



6-1-2004

## Leader-to-Formation Stability

Herbert G. Tanner  
*University of Pennsylvania*

George J. Pappas  
*University of Pennsylvania*, pappasg@seas.upenn.edu

Vijay Kumar  
*University of Pennsylvania*, kumar@grasp.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.upenn.edu/meam\\_papers](https://repository.upenn.edu/meam_papers)

 Part of the [Mechanical Engineering Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Tanner, Herbert G.; Pappas, George J.; and Kumar, Vijay, "Leader-to-Formation Stability" (2004).  
*Departmental Papers (MEAM)*. 237.  
[https://repository.upenn.edu/meam\\_papers/237](https://repository.upenn.edu/meam_papers/237)

### Suggested Citation:

Tanner, Herbert G., George J. Pappas and Vijay Kumar. (2004). *Leader-to-Formation Stability*. IEEE Transactions on Robotics. Vol. 20(3). p. 443-455.

©2004 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. However, permission to reprint/republish this material for advertising or promotional purposes or for creating new collective works for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or to reuse any copyrighted component of this work in other works must be obtained from the IEEE.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. [https://repository.upenn.edu/meam\\_papers/237](https://repository.upenn.edu/meam_papers/237)  
For more information, please contact [repository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:repository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

## Leader-to-Formation Stability

### Abstract

The paper investigates the stability properties of mobile agent formations which are based on leader-following. We derive nonlinear gain estimates that capture how leader behavior affects the interconnection errors observed in the formation. Leader to formation stability (LFS) gains quantify error amplification, relate interconnection topology to stability and performance and offer safety bounds for different formation topologies. Analysis based on the LFS gains provides insight to error propagation and suggests ways to improve the safety, robustness and performance characteristics of a formation.

### Disciplines

Engineering | Mechanical Engineering

### Comments

Suggested Citation:

Tanner, Herbert G., George J. Pappas and Vijay Kumar. (2004). *Leader-to-Formation Stability*. IEEE Transactions on Robotics. Vol. 20(3). p. 443-455.

©2004 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. However, permission to reprint/republish this material for advertising or promotional purposes or for creating new collective works for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or to reuse any copyrighted component of this work in other works must be obtained from the IEEE.

# Leader-to-Formation Stability

Herbert G. Tanner

George J. Pappas

Vijay Kumar

**Abstract**—The paper investigates the stability properties of mobile agent formations which are based on leader-following. We derive nonlinear gain estimates that capture how leader behavior affects the interconnection errors observed in the formation. Leader to formation stability (LFS) gains quantify error amplification, relate interconnection topology to stability and performance and offer safety bounds for different formation topologies. Analysis based on the LFS gains provides insight to error propagation and suggests ways to improve the safety, robustness and performance characteristics of a formation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Interconnected systems have lately received considerable attention, motivated by recent advances in computation and communication, which provide the enabling technology for applications such as automated highway systems [1], cooperative robot reconnaissance [2], [3] and manipulation [4], [5], formation flight control [6], [7], satellite clustering [8] and control of groups of unmanned vehicles [9], [10], [6]. Advantages of interconnected multi-agent systems over conventional systems include reduced cost, increased efficiency, performance, reconfigurability and robustness, and new capabilities. A space radar based on satellite clusters [11] is estimated to cost three times less than currently available systems, increase geolocation accuracy by a factor of 500, offer two orders of magnitude smaller propulsion requirement and be able to track moving targets through formation flight.

Formations have been represented by means of virtual structures or templates [12], [7]. Graphs have also been used to capture the interconnection topology in a formation [13], [14] and reflect control structure [15], constraint feasibility [16], information flow [17] and error propagation [18]. These graphs can have undirected edges, when the latter model position constraints [13], [14], or directed for the case of information flow [17] or leader-following inter-agent control specifications [19], [20], [21].

Formation control and interconnected systems stability have been analyzed recently from many different perspectives. In behavior-based approaches [2] the group behavior emerges as a combination of group member behaviors, selected among a set of primitive actions. Lyapunov based techniques have been used extensively to establish asymptotic stability in multi-agent

formations. Formation control specifications are usually encoded in a formation constraint function [22] or in some artificial potential functions [23], [13] that usually play the role of Lyapunov function candidates. Another approach that applies to linear spatially interconnected systems is a distributed control scheme [24] that is based on  $\mathcal{L}_2$ -norm performance measures. Local coordination control schemes that aim at stabilizing agents around some desired configurations have also been successfully applied [7], [19], [25]. String stability has proved to be an important tool in analyzing the stability of platoons of vehicles [26], [27], [28], [29]. System cascading is made stable by ensuring that the error attenuates as it propagates from one system to the next downstream. The string stability property is given an elegant state space formulation and it was shown to be robust with respect to structural perturbations [1]. Mesh stability, which can be thought of as a generalization to multiple dimensions [30], also enjoys similar properties.

In the new generation of interconnected systems that are now being developed, safety, robustness and performance are going to be critical properties, and distinguish such systems from all their predecessors. Most previous approaches to formation control aim at establishing convergence properties for formation errors, which is necessary to make such a system operational. To address issues related to safety and performance, we need new tools [31] that allow us to quantify, bound and estimate the error amplitudes in the worst case.

In this paper we introduce *Leader-to-Formation Stability (LFS)* in an effort to address these issues. The notion is based on input-to-state stability [32] and its invariance properties under cascading [33], [34]. LFS quantifies error amplification during signal propagation in leader-following formations. We establish nonlinear gain estimates between the errors of the formation leaders and the interconnection errors observed inside the formation. In this way, we can characterize how leader inputs and disturbances affect the stability of the group. We are also able to assess the stability of particular subgroups inside the formation and thus guide analysis. In the case where the gain estimates can be expressed as linear functions of the formation errors, then gain propagation can be done efficiently through an algorithm based on algebraic matrix formulas, in which the interconnection topology of the formation appears explicitly in the form of the adjacency matrix of the underlying graph.

## II. DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARY REMARKS

In the context of this paper, a formation is defined as a network of vehicles interconnected via their controller specifications. These specifications dictate that each agent must maintain a certain relative state vector with respect to its leaders. Agent interconnections are modeled as edges in a directed (formation) graph [35], labeled by the respective control specifica-

Herbert Tanner is with the Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, 3401 Walnut Street, Suite 301C, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6228 (e-mail:tanner@grasp.cis.upenn.edu)

George Pappas is with the Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, 200 South 33rd Street, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104 (e-mail:pappasg@ee.upenn.edu)

Vijay Kumar is with the Department of Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics, 3401 Walnut Street, Suite 301C, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6228, (e-mail:kumar@grasp.cis.upenn.edu)

tions. This section introduces the material needed for describing formally the formation, and defines the stability notions that are going to be used in the subsequent analysis.

### A. Graph Theory Preliminaries

A *directed graph* consists of a vertex set  $V(X)$  and an directed edge set  $E(X)$ , where a directed edge is an ordered pair of distinct vertices. An edge  $(x, y)$  in a directed graph is said to be incoming with respect to  $y$  and outgoing with respect to  $x$ . Such an edge has vertex  $x$  as a *tail* and vertex  $y$  as a *head*. The *indegree* of a vertex in a directed graph is defined as the number of edges that have this vertex as a head. If  $(x, y)$  is an edge, then  $x$  and  $y$  are *adjacent*. A *subgraph* of a graph  $X$  is a graph  $Y$  such that  $V(Y) \subseteq V(X)$  and  $E(Y) \subseteq E(X)$ . A subgraph  $Y$  of  $X$  is an *induced subgraph* when any two adjacent vertices in  $V(Y)$  are also adjacent in  $X$ . A *path* of length  $r$  in a directed graph is a sequence  $v_0, \dots, v_r$  of distinct vertices such that for every  $i \in [1, r]$ ,  $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$ . A *weak path* is a sequence  $v_0, \dots, v_r$  of  $r + 1$  distinct vertices such that for each  $i \in [1, r]$  either  $(v_i, v_{i+1})$  or  $(v_{i+1}, v_i)$  is an edge in  $E$ . A directed graph is *weakly connected* or simply *connected* if any two vertices can be joined with a weak path. The *distance* between two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  in a graph  $X$  is the length of the shortest path from  $x$  to  $y$ . The *diameter* of a graph is the maximum distance between two distinct vertices. A (directed) *cycle* is a connected graph where every vertex is incident with one incoming and one outgoing edge. An *acyclic graph* is a graph with no cycles.

### B. Formation Graphs

We consider formations that can be represented by acyclic<sup>1</sup> directed graphs. In these graphs, the agents involved are identified by vertices and the leader-following relationships by (directed) edges. The orientation of each edge distinguishes the leader from the follower. Follower controllers implement static state feedback control laws that depend on the state of the particular follower and the states of its leaders.

**Definition II.1 (Formation Control Graph).** A *formation control graph*  $\mathcal{F} = (V, E, S)$  is a directed acyclic graph consisting of:

- A finite set  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$  of  $N$  vertices and a map assigning to each vertex  $v_i$  a control system  $\dot{x}_i = f_i(t, x_i, u_i)$  where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .
- An edge set  $E \subset V \times V$  encoding leader-follower relationships between agents. The ordered pair  $(v_i, v_j) \triangleq e_{ij}$  belongs to  $E$  if  $u_j$  depends on the state of agent  $i$ ,  $x_i$ .
- A collection  $D = \{d_{kj}\}$  of edge specifications, defining control objectives (setpoints) for each  $j : (v_i, v_j) \in E$  for some  $v_i \in V$ .

For agent  $j$ , the tails of all incoming edges to vertex  $j$  represent leaders of  $j$ , and their set is denoted by  $L_j \subset V$ . Vertices  $v_\ell$  of indegree zero represent formation leaders with  $v_\ell \in L_F \subseteq V$ . Since there are no incoming edges for the vertices in  $L_F$ , no formation specifications can be defined for formation leaders; instead, these agents regulate their behavior so

that the formation may achieve some group objectives such as navigation in obstacle environments or tracking reference paths.

Given a specification  $d_{kj}$  on edge  $(v_k, v_j) \in E$ , a setpoint for agent  $j$  can be expressed as  $x_j^r = x_k - d_{kj}$ . For agents with multiple leaders, the specification redundancy can be resolved by projecting the incoming edges specifications into orthogonal components:

$$x_j^r = \sum_{k \in L_j} S_{kj}(x_k - d_{kj}) \quad (1)$$

where  $S_{kj}$  are projection matrices with  $\sum_k \text{rank}(S_{kj}) = n$ . Then the error for the closed loop system of agent  $j$  is defined to be the deviation from the prescribed setpoint  $\tilde{x}_j \triangleq x_j^r - x_j$ , and the formation error vector is constructed by stacking the errors of all followers:

$$\tilde{x} \triangleq [\dots \tilde{x}_j \dots]^T, \quad v_j \in V \setminus L_F$$

Formation leaders are supposed to pursue some group objectives (missions). Consider a formation leader associated with a vertex  $v_\ell \in L_F$ . If these objectives are known a priori, then they can be encoded in some nominal trajectory,  $x_\ell^r$ , in which case we can define the error for agent  $\ell$  as:  $\tilde{x}_\ell = x_\ell^r - x_\ell$ . Now consider the input transformation  $u_\ell = \tilde{u}_\ell + w_\ell$ , and assume a feedback control law  $\tilde{u}_\ell(\tilde{x}_\ell)$ , which makes the origin of the closed loop system

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_\ell = \tilde{f}_\ell(t, \tilde{x}_\ell, w_\ell)$$

with  $w_\ell = 0$ , asymptotically stable. Similarly, if the mission objectives are unspecified, we can set  $x_\ell^r = 0$ , and assume the existence of an asymptotically stabilizing control law,  $\tilde{u}_\ell$ , that makes  $\tilde{x}_\ell = \tilde{f}_\ell(t, \tilde{x}_\ell, 0)$  asymptotically stable. Then, the mission objectives can be realized by means of the input term  $w_\ell$ .

### C. Leader-to-Formation Stability

In this section we investigate the stability properties of the formation with respect to all leader inputs  $w_\ell$  or errors  $\tilde{x}_\ell$  (in the case where leader control specs have been encoded in  $x_\ell^r$ .) We obtain nonlinear gain estimates that quantify the transient effects of initial errors  $\tilde{x}(t_0)$  and the steady state effects of leader inputs  $w_\ell$ ,  $v_\ell \in L_F$  on the amplitude of the formation error  $\tilde{x}$ .

**Definition II.2 (LFS).** A formation is called *leader-to-formation stable (LFS)* if there is a class  $\mathcal{KL}$  function  $\beta$  and a class  $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\gamma$  such that for any initial formation error  $\tilde{x}(0)$  and for any bounded inputs of the formation leaders,  $\{w_\ell\}$  the formation error satisfies:

$$\|\tilde{x}(t)\| \leq \beta(\|\tilde{x}(0)\|, t) + \sum_{\ell \in L_F} \gamma_\ell \left( \sup_{[0, t]} \|w_\ell\| \right) \quad (2)$$

The functions  $\beta(r, t)$  and  $\gamma_\ell(r)$  are called *transient and asymptotic LFS gains for the formation*.

Leader-to-formation stability builds on the notion of input-to-state stability and it is a ‘robustness’ property [36], [37]. In this approach, the formation is viewed as a nonlinear operator from the space of leader input/disturbances to the space of the formation internal state. Functions  $\beta(r, t)$  and  $\gamma_\ell(r)$ , in (2)

<sup>1</sup>The case of cycles in a formation graph is treated in [18].

are ‘nonlinear gain estimates’ quantifying the effect of initial conditions and leader input on formation errors. Inequality (2) provides a safety bound on the formation error. Thus, given a safety specification, and a set of initial conditions, one can estimate an upper bound on the admissible input that can keep the system safe; conversely, given a safety specification and under a particular input regime, a set of initial conditions from which systems trajectories remain safe at all times, can be determined.

Based on alternative characterizations of input-to-state stability [36], Definition II.2 implies the following:

**Corollary II.3.** *If a formation is LFS, in the sense of Definition II.2, then the formation error satisfies:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{x}(t)\| \leq \sum_{\ell \in L_F} \gamma_\ell(\sup \|w_\ell\|)$$

Corollary II.3 establishes the asymptotic LFS gain  $\gamma(\sup \|w_\ell\|)$  as an ultimate bound for the formation error. This motivates the definition of the following LFS stability measure:

**Definition II.4.** *Consider a formation that is LFS. Then the scalar quantity:*

$$P_{LFS} \triangleq \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in L_F} \gamma_\ell(1)}$$

is called the LFS stability measure of the formation.

As defined,  $P_{LFS}$  varies in  $[0, 1]$ . The sum in the denominator of the defining equation for the LFS measure gives an estimate of the region in which the steady state formation error will remain, when the inputs to the formation leaders are bounded inside unit balls. The larger the error region grows, the smaller the LFS measure becomes. On the other hand, as the size of the error region shrinks, the performance measure tends to 1.

### III. LFS PROPAGATION




Fig. 1. A generic formation control graph.

In the formation graphs we consider in this paper, all induced subgraphs with  $N$  vertices have the form of Figure 1. This means that all cycles in the underlying undirected graph are of order 3. This is done to simplify the analysis, which can be extended to more general interconnection topologies at the expense of added analytical complexity. Assume an enumeration

on the induced formation control graph of Figure 1, where the vertices in the first row are assigned the numbers  $1, \dots, L$ , the vertices in the second are assigned the numbers  $L+1, \dots, M$  and the rest are assigned the numbers  $M+1, \dots, N$ . Let the dynamics of the agents be expressed as follows:

$$\dot{x}_\ell = f_\ell(t, x_\ell, u_\ell), \quad \ell \in \{1, \dots, L\} \quad (3a)$$

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i(t, x_i, u_i), \quad i \in \{L+1, \dots, M\} \quad (3b)$$

$$\dot{x}_f = f_f(t, x_f, u_f), \quad f \in \{M+1, \dots, N\} \quad (3c)$$

The agents are driven by control laws of the form:

$$u_\ell = u_\ell(t, x_\ell, \tilde{x}_\ell, w_\ell), \quad \ell \in \{1, \dots, L\} \quad (4a)$$

$$u_i = u_i(t, x_i, \tilde{x}_i), \quad i \in \{L+1, \dots, M\} \quad (4b)$$

$$u_f = u_f(t, x_f, \tilde{x}_f), \quad f \in \{M+1, \dots, N\} \quad (4c)$$

resulting in closed loop error dynamics which can be written as:

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_\ell = \tilde{f}_\ell(t, \tilde{x}_\ell, v_\ell) \quad (5a)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i = \tilde{f}_i(t, \tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_L, \tilde{x}_i) \quad (5b)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_f = \tilde{f}_f(t, \tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_M, \tilde{x}_f) \quad (5c)$$

The main result of the paper is based on the invariance of the LFS property under a broad class of interconnections:

**Proposition III.1.** *Consider the formation of Figure 1 with closed loop error dynamics given by (5). If (5b) is LFS with respect to  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_L$ :*

$$\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\| \leq \beta_i(\|\tilde{x}(0)\|, t) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|)$$

and (5c) is LFS with respect to  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_M$ :

$$\|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| \leq \beta_f(\|\tilde{x}_f(0)\|, t) + \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma_{if}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_i\|)$$

then the induced formation control graph is LFS with respect to  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_L$ :

$$\|\tilde{x}(t)\| \leq \beta(\|\tilde{x}(0)\|, t) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_\ell(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|)$$

with  $\tilde{x} := (\tilde{x}_{L+1}, \dots, \tilde{x}_N)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(r, t) = & \sum_{f=M+1}^N \left\{ \sum_{i=L+1}^M \left[ \gamma_{if} \left( 4\beta_i(2\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}(0)\|, 0), \frac{t}{2}) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \beta_i(\|\tilde{x}(0)\|, t) \right] + \beta_f \left( 2\beta_f(\|\tilde{x}(0)\|, \frac{t}{2}) + \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. 2 \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if}(2\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}(0)\|, 0), t) \right) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (6a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\ell(r) = & \sum_{f=M+1}^N \left[ \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if}(2L\gamma_{\ell i}(r)) + \gamma_{\ell f}(r) + \right. \\ & \left. \beta_f \left( 2L \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell f}(r) + \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if}(2L\gamma_{\ell i}(r)) \right), 0 \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{\ell i}(r) + \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if} \left( 4\beta_i(2L\gamma_{\ell i}(r), 0) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6b)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix.  $\square$

In the case where the agent dynamics are linear, then the conditions for LFS are automatically satisfied. The following

Proposition takes into account the linearity of the gain functions and provide less conservative bounds than those obtained by applying (6) to the linear case. The linear version of (3) has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_\ell &= Ax_\ell + Bu_\ell, \quad \ell \in \{1, \dots, L\} \\ \dot{x}_i &= Ax_i + Bu_i, \quad i \in \{L+1, \dots, M\} \\ \dot{x}_f &= Ax_f + Bu_f, \quad f \in \{M+1, \dots, N\}, \end{aligned}$$

along with the feedback control laws:

$$u_i = K_i \tilde{x}_i + e_i \quad (7a)$$

$$u_f = K_f \tilde{x}_f + e_f, \quad (7b)$$

$$u_\ell = K_\ell \tilde{x}_\ell + e_\ell, \quad (7c)$$

where  $K_i$ ,  $K_f$ , and  $K_\ell$  are such that  $(A_s - B_s K_s)$ ,  $s \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  are Hurwitz, and  $e_i$ ,  $e_\ell$  and  $e_f$  satisfy:

$$B_i e_i = -A_i x_i^r, \quad B_f e_f = -A_f x_f^r, \quad B_\ell e_\ell = -A_\ell x_\ell^r$$

These ensure that the control inputs of each follower can provide the appropriate feedforward action to track the leader. Application of (7) results in closed loop error dynamics that can be written as:

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_\ell = -(A_\ell - B_\ell K_\ell) \tilde{x}_\ell, \quad (8a)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i = (A_i - B_i K_i) \tilde{x}_i + \dot{\tilde{x}}_i^r \quad (8b)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_f = (A_f - B_f K_f) \tilde{x}_f - \sum_{i=L+1}^M S_{if} (A_i - B_i K_i) \tilde{x}_i, \quad (8c)$$

This model is equivalent to the one used for a string of LTI systems in [38]. In this case, the LFS gains are as follows:

**Proposition III.2.** *Consider the formation of Figure 1 where the closed loop error dynamics of the agents are given by (8). Then, (8) is LFS with respect to  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_L$ :*

$$\|\tilde{x}(t)\| \leq \bar{\beta} \|\tilde{x}(0)\| e^{-\mu t} + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_\ell \sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|$$

where  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  is a parameter,  $\mu = \frac{1-\theta}{4 \max\{\lambda_M[P_i], \lambda_M[P_f]\}}$ ,  $\lambda_M[\cdot]$  and  $\lambda_m[\cdot]$  are the largest and smallest eigenvalues of a matrix, respectively,

$$\bar{\beta} \triangleq \sum_{i=L+1}^M \left[ \sum_{f=M+1}^N (\bar{\beta}_f^2 + (\bar{\beta}_i + \bar{\beta}_f) \bar{\beta}_i \bar{\gamma}_{if}) + \bar{\beta}_i \right] \quad (9a)$$

$$\bar{\gamma}_\ell \triangleq \sum_{f=M+1}^N [(1 + \bar{\beta}_f) \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f} + \sum_{i=L+1}^M (\bar{\beta}_f + \bar{\beta}_i + 1) \bar{\gamma}_{if} \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} + \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i}] \quad (9b)$$

with  $\bar{\beta}_r = \left( \frac{\lambda_M[P_r]}{\lambda_m[P_r]} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , for  $r = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\bar{\gamma}_{ji} = \frac{2(\lambda_M[P_i])^{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda_M[A_j - B_j K_j]}{(\lambda_m[P_i])^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta}$ , and each  $P_j$  satisfying:

$$P_j (A_j - B_j K_j) + (A_j - B_j K_j)^T P_j = -I$$

*Proof.* See Appendix.  $\square$

#### IV. GRAPH PROPAGATION MATRIX EQUATIONS

For linear systems, the LFS gain propagation equations (9) can be encoded in recursive matrix equations, in which the formation graph structure appears explicitly in the form of the graph adjacency matrix. The recursion is based on the property of the powers of the adjacency matrix to give the number of paths of length equal to the exponent between two vertices in the graph [35]. By labeling the edges of the graph with the LFS gains associated with the particular edge, we are able to propagate the gains through the graph and obtain a sequence of matrices that express the LFS gains of all paths inside the formation graph.

Consider the adjacency matrix  $A$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ :

$$A = [a_{ij}], \text{ where } \begin{cases} a_{ij} = 1, & \text{if } (v_i, v_j) \in E \\ a_{ij} = 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and define the matrices  $\Gamma, B \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$  as follows:

$$B = [b_{ij}], \text{ where } \begin{cases} b_{ij} = \bar{\beta}_j, & \text{if } a_{ij} = 1 \\ b_{ij} = 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

$$G = [g_{ij}], \text{ where } \begin{cases} g_{ij} = \bar{\gamma}_{ji}, & \text{if } a_{ij} = 1 \\ g_{ij} = 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Obviously, matrices  $B$  and  $G$  provide the transient and asymptotic LFS gains of all paths of length one (edges) in the formation graph. Thus we define:

$$B_1 = B, \quad G_1 = G,$$

respectively, where the subscript denotes the length of the path. Then the LFS gains of all longer paths in the formation graph can be computed through the recursive procedure described in the following Proposition:

**Proposition IV.1.** *Consider a formation control graph  $\mathcal{G}$  with adjacency matrix  $A$  and matrices  $B, G$  defined by (10) and (11), respectively. Then, the asymptotic and transient LFS gains of paths of length  $k > 1$  between two vertices  $v_i, v_j \in \mathcal{V}$  are given recursively as the  $(i, j)$  elements of matrices*

$$G_k = G(G_{k-1} \circ B_{k-1}) + GG_{k-1} + (G \circ B)G_{k-1} + GA^{k-1} + G \circ (AB_{k-1} + A^k) \quad (12a)$$

$$B_k = A(B_{k-1} \circ B_{k-1}) + BA^{k-1} + (B \circ B)G_{k-1} + B(G_{k-1} \circ B_{k-1}), \quad (12b)$$

respectively, where  $\circ$  denotes the Schur (elementwise) matrix product. Moreover, the recursion terminates after  $d \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 1$  steps, where  $d$  is the diameter of the formation graph  $\mathcal{G}$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix.  $\square$

#### V. RELATION TO ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGIES

The framework of string and mesh stability provides an alternative way of analyzing the stability of interconnected systems. Mesh stability guarantees error attenuation and establishes stability properties which are preserved when the group is augmented. LFS, on the other hand, models the effect of leader

inputs and can be used to address issues related to safety and performance.

Although both notions reflect some robustness properties of the system, due structural perturbations in the former case and input disturbances in the latter, the similarities seem to end here:

- mesh stability ensures scalable stability properties which are independent of system size whereas LFS relates stability properties with initial conditions, input and error specifications, and system size and interconnection topology;
- mesh stability establishes the convergence of interconnection errors to zero while LFS provides ultimate bounds that depend on initial conditions and inputs;
- in a mesh stable system errors attenuate due to ‘weak interaction’ conditions while in an LFS system errors can increase but their amplification is quantified via nonlinear gain estimates.
- there is no notion of input in mesh stability;
- LFS nonlinear systems are generally not mesh stable;

Although LFS and mesh stability are generally incomparable, one can establish a link between them, in the sense that mesh stability of the unforced system may, under some sector conditions on the input vector fields, imply local LFS. In this respect, it is possible to introduce inputs in a mesh stable system and analyze their effect on the size of the errors observed.

**Proposition V.1.** *For a look ahead system, affine in control:*

$$\dot{x}_1 = f_1(t, x_1) + g_1(t, x_1)u_1 \quad (13a)$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = f_2(t, x_2, x_1) + g_2(t, x_2, x_1)u_2 \quad (13b)$$

⋮

$$\dot{x}_N = f_N(t, x_N, \dots, x_1) + g_N(t, x_N, \dots, x_1)u_N \quad (13c)$$

If for  $u_i = 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , (13) is asymptotically mesh stable at the origin  $x \triangleq (x_1, \dots, x_N) = 0$ , and there are class- $\mathcal{K}$  functions  $\zeta_i(\cdot)$  such that

$$\|g_i(t, x_i, \dots, x_1)\| \leq \zeta(\|x\|) \triangleq \max_{r,i} \{\zeta_i(r)\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N$$

then there is a neighborhood of the origin,  $D = \{x : \|x\| \leq r\}$  where (13) is LFS.

*Proof.* See Appendix.  $\square$

The converse, however, is not true. If (13) is LFS, setting  $u_i = 0$  does not necessarily mean that  $\|x_i(t)\|_\infty \leq \|x(t)\|_\infty^{i-1}$ , which is required for mesh stability [30]. Sufficient conditions for mesh stability include global Lipschitz continuity of the system vector fields with respect to coupling terms and exponential stability of the unforced dynamics [30]. These conditions may not necessarily be satisfied in LFS systems [21].

## VI. APPLICATIONS

### A. LFS in Mobile Robot Formations

The results of Section III can be applied to formations of non-holonomic mobile robots. We borrow the application example of [15] and we show that the resulting edge error dynamics are

LFS. For each nonholonomic mobile robot we consider the following kinematic model:

$$\dot{x}_i = v_i \cos \theta_i, \quad \dot{y}_i = v_i \sin \theta_i \quad \dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i. \quad (14)$$

where  $(x, y, \theta)$  is the position and orientation of mobile robot  $i$ , and  $v_i, \omega_i$  are the translational and rotational velocity control inputs. For a triple of robots  $i, j$  and  $k$  where  $j$  is supposed




Fig. 2. Leader following using a separation-bearing controller.

to follow  $i$  and  $i$  is supposed to follow  $k$ , the specification for the leader-follower relationship can be expressed in terms of the separation distance  $\ell$  and the relative bearing  $\psi$  (Figure 2) which e.g. for the  $i - j$  pair can be written as:

$$h_{ij} = (\ell_{ij}^d - \ell_{ij}, \psi_{ij}^d - \psi_{ij}) \triangleq (\tilde{\ell}_{ij}, \tilde{\psi}_{ij}) = 0.$$

where  $\ell_{ij}^d$  and  $\psi_{ij}^d$  are constant specification parameters. Taking  $h_{ij}$  as an output, the dynamics of the  $i - j$  leader-follower pair can be expressed in new coordinates as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\tilde{\ell}}_{ij} \\ \dot{\tilde{\psi}}_{ij} \\ \dot{\phi}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \psi_{ij} & 0 \\ -\sin \psi_{ij} & 1 \\ \frac{\ell_{ij}}{0} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_i \\ \omega_i \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij}) & d \sin(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij}) \\ -\sin(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij}) & d \cos(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij}) \\ \frac{\ell_{ij}}{0} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_j \\ \omega_j \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $d$  is a modeling parameter and  $\phi_{ij} = \theta_i - \theta_j$ . Using input-output feedback linearization:

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_j \\ \omega_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij}) & -\ell_{ij} \sin(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij}) \\ \frac{\sin(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij})}{d} & \frac{\ell_{ij} \cos(\phi_{ij} + \psi_{ij})}{d} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k_1^j \tilde{\ell}_{ij} \\ k_2^j \tilde{\psi}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} \quad (15a)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_i \\ \omega_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki}) & -\ell_{ki} \sin(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki}) \\ \frac{\sin(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki})}{d} & \frac{\ell_{ki} \cos(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki})}{d} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k_1^i \tilde{\ell}_{ki} \\ k_2^i \tilde{\psi}_{ki} \end{bmatrix} \quad (15b)$$

the interconnection error dynamics can take the form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\tilde{\ell}}_{ij} \\ \dot{\tilde{\psi}}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} k_1^j \tilde{\ell}_{ij} \\ k_2^j \tilde{\psi}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \psi_{ij} \cos(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki}) \\ \frac{\sin \psi_{ij} \cos(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki})}{\ell_{ij}} - \frac{\sin(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki})}{d} \\ \frac{\ell_{ki} \cos \psi_{ij} \sin(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki})}{\ell_{ij}} - \frac{\ell_{ki} \cos(\phi_{ki} + \psi_{ki})}{d} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k_1^i \tilde{\ell}_{ki} \\ k_2^i \tilde{\psi}_{ki} \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

The internal dynamics of  $\phi_{ij}$  can be shown to be stable [15]. Then, using  $V_{ij} = \frac{1}{2k_1^j} \|\tilde{\ell}_{ij}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2k_2^j} \|\tilde{\psi}_{ij}\|^2$  as a Lyapunov function for (16), and denoting  $(\tilde{\ell}_{ij}, \tilde{\psi}_{ij})^T$  by  $\tilde{z}_{ij}$ , we can arrive at:

$$\dot{V}_{ij} \leq -\|\tilde{z}_{ij}\|^2 + \|\tilde{z}_{ij}\| \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{k_1^j} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{k_2^j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \psi_{ij} & 0 \\ \frac{\sin \psi_{ij}}{\ell_{ij}} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \|(\omega_i)\|$$

which yields for  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ :

$$\dot{V}_{ij} \leq -(1-\xi) \|\tilde{z}_{ij}\|^2, \quad \forall \|\tilde{z}_{ij}\| \geq \frac{\max\{k_1^i, k_2^i\}(d + \ell_{ki}^d + \|\tilde{z}_{ki}\|) \|\tilde{z}_{ki}\|}{\xi d \min\{k_1^j, k_2^j\}}$$

Then follows that:  $\|\tilde{z}_{ij}\| \leq \beta_{ij}(\|\tilde{z}_{ij}(0)\|, t) + \gamma_{ij}(\sup \|\tilde{z}_{ki}\|)$ , where

$$\beta_{ij}(r, t) = r \sqrt{\frac{\max\{k_1^j, k_2^j\}}{\min\{k_1^j, k_2^j\}}} e^{-(1-\xi) \min\{k_1^j, k_2^j\} t} \quad (17a)$$

$$\gamma_{ij}(r) = \frac{\max\{k_1^j, k_2^j\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \max\{k_1^i, k_2^i\} (d + \ell_{ki}^d + r)r}{\xi d \min\{k_1^j, k_2^j\}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (17b)$$

establishing the LFS property of the leader-follower pair.

The simulated response of a string of ten mobile robots with dynamics described by (14), is steered using the leader-follower controllers (15) is depicted in Figures 3-4. Figure 3 shows the paths of the first and the last robots in the string, in an effort to follow a sinusoidal reference trajectory while maintaining the shape of a straight line. Error propagation causes large overshoot for the last follower. Figure 4 presents the time evolution of the formation errors related to separation and bearing. After an initial transient period, the errors remain bounded inside a certain region that depends on the magnitude of the velocity along the reference trajectory.




Fig. 3. A string of 10 vehicles tracking a sinusoidal trajectory.




Fig. 4. Formation errors for the string of 10 vehicles.

### B. Architecture Comparison

In this section we will first turn our attention to a formation of three mobile robots (Figure 5). We will use LFS to assess

and numerically verify the stability properties of three different formation architectures, based on (16). We compare the three architectures depicted in Figures 6 and 8. In the simulation runs, the formation leader, robot 1 has to follow a circular reference trajectory, while the other robots have to remain in a straight line behind the leader. The parameter values selected are  $\ell_{12}^d = 0.75[m]$ ,  $\psi_{12}^d = \pi[rad]$ ,  $\ell_{23}^d = 0.75[m]$ ,  $\psi_{23}^d = \pi[rad]$ ,  $\ell_{13}^d = 1.75[m]$ ,  $d = 0.25[m]$  and the controller gains are set to  $k_1 = 10$ ,  $k_2 = 10$  for all robots.

The cascade formation of Figure 6 has an LFS asymptotic gain:  $\gamma(r) = 8r(r+2) + 256r(r+2)[2 + 16r(2+r)] + 512r(2+r)[2 + 64r(2+r)]$  and an LFS performance measure  $P_{LFS} = 3.367 \times 10^{-7}$ . For the parallel formation of Figure 8 we have  $\gamma(r) = 16r(2+r)$  and  $P_{LFS} = 0.98$ , which indicate a significant qualitative difference in performance. This difference is depicted in Figures 7 and 9, where it is obvious that in parallel formation, the robots are able to move in alignment more accurately. Although the gain estimates calculated are crude, having to account for the worst case, there are still indicative of the stability properties of the system. Indeed, as it can be seen in Figure VI-B, the parallel formation clearly outperforms the cascade architecture.




Fig. 5. Three mobile robots using separation-bearing controllers.




Fig. 6. Cascade formation.




Fig. 7. Robot paths for the cascade formation.




Fig. 8. Parallel formation.




Fig. 9. Robot paths for the parallel formation.






Fig. 10. Formation error evolution for the two formation architectures.

Consider now the formation depicted in Figure VI-B. All robots are thought to use the controllers (15), with the only difference that the vehicle 3 uses higher feedback gains compared to all the others. In view of the increased performance capabilities of robot 3, one may consider assigning robots 5, 6, and 7 to follow 3. However, an LFS analysis reveals that such a change will in fact increase the magnitude of the formation errors: assume that  $k_1^i = kI_2 = k$ , for  $i = \{1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$  and  $k_1^3 = k_2^3 = k' > k$ . Suppose that collision avoidance imposes a maximum allowable error bound,  $\|r\| < R$ . Then the LFS gains of (17) can be overapproximated as follows:

$$\beta_{ij}(r, t) = re^{-(1-\xi)k^j t}, \quad (18a)$$

$$\gamma_{ij}(r) = \frac{k^i}{k^j} \left( \frac{d + \ell + R}{\xi d} \right) r \quad (18b)$$

With  $\xi = 0.5$ ,  $d = 0.25$  and  $\ell = 0.75$ , from (18) we derive:

Nearest neighbor following	Following 3
$\gamma_{25} = 2(1 + R)r$	$\gamma_{25} = 2\frac{k'}{k}(1 + R)r$
$\gamma_{36} = 2\frac{k'}{k}(1 + R)r$	$\gamma_{36} = 2\frac{k'}{k}(1 + R)r$
$\gamma_{47} = 2(1 + R)r$	$\gamma_{47} = 2\frac{k'}{k}(1 + R)r$

Since  $k' > k$ , robots 5 and 7 will exhibit larger errors in the interconnection of Figure VI-B compared to those expected in the interconnection of Figure VI-B. This is because higher feedback gains for robot 3 result to larger control inputs which propagate into robots 5 and 7, increasing their formation errors.




Fig. 11. Nearest neighbor following. Fig. 12. Following the fastest robot.

### C. Safety Specifications

Leader-to-Formation Stability gains can be used to check and implement safety specifications that are related to formation errors. In the example of this Section, we consider a formation of three robots connected in cascade via the separation-bearing controllers (15). The group is supposed maneuver maintaining a triangular shape for which the faces must not exceed a certain distance. This will ensure that the robots move in a tight formation, in the same way as fighters when flying in formation have to maintain certain patterns to avoid detection by enemy radars.

The leader of the formation is to follow a reference trajectory. The time parameterization of the reference trajectory defines a desired velocity for the leader. This reference velocity can be regarded as an input to the formation and as such it will affect the size of the formation errors. If the magnitude of this velocity were a design parameter, then a question that arises is whether one can select an appropriate value to ensure that the formation can track the reference trajectory without violating its safety specification.

The formation motion is simulated first for the case where the reference velocity is set to a constant value:  $\|u_\ell\| = 1$ . The robot paths are given in Figure VI-C. A circle of radius  $\rho = 1.5[m]$  around the formation leader marks the boundary of the region in which the followers should be for the group to satisfy the safety specification. Due to the magnitude of the reference velocity for the leader, the formation shape is distorted and the last follower in the string exhibits an unacceptable error, which forces it to remain outside the safe region.




Fig. 13. Formation input not satisfying safety spec.

Based on the fact that the distance between the last follower and the leader should not exceed  $1.5[m]$ , we can determine the largest allowable formation error:  $\tilde{x}_{\max} = 0.5829$ . Using the LFS gain estimates (18), with  $R = 0.5829$ ,  $k_1 = k_2 = 10$  and  $\xi = 0.5$ , we derive a formation asymptotic gain:  $\tilde{\gamma}_\ell = 1721.73$ . This implies that in order for  $\tilde{x} \leq \tilde{x}_{\max}$  it suffices to have  $\|u_\ell\| \leq 0.000338$ . Then the reference speed for the leader is set to  $\|u_\ell\| \triangleq 0.0001$  and the formation motion is simulated again and depicted in Figure VI-C, where it is clear that the safety specification is now satisfied.




Fig. 14. Slowing down the formation to satisfy safety spec.

#### D. Gain Computation

One of the major considerations when dealing with large scale interconnected systems such as large vehicle formations, is the ability to compute the gain estimates efficiently, regardless of the size of the system. For nonlinear systems, due to their inherent complexity, LFS gain computation using (6) is cumbersome and does not scale well. The conclusions that can be drawn in the case of large scale vehicle formations are basically qualitative: one knows that the LFS property of individual subsystems ensures the continuous dependence of the size of the formation errors on the amplitude of the leaders excitation. Figure 3 shows the vehicle paths in a string of ten, with closed loop dynamics described by (16). Figure 4 gives the formation error evolution with respect to time in which, due to the absence of an appropriate norm on  $SE(2)$ , we chose to plot the position and orientation errors separately. Figures 3-4 show how LFS can ensure boundedness of errors and continuous dependence of system trajectories on leader input.

In the remaining of this section we will demonstrate the use of equations (12) to assess the stability properties of the formation depicted in Figure VI-D. To apply equations (12) we consider a linear overapproximation of the LFS gains in the sense of (18) and assume  $\beta_{ij} = 1.2$ ,  $\bar{\gamma}_{ij} = 0.2$  for any pair of leader  $i$  and follower  $j$  with  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 36\}$ . In this formation graph, the largest path is of length 5. The computation process terminates after 6 steps, yielding an LFS performance measure:

$$P_{LFS} = \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^3 6\bar{\gamma}_{1j}\right)^{-1} = 772.952^{-1}$$

#### VII. CONCLUSION

LFS is a stability property of formations that are based on leader-following which quantifies the propagation of the input of the formation leaders to the interconnection network of the group and captures its effects on the magnitude of the errors observed. It provides performance measures that can be calculated analytically, and allows the calculation of worst case ultimate error bounds, which can be used to check the design against safety specifications. The intuitive fact that performance deteriorates as the graph that represents the formation interconnections increases in diameter, can now be formally justified. LFS




Fig. 15. Gain computation in large formations.

can be used as an analysis tool to assess the performance and robustness capabilities of different interconnection topologies and expose weaknesses in the design of the formation architecture in the form of error amplifying interconnections. Finally, the worst case ultimate error bounds obtained by LFS can be used to check a particular formation design against error-related safety specifications.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is partially supported under DARPA MICA Contract Number N66001-01-C-8076, and by DARPA/AFRL Software-Enabled Control Grant F33615-01-C-1848.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. Swaroop and J. K. Hedrick, "Sting stability of interconnected systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 41, pp. 349–357, March 1996.
- [2] T. Balch and R. Arkin, "Behavior-based formation control for multirobot systems," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 14, no. 12, 1998.
- [3] P. Ögren, E. Fiorelli, and N. E. Leonard, "Formations with a mission: Stable coordination of vehicle group maneuvers," in *Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, (Notre Dame, IN), August 2002.
- [4] H. G. Tanner, S. G. Loizou, and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "Nonholonomic navigation and control of multiple mobile manipulators," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 19, pp. 53–64, February 2003.
- [5] T. Sugar, J. Desai, V. Kumar, and J. P. Ostrowski, "Coordination of multiple mobile manipulators," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Robotics Automation*, vol. 3, pp. 3022–2027, May 2001.
- [6] M. Mesbahi and F. Hadaegh, "Formation flying of multiple spacecraft via graphs, matrix inequalities, and switching," *AIAA Journal of Guidance, Control and Dynamics*, vol. 24, pp. 369–377, March 2001.
- [7] R. W. Beard, J. Lawton, and F. Y. Hadaegh, "A coordination architecture for spacecraft formation control," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 9, pp. 777–790, November 2001.
- [8] C. R. McInnes, "Autonomous ring formation for a planar constellation of satellites," *AIAA Journal of Guidance Control and Dynamics*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 1215–1217, 1995.
- [9] F. Giulietti, L. Pollini, and M. Innocenti, "Autonomous formation flight," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 34–44, 2000.
- [10] D. J. Stilwell and B. E. Bishop, "Platoons of underwater vehicles," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, pp. 45–52, 2000.
- [11] S. K. Maurice Martin, Pete Klupar and J. Winter, "Techsat 21 and revolutionizing space missions using microsattellites," in *15th USU/AIAA*, (Logan, Utah), August 2001.
- [12] K.-H. Tan and M. A. Lewis, "Virtual structures for high-precision cooperative mobile robot control," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 4, pp. 387–403, October 1997.

## APPENDIX

- [13] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Distributed structural stabilization and tracking for formations of dynamic multi-agents," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, (Las Vegas, NV), pp. 209–215, December 2002.
- [14] P. N. B. Tolga Eren and A. S. Morse, "Closing ranks in vehicle formations based on rigidity," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, (Las Vegas, NV), pp. 2959–2964, December 2002.
- [15] A. K. Das, R. Fierro, and V. Kumar, *Control graphs for robot networks*, vol. Cooperative Control and Optimization of *Applied Optimization*, ch. 4, pp. 55–73. Kluwer Academic Press, 2002.
- [16] P. Tabuada, G. J. Pappas, and P. Lima, "Feasible formations of multi-agent systems," in *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, (Arlington, VA), pp. 56–61, June 2001.
- [17] J. A. Fax and R. M. Murray, "Information flow and cooperative control of vehicle formations," in *Proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> IFAC World Congress*, (Barcelona, Spain), pp. 2360–2365, July 2002.
- [18] H. Tanner, V. Kumar, and G. Pappas, "Stability properties of interconnected vehicles," in *Proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, (Notre Dame, IN), August 2002.
- [19] J. P. Desai, J. P. Ostrowski, and V. Kumar, "Modeling and control of formations of nonholonomic mobile robots," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 905–908, 2001.
- [20] R. Fierro, A. Das, V. Kumar, and J. P. Ostrowski, "Hybrid control of formation of robots," in *IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. Automat., ICRA01*, May 2001.
- [21] H. G. Tanner, G. J. Pappas, and V. Kumar, "Input-to-state stability on formation graphs," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Decision and Control*, (Las Vegas, NV), December 2002.
- [22] M. Egerstedt and X. Hu, "Formation constrained multi-agent control," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Robotics and Automation*, (Seoul, Korea), pp. 3961–3966, May 2001.
- [23] N. E. Leonard and E. Fiorelli, "Virtual leaders, artificial potentials and coordinated control of groups," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Decision and Control*, (Orlando, FL), pp. 2968–2973, December 2001.
- [24] R. D'Andrea and G. E. Dullerud, "Distributed control of spatially interconnected systems," *Transactions on Automatic Control* (submitted), 2002.
- [25] R. Fierro, A. Das, V. Kumar, and J. Ostrowski, "Hybrid control of formations of robots," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, (Seoul, Korea), pp. 157–162, May 2001.
- [26] L. E. Peppard, "String stability of relative-motion PID vehicle control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 579–581, October 1974.
- [27] S. Sheikholeslam and C. Desoer, "Longitudinal control of a platoon of vehicles," in *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, vol. 1, pp. 291–297, May 1990.
- [28] K. C. Chu, "Decentralized control of high speed vehicle strings," *Transportation Science*, vol. 8, pp. 361–383, 1974.
- [29] D. Swaroop, J. Hedrick, C. Chien, and P. Ioannou, "A comparison of spacing and headway control laws for automatically controlled vehicles," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 23, pp. 597–625, 1994.
- [30] A. Pant, P. Seiler, and K. Hedrick, "Mesh stability of look-ahead interconnected systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 47, pp. 403–407, Feb. 2002.
- [31] R. M. Murray, K. J. Åström, S. P. Boyd, R. W. Brockett, and G. Stein, "Future directions in control in an information-rich world," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 2003. to appear.
- [32] E. D. Sontag and Y. Wang, "On characterizations of the input-to-state stability property," *Systems & Control Letters*, no. 24, pp. 351–359, 1995.
- [33] M. Krstić, I. Kanellakopoulos, and P. Kokotović, *Nonlinear and Adaptive Control Design*. John Wiley and Sons, 1995.
- [34] A. Isidori, *Nonlinear Control Systems II*. Communications and Control Engineering, Springer, 1999.
- [35] C. Godsil and G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics; 207, Springer, 2001.
- [36] E. Sontag, "On the input-to-state stability property," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 1, pp. 24–36, 1995.
- [37] E. Sontag, "Smooth stabilization implies coprime factorization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 34, pp. 435–443, 1989.
- [38] D. Swaroop, "A note about the stability of a string of LTI systems," *ASME Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement and Control*, vol. 124, pp. 472–475, September 2002.
- [39] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

*Proof of Proposition III.1*

For the generic formation of Figure 1, note that LFS of each follower  $f$  with respect to  $\tilde{x}_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ , for the time interval  $[0, t/2]$  and  $f = M + 1, \dots, N$  yields:

$$\|\tilde{x}_f(\frac{t}{2})\| \leq \beta_f(\|\tilde{x}_f(0)\|, \frac{t}{2}) + \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma_{kf}(\sup_{[0, \frac{t}{2}]} \|\tilde{x}_k\|), \quad (19)$$

$$\|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| \leq \beta_f(\|\tilde{x}_f(\frac{t}{2})\|, t) + \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma_{kf}(\sup_{[\frac{t}{2}, t]} \|\tilde{x}_k\|) \quad (20)$$

In case agent  $f$  does not follow agent  $k$ , the corresponding term  $\gamma_{kf}$  is zero. Similarly, the LFS property of  $i$  with respect to  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_L$  is equivalent to:

$$\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\| \leq \beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, t) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|) \quad (21)$$

and implies:

$$\sup_{[0, \frac{t}{2}]} \|\tilde{x}_i\| \leq \beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, 0) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|) \quad (22a)$$

$$\sup_{[\frac{t}{2}, t]} \|\tilde{x}_i\| \leq \beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(\frac{t}{2})\|, \frac{t}{2}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|) \quad (22b)$$

Substituting (19), (22) into (20) yields a new bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| \leq & \beta_f\left(\beta_f(\|\tilde{x}_f(0)\|, \frac{t}{2}) + \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma_{kf}(\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, 0) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|)), t\right) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell f}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|) + \\ & \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if}\left(\beta_i(\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, 0) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|), \frac{t}{2}) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|)\right) \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

Combining (23) with (21) and recalling that for any class- $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha(x_1 + \dots + x_n) \leq \alpha(nx_1) + \dots + \alpha(nx_n)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| \leq & \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if}\left(2\beta_i(2\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, 0), \frac{t}{2})\right) + \\ & \beta_f\left(2\beta_f(\|\tilde{x}_f(0)\|, \frac{t}{2}) + \sum_{i=L+1}^M 2\gamma_{if}(2\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, 0)), t\right) + \\ & \sum_{\ell=1}^L \beta_f\left(2L\left[\sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if}(2L\gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|)) + \gamma_{\ell f}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|)\right], 0\right) \\ & + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i=L+1}^M \left[\gamma_{if}\left(4L\beta_i(2L\gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|), 0)\right) \right. \\ & \left. + \gamma_{if}(4L\gamma_{\ell i}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|))\right] + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell f}(\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|) \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all  $f \in \{M+1, \dots, N\}$  and denoting  $\sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| \equiv \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|_\infty$  for brevity, we obtain for  $\tilde{x} \triangleq (\tilde{x}_{L+1}, \dots, \tilde{x}_N)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}(t)\| &\leq \sum_{i=L+1}^M \beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, t) \\ &+ \sum_{f=M+1}^N \left[ \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if} \left( 2\beta_i(2\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, 0), \frac{t}{2}) \right) + \right. \\ &\left. \beta_f \left( 2\beta_f(\|\tilde{x}_f(0)\|, \frac{t}{2}) + \sum_{i=L+1}^M 2\gamma_{if}(2\beta_i(\|\tilde{x}_i(0)\|, 0), t) \right) \right] \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{f=M+1}^N \gamma_{\ell f}(\|\tilde{x}_\ell\|_\infty) + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i=L+1}^M \sum_{f=M+1}^N \left[ \gamma_{if}(4L\gamma_{\ell i}(\|\tilde{x}_\ell\|_\infty)) \right. \\ &\left. + \gamma_{if} \left( 4L\beta_i(2L\gamma_{\ell i}(\|\tilde{x}_\ell\|_\infty), 0) \right) \right] + \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{\ell i}(\|\tilde{x}_\ell\|_\infty) + \\ &\sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{f=M+1}^N \beta_f \left( 2L \left[ \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if}(2L\gamma_{\ell i}(\|\tilde{x}_\ell\|_\infty)) + \gamma_{\ell f}(\|\tilde{x}_\ell\|_\infty) \right], 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

### Proof of Proposition III.2

The proof follows the same lines as that of Proposition III.1. Note that every follower  $f$  is a perturbed system with exponentially stable nominal error dynamics having as a Lyapunov function:  $V_f = \tilde{x}_f^T P_f \tilde{x}_f$ . This implies that for  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ :

$$\|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| \leq \bar{\beta}_f \|\tilde{x}_f(0)\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_f]}} + \sum_{i=L+1}^M \bar{\gamma}_{if} \sup \|\tilde{x}_i\|. \quad (24)$$

Expressing (24) for the time intervals  $[0, \frac{t}{2}]$  and  $[\frac{t}{2}, t]$  and substituting we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| &\leq \bar{\beta}_f^2 \|\tilde{x}_f(0)\| e^{-\frac{3(1-\theta)t}{4\lambda_M[P_f]}} \\ &+ \sum_{i=L+1}^M \gamma_{if} \sup_{[\frac{t}{2}, t]} \|\tilde{x}_i\| + \bar{\beta}_f e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_f]}} \sum_{i=L+1}^M \bar{\gamma}_{if} \sup_{[0, \frac{t}{2}]} \|\tilde{x}_i\| \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=1}^L \gamma_{\ell f} \sup_{[\frac{t}{2}, t]} \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| + \bar{\beta}_f e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_f]}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f} \sup_{[0, \frac{t}{2}]} \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|. \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the error for agent  $i$  satisfies:

$$\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\| \leq \bar{\beta}_i \|\tilde{x}_i(0)\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_i]}} + \frac{2(\lambda_M[P_i])^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(\lambda_m[P_i])^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta} \sup \|\dot{x}_i^r\|.$$

By (1),  $\sup \|\dot{x}_i^r\| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|$  which allows us to obtain the bound:

$$\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\| \leq \bar{\beta}_i \|\tilde{x}_i(0)\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_i]}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|, \quad (26)$$

Equation (26) now yields the following bounds for the error of an agent  $i$ :

$$\sup_{[0, \frac{t}{2}]} \|\tilde{x}_i\| \leq \bar{\beta}_i \|\tilde{x}_i(0)\| + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \sup_{[0, \frac{t}{2}]} \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| \quad (27a)$$

$$\sup_{[\frac{t}{2}, t]} \|\tilde{x}_i\| \leq \bar{\beta}_i \|\tilde{x}_i(\frac{t}{2})\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{4\lambda_M[P_i]}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \sup_{[\frac{t}{2}, t]} \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|, \quad (27b)$$

which are then combined with (25) to produce:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| &\leq \bar{\beta}_f^2 e^{-\frac{3(1-\theta)t}{4\lambda_M[P_f]}} \|\tilde{x}_f(0)\| + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f} \sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| \\ &+ \sum_{i=L+1}^M \bar{\gamma}_{if} \left( \bar{\beta}_i \|\tilde{x}_i(\frac{t}{2})\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{4\lambda_M[P_i]}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \sup_{[\frac{t}{2}, t]} \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| \right) \\ &+ \bar{\beta}_f e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_f]}} \sum_{i=L+1}^M \bar{\gamma}_{if} \left( \bar{\beta}_i \|\tilde{x}_i(0)\| + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \sup_{[0, \frac{t}{2}]} \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| \right) \\ &+ \bar{\beta}_f e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_f]}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f} \sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\|, \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that for a linear  $\mathcal{K}$  class function  $\alpha(\cdot)$  it holds  $\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \alpha(x_1) + \dots + \alpha(x_n)$ . Using once again (26) for  $\|\tilde{x}_i(\frac{t}{2})\|$  we finally arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_f(t)\| &\leq \bar{\beta}_f^2 \|\tilde{x}_f(0)\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{2\lambda_M[P_f]}} + \\ &\sum_{i=L+1}^M \left[ \bar{\beta}_i \bar{\gamma}_{if} (\bar{\beta}_f \|\tilde{x}_i(0)\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{4\lambda_M[P_i]}} + \bar{\beta}_i \|\tilde{x}_i(0)\| e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)t}{4\lambda_M[P_i]}}) \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_{\ell=1}^L ((1 + \bar{\beta}_f) \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f} + (\bar{\beta}_f + \bar{\beta}_i + 1) \bar{\gamma}_{if} \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i}) \sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above with (26) and summing over  $f$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}(t)\| &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{f=M+1}^N \left\{ (1 + \bar{\beta}_f) \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f} + \right. \\ &\sum_{i=L+1}^M ((\bar{\beta}_f + \bar{\beta}_i + 1) \bar{\gamma}_{if} + 1) \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \left. \right\} \sup \|\tilde{x}_\ell\| \\ &+ \sum_{i=L+1}^M \sum_{f=M+1}^N (\bar{\beta}_f^2 + (\bar{\beta}_i + \bar{\beta}_f) \bar{\beta}_i \bar{\gamma}_{if} + \bar{\beta}_i) \|\tilde{x}(0)\| e^{-\mu t}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu = \frac{-(1-\theta)t}{2 \max\{\lambda_M[P_f], 2\lambda_M[P_i]\}}$ .

### Proof of Proposition IV.1

By definition, the LFS gains of the paths of length one are given in matrix form by  $B_1$  and  $G_1$ :

$$G_1 = G, \quad B_1 = B \quad (28a)$$

The gains in paths of length two ending at an agent  $f$  can be derived using (9):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f}^{(2)} &= \sum_{i \sim f} (\bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \bar{\gamma}_{if} \bar{\beta}_f + \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \bar{\gamma}_{if} + \bar{\gamma}_{\ell i} \bar{\beta}_i \bar{\gamma}_{if} + \bar{\gamma}_{if}) \\ &+ \bar{\gamma}_{\ell f} (1 + \bar{\beta}_f) \end{aligned} \quad (29a)$$

$$\bar{\beta}_f^{(2)} = \bar{\beta}_f^2 + \sum_{k \sim f} (\bar{\beta}_k + \bar{\beta}_i \bar{\gamma}_{if} + \bar{\beta}_i \bar{\gamma}_{if} \bar{\beta}_f). \quad (29b)$$

where  $\sim$  denotes vertex adjacency. Equations (29) can be written in matrix form:

$$G_2 = G(G_1 \circ B_1) + GG_1 + (G \circ B)G_1 + GA + G \circ (AB_1 + A^2) \quad (30a)$$

$$B_2 = A(B_1 \circ B_1) + BA + (B \circ B)G_1 + B(G_1 \circ B_1) \quad (30b)$$

where  $\circ$  denotes the Schur matrix product (also known as Harmand product) [39]. The Schur product is used to generate the terms  $\bar{\gamma}_{ij}\bar{\beta}_j$  and  $\bar{\beta}_i^2$  for an arbitrary  $i$ . The rightmost term in (29a) is related to the existence of paths of length two between two vertices in Figure 1 which are already connected with an edge. These are identified by the term  $G \circ (AB_1)$  as stated in the following Lemma:

**Lemma 1.** *The elements of the matrix  $A \circ A^2$  give the number of paths of length two between any two adjacent vertices.*

*Proof.* Matrix  $A^2$  has as elements the number of paths of length two between two vertices. On the other hand, the nonzero elements of the adjacency matrix,  $A$ , are in positions that correspond to edges in the graph. The Schur product  $A \circ A^2$  will therefore have nonzero elements only at positions that correspond to a pair of vertices that are connected both by an edge and by a path of length two. Further, since a nonzero element of  $A \circ A^2$  is given by  $[a_{ij}] \cdot [a_{ij}]^2 \neq 0$  and the first term,  $[a_{ij}] = 1$ , then necessarily  $[a_{ij}] \cdot [a_{ij}]^2 = [a_{ij}]^2 \neq 0$ .  $\square$

Multiplication by the adjacency matrix of the formation graph,  $A$ , shifts the gains of paths of length one from positions at rows  $f = M + 1, \dots, N$  to the corresponding positions of their leaders at positions in rows  $1, \dots, M$ , based on the fact that powers of the adjacency matrix provide the number of paths between two vertices of length equal to the exponent [35].

Equations (29) and (30) are based on combining the gains of agents  $f = M + 1, \dots, N$ , that is,  $\bar{\beta}_f$ ,  $\bar{\gamma}_{if}$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_{\ell f}$ , with those of their leaders,  $\bar{\beta}_i$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_{\ell i}$ . The idea now is to apply (30) recursively, starting from the agents at the end of the longest paths and moving towards the formation leaders. In each step, one needs to update the gains of the followers that correspond to positions  $f = M + 1, \dots, N$  in the graph of Figure 1, as the latter shifts up towards the formation leaders position. In (30), the gains of agents  $1, \dots, M$  are provided by  $B$  and  $\Gamma$ , whereas the gains of  $M + 1, \dots, N$  were computed in previous steps.

This is formalized with an induction argument. The induction step is as follows: assume that for some  $k < d \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 1$ , where  $d$  denotes the formation graph diameter, the gains of paths of length  $k - 1$  are given by matrices  $B_{k-1}$  and  $G_{k-1}$ . Since all paths of length  $k$  ending at an agent  $i$  have as a suffix a path of length  $k - 1$  ending at  $i$ , the former will be represented as paths of length two. Then, by (30), the gain matrices of paths of length  $k$  will be:

$$G_k = G(G_{k-1} \circ B_{k-1}) + GG_{k-1} + (G \circ B)G_{k-1} + GA^{k-1} + G \circ (AB_{k-1} + A^k) \quad (31)$$

$$B_k = A(B_{k-1} \circ B_{k-1}) + BA^{k-1} + (B \circ B)G_{k-1} + B(G_{k-1} \circ B_{k-1}). \quad (32)$$

In this way one can compute recursively all paths of length at most  $|\mathcal{V}| - 1$ . Since this is the maximal path length in any graph with  $|\mathcal{V}|$  vertices, the procedure is guaranteed to terminate.

*Proof of Proposition V.1*

Let the (13) be denoted for brevity as follows:

$$\dot{x} = f(x) + g(x)u \quad (33)$$

where the special ‘‘look ahead’’ structure of  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  is assumed. By definition, since the unforced (33) is asymptotically mesh stable, there exists a class- $\mathcal{KL}$  function  $\beta(r, t)$  such that:

$$\|x\| \leq \beta(\|x(0)\|, t), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

A converse Lyapunov argument for the unforced (33) establishes the existence of a Lyapunov function  $V(x)$ , such that for some class- $\mathcal{K}$  functions  $\alpha_1(\cdot)$ ,  $\alpha_2(\cdot)$ ,  $\alpha_3(\cdot)$ ,  $\alpha_4(\cdot)$ , it holds:

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|) \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}f(x) \leq -\alpha_3(\|x\|), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} \right\| \leq \alpha_4(\|x\|)$$

Then for (33) with  $u \neq 0$ , the Lyapunov function  $V$  will satisfy:

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} \right\| \leq \alpha_4(\|x\|) \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(f(x) + g(x)u) \\ \leq -\alpha_3(\|x\|) + \zeta(\|x\|)\alpha_4(\|x\|)\|u\|$$

From stability of perturbed system it follows that

$$\|x(t)\| \leq \beta(\|x\|(0), t) + \alpha_1^{-1}(\alpha_2(\alpha_3^{-1}(\kappa \sup \|u\|)))$$

where  $\kappa = \frac{\zeta(r)\alpha_4(r)}{\theta}$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ .