–569, Mar. 2017.
- [23] C. Edwards and S. Spurgeon, *Sliding Mode Control: Theory And Applications*. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 1998.
- [24] J. Farrell and M. M. Polycarpou, *Adaptive Approximation Based Control*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2006.
- [25] C.-T. Chen, *Linear System Theory and Design*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999.
- [26] H. Zhang and F. Ding, "On the kronecker products and their applications," *J. Appl. Math.*, vol. 2013, Jun. 2013, Art. no. 296185.
- [27] P. Ioannou and J. Sun, *Robust Adaptive Control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 1996.

- [28] M. Khalili, "Distributed adaptive fault-tolerant control of nonlinear uncertain multi-agent systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Elect. Eng., Wright State Univ., Dayton, OH, USA, 2017.
- [29] R. Rajamani and Y. M. Cho, "Existence and design of observers for nonlinear systems: Relation to distance to unobservability," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 717–731, 1998.



Mohsen Khalili received the B.S. degree in electrical engineering from the Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran, in 2007, the M.S. degree in electrical engineering from the Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran, in 2009, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA, in 2017.

His current research interests include fault diagnosis and prognosis, adaptive fault-tolerant control, uncertain multiagent systems, distributed systems, and learning systems.



Xiaodong Zhang received the B.S. degree in electrical engineering from the Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China, in 1994, the M.S. degree in electrical engineering from Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China, in 1997, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA, in 2002.

He is currently an Associate Professor of electrical engineering with Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA. In 2007, he was a Senior Researcher with the General Motors Research and Development Center, Warren, MI, USA. His current research interests include intelligent control systems, fault diagnosis/prognosis and fault-tolerant control, distributed multiagent systems, and autonomous unmanned systems.

Dr. Zhang is a member of the IFAC SAFEPROCESS Technical Committee. He served as an Associate Editor for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON CONTROL SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY.



Yongcan Cao received the B.S. degree in electrical engineering from the Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing, China, in 2003, the M.S. degree in electrical engineering from Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China, in 2006, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from Utah State University, Logan, UT, USA, in 2010.

He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, USA. He has co-authored the book *Distributed Coordination of Multiagent Networks* (Springer-Verlag, 2011). His current research interests include autonomous systems, cyber-physical systems, sensor networks, human-robot interaction, and machine learning.

Dr. Cao serves as an Associate Editor for the IEEE Control Systems Society Conference Editorial Board.



Marios M. Polycarpou (F'06) received the B.A. degree in computer science and the B.Sc. degree in electrical engineering from Rice University, Houston, TX, USA, in 1987, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, in 1989 and 1992, respectively.

He is currently a Professor of electrical and computer engineering and the Director of the KIOS Research and Innovation Center of Excellence, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus. He has

authored or co-authored more than 350 articles in refereed journals, edited books, and refereed conference proceedings, and has co-authored seven books. He holds six patents. His current research interests include intelligent systems and networks, adaptive and cooperative control systems, computational intelligence, fault diagnosis and distributed agents.

Dr. Polycarpou is a fellow of IFAC. He was the recipient of the 2016 IEEE Neural Networks Pioneer Award and the 2014 Best Paper Award for the journal *Building and Environment* (Elsevier). He served as the Editor-in-Chief for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON NEURAL NETWORKS AND LEARNING SYSTEMS from 2004 to 2010. He has participated in more than 60 research projects/grants, funded by several agencies and industry in Europe and the United States, including the prestigious European Research Council (ERC) Advanced Grant. He was the President of the IEEE Computational Intelligence Society from 2012 to 2013. He is currently the President of the European Control Association (EUCA).



Thomas Parisini (F'11) received the Ph.D. degree in electronic engineering and computer science from the University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy, in 1993.

He was with the Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy. Since 2010, he has been holding the Chair of industrial control with Imperial College London, London, U.K. From 2009 to 2012, he was a Deputy Rector with the University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy. Since 2015, he has been the Director of research with Imperial College London, London, U.K. In 2018, he received an Honorary Doctorate

from the University of Aalborg, Aalborg, Denmark. He is currently the Deputy Director of the KIOS Research and Innovation Centre of Excellence, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus. He has authored or co-authored more than 300 research papers in archival journals, book chapters, and international conference proceedings. His current research interests include monitoring, diagnosis, control and security of large-scale interconnected nonlinear systems with applications in smart grids, power electronics and industrial process control.

Dr. Parisini is a fellow of the IFAC. He was a co-recipient of the IFAC Best Application Paper Prize of the *Journal of Process Control*, Elsevier, and the 2004 Outstanding Paper Award of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON NEURAL NETWORKS. In 2016, he was awarded as the Principal Investigator at Imperial of the H2020 European Union flagship Teaming Project KIOS Research and Innovation Centre of Excellence led by the University of Cyprus. Among other activities, he was the General Co-Chair of the 2013 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control. From 2009 to 2016, he was the Editor-in-Chief of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON CONTROL SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY. Since 2018, he has been the Editor-in-Chief of the *European Journal of Control*. Since 2017, he has been the Editor for *Control Applications of Automatica*. He currently serves as the Vice President for Publications Activities of the IEEE Control Systems Society.