

# Resilient Synchronization of Heterogeneous Multi-agent Systems under Cyber-Physical Attacks

Hamidreza Modares, *Member, IEEE*, Aquib Mustafa, *Student Member, IEEE*, Rohollah Moghadam, *Student Member, IEEE*, Tamer Başar, *Life Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In this paper, we first address adverse effects of cyber-physical attacks on distributed synchronization of multi-agent systems, by providing necessary and sufficient conditions under which an attacker can destabilize the underlying network, as well as another set of necessary and sufficient conditions under which local neighborhood tracking errors of intact agents converge to zero. Based on this analysis, we propose a Kullback-Liebler divergence based criterion in view of which each agent detects its neighbors' misbehavior and, consequently, forms a self-belief about the trustworthiness of the information it receives. Agents continuously update their self-beliefs and communicate them with their neighbors to inform them of the significance of their outgoing information. Moreover, if the self-belief of an agent is low, it forms trust on its neighbors. Agents incorporate their neighbors' self-beliefs and their own trust values on their control protocols to slow down and mitigate attacks. We show that using the proposed resilient approach, an agent discards the information it receives from a neighbor only if its neighbor is compromised, and not solely based on the discrepancy among neighbors' information, which might be caused by legitimate changes, and not attacks. The proposed approach is guaranteed to work under mild connectivity assumptions.

**Index Terms**—Distributed control, Resilient Control, Attack Analysis, Multi-agent systems, Cyber-physical Systems.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The term cyber-physical system (CPS) refers to a relatively new generation of systems that integrate the cyber aspect of computation and communication with physical processes. Depending on the control objectives, CPSs can be categorized into two classes. In the first class, called single-agent networked control systems (NCSs), the CPS is a single but large-scale distributed system, wherein sensors, actuators, and controllers are distributed across the system, and centrally controlled control loops are closed over a real-time communication network [1]–[4]. The global objective in a NCS is generally to assure that the output of the system tracks a desired trajectory. In the second class, called multi-agent CPS, the CPS is comprised of a set of dynamical systems

or agents that interact with each other over a communication network to achieve coordinated operation and behavior [5]–[8]. Despite their numerous applications in a variety of disciplines, CPSs are vulnerable to attacks, which is the main drawback in their wide deployment. In contrast to other undesirable inputs, such as disturbances and noises, cyber-physical attacks are intentionally planned to maximize the damage to the overall system or even destabilize it.

There has been extensive research progress in developing attack detection/identification and mitigation approaches for both single-agent NCSs [9]–[16] and multi-agent CPSs [17]–[29]. Despite tremendous and welcoming progress, most of the mentioned mitigation approaches for multi-agent CPSs use the discrepancy among agents and their neighbors to detect and mitigate the effect of an attack. However, as shown in this paper, a stealthy attack can make all agents become unstable simultaneously, and thus misguide existing mitigation approaches. Moreover, this discrepancy could be caused by a legitimate change in the state of an agent, and rejecting this useful information can decrease the speed of convergence to the desired consensus and harm connectivity of the network.

In this paper, we present attack analysis, detection, and mitigation mechanisms for distributed multi-agent CPSs with linear structures. We show that local neighborhood tracking errors of intact agents converge to zero, regardless of the attack, if and only if the eigenvalues of the attacker signal generator dynamics matrix are a subset of the eigenvalues of the consensus dynamics matrix. We call these types of attacks internal model principle (IMP)-based attacks. In spite of convergence to zero of local neighborhood tracking errors, the overall network could be destabilized, and we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for this. We then develop attack detectors that identify both IMP-based and non-IMP-based attacks. To detect IMP-based attacks, two local error sequences with folded Gaussian distributions are introduced based on the relative information of the agents. We show that they diverge under an IMP-based attack. A Kullback-Liebler (KL) divergence criterion is then introduced to measure the divergence between these two univariate folded Gaussian distributions, and consequently capture IMP-based attacks. Similarly, since non-IMP based attacks change the statistical properties of the local neighborhood tracking error, to detect non-IMP-based attacks, the KL divergence is employed to measure the discrepancy between the Gaussian distributions of the actual and nominal expected local neighborhood tracking errors. Then, a self-belief value, as an indication of the probability of presence of attacks on neighbors of an agent,

This research is supported in part by Office of Naval Research (ONR) MURI Grant N00014-16-1-2710, and in part by US Army Research Office (ARO) Grant W911NF-16-1-0485.

Hamidreza Modares and Aquib Mustafa are with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48823 USA

Rohollah Moghadam is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla, MO 65409 USA

Tamer Başar is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Coordinated Science Laboratory, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801 USA (e-mails: moghadamr@mst.edu, a.mustafa@mst.edu, modares@mst.edu, basar1@illinois.edu).

is presented for each agent by combining these two KL-based detectors. The self-belief indicates the level of trustworthiness of the agent's own outgoing information, and is transmitted to its neighbors. Furthermore, when the self-belief of an agent is low, the trustworthiness of its incoming information from its neighbors is estimated using a particular notion of trust. Trust for each individual neighbor is developed based on the relative entropy between each individual neighbor's information and its own information. Finally, by incorporating neighbor's self-belief and trust values, we propose modified weighted control protocols to ensure mitigation of both types of attacks. Simulation results validate the effectiveness of the presented resilient approach.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

A directed graph (digraph)  $\mathcal{G}$  consists of a pair  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  in which  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$  is a set of nodes and  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  is a set of edges. We denote the directed link (edge) from  $v_j$  to  $v_i$  by the ordered pair  $(v_j, v_i)$ . The adjacency matrix is defined as  $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}]$ , with  $a_{ij} > 0$  if  $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ , and  $a_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. The nodes in the set  $\mathcal{N}_i = \{v_j : (v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$  are said to be neighbors of node  $v_i$ . The graph Laplacian matrix is defined as  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{A}$ , where  $\mathcal{D} = \text{diag}(d_i)$  is the in-degree matrix, with  $d_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}$  as the weighted in-degree of node  $v_i$ . A node is called as a *root node* if it can reach all other nodes of the digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  through a directed path. A leader is a root node with no incoming link. A (directed) tree is a connected digraph where every node except one, called the root, has in-degree equal to one. A spanning tree of a digraph is a directed tree formed by graph edges that connects all the nodes of the graph. If the topology of the graph changes over time, e.g., links are added or removed, then we write the time-varying graph as  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}(t))$  with  $\mathcal{E}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  representing the set of time-varying edges.

Throughout the paper, we denote the set of integers by  $\mathbb{Z}$ . The set of integers greater than or equal to some integer  $q \in \mathbb{Z}$  is denoted  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq q}$ . The cardinality of a set  $S$  is denoted by  $|S|$ .  $\lambda(A)$  and  $\text{tr}(A)$  denote, respectively, the eigenvalues and trace of the matrix  $A$ . The Kronecker product of matrices  $A$  and  $B$  is denoted by  $A \otimes B$ , and  $\text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_n)$  represents a block diagonal matrix with matrices  $A_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  as its diagonal entries.  $\mathbf{1}_N$  is the  $N$ -vector of ones and  $\mathbf{I}_N$  is the  $N \times N$  identity matrix.  $\text{Im}(R)$  and  $\text{ker}(R)$  represent, respectively, the range space and the null space of  $R$ , and  $\text{span}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  is the set of all linear combinations of the vectors  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ . A Gaussian distribution with mean  $\mu$  and covariance  $\Sigma$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{FN}(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\sigma}^2)$  represents univariate folded Gaussian distribution with  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}^2$  as mean and variance, respectively [30].  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation operator.

**Assumption 1.** The communication graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is directed and has a spanning tree.

**Definition 1 (Intact Agent).** Agents that are not directly under attack are called intact agents.  $\square$

**Definition 2 (Compromised Agent).** Agents that are directly under attack are called compromised agents.  $\square$

**Definition 3 [31].** A square matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is called a singular M-matrix, if all its off-diagonal elements are non-positive and all eigenvalues of  $A$  have non-negative real parts.  $\square$

**Definition 4 [31].** A square matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is called a non-singular M-matrix, if all its off-diagonal elements are non-positive and all eigenvalues of  $A$  have positive real parts.  $\square$

**Definition 5 (r-reachable set) [32].** Given a directed graph  $\mathcal{G}$  and a nonempty subset  $\mathcal{V}_s \subset \mathcal{V}$ , the set  $\mathcal{V}_s$  is r-reachable if there exists a node  $i \in \mathcal{V}_s$  such that  $|\mathcal{N}_i \setminus \mathcal{V}_s| \geq r$ , where  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 6 (r-robust graph) [32].** A directed graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is called an r-robust graph with  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  if for every pair of nonempty, disjoint subsets of  $\mathcal{V}$ , at least one of the subsets is r-reachable.  $\square$

**Lemma 1 [31].** The graph Laplacian matrix  $\mathcal{L}$  of a directed graph  $\mathcal{G}$  has at least one zero eigenvalue and all nonzero eigenvalues have positive real parts. Zero is a simple eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}$ , if and only if Assumption 1 is satisfied.

## III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, the output synchronization problem for multi-agent CPSs is presented. Both leader-follower and leaderless multi-agent systems are considered.

Consider a group of  $N$  linear heterogeneous agents with dynamics described by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i(t) = A_i x_i(t) + B_i u_i(t) \\ y_i(t) = C_i x_i(t) \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (1)$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ ,  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$  denote, respectively, the state, the control input and the output of agent  $i$ . The matrices  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ ,  $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m_i}$  and  $C_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n_i}$  are, respectively, the drift dynamics, the input matrix and the output matrix. The pair  $(A_i, B_i)$  is assumed to be stabilizable and the pair  $(A_i, C_i)$  is assumed to be observable,  $\forall i = 1, \dots, N$ .

Assume now that the consensus trajectory is generated by dynamics

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_c(t) = S x_c(t) \\ y_c(t) = R x_c(t) \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $x_c \in \mathbb{R}^q$  and  $y_c \in \mathbb{R}^p$  are, respectively, the state and output of the desired consensus trajectory. Moreover,  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  denote, respectively, the drift and the output matrices of the consensus dynamics. The pair  $(S, R)$  is assumed to be observable.

**Assumption 2.** The consensus dynamics matrix  $S$  is marginally stable and is known to all the agents.

**Remark 1.** Note that if  $S$  is Hurwitz, the synchronization problem has a trivial solution and can be solved by making the dynamics of each agent stable independently. Moreover, stable eigenvalues of  $S$ , if there are any, can be ignored by reducing the dimension of  $S$ , because they only contribute to the transient response of the consensus trajectories [33]. Note also that it is a standard assumption that the consensus dynamics  $S$  in (2) is known to all agents [34]. For example, in case of frequency synchronization in power networks [35] and velocity synchronization in a group of robots [6], it is

known to all agents that the desired trajectory is a constant, i.e.,  $S = 0$ , but the consensus value is not known to all agents. As another example, in case of synchronization of oscillators [36], all that is known to all agents is that the desired trajectory is sinusoidal, but its amplitude is not known to them.

**Remark 2.** In the case of leader-follower multi-agent systems, the consensus dynamics (2) is in fact the leader dynamics, which generates the desired consensus trajectory. The leader is only pinned to a small subset of agents and thus not all agents have direct access to the state or output of the leader. In the case of the leaderless multi-agent CPSs, the agents communicate through a directed graph to reach a common value of interest, which is not known to any of the agents a priori and depends on the initial state of the root nodes.

We now formulate the problem of output synchronization of multi-agent CPSs. To this end, the output synchronization error is defined as

$$e_i(t) = y_i(t) - y_c(t) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N \quad (3)$$

with  $y_i$  defined in (1) and  $y_c$  defined in (2).

**Problem 1 (Output Synchronization).** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1) with the consensus dynamics (2). Design a local control protocol  $u_i$  in (1) such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e_i(t) = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N \quad (4)$$

To demonstrate the broadness of our analysis, a general control protocol is considered for solving Problem 1, given as

$$\dot{\zeta}_i = S\zeta_i + \mu\eta_i \quad (5)$$

$$u_i = K_i x_i + \Gamma_i \zeta_i \quad (6)$$

where  $\zeta_i$  is the internal state of the dynamic controller,  $S$  is the consensus dynamics defined in (2), and  $K_i, \Gamma_i$  and  $\mu$  are design matrices with appropriate dimensions. Moreover,  $\eta_i$  denotes the local neighborhood tracking error given by

$$\eta_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) \quad (7)$$

with  $h_j$  as the data exchanged among agents (e.g. the internal state of agents [34], the actual state [37] or the output [38], [39] of agents).

**Remark 3.** Note that the design of the control gains in (5)-(6) is not addressed in this paper. We assume here that these gains have already been designed appropriately to guarantee synchronization in the absence of attacks, and instead analyze the effect of attacks on the network performance and propose mitigation methods. Still, we briefly discuss below a solution to Problem 1 as provided in [34]. To solve Problem 1, the controller  $u_i$  in (6) and the local neighborhood tracking error in (7) are given in [34] as

$$\begin{cases} u_i = K_{i1} (x_i - \Pi_i \zeta_i) + \Gamma_{i1} \zeta_i \\ \eta_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (\zeta_j - \zeta_i) \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where  $\zeta_i$  evolves according to (5) and  $K_{i1}$  is designed such that  $A_i + B_i K_{i1}$  is Hurwitz and,  $\Pi_i$  and  $\Gamma_{i1}$  are solutions to the following linear matrix equations

$$\begin{cases} A_i \Pi_i + B_i \Gamma_{i1} = \Pi_i S \\ C_i \Pi_i = R \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where  $S$  and  $R$  are defined in (2). Necessary and sufficient condition for solving Problem 1 is the existence of a solution to (9) [34].

**Remark 4.** The general control protocol (5)-(6) covers many of the existing control protocols for multi-agent CPSs with possibly different forms of data exchange. For instance, in [34], [40], data exchanged in (7) is considered as the internal state of the controller, i.e.,  $h_j = \zeta_j$ . In [38], for the case of leader-follower systems, the relative output measurement is exchanged among agents and, therefore,  $h_j = y_j$ . Moreover, homogeneous multi-agent CPSs can also be modeled as (5), which is the main equation for attack analysis and detection, as to be shown later. Note that, for a homogeneous system, one has  $A_i = S$ ,  $B_i = B$  and  $C_i = R$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and thus the dynamics of agent  $i$  becomes

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i(t) = S x_i(t) + B u_i(t) \\ y_i(t) = R x_i(t) \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The controller is designed as  $u_i = cK \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (x_j - x_i)$  [41], and thus the dynamics of an agent combined with its controller reduces to

$$\dot{x}_i = S x_i + cBK \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (x_j - x_i) \quad (11)$$

which is the same as (5) with  $\zeta_i$  replaced with the state of the agent, i.e.,  $x_i$ ,  $\mu = cBK$  and  $h_i = x_i$  in (7) [31], [41].

**Remark 5.** In the presence of communication noise, the local neighborhood tracking error (7) for agent  $i$  becomes

$$\eta_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) + \omega_i \quad (12)$$

where  $\omega_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\omega_i})$  denotes the aggregate Gaussian noise affecting the incoming information to agent  $i$  and is given as

$$\omega_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} \omega_{ij} \quad (13)$$

with  $\omega_{ij}$  the incoming communication noise from agent  $j$  to agent  $i$ . In such situations, although agents cannot reach exact synchronization, the expected value of the synchronization error converges to zero with a variance depending on the variance of  $\omega_i$  (i.e., it depends on the statistical properties of the noise).

We now argue that we can take equation (5) as the main one in our analysis and mitigation. This is because,  $y_i - y_j \rightarrow 0$  if and only if  $\zeta_i - \zeta_j \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, if the discrepancy between agents' internal states in (5) does not vanish, they will not reach synchronization. This is obvious for the case of homogeneous multi-agent CPSs (see (11)) for which  $h_i = x_i$ . It is also evident for the case of leader-follower systems with  $h_i = y_i$ . For the case in which  $h_i = \zeta_i$ , the following theorem proves this fact. Therefore, in the rest of the paper, most of

our analysis is performed on analyzing the effect of attack on (5) and it is also assumed that  $h_i = \zeta_i$  for simplicity.

**Lemma 2.** [42] Consider the following system

$$\dot{x}(t) = \varepsilon Fx(t) + f_1(t) \quad (14)$$

where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is Hurwitz,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $f_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded and continuous for all  $t \geq 0$ . Then,  $x(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $f_1(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  (exponentially), for any  $x(t_0)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Theorem 1.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) with the controller (5)-(7). Then,  $y_i - y_j \rightarrow 0$  if and only if  $\zeta_i - \zeta_j \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.* Note that for heterogeneous agents, the controller (6) reduces to (8)-(9), as stated in Remark 2. It was shown in [34] that agents reach output synchronization if and only if  $x_i \rightarrow \Pi_i \zeta_i$ , where  $\Pi_i$  is defined in (9). To proceed, define the tracking error as  $\phi_i = x_i - \Pi_i \zeta_i$ . With the aid of (1), (5)-(7) and (8)-(9), the dynamics of tracking error  $\phi_i$  can be written as

$$\dot{\phi}_i = (A_i + B_i K_{i1}) \phi_i - \mu \Pi_i \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (\zeta_j - \zeta_i) \quad (15)$$

To guarantee synchronization, the tracking error (15) should converge to zero asymptotically. As shown in [34],  $K_{i1}$  is designed such that  $A_i + B_i K_{i1}$  is Hurwitz. Therefore, based on Lemma 2,  $\phi_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $\zeta_j - \zeta_i \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore,  $\zeta_j - \zeta_i \rightarrow 0$  provides the necessary condition for  $y_i - y_j \rightarrow 0$ . If  $\zeta_j \not\rightarrow \zeta_i$ , then  $x_i \not\rightarrow \Pi_i \zeta_i$  and, consequently,  $y_i - y_j \not\rightarrow 0$ . This proves the sufficient condition, and therefore completes the proof.  $\square$

#### IV. ATTACK MODELLING AND ANALYSIS

In this section, CPS attacks on agents are modelled and a complete attack analysis is performed.

##### A. Attack Modelling

In this subsection, attacks on multi-agent CPSs are modelled. Generally, the attacker injects a disrupted signal to corrupt the data exchanged among agents. Since in the control protocol (5)-(6) for the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2), only  $h_i$  in (7) is exchanged among agents, *direct attacks* on agent  $i$  can be modelled as

$$h_i^c = h_i + \alpha_i h_i^d \quad (16)$$

where  $h_i$ ,  $h_i^d$  and  $h_i^c$  denote, respectively, the nominal values of the exchanged information in (7), the disrupted signal injected into agent  $i$ , and the corrupted value of the transmitted information of agent  $i$ . If agent  $i$  is under attack,  $\alpha_i = 1$ , otherwise  $\alpha_i = 0$ . Agent  $i$  could also be affected by attacks indirectly, e.g., receiving corrupted information from its neighbors. To model the *overall attack* on agent  $i$ , using (16) and (7), (5) becomes

$$\dot{\zeta}_i = S \zeta_i + \mu \eta_i + \mu f_i \quad (17)$$

where  $f_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (\alpha_j h_j^d)$  is the *overall attack* affecting the agent  $i$ . If the exchanged information is the internal state of the controller, i.e.,  $h_j = \zeta_j$  in (7), then one has

$$f_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (\alpha_j \zeta_j^d) \quad (18)$$

with  $\zeta_j^d$  the attack signal on the outgoing communication link of agent  $j$ .

**Definition 7 (IMP-based and non-IMP-based Attacks).** Let the attack signal  $f$  in (17) be generated by

$$\dot{f} = \Psi f \quad (19)$$

where  $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  denotes the dynamics of the attack signal. Define

$$\begin{cases} E_\Psi = \{\lambda_1(\Psi), \dots, \lambda_k(\Psi)\} \\ E_S = \{\lambda_1(S), \dots, \lambda_q(S)\} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where  $\lambda_i(\Psi) \forall i = 1, \dots, k$  and  $\lambda_i(S) \forall i = 1, \dots, q$  are, respectively, the set of eigenvalues of the attack signal generator dynamics matrix  $\Psi$  and the consensus dynamics matrix  $S$ , respectively. Then, if  $E_\Psi \subseteq E_S$ , the attack signal is called the internal model principle (IMP)-based attack. Otherwise, i.e.,  $E_\Psi \not\subseteq E_S$  or if the attacker has no dynamics (e.g. a random signal), it is called a non-IMP based attack.  $\square$

**Remark 6.** Note that we do not impose any limitations on the attack signal. Attacks are placed into two classes in Definition 7 based on their impact on the system performance, as to be shown in the subsequent sections. The non-IMP based attacks cover a broad range of attacks.

Based on (17), the global form of the controller (5)-(6) under attack can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\zeta} = (I_N \otimes S) \zeta + \mu \varepsilon \\ u = Kx + \Gamma \zeta \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is the overall disrupted disagreement among agents, i.e.,  $\varepsilon = [\varepsilon_1^T, \dots, \varepsilon_N^T]^T$  given by

$$\varepsilon = (-\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \zeta + f \quad (22)$$

where  $f = [f_1^T, \dots, f_N^T]^T$  is the overall vector of attacks on agents and  $\mathcal{L}$  is the graph Laplacian matrix. Moreover,  $u = [u_1^T, \dots, u_N^T]^T$ ,  $\zeta = [\zeta_1^T, \dots, \zeta_N^T]^T$ , and  $x = [x_1^T, \dots, x_N^T]^T$  are, respectively, the global vectors of the control inputs, the internal states of the controller and the states of agents, and  $K = \text{diag}(K_1, \dots, K_N)$ ,  $\Gamma = \text{diag}(\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_N)$ .

##### B. Attack Analysis

In this subsection, a graph theoretic-based approach is utilized to analyze the effect of attacks on the output synchronization of heterogeneous multi-agent CPSs. To this end, the following definitions and lemmas are used.

Let the graph Laplacian matrix  $\mathcal{L}$  be partitioned as

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_{r \times r} & 0_{r \times nr} \\ \mathcal{L}_{nr \times r} & \mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where  $r$  and  $nr$  in (23) denote, respectively, the number of root nodes and non-root nodes. Moreover,  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr}$  are, respectively, the sub-graph matrices corresponding to the sub-graphs of root nodes and non-root nodes.

**Lemma 3.** Consider the partitioned graph Laplacian matrix (23). Then,  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  is a singular M-matrix and  $\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr}$  is a non-singular M-matrix.

*Proof.* We first prove that the subgraph of root nodes is strongly connected. According to the definition of a root node,

there always exists a directed path from a root node to all other nodes of the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , including other root nodes. Therefore, in the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , there always exists a path from each root node to all other root nodes. We now show that removing non-root nodes from the graph  $\mathcal{G}$  does not affect the connectivity of the subgraph comprised of only root nodes. In the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , if a non-root node is not an incoming neighbor of a root node, then its removal does not harm the connectivity of the subgraph of the root nodes. Suppose that removing a non-root node affects the connectivity of the subgraph of root nodes. This requires the non-root node to be an incoming neighbor of a root node. However, this makes the removed node a root node, as it can now access all other nodes through the root node it is connected to. Hence, this argument shows that the subgraph of root nodes is always strongly connected. Then,  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$ , has zero as one of its eigenvalues, which implies that  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  is a singular M-matrix according to Definition 3. On the other hand, from (23), since  $\mathcal{L}$  is a lower triangular matrix, the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}$  are the union of the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr}$ . Moreover, as stated in Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{L}$  has a simple zero eigenvalue and, as shown above, zero is the eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$ . Therefore, all eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr}$  have positive real parts, and thus based on Definition 4,  $\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr}$  is a non-singular M-matrix.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) under attack with the controller (6), (17). Assume that

$$f(t) \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \quad \forall t \quad (24)$$

with  $f(t)$  defined in (22) as the overall attack. Then,  $\zeta_i \forall i$  reaches a steady state, i.e.,  $\zeta_i \rightarrow S \zeta_i$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, the agents' states also reach a steady state given by

$$x_i \rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^q e^{\lambda_k(S)t} \delta_{ik} \quad (25)$$

for some  $\delta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $\lambda_k(S)$  the eigenvalues of  $S$  in the consensus dynamics (2).

*Proof.* From the global dynamics of the controller (21), the disrupted disagreement  $\varepsilon$  in (22) vanishes and, consequently, the internal state of the controller  $\zeta$  reaches a steady state, i.e.,  $\zeta \rightarrow (I_N \otimes S) \zeta$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , if  $(-\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \zeta + f(t)$  goes to zero. This condition is satisfied if there exists a bounded steady state solution  $\zeta$  such that  $(-\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \zeta = -f(t)$ . That is,  $f(t) \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \forall t$ . On the other hand, when the disagreement in (22) vanishes, i.e.,  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , then using (1) with the dynamic controller in (21), one can write the state of agent  $i$  as

$$x_i(t) = e^{A_c t} x_i(0) + \int_0^t e^{A_c(t-\tau)} (B_i \Gamma_i) e^{S \tau} \zeta_i(0) d\tau \quad (26)$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $A_c = A_i + B_i K_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Since  $K_i$  is designed such that  $A_c$  becomes Hurwitz [34], as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , then using modal decomposition one gets (25). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 7.** The condition (24) plays an important role in the analysis to follow. We will show that if this condition is violated, an IMP-based attack can make the entire system unstable. On the other hand, if this condition is satisfied, an

IMP-based attack makes agents reach a steady state with zero local neighborhood tracking error, while they are far from synchronization. Conditions under which the local neighborhood tracking error of agents does not converge to zero in the presence of the attack are also found based on (24). These results are then used to detect and mitigate both IMP-based and non-IMP based attacks in the subsequent sections.

**Corollary 1.** If condition (24) is not satisfied, then agents do not reach a steady state as long as the attack signal is nonzero.

*Proof.* The proof follows Lemma 4.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) along with the controller (6), (17), under a non-IMP based attack. Then, (24) cannot be satisfied.

*Proof.* We prove this result by contradiction. Let  $E_\Psi \not\subseteq E_S$ , but  $f(t) \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , which implies that there exists a nonzero bounded vector  $\zeta$  such that  $(-\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \zeta + f(t) \rightarrow 0$ . This then says that the internal state of the controller (21) reaches a steady state and thus  $\dot{\zeta}_i \rightarrow S \zeta_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Using the modal decomposition, one has

$$\zeta_i(t) \rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^q (r_j \zeta_i(0)) e^{\lambda_j(S)t} m_j \quad (27)$$

where  $r_j$  and  $m_j$  denote, respectively, the left and right eigenvectors associated with the eigenvalue  $\lambda_j(S)$ . On the other hand,  $(-\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \zeta + f(t) \rightarrow 0$  yields

$$\sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (\zeta_j - \zeta_i) \rightarrow -f_i(t) \quad (28)$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . As shown in (27), the left-hand side of (28) is generated by the natural modes of the consensus dynamics whereas the right-hand side is generated by the natural modes of the attack signal generator dynamics in (19). By the prior assumption,  $E_\Psi \not\subseteq E_S$ , the attacker's natural modes are different from those of the consensus dynamics. Therefore, (28) cannot be satisfied which contradicts the assumption. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Note that for notational simplicity, we use  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  throughout the paper, in place of  $f(t) \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q) \forall t > 0$ .

**Lemma 6.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) along with the controller (6), (17), where the attack signal  $f$  is injected only into non-root nodes, i.e.,  $f = [0_r, \bar{f}_{nr}^T]^T$ . If  $E_\Psi \subseteq E_S$  where  $E_\Psi$  and  $E_S$  are defined in (20), then,  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ .

*Proof.* It was shown in Lemma 4 that if  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , then agents reach a steady state. That is,  $\dot{\zeta}_s \rightarrow (I_N \otimes S) \zeta_s$ , where  $\zeta_s$  can be represented as the steady state of the internal state of all agents. This implies that  $\zeta_i(t) \rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^q (r_j \zeta_i(0)) e^{\lambda_j(S)t} m_j$  where  $r_j$  and  $m_j$  denote, respectively, the left and right eigenvectors associated with the eigenvalue  $\lambda_j(S)$  of the consensus dynamics matrix  $S$ . Define  $\zeta_s = [\bar{\zeta}_{rs}^T, \bar{\zeta}_{nr}^T]^T$ , where  $\bar{\zeta}_{rs}$  and  $\bar{\zeta}_{nr}$  are, respectively, the global steady states of root nodes and non-root nodes. Using (23) and  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , one has

$$\begin{cases} (\mathcal{L}_{r \times r} \otimes I_q) \bar{\zeta}_{rs} = 0 \\ (\mathcal{L}_{nr \times r} \otimes I_q) \bar{\zeta}_{rs} + (\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr} \otimes I_q) \bar{\zeta}_{nr} = \bar{f}_{nr} \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

where  $\bar{f}_{nr} = [f_{r+1}^T, \dots, f_N^T]^T$  represents the attack on non-root nodes. As stated in Lemma 3,  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  is a singular M-matrix with zero as an eigenvalue and  $\mathbf{1}_r$  is its corresponding right eigenvector and, thus, the solution to the first equation of (29) becomes  $\bar{\zeta}_{rs} = c_1 \mathbf{1}_r$ . Therefore, from (29), the global vector of the steady state value of non-root nodes can be written as

$$\bar{\zeta}_{nr} = (\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr} \otimes I_q)^{-1} [-(\mathcal{L}_{nr \times r} \otimes I_q) c_1 \mathbf{1}_r + \bar{f}_{nr}] \quad (30)$$

for some positive scalar  $c_1$ . Based on Lemma 3,  $\mathcal{L}_{nr \times nr}$  is a non-singular M-matrix and this implies that (30) always has a solution. However, it was shown in Lemma 5 that if  $E_\Psi \not\subseteq E_S$ , then condition in (24) cannot be satisfied. Therefore, one can conclude that for any  $f = [0_r, \bar{f}_{nr}^T]^T$ , there exists a solution  $\zeta_s$  such that  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  if and only if  $E_\Psi \subseteq E_S$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

The following theorem provides necessary and sufficient conditions for IMP-based attacks to assure  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ .

**Theorem 2.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) along with the controller (6), (17), where the attack signal  $f$  is generated based on an IMP-based attack, i.e.,  $E_\Psi \subseteq E_S$ . Then,  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  if and only if the attack signals satisfy

$$\sum_{k=1}^N p_k f_k = 0 \quad (31)$$

where  $p_k$  are the nonzero elements of the left eigenvector of the graph Laplacian matrix  $\mathcal{L}$  associated with its zero eigenvalue.

*Proof.* It was shown in the Lemma 6 that for the IMP-based attacks on non-root nodes, i.e.,  $f = [0_r, \bar{f}_{nr}^T]^T$ ,  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  regardless of  $\bar{f}_{nr}$ . Therefore, whether  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  is satisfied or not depends solely upon attacks on root nodes, i.e.,  $\bar{f}_r = [f_1^T, \dots, f_r^T]^T$ . Now, we first prove the necessary condition for root nodes. If  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , then, using (23), there exists a nonzero vector  $\bar{\zeta}_{rs}$  for root nodes such that

$$(\mathcal{L}_{r \times r} \otimes I_q) \bar{\zeta}_{rs} = \bar{f}_r \quad (32)$$

where  $\bar{\zeta}_{rs}$  can be considered as the global steady state of the root nodes. Moreover, based on Lemma 5, (32) holds, if and only if  $E_\Psi \subseteq E_S$ . As stated in Lemma 3,  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  is a strongly connected graph of root nodes and, therefore, it is a singular M-matrix. Let  $\bar{w}^T = [p_1, \dots, p_r]$  be the left eigenvector associated with the zero eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$ . Now, pre-multiplying both sides of (32) by  $\bar{w}^T$  and using the fact that  $\bar{w}^T \mathcal{L}_{r \times r} = 0$  yield

$$\bar{w}^T (\mathcal{L}_{r \times r} \otimes I_q) \bar{\zeta}_{rs} = \bar{w}^T \bar{f}_r = 0 \quad (33)$$

This states that IMP-based attacks on root nodes have to satisfy  $\sum_{k=1}^N p_k f_k = 0$  to guarantee  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ . Note that  $p_k = 0$  for  $k = r + 1, \dots, N$ , i.e., the elements of the left eigenvector of the graph Laplacian matrix  $\mathcal{L}$ , corresponding to its zero eigenvalue, are zero for non-root nodes [41], [43]. This proves the necessity part.

Now, we prove the sufficient part by contradiction for root nodes. Assume  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , but  $\sum_{k=1}^N p_k f_k \neq 0$ . Note that,  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  implies that there exists a nonzero vector  $\bar{\zeta}_{rs}$  such

that (32) holds. Using (33) and  $\sum_{k=1}^N p_k f_k \neq 0$ , one can conclude that  $\bar{w}^T (\mathcal{L}_{r \times r} \otimes I_q) \bar{\zeta}_{rs} \neq 0$ . This can happen only when  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  does not have any zero eigenvalue, which violates the fact in Lemma 3 that  $\mathcal{L}_{r \times r}$  is a strongly connected graph. Therefore,  $\bar{w}^T (\mathcal{L}_{r \times r} \otimes I_q) \bar{\zeta}_{rs} = 0$  which results in  $\sum_{k=1}^N p_k f_k = 0$  and contradicts the assumption made. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) along with the controller (6), (17), and assume that attacks are on root nodes. Then, the output of all agents diverge to infinity, i.e.,  $y_i \rightarrow \infty \forall i = 1, \dots, N$ , if and only if  $E_\Psi \cap E_S \neq \emptyset$  and (24) is not satisfied.

*Proof.* Since it is assumed that the condition in (24) is not satisfied, the disrupted disagreement  $\varepsilon$  in (22) and, consequently, the attack signal  $f$  does not vanish over time based on Corollary 1 and eventually acts as an input to the internal state of the dynamic controller (21). Assume that there exists at least one common eigenvalue between the consensus dynamics matrix  $S$  in (2) and the attacker dynamics matrix  $\Psi$  in (19), i.e.,  $E_\Psi \cap E_S \neq \emptyset$ . Based on Assumption 2, the consensus dynamics is marginally stable and since the attacker dynamics has common eigenvalues with the consensus dynamics, the multiplicity of at least one marginally stable pole becomes greater than 1. Therefore, the attacker destabilizes the internal state of the dynamic controller  $u$  in (21). Moreover, since the attack is on root nodes, and root nodes have a path to all other nodes in the network, the internal state of the controller of all agents converge to infinity as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This results in an unbounded control input  $u$  in (21) for all agents which makes the state and, thereby, the output of all agents unstable as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Note that in Theorem 3, even if  $f(t) \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  only for a finite time  $0 < t < t_f$  with  $t_f$  sufficiently large, the agent's state will significantly grow, as the entire network is unstable, and the agents cannot recover.

**Remark 8.** For the case of IMP-based attacks, i.e.,  $E_\Psi \subseteq E_S$ , the condition  $E_\Psi \cap E_S \neq \emptyset$  is always satisfied. Moreover,  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$  does not hold if condition (31) is not satisfied. Therefore, for an IMP-based attack, the output of all agents tend to infinity only if condition (31) is not satisfied.

Theorem 4 below now shows that despite IMP-based attacks, if  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , the local neighborhood tracking error (7) converges to zero for intact agents that have a path to the compromised agent, while they do not synchronize.

**Theorem 4.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) along with the controller (6), (17). Then, the local neighborhood tracking error (7) converges to zero for all intact agents if and only if  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ . Moreover, intact agents that are reachable from the compromised agents do not converge to the desired consensus trajectory.

*Proof.* In the presence of attacks, the global form of the internal state of the dynamic controller (17) can be written as

$$\dot{\zeta} = (I_N \otimes S) \zeta + \mu (\eta + f) \quad (34)$$

where  $\zeta = [\zeta_1^T, \dots, \zeta_N^T]^T$  is the global vector of the internal state of agents,  $\eta = [\eta_1^T, \dots, \eta_N^T]^T$  is the global vector of the local neighborhood tracking error (7) and  $f = [f_1^T, \dots, f_N^T]^T$  denotes the global vector of attacks. It was shown in Lemma 4 that if  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , agents reach a steady state, i.e.,  $\eta + f \rightarrow 0$ . That is,

$$\eta_i \rightarrow -f_i \quad (35)$$

$\forall$  agents  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . For the intact agent, by definition one has  $f_i = 0$ , and thus (35) implies that the local neighborhood tracking error (7) converges to zero. Now, we show that intact agents which are reachable from the compromised agent do not synchronize to the desired consensus. To do this, let agent  $j$  be under attack. Assuming that all intact agents synchronize, one has  $\zeta_k = \zeta_i \forall i, k \in \{1, \dots, N\} - \{j\}$ . Now, consider the intact agent  $i$  as an immediate neighbor of the compromised agent  $j$ . Then, from  $f \in \text{Im}(\mathcal{L} \otimes I_q)$ , for intact agent  $i$ , i.e.,  $f_i = 0$ , one has

$$\sum_{k \in N_i - \{j\}} a_{ij}(\zeta_k - \zeta_i) + (\zeta_j - \zeta_i) \rightarrow 0 \quad (36)$$

where  $\zeta_k$  denotes the internal state of the dynamic controller of all intact neighbors of agent  $i$ . On the other hand, (17) shows that the internal state of the dynamic controller of the compromised agent  $j$ , i.e.,  $\zeta_j$ , is deviated from the desired value with a value proportional to  $f_j$ . Therefore, (36) results in deviating the internal state of the dynamic controller of the immediate neighbor of the compromised agent  $j$  from the consensus trajectory, which contradicts the assumption. Consequently, intact agents that have a path to the compromised agent do not reach consensus, while their local neighborhood tracking error is zero. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 9.** The effects of an attacker on a network of agents depend upon the dynamics of the attack signal. As stated in Theorem 3, to destabilize the entire network, the attack signal requires access to at least one common eigenvalue with the consensus dynamics. To this end, an attacker can exploit the security of the network by eavesdropping and monitoring the transmitted data to identify at least one of the eigenvalues of the agent dynamics, and then launch a signal with the same frequency to a root node to make the output synchronization error go to infinity.

**Remark 10.** All results can be extended for the case when there exists communication noise on the incoming links as introduced in (12) and (13). In such a situation, the output synchronization problem changes to the problem of mean square consensus of output synchronization error as

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \|e_i(t)\|^2 = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N \quad (37)$$

Moreover, the steady state of the internal state of the dynamic controller of each agent changes into the noisy steady state as

$$\zeta_i \rightarrow S \zeta_i + \omega_i \quad (38)$$

and the noisy steady state of agents can be represented as

$$x_i \rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^q \delta_{ik} e^{\lambda_k(S)t} + \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} \bar{\delta}_{ij} \omega_j \quad (39)$$

for some  $\delta_{ik}$  and  $\bar{\delta}_{ij}$  using modal decomposition. Moreover,  $\lambda_k(S)$  is the eigenvalue of the consensus dynamics matrix  $S$  in (2). This implies that agents converge to a consensus trajectory which is affected by the communication noise and, therefore, its mean and variance depend upon the mean and variance of the communication noise. Moreover, from (12) and (38), the local neighborhood tracking error for each agent also converges to the mean and variance of the incoming communication noise. Therefore, one can show that an IMP-based attack does not change the statistical properties of the local neighborhood tracking error, while a non-IMP based attack does.

In the next section, attack detection and mitigation mechanisms are proposed for both IMP-based and non-IMP based attacks. To this end, it is assumed that the communication network is noisy.

## V. AN ATTACK DETECTION MECHANISM

In this section, Kullback-Liebler (KL)-based attack detection and mitigation approaches are developed for both IMP-based and non-IMP-based attacks.

The KL divergence is a non-negative measure of the relative entropy between two probability distributions [44], [45] which is defined as follows.

**Definition 8 (KL divergence)** [44], [45]. Let  $X$  and  $Z$  be two random sequences with probability density functions  $P_X$  and  $P_Z$ , respectively. The KL divergence measure between  $P_X$  and  $P_Z$  is defined as

$$D_{KL}(X||Z) = \int P_X(\theta) \log \left( \frac{P_X(\theta)}{P_Z(\theta)} \right) d\theta \quad (40)$$

with the following properties [44]:

- 1)  $D_{KL}(P_X||P_Z) \geq 0$
- 2)  $D_{KL}(P_X||P_Z) = 0$  if and only if,  $P_X = P_Z$
- 3)  $D_{KL}(P_X||P_Z) \neq D_{KL}(P_Z||P_X)$

In the following subsections, KL-divergence is used to detect IMP-based and non-IMP-based attacks on heterogeneous multi-agent CPSs.

### A. Attack detection for IMP-based attacks

In this subsection, an attack detector is designed to identify IMP-based attacks. To this end, two error sequences  $\tau_i$  and  $\varphi_i$  are defined based on only local exchanged information for agent  $i$  as

$$\tau_i = \left\| \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) + \omega_i + f_i^d \right\| \quad (41)$$

and

$$\varphi_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} \left\| a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) + a_{ij} (\omega_{ij} + f_j^d) \right\| \quad (42)$$

where  $\omega_i$  and  $\omega_{ij}$  are defined in (13) and  $f_i^d = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} f_j^d$ . In fact, (41) is the norm of the summation of the discrepancy of agent  $i$  and all its neighbors, and (42) is the summation of norms of those discrepancies. In the absence of attack, these two signals show the same behavior in the sense that their means converge to zero.

In the presence of an IMP-based attack and in the absence of noise, based on Theorem 4,  $\tau_i$  goes to zero, despite attack. However, it is obvious that  $\varphi_i$  does not converge to zero in the presence of an attack. In the presence of noise, the statistical properties of  $\tau_i$  converge to the statistical properties of the noise. In contrast, the statistical properties of  $\varphi_i$  depend upon not only the statistical properties of the noise signal, but also of the attack signal. Therefore, the behavior of these two signals significantly diverges in the presence of attacks and can be captured by KL-divergence methods. Existing KL-divergence methods are, nevertheless, developed for Gaussian signals. However, while the communication noise is assumed to be Gaussian, error sequences (41) and (42) are norms of some variable with Gaussian distributions, thus, they have univariate folded Gaussian distributions given by [30]  $\varphi_i \sim \mathcal{FN}(\mu_{1i}, \sigma_{1i}^2)$  and  $\tau_i \sim \mathcal{FN}(\mu_{2i}, \sigma_{2i}^2)$ . That is,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\varphi_i}(q_i, \mu_{1i}, \sigma_{1i}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i - \mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i + \mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \\ P_{\tau_i}(q_i, \mu_{2i}, \sigma_{2i}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{2i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i - \mu_{2i})^2}{2\sigma_{2i}^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{2i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i + \mu_{2i})^2}{2\sigma_{2i}^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where  $\mu_{1i}$  and  $\sigma_{1i}$  are the mean and variance of the error sequences  $\varphi_i$  and  $\mu_{2i}$  and  $\sigma_{2i}$  are the mean and variance of the error sequences  $\tau_i$ . Using (40), the KL divergence in terms of the local error sequences  $\varphi_i$  and  $\tau_i$  can be defined as

$$D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) = \int P_{\varphi_i}(q_i) \log \left( \frac{P_{\varphi_i}(q_i)}{P_{\tau_i}(q_i)} \right) dq_i = \mathbb{E}_1 \left( \log \frac{P_{\varphi_i}(q_i)}{P_{\tau_i}(q_i)} \right) \quad (44)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_1[\cdot]$  represents the expectation value with respect to the distribution of the first sequence.

A KL divergence formula for the folded Gaussian distributions is now developed in the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.** Consider the error sequences  $\tau_i$  and  $\varphi_i$  in (41)-(42) with folded Gaussian distributions  $P_{\varphi_i}$  and  $P_{\tau_i}$  in (43). Then, the KL divergence between error sequences  $\tau_i$  and  $\varphi_i$ , i.e.,  $D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i)$ , becomes

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) &\approx \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{\sigma_{2i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2} - 1 + (\sigma_{2i}^{-2} \sigma_{1i}^2) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{2i}^{-2} (\mu_{2i} - \mu_{1i})^2 + 1 \\ &\frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{4\mu_{1i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{8\mu_{1i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) + e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( e^{\frac{\rho_3^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + e^{\frac{\rho_4^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) - \left( e^{\frac{\rho_1^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + e^{\frac{\rho_2^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

for some  $\rho_1 = (\mu_{1i} - 2\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$ ,  $\rho_2 = (\mu_{1i} + 2\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$ ,  $\rho_3 = (\mu_{1i} - 4\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$  and  $\rho_4 = (\mu_{1i} + 4\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix A.  $\square$

In the following theorem, we show that the effect of IMP-based attacks can be captured using the KL divergence defined in (45).

**Theorem 5.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) along with the controller (6), (17), and under the IMP-based attacks. Assume that the communication noise sequences are i.i.d. Then, for a reachable intact agent  $i$ ,

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_k^{k+T-1} D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) dk > \gamma_i \quad (46)$$

where  $\varphi_i$  and  $\tau_i$  are defined in (41) and (42), respectively, and  $T$  and  $\gamma_i$  represent the window size and the predesigned threshold parameter.

*Proof.* According to Theorem 4, the local neighborhood tracking error goes to zero for intact agents in the presence of an IMP-based attack when there is no communication noise. In the presence of communication noise with Gaussian distribution, i.e.,  $\omega_i \sim (0, \Sigma_{\omega_i})$  and IMP-based attack, the expectation value of the local neighborhood tracking error becomes

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta_i] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) + \omega_i + f_i^d \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad (47)$$

Using (47), one can write (41) as

$$\tau_i = \left\| \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) + \omega_i + f_i^d \right\| \sim \mathcal{FN}(0, \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2) \quad (48)$$

which represents a folded Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance  $\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2$ . Note that the mean and variance of the distribution in (41) become  $\mu_{2i} = 0$  and  $\sigma_{2i}^2 = \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2$ .

Since noise signals are independent and identically distributed, from (42), one can infer that the folded Gaussian distribution  $P_{\varphi_i}$  has the following statistical properties

$$\varphi_i \sim \mathcal{FN}(\mu_{f_i^d}, \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \bar{\nu}_{f_i^d}^2) \quad (49)$$

where  $\mu_{f_i^d}$  and  $\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \bar{\nu}_{f_i^d}^2$  represent the overall mean and covariance due to the communication noise and overall deviation from the desired behavior in intact neighbors reachable from the compromised agent.

In the absence of attack, the statistical properties corresponding to sequences  $\tau_i$  and  $\varphi_i$  become  $\mathcal{FN}(0, \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2)$  and  $\mathcal{FN}(0, \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2)$ , respectively, and the corresponding KL divergence in (45) becomes

$$D_{KL}^{wa}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) \approx \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2}{\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2} + \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^{-2} \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 \right) \quad (50)$$

where  $\hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2$  represents additional variance in sequence  $\varphi_i$ , which depends on the communication noise.

Now, in the presence of IMP-based attacks, using the derived form of KL divergence for folded Gaussian distributions from Lemma 7, one can simplify (45) using (48)-(49) as

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) &\approx \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2}{\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \bar{\nu}_{f_i^d}^2} + \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^{-2} (\bar{\nu}_{f_i^d}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2) \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^{-2} (\mu_{f_i^d})^2 + \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{4(\mu_{f_i^d})^2}{\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \bar{\nu}_{f_i^d}^2}} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{8(\mu_{f_i^d})^2}{\bar{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \hat{\nu}_{\omega_i}^2 + \bar{\nu}_{f_i^d}^2}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Then, one can design the threshold parameter  $\gamma_i$  such that

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_k^{k+T-1} D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) dk > \gamma_i \quad (52)$$

where  $T$  denotes the sliding window size. This completes the proof.  $\square$



Based on Theorem 5, one can use the following conditions for attack detection.

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{T} \int_k^{k+T-1} D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) dk < \gamma_i & : H_0 \\ \frac{1}{T} \int_k^{k+T-1} D_{KL}(\varphi_i || \tau_i) dk > \gamma_i & : H_1 \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

where  $\gamma_i$  denotes the designed threshold for detection, the null hypotheses  $H_0$  represents the intact mode and  $H_1$  denotes the compromised mode of an agent.

### B. Attack detection for non-IMP-based attacks

This subsection presents the design of a KL-based attack detector for non-IMP based attacks.

It was shown in Theorem 4 that the local neighborhood tracking error goes to zero if and only if agents are under IMP-based attacks. Therefore, for the case of non-IMP-based attacks, one can identify these types of attacks using the changes in the statistical properties of the local neighborhood tracking error. In the absence of attack, since the Gaussian noise, i.e.,  $\omega_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\omega_i})$ , is considered in the communication link, the local neighborhood tracking error  $\eta_i$  in (12) has the following statistical properties

$$\eta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\omega_i}) \quad (54)$$

and it represents the nominal behavior of the system.

In the presence of attacks, using (12), the local neighborhood tracking error  $\eta_i^a$  can be written as

$$\eta_i^a = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) + f_i + \omega_i \quad (55)$$

where  $f_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij} f_j^d$  denotes overall deviation in incoming information from neighbors due to the attacks in the network. From (55), one has

$$\eta_i^a \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{f_i}, \Sigma_{f_i} + \Sigma_{\omega_i}) \quad (56)$$

where  $\mu_{f_i}$  and  $\Sigma_{f_i}$  are, respectively, mean and covariance of the overall deviation due to the attacks.

Now, since both  $\eta_i^a$  and  $\eta_i$  have normal Gaussian distributions, the KL divergence in the terms of  $\eta_i^a$  and  $\eta_i$  as  $D_{KL}(\eta_i^a || \eta_i)$  can be written as [46]

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(\eta_i^a || \eta_i) &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{|\Sigma_{\eta_i}|}{|\Sigma_{\eta_i^a}|} - n + \text{tr}(\Sigma_{\eta_i}^{-1} \Sigma_{\eta_i^a}) \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (\mu_{\eta_i} - \mu_{\eta_i^a})^T \Sigma_{\eta_i}^{-1} (\mu_{\eta_i} - \mu_{\eta_i^a}) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where  $\mu_{\eta_i}$  and  $\Sigma_{\eta_i}$  denote the mean and covariance of  $\eta_i$  and  $\mu_{\eta_i^a}$  and  $\Sigma_{\eta_i^a}$  denote the mean and covariance of  $\eta_i^a$ . Moreover,  $n$  denotes the dimension of the error sequence. Define the average of KL divergence over a window  $T$  as

$$\bar{D}_i = \frac{1}{T} \int_k^{k+T-1} D_{KL}(\eta_i^a || \eta_i) dk \quad (58)$$

The following theorem says that the effect of non-IMP based attacks can be detected using the KL divergence between the two error sequences  $\eta_i^a$  and  $\eta_i$ .

**Theorem 6.** Consider the multi-agent CPS (1)-(2) along with the controller (6), (17). Then,

- 1) in the absence of any attack,  $\bar{D}_i$  defined in (58) tends to zero.
- 2) in the presence of a non-IMP-based attack,  $\bar{D}_i$  defined in (58) is greater than a predefined threshold  $\gamma_i$ .

*Proof.* In the absence of attacks, the statistical properties of sequences  $\eta_i$  and  $\eta_i^a$  are the same as in (54). Therefore, the KL divergence  $D_{KL}(\eta_i^a || \eta_i)$  in (57) becomes zero and this makes  $\bar{D}_i$  in (58) zero. This completes the proof of part 1.

To prove Part 2, the mean of the local neighborhood tracking error (55) under attacks becomes

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta_i^a] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j \in N_i} (h_j - h_i) + \omega_i + f_i \right] \quad (59)$$

where  $\omega_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\omega_i})$  is defined in (13). Using (54)-(56) in (57) and the fact that  $(\Sigma_{\omega_i}^{-1} (\Sigma_{f_i} + \Sigma_{\omega_i}) - n = \text{tr}(\Sigma_{\omega_i}^{-1} \Sigma_{f_i}))$ , the KL divergence between  $\eta_i^a$  and  $\eta_i$  becomes

$$D_{KL}(\eta_i^a || \eta_i) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{|\Sigma_{\omega_i}|}{|\Sigma_{f_i} + \Sigma_{\omega_i}|} + \text{tr}(\Sigma_{\omega_i}^{-1} \Sigma_{f_i}) + \mu_{f_i}^T \Sigma_{\omega_i}^{-1} \mu_{f_i} \right) \quad (60)$$

Then, using (58), one has

$$\bar{D}_i = \frac{1}{T} \int_k^{k+T-1} \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{|\Sigma_{\omega_i}|}{|\Sigma_{f_i} + \Sigma_{\omega_i}|} + \text{tr}(\Sigma_{\omega_i}^{-1} \Sigma_{f_i}) + \mu_{f_i}^T \Sigma_{\omega_i}^{-1} \mu_{f_i} > \gamma_i \quad (61)$$

where  $T$  and  $\gamma_i$  denote the sliding window size and the predefined design threshold, respectively. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Based on Theorem 6, one can use the following conditions for attack detection:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{D}_i < \gamma_i & : H_0 \\ \bar{D}_i > \gamma_i & : H_1 \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

where  $\gamma_i$  denotes the designed threshold for detection, the null hypotheses  $H_0$  represents the intact mode of the system and  $H_1$  denotes the compromised mode of the system.

In the next section, Theorems 5 and 6 are employed to propose an attack mitigation approach which enables us to mitigate both IMP-based attacks and non-IMP-based attacks.

## VI. AN ATTACK MITIGATION MECHANISM

In this section, both IMP-based and non-IMP-based attacks are mitigated using the proposed KL-based detectors developed in the previous section.

### A. Self-belief of agents about their outgoing information

To determine the level of trustworthiness of each agent about its own information, a self-belief value is presented. If an agent detects an attack, it reduces its level of trustworthiness about its own understanding of the environment and communicates it with its neighbors to inform them about the significance of its outgoing information and thus slow down the attack propagation.

For the IMP-based attacks, using the  $D_{KL}(\varphi_i||\tau_i)$  from Theorem 5, we define  $C_i^1(t)$  as

$$C_i^1(t) = \kappa_1 \int_0^t e^{\kappa_1(\tau-t)} \chi_i^1(\tau) d\tau \quad (63)$$

where  $0 \leq C_i^1(t) \leq 1$  with

$$\chi_i^1(t) = \frac{\Delta_i}{\Delta_i + D_{KL}(\varphi_i||\tau_i)} \quad (64)$$

where  $\Delta_i$  represents the threshold to account for the channel fading and other uncertainties and  $\kappa_1 > 0$  denotes the discount factor. Equation (63) can be implemented by the following differential equation

$$\dot{C}_i^1(t) + \kappa_1 C_i^1(t) = \kappa_1 \chi_i^1(t)$$

According to Theorem 5, in the presence of IMP-based attacks,  $D_{KL}(\varphi_i||\tau_i)$  increases, which makes  $\chi_i^1(t)$  approach zero and consequently makes the value of  $C_i^1(t)$  close to zero. On the other hand, without an attack,  $D_{KL}(\varphi_i||\tau_i)$  tends to zero, making  $\chi_i^1(t)$  approach 1 and, consequently,  $C_i^1(t)$  becomes close to 1. The larger the value of  $C_i^1(t)$  is, the more confident the agent is about the trustworthiness of its broadcasted information.

Similarly, for the non-IMP-based attacks, using the  $D_{KL}(\eta_i^a||\eta_i)$  from Theorem 6, we define  $C_i^2(t)$  as

$$C_i^2(t) = \kappa_2 \int_0^t e^{\kappa_2(\tau-t)} \chi_i^2(\tau) d\tau \quad (65)$$

where  $0 \leq C_i^2(t) \leq 1$  with

$$\chi_i^2(t) = \frac{\Delta_i}{\Delta_i + D_{KL}(\eta_i^a||\eta_i)} \quad (66)$$

where  $\Delta_i$  represents the threshold to account for the channel fading and other uncertainties, and  $\kappa_2 > 0$  denotes the discount factor. Expression (65) can be generated by

$$\dot{C}_i^2(t) + \kappa_2 C_i^2(t) = \kappa_2 \chi_i^2(t)$$

Using Theorem 6 and the same argument as we employed for  $C_i^1(t)$ , one can show that  $C_i^2(t)$  is close to 1 in the absence of an attack, and close to zero in the presence of a non-IMP based attack.

Then, using  $C_i^1(t)$  and  $C_i^2(t)$  defined in (63) and (65), the self-belief of an agent  $i$  for both IMP and non-IMP-based attacks is defined as

$$C_i(t) = \min\{C_i^1(t), C_i^2(t)\} \quad (67)$$

If an agent is reachable from a compromised agent under IMP or non-IMP based attack, its self-belief tends to zero. In such a situation, it sends the low self-belief value to its neighbor to put less weight on the information they receive from it and this prevents attacks from propagating.

## B. Trust of agents about their incoming information

The trust value represents the level of confidence of an agent on its neighbors' information. If the self-belief value of an agent is low, it forms beliefs on its neighbors (either intact or compromised) and updates its trust value which depends on the beliefs on each of its neighbors using only local information. Therefore, agents identify the compromised neighbor and discard its information.

Using the KL divergence between exchanged information of agent  $i$  and its neighbor, one can define  $\eta_{ij}(t)$  as

$$\eta_{ij}(t) = \kappa_3 \int_0^t e^{\kappa_3(\tau-t)} L_{ij}(\tau) d\tau \quad (68)$$

where  $0 \leq \eta_{ij}(t) \leq 1$  with

$$L_{ij}(t) = 1 - \frac{\Lambda_1}{\Lambda_1 + e^{\left(\frac{-\Lambda_2}{D_{KL}(h_j||m_i)}\right)}} \quad \forall j \in N_i \quad (69)$$

with  $m_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} h_j$  and  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 > 0$  represent the threshold to account for channel fading and other uncertainties, and  $\kappa_3 > 0$  denotes the discount factor. For the compromised neighbor, the KL divergence  $D_{KL}(h_j||m_i)$  tends to zero, which makes  $L_{ij}(t)$  close to zero. Consequently, this makes the value of  $\eta_{ij}(t)$  close to zero. On the other hand, if the incoming neighbor is not compromised, then  $D_{KL}(h_j||m_i)$  increases and makes  $\eta_{ij}(t)$  approach 1. Equation (68) can be implemented using the following differential equation

$$\dot{\eta}_{ij}(t) + \kappa_3 \eta_{ij}(t) = \kappa_3 L_{ij}(t)$$

Now, we define the trust value of an agent on its neighbors as

$$\Omega_{ij}(t) = \max(C_i(t), \eta_{ij}(t)) \quad (70)$$

with  $0 \leq \Omega_{ij}(t) \leq 1$ .

In the absence of attacks, the state of agents converge to the consensus trajectory and the KL divergence  $D_{KL}(h_j||m_i)$ ,  $\forall j \in N_i$  tends to zero which results in  $\Omega_{ij}(t)$  being 1  $\forall j \in N_i$ . In the presence of attacks,  $\eta_{ij}(t)$  corresponding to the compromised agents tends to zero.

## C. The mitigation mechanism using trust and self-belief values

In this subsection, the trust and self-belief values are utilized to design the mitigation algorithm. To this end, both self-belief and trust values are incorporated into the exchange information among agents. Consequently, the local neighborhood tracking error (12) is modified as

$$\eta_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} \Omega_{ij}(t) C_j(t) a_{ij} (h_j - h_i) + \omega_i \quad (71)$$

where  $\Omega_{ij}(t)$  and  $C_j(t)$  denote, respectively, the trust value and the self-belief of neighboring agents.

**Remark 11.** The proposed approach discards the compromised agent only when an attack is detected, in contrast to most of the existing methods that are based on solely the discrepancy among agents. Note that discrepancy can be the result of a legitimate change in the state of one agent. Moreover, in the beginning of synchronization, there could be a huge discrepancy between agents' states that should not be discarded.

**Assumption 3.** If at most  $q$  neighbors of each intact agents is under attack, at least  $(2q + 1)$  neighbors of each intact agents are intact.

**Lemma 8.** [32] Consider an  $r$ -robust time-varying directed graph  $\mathcal{G}(t)$ . Then, the graph has a directed spanning tree, if and only if  $\mathcal{G}(t)$  is 1-robust.

**Theorem 7.** Consider the internal state (5) with the local neighborhood tracking error defined in (71) without noise. Let the time varying graph be  $\mathcal{G}(t)$  such that at each time instant  $t$ , Assumption 1 and Assumption 3 are satisfied. Then,  $\zeta_j - \zeta_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly exponentially.

*Proof.* The dynamics (5) of the internal state of the controller using the proposed local neighborhood tracking error (71) can be written as

$$\dot{\zeta}_i = S \zeta_i + \mu \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij}(t) (\zeta_j - \zeta_i) \quad (72)$$

where  $a_{ij}(t) = \Psi_{ij}(t) C_j(t) a_{ij}$ . Defining the new variable  $z_i = e^{-S(t-t_0)} \zeta_i$ , gives

$$\dot{z}_i = \mu \sum_{j \in N_i} a_{ij}(t) (z_j - z_i) \quad (73)$$

with the global form as

$$\dot{z} = -\mu (\mathcal{L}(t) \otimes I_q) z \quad (74)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(t)$  denotes the time varying graph Laplacian matrix of the directed graph  $\mathcal{G}(t)$ . Assumption 3 implies that the total number of the compromised agents is assumed less than half of the network connectivity, i.e.,  $2q + 1$ . Therefore, even if  $q$  neighbors of an intact agent are attacked and collude to send the same value to misguide it, there still exists  $q + 1$  intact neighbors that communicate values different from the compromised ones. Moreover, since at least half of the intact agent's neighbors are intact, it can update its trust values to remove the compromised neighbors. Furthermore, since the time varying graph  $\mathcal{G}(t)$  resulting from isolating the compromised agents is 1-robust, based on Definition 6 and Lemma 8, the entire network is still connected to the intact agents. Therefore, there exists a spanning tree in the graph associated with all intact agents. Under this assumption, it is shown in [47] that all the solutions of (72) synchronize to the system  $\dot{\zeta}_0 = S \zeta_0$  uniformly exponentially. This results in  $\zeta_j - \zeta_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## VII. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, an example is provided to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed detection and mitigation approaches. Consider a group of 5 heterogeneous agents with the dynamics defined as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_k = A_k x_k + B_k u_k \\ y_k = C_k x_k \end{cases} \quad k = 1, \dots, 5 \quad (75)$$

where

$$A_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r_k \\ 0 & -s_k & -p_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ q_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

with parameters  $\{p_k, q_k, r_k, s_k\}$  selected as  $\{1, 1, 1, 0\}, \{10, 2, 1, 0\}, \{2, 1, 1, 10\}, \{2, 1, 1, 1\}$  and  $\{5, 1, 1, 2\}$ . The communication graph is shown in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1: Communication topology.

Let the consensus dynamics matrices in (2) be picked as

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (76)$$

Using (9), the control gains can be obtained as  $\Pi_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0; 0 & 1; -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \forall k = 1, \dots, 5$ ,  $\Gamma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\Gamma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -5 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\Gamma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 9 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\Gamma_4 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\Gamma_5 = \begin{bmatrix} -2.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$ . Moreover, the feedback gain  $K_k$  is designed using the associated algebraic Riccati equation (ARE) such that  $A_k + B_k K_k$  becomes Hurwitz for all  $k = 1, \dots, 5$ . In the absence of an attack, agents reach output synchronization and there emerges the healthy behavior of the system with noisy communication as shown in Fig. 2.

### A. IMP-based attacks

This subsection analyzes the effects of IMP-based attacks and illustrates our attack detection and mitigation scheme. The attack signal is assumed to be  $f = 10 \sin(t)$ . This is an IMP-based attack and is assumed to be launched on Agent 1 (root node) at time  $t=20$ . The results are shown in Fig. 3. It can be seen that the compromised agent destabilizes the entire network. This result is consistent with Theorem 3. It is shown in Fig. 4 that the same IMP-based attack on Agent 5 (noon-root node) cannot destabilize the entire network. However, Agent 4, which is the only agent reachable from Agent 5, does not synchronize to the desired consensus trajectory. Moreover, one can see that the local neighborhood tracking error converges to zero for all intact agents except the compromised Agent 5. These results are in line with Theorem 4. Then, the effect of




Fig. 2: Synchronization in the absence of attack. (a) The output of agents. (b) The local neighborhood tracking error of agents.

attack is rejected using the presented detection and mitigation approach in Theorem 5 and Theorem 7. Fig.5 shows that reachable agents follow the desired consensus trajectory, even in the presence of the attack.




Fig. 3: The state of agents when Agent 1 is under an IMP-based attack.

### B. Non-IMP-based attacks

This subsection analyzes the effects of non-IMP-based attacks and validates our attack detection and mitigation approach. The attack signal is assumed to be  $f = 20 + 10 \sin(4t)$ . The effect of this non-IMP-based attack on Agent 5 (non-root node) is shown in Fig.6. It can be seen that this non-IMP-based attack on Agent 5 only affects the reachable Agent 4. It is shown in Fig.7 that the effect of the attack is removed for the intact Agent 4 using detection and mitigation approaches presented in Theorems 6 and 7.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

A resilient control framework has been introduced for multi-agent CPSs. First, the effects of IMP-based and non-IMP-based attacks on multi-agent CPSs have been analyzed using a graph-theoretic approach. Then, a KL divergence based criterion, using only the observed local information of agents, has been employed to detect attacks. Each agent detects its neighbors' misbehaviors, consequently forming a self-belief about the correctness of its own information, and continuously updates its self-belief and communicates it with its neighbors to inform them about the significance of its outgoing information. Additionally, if the self-belief value of an agent is low, it forms beliefs on the type of its neighbors (intact or compromised) and, consequently, updates its trust of




Fig. 5: The output of agents using the proposed attack detection and mitigation approach.




Fig. 6: The output of agents when Agent 5 is under a non-IMP-based attack.




Fig. 7: The output of agents after attack detection and mitigation.




Fig. 4: Agent 5 is under IMP-based attack. (a) The output of agents. (b) The local neighborhood tracking error of agents.

its neighbors. Finally, agents incorporate their neighbors' self-beliefs and their own trust values in their control protocols to slow down and mitigate attacks.

A possible direction for future work is to extend these results to synchronization of multi-agent CPSs with nonlinear dynamics. Since nonlinear systems can exhibit finite-time escape behavior, a problem of interest is to find the conditions under which the attacker can make the trajectories of agents become unbounded in finite time, and to obtain detection and mitigation mechanisms to counteract such attacks fast and thus avoid instability.

APPENDIX A  
PROOF OF LEMMA 7

Using (45), the KL divergence between error sequences  $\varphi_i$  and  $\tau_i$  can be written as

$$D_{KL}(\varphi_i||\tau_i) = \mathbb{E}_1[\log P_{\varphi_i} - \log P_{\tau_i}] \quad (77)$$

where probability density functions  $P_{\varphi_i}$  and  $P_{\tau_i}$  are defined in (43). Using (43), (77) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(\varphi_i||\tau_i) &= \mathbb{E}_1\left[\log\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|}e^{-\frac{(q_i-\mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|}e^{-\frac{(q_i+\mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}}\right)\right. \\ &\quad \left.- \log\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{2i}|}e^{-\frac{(q_i-\mu_{2i})^2}{2\sigma_{2i}^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{2i}|}e^{-\frac{(q_i+\mu_{2i})^2}{2\sigma_{2i}^2}}\right)\right] \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

By the aid of the logarithm property as  $\log(a+b) = \log(a) + \log(1+b/a)$ , (78) turns into

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(\varphi_i||\tau_i) &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_1\left[\log\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|}e^{-\frac{(q_i-\mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}}\right) - \log\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{2i}|}e^{-\frac{(q_i-\mu_{2i})^2}{2\sigma_{2i}^2}}\right)\right]}_{T_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_1\left[\log\left(1 + e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}}\right) - \log\left(1 + e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{2i}}{\sigma_{2i}^2}}\right)\right]}_{T_2} \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

The first term in (79) is a KL divergence formula for statistical sequences with normal Gaussian distribution which is given in [46] as

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{\sigma_{2i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2} - 1 + (\sigma_{2i}^{-2}\sigma_{1i}^2) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{2i}^{-2} (\mu_{2i} - \mu_{1i})^2 \quad (80)$$

The second term  $T_2$  in (79), using power series expansion  $\log(1+a) = \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n a^{n+1} / (n+1)$  and ignoring higher order terms, can be approximated as

$$T_2 \approx \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} - \frac{\left( e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right)^2}{2} \right] - \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{2i}}{\sigma_{2i}^2}} - \frac{\left( e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{2i}}{\sigma_{2i}^2}} \right)^2}{2} \right] \quad (81)$$

which can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &\approx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i - \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{4q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \\ &\quad - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{2i}}{\sigma_{2i}^2}} dq_i + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{4q_i\mu_{2i}}{\sigma_{2i}^2}} dq_i \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Now, the first term of  $T_2$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i+\mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i-\mu_{1i})^2+4q_i\mu_{1i}}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Using the fact that density integrates to 1, (83) becomes

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i = 1 + e^{\frac{4\mu_{1i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} \quad (84)$$

Similarly, second term of  $T_2$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{4q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( e^{-\frac{(q_i+3\mu_{1i})^2-8\mu_{1i}^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i + e^{-\frac{(q_i+5\mu_{1i})^2-24\mu_{1i}^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \right) \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

which yields

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{4q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i = -\frac{1}{2} \left( e^{\frac{4\mu_{1i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} + e^{\frac{12\mu_{1i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) \quad (86)$$

The third term of  $T_2$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( e^{-\frac{(q_i-\mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{2i}}{\sigma_{2i}^2}} + e^{-\frac{(q_i+\mu_{1i})^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{2i}}{\sigma_{2i}^2}} \right) dq_i \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

which can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} &-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \\ &= -\left( e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2-\rho_1^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i-\rho_1)^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2-\rho_2^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\sigma_{1i}|} e^{-\frac{(q_i-\rho_2)^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i \right) \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where  $\rho_1 = (\mu_{1i} - 2\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$  and  $\rho_2 = (\mu_{1i} + 2\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$  which becomes

$$-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{2q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i = -\left( e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2-\rho_1^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2-\rho_2^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) \quad (89)$$

Similarly, the last term of  $T_2$  can be simplified as

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\varphi_i} e^{-\frac{4q_i\mu_{1i}}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} dq_i = \frac{1}{2} \left( e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2-\rho_3^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2-\rho_4^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) \quad (90)$$

where  $\rho_3 = (\mu_{1i} - 4\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$  and  $\rho_4 = (\mu_{1i} + 4\mu_{2i}\sigma_{1i}^2\sigma_{2i}^{-2})$ . Adding (84), (86), (89) and (90),  $T_2$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &\approx e^{-\frac{\mu_{1i}^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( e^{\frac{\rho_3^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + e^{\frac{\rho_4^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) - \left( e^{\frac{\rho_1^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} + e^{\frac{\rho_2^2}{2\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + 1 + \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{4\mu_{1i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} \left( 1 - e^{\frac{8\mu_{1i}^2}{\sigma_{1i}^2}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

Now, using (80)-(81) and (91), one gets (45). This completes the proof.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Campbell, M. Egerstedt, J. P. How, and R. M. Murray, "Autonomous driving in urban environments: approaches, lessons and challenges," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 368, no. 1928, pp. 4649–4672, 2010.
- [2] R. A. Gupta and M. Y. Chow, "Networked control system: Overview and research trends," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 57, pp. 2527–2535, July 2010.
- [3] S. Sridhar, A. Hahn, and M. Govindarasu, "Cyber-physical system security for the electric power grid," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 100, no. 1, pp. 210–224, 2012.
- [4] J. P. Hespanha, P. Naghshtabrizi, and Y. Xu, "A survey of recent results in networked control systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 95, pp. 138–162, Jan 2007.
- [5] R. Olfati-Saber, J. A. Fax, and R. M. Murray, "Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 95, pp. 215–233, Jan 2007.
- [6] F. Bullo, J. Cortes, and S. Martinez, *Distributed Control of Robotic Networks: A Mathematical Approach to Motion Coordination Algorithms*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [7] A. Khanafar and T. Başar, "Robust distributed averaging: When are potential-theoretic strategies optimal?," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, pp. 1767–1779, July 2016.
- [8] Q. Zhu and T. Başar, "Game-theoretic methods for robustness, security, and resilience of cyberphysical control systems: Games-in-games principle for optimal cross-layer resilient control systems," *IEEE Control Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 46–65, Feb 2015.
- [9] Y. Mo, R. Chabukswar, and B. Sinopoli, "Detecting integrity attacks on scada systems," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 22, pp. 1396–1407, July 2014.
- [10] Y. Shoukry, P. Martin, P. Tabuada, and M. Srivastava, "Non-invasive spoofing attacks for anti-lock braking systems," in *International Workshop on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*, pp. 55–72, Springer, 2013.
- [11] H. Fawzi, P. Tabuada, and S. Diggavi, "Secure estimation and control for cyber-physical systems under adversarial attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, pp. 1454–1467, June 2014.
- [12] M. Pajic, J. Weimer, N. Bezzo, P. Tabuada, O. Sokolsky, I. Lee, and G. J. Pappas, "Robustness of attack-resilient state estimators," in *2014 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCCPS)*, pp. 163–174, April 2014.
- [13] F. Pasqualetti, F. Drfler, and F. Bullo, "Attack detection and identification in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, pp. 2715–2729, Nov 2013.
- [14] Y. Shoukry and P. Tabuada, "Event-triggered state observers for sparse sensor noise/attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, pp. 2079–2091, Aug 2016.
- [15] Y. Mo and B. Sinopoli, "Secure estimation in the presence of integrity attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, pp. 1145–1151, April 2015.
- [16] Y. Yan, P. Antsaklis, and V. Gupta, "A resilient design for cyber physical systems under attack," in *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 4418–4423, May 2017.
- [17] F. Pasqualetti, A. Bicchi, and F. Bullo, "Consensus computation in unreliable networks: A system theoretic approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, pp. 90–104, Jan 2012.
- [18] A. Teixeira, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "Networked control systems under cyber attacks with applications to power networks," in *Proceedings of the 2010 American Control Conference*, pp. 3690–3696, June 2010.
- [19] S. Amin, X. Litrico, S. S. Sastry, and A. M. Bayen, "Cyber security of water scada systems-part ii: Attack detection using enhanced hydrodynamic models," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 21, pp. 1679–1693, Sept 2013.
- [20] S. Weerakkody, X. Liu, S. H. Son, and B. Sinopoli, "A graph-theoretic characterization of perfect attackability for secure design of distributed control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 4, pp. 60–70, March 2017.
- [21] Z. Feng and G. Hu, "Distributed secure average consensus for linear multi-agent systems under dos attacks," in *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 2261–2266, May 2017.
- [22] S. Sundaram and C. N. Hadjicostis, "Distributed function calculation via linear iterative strategies in the presence of malicious agents," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, pp. 1495–1508, July 2011.
- [23] W. Zeng and M. Y. Chow, "Resilient distributed control in the presence of misbehaving agents in networked control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 44, pp. 2038–2049, Nov 2014.
- [24] X. Jin, W. M. Haddad, and T. Yucelen, "An adaptive control architecture for mitigating sensor and actuator attacks in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, pp. 6058–6064, Nov 2017.
- [25] H. J. LeBlanc and X. Koutsoukos, "Resilient first-order consensus and weakly stable, higher order synchronization of continuous-time networked multi-agent systems," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, pp. 1–1, 2017.
- [26] S. Bolouki, D. G. Dobakhshari, T. Başar, V. Gupta, and A. Nedić, "Applications of group testing to security decision-making in networks," in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 2929–2934, Dec 2017.
- [27] E. Akyol, T. Başar, and C. Langbort, "Signaling games in networked cyber-physical systems with strategic elements," in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 4576–4581, Dec 2017.
- [28] M. O. Sayin and T. Başar, "Secure sensor design for cyber-physical systems against advanced persistent threats," in *Decision and Game Theory for Security* (S. Rass, B. An, C. Kiekintveld, F. Fang, and S. Schauer, eds.), (Cham), pp. 91–111, Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [29] R. Moghadam and H. Modares, "An internal model principle for the attacker in distributed control systems," in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 6604–6609, Dec 2017.
- [30] S. Kotz and N. L. Johnson, *Process Capability Indices*. New York, USA: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1993.
- [31] Z. Li and Z. Duan, *Cooperative Control of Multi-Agent Systems: A Consensus Region Approach*. Automation and Control Engineering, Taylor & Francis, 2014.
- [32] H. J. LeBlanc, H. Zhang, X. Koutsoukos, and S. Sundaram, "Resilient asymptotic consensus in robust networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 31, pp. 766–781, April 2013.
- [33] J. Huang, *Nonlinear Output Regulation: Theory and Applications*, vol. 8. SIAM, 2004.
- [34] P. Wieland, R. Sepulchre, and F. Allgöwer, "An internal model principle is necessary and sufficient for linear output synchronization," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 1068 – 1074, 2011.
- [35] F. Dörfler and F. Bullo, "Synchronization and transient stability in power networks and nonuniform kuramoto oscillators," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 1616–1642, 2012.
- [36] L. Chechurin and S. Chechurin, "Synchronization of oscillations," in *Physical Fundamentals of Oscillations*, pp. 99–116, Springer, 2017.
- [37] L. Alvergue, A. Pandey, G. Gu, and X. Chen, "Output consensus control for heterogeneous multi-agent systems," in *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 1502–1507, Dec 2013.
- [38] S. Zuo, Y. Song, H. Modares, F. L. Lewis, and A. Davoudi, "A unified approach to output synchronization of heterogeneous multi-agent systems via l2-gain design," *Control Theory and Technology*, vol. 15, pp. 340–353, Nov 2017.
- [39] J. Lunze, "Synchronization of heterogeneous agents," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, pp. 2885–2890, Nov 2012.
- [40] Y. Su and J. Huang, "Cooperative output regulation of linear multi-agent systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, pp. 1062–1066, April 2012.
- [41] F. Lewis, H. Zhang, K. Hengster-Movric, and A. Das, *Cooperative Control of Multi-Agent Systems: Optimal and Adaptive Design Approaches*. Communications and Control Engineering, Springer London, 2013.
- [42] H. Cai, F. L. Lewis, G. Hu, and J. Huang, "The adaptive distributed observer approach to the cooperative output regulation of linear multi-agent systems," *Automatica*, vol. 75, pp. 299 – 305, 2017.
- [43] C. Wu, *Synchronization in Complex Networks of Nonlinear Dynamical Systems*. World Scientific, 2007.
- [44] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler, "On information and sufficiency," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 79–86, 1951.
- [45] M. Basseville and I. V. Nikiforov, *Detection of Abrupt Changes: Theory and Application*, vol. 104. Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs, 1993.
- [46] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley-Interscience, 2006.
- [47] L. Scardovi and R. Sepulchre, "Synchronization in networks of identical linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 2557 – 2562, 2009.



**Hamidreza Modares** (M15) received the B.Sc. degree from Tehran University, Tehran, Iran, in 2004, the M.Sc. degree from the Shahrood University of Technology, Shahrood, Iran, in 2006, and the Ph.D. degree from the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), Arlington, TX, USA, in 2015. From 2006 to 2009, he was with the Shahrood University of Technology as a Senior Lecturer. From 2015 to 2016, he was a Faculty Research Associate with UTA. From 2016 to 2018, he was an Assistant Professor with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,

Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla, USA.

He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, USA. He has authored several journal and conference papers on the design of optimal controllers using reinforcement learning. His current research interests include cyber-physical systems, machine learning, distributed control, robotics, and renewable energy microgrids.

Dr. Modares was a recipient of the Best Paper Award from the 2015 IEEE International Symposium on Resilient Control Systems, the Stelmakh Outstanding Student Research Award from the Department of Electrical Engineering, UTA, in 2015, and the Summer Dissertation Fellowship from UTA, in 2015. He is an Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON NEURAL NETWORKS AND LEARNING SYSTEMS.



**Aquib Mustafa** (S17) received the B. Tech. degree from the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India, in 2013, and the Masters degree from the Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, India, in 2016. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, USA. His primary research interests include Resilient control, Multi-agent systems, and sensor networks.



**Rohollah Moghadam** (S17) received the M.S. degree from the Shahrood University of Technology, Shahrood, Iran, in 2007, all in electrical engineering. He was a visiting scholar with the University of Texas at Arlington Research Institute, Fort Worth, TX, USA in 2016. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla, USA. His current research interests include cyber-physical systems, reinforcement learning, and distributed control of multi-agent

systems.



**Tamer Başar** (S'71-M'73-SM'79-F'83-LF'13) received the B.S.E.E. degree from Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey, and the M.S., M.Phil, and Ph.D. degrees from Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA.

He is with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), Urbana, IL, USA, where he holds the academic positions of Swanlund Endowed Chair; Center for Advanced Study Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering; Research Professor at the Coordinated Science Laboratory; and

Research Professor at the Information Trust Institute. He is also the Director of the Center for Advanced Study. He has more than 900 publications in systems, control, communications, networks, and dynamic games, including books on non-cooperative dynamic game theory, robust control, network security, wireless and communication networks, and stochastic networked control. He was the Editor-in-Chief of *Automatica* between 2004 and 2014, and is currently editor of several book series. His current research interests include stochastic teams, games, and networks; security; energy systems; and cyber-physical systems.

Dr. Başar is a member of the US National Academy of Engineering, a member of the European Academy of Sciences, and a Fellow of IEEE, IFAC (International Federation of Automatic Control) and SIAM (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics). He has served as president of IEEE CSS (Control Systems Society), ISDG (International Society of Dynamic Games), and AACC (American Automatic Control Council). He was the recipient of several awards and recognitions over the years, including the highest awards of IEEE CSS, IFAC, AACC, and ISDG, the IEEE Control Systems Award, and a number of international honorary doctorates and professorships.