

Neighbourhood conditions for network stability with link uncertainty

Simone Mariano and Michael Cantoni

Abstract—The main result relates to structured robust stability analysis of an input-output model for networks with link uncertainty. It constitutes a collection of integral quadratic constraints, which together imply robust stability of the uncertain networked dynamics. Each condition is decentralized in the sense that it depends on model data pertaining to the neighbourhood of a specific agent. By contrast, pre-existing conditions for the network model are link-wise decentralized, with each involving conservatively more localized problem data. A numerical example is presented to illustrate the advantage of the new broader neighbourhood conditions.

Index Terms—Integral-Quadratic Constraints (IQCs), Network Robustness, Scalable Analysis.

I. INTRODUCTION

Motivated by problems in power and water distribution, transportation, ecology, and economics, large-scale networks of dynamical systems have been long studied in system and control theoretic terms; e.g., see [1], [2] for state-space methods, and [3], [4] for input-output methods.

In this paper, an input-output approach, based on integral quadratic constraints (IQCs) [5], is pursued to progress the development of scalable stability certificates for networks with uncertain links. The uncertain network model considered here was recently developed in [6], with a focus on assessing the impact of link uncertainty expressed relative to the ideal (unity gain) link. The work is related to [7]–[10], and as in [6], most closely to [11]. The main contribution is an alternative approach to the decomposition of a monolithic IQC certificate that implies robust network stability. The new decomposition involves a collection of sufficient conditions, each depending on model data pertaining to a specific agent, its neighbours, and the corresponding links. That is, each condition is local to a specific neighbourhood. As such, compared to the link-wise decomposition presented in [6], each neighbourhood based condition involves more (still localized) model data. This provides scope for reduced conservativeness, as illustrated by a numerical example.

The paper is organized as follows: Various preliminaries are established next. In Section III, the structured feedback model of a network with uncertain links, and a correspondingly structured IQC based robust stability condition, which is amenable to decomposition, are recalled from [6]. Then, in Section IV, the novel neighborhood based decomposition is developed, alongside statement of the link-wise conditions from [6] for comparison, including a numerical example. Some concluding remarks are provided in Section V.

Supported in part by the Australian Research Council (DP210103272).

S. Mariano and M. Cantoni are with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Australia. E-mails: {simone.mariano, cantoni}@unimelb.edu.au

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Basic notation

The natural, real, and complex numbers are denoted \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{R} , and \mathbb{C} , respectively. For $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $[i : j] := \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \leq k \leq j\}$, which is empty if $j < i$, $\mathbb{R}_{\bullet\alpha} := \{\beta \in \mathbb{R} \mid \beta \bullet \alpha\}$ for given order relation $\bullet \in \{>, \geq, <, \leq\}$, and $[\alpha, \beta] := \mathbb{R}_{\geq\alpha} \cap \mathbb{R}_{\leq\beta}$.

With $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$, for $p \in \mathbb{N}$, the p -dimensional Euclidean space over \mathbb{F} is denoted by \mathbb{F}^p . Given $x \in \mathbb{F}^p$, for $i \in [1 : p]$, the scalar $x_i \in \mathbb{F}$ denotes the i -th coordinate. The vectors $\mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{0}_p \in \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfy $\mathbf{1} = (\mathbf{1}_p)_i = 1 + (\mathbf{0}_p)_i$ for every $i \in [1 : p]$.

$\mathbb{F}^{p \times q}$ denotes the space of $p \times q$ matrices over \mathbb{F} , for $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. The identity matrix is denoted by $I_p \in \mathbb{F}^{p \times p}$, the square zero matrix by $O_p \in \mathbb{F}^{p \times p}$, and the respective $p \times q$ matrices of ones and zeros by $\mathbf{1}_{p \times q}$ and $\mathbf{0}_{p \times q}$. Given $M \in \mathbb{F}^{p \times q}$, for $i \in [1 : p]$, $j \in [1 : q]$, the respective matrices $M_{(\cdot, j)} \in \mathbb{F}^{p \times 1} \sim \mathbb{F}^p$, and $M_{(i, \cdot)} \in \mathbb{F}^{1 \times q}$, denote the j -th column, and i -th row. Further, $M_{(i, j)} \in \mathbb{F}$ denotes the entry in position (i, j) . Given $x \in \mathbb{F}^p$, the matrix $M = \text{diag}(x) \in \mathbb{F}^{p \times p}$ is such that $M_{(i, i)} = x_i$ and $M_{(i, j)} = 0$, $j \neq i \in [1 : p]$, whereby $I_p = \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_p)$. The transpose of $M \in \mathbb{F}^{p \times q}$ is denoted by $M' \in \mathbb{F}^{q \times p}$, and $M^* = \overline{M'}$ denotes the complex conjugate transpose. For $M_i = M_i^* \in \mathbb{F}^{p \times p}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $M_i \succ 0$ means there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $x^* M_i x \geq \varepsilon x^* x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{F}^p$, $M_i \succeq 0$ means $x^* M_i x \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{F}^p$, and $M_1 \succeq$ (resp. \succ) M_2 means $M_1 - M_2 \succeq$ (resp. \succ) 0 .

B. Signals and systems

The Hilbert space of square integrable signals $v = (t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p)$ is denoted $\mathbf{L}_{\geq 0}^p$, where the inner-product $\langle v, u \rangle := \int_0^\infty v(t)' u(t) dt$ and norm $\|v\|_2 := \langle v, v \rangle^{1/2}$ are finite; the superscript is dropped when $p = 1$. The corresponding extended space of locally square integrable signals is denoted by \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q ; i.e., $v : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $\pi_\tau(v) \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $(\pi_\tau(v))(t) := v(t)$ for $t \in [0, \tau)$, and $(\pi_\tau(v))(t) := 0$ otherwise. The composition of maps $F : \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p \mapsto \mathbf{L}_{2e}^r$ and $G : \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q \mapsto \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p$ is denoted by $F \circ G := (v \mapsto F(G(v)))$, and the direct sum by $F \oplus G := ((u, v) \mapsto (F(u), G(v)))$. Similarly, $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n G_i = G_1 \oplus \dots \oplus G_n$. When G is linear, in the sense $(\forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}) (\forall u, v \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q) G(\alpha u + \beta v) = \alpha G(u) + \beta G(v)$, the image of v under G is often written Gv , and in composition with another linear map \circ is dropped. The action of a linear $G : \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p$ corresponds to the action of $p \cdot q$ scalar systems $G_{(i, j)} : \mathbf{L}_{2e} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}$, $i \in [1 : p]$, $j \in [1 : q]$, on the coordinates of the signal vector input associated with $\mathbf{L}_{2e}^q \sim \mathbf{L}_{2e} \times \dots \times \mathbf{L}_{2e}$; i.e., $(Gv)_i = \sum_{j=1}^q G_{(i, j)} v_j$. Matrix notation is used to denote this. Also, for convenience, the map of pointwise multiplication by a matrix on \mathbf{L}_{2e} is not distinguished in notation from the matrix.

A system is any map $G: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p$, with $G(0) = 0$, that is *causal* in the sense $\pi_\tau(G(u)) = \pi_\tau(G(\pi_\tau(u)))$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. It is called *stable* if $u \in \mathbf{L}_2^q$ implies $G(u) \in \mathbf{L}_2^p$ and $\|G\| := \sup_{0 \neq u} \|G(u)\|_2 / \|u\|_2 < \infty$ (the composition of stable systems is therefore stable.) The feedback interconnection of G with system $\Delta: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q$ is *well-posed* if for all $(d_y, d_u) \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p \times \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q$, there exists unique $(y, u) \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p \times \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q$, such that

$$y = G(u) + d_y, \quad u = \Delta(y) + d_u, \quad (1)$$

and $\llbracket G, \Delta \rrbracket := ((d_y, d_u) \mapsto (y, u))$ is causal; see Figure 1. If, in addition, $\|\llbracket G, \Delta \rrbracket\| < \infty$, then the closed-loop is called stable.




Fig. 1: Standard feedback interconnection.

The following result is the well-known IQC robust feedback stability theorem, taken from [5]:

Theorem 1. *Given stable system $\Delta: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q$, and bounded linear map $\Pi: \mathbf{L}_2^p \times \mathbf{L}_2^q \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^p \times \mathbf{L}_2^q$ that is self-adjoint in the sense $(\forall g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{L}_2^p \times \mathbf{L}_2^q) \langle g_1, \Pi g_2 \rangle = \langle \Pi g_1, g_2 \rangle$, suppose*

$$\langle (y, u), \Pi(y, u) \rangle \geq 0, \quad u = \alpha \Delta(y), \quad (2)$$

for all $(y, \alpha) \in \mathbf{L}_2^p \times [0, 1]$. Further, given stable system $G: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^q \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^p$, suppose $\llbracket G, \alpha \Delta \rrbracket$ is well-posed for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\langle (y, u), \Pi(y, u) \rangle \leq -\varepsilon \|u\|_2^2, \quad y = G(u), \quad (3)$$

for all $u \in \mathbf{L}_2^q$. Then, $\llbracket G, \Delta \rrbracket$ is stable.

C. Graphs

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a simple (self-loopless and undirected) graph, where $\mathcal{V} = [1 : n]$ is the set of $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ vertices, and $\mathcal{E} \subset \{\{i, j\} \mid i, j \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is the set of $m := |\mathcal{E}| \in \mathbb{N}$ edges. Bijective $\kappa_{\mathcal{E}}: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{M} := [1 : m]$ denotes a fixed enumeration of the edge set \mathcal{E} for indexing. The set $\mathcal{N}_i := \{j \mid \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}\}$ comprises the neighbours of $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{E}_i := \{\{i, j\} \mid j \in \mathcal{N}_i\}$ is the corresponding neighbourhood edge set, and bijective $\kappa_{\mathcal{E}_i}: \mathcal{E}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i$ is a fixed enumeration of the $m_i := |\mathcal{E}_i|$ edges, where $\mathcal{M}_i := [1 : m_i]$. The edge indexes associated with $i \in \mathcal{V}$ are gathered in the set denoted by $\mathcal{K}_i := \{\kappa_{\mathcal{E}}(\{i, j\}) \mid j \in \mathcal{N}_i\}$. For each $k \in \mathcal{M}$, the set $\mathcal{L}_k := (\mathcal{K}_i \cup \mathcal{K}_j) \setminus \{k\}$, where $\{i, j\} = \kappa_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1}(k)$, is the collection of all indexes of the edges associated with either of the neighbouring vertices i and j , excluding the one linking them. The following technical result regarding the given graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is used subsequently.

Lemma 1. *Given arbitrary $E_k, F_k: \mathbf{L}_2^p \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^p$ for $k \in \mathcal{M}$:*

$$i) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \frac{1}{2} F_k = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} F_k;$$

$$ii) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \{k\}} E_k \circ F_\ell = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_k} E_k \circ F_\ell.$$

Proof. See Appendix. \square

III. NETWORKED SYSTEM MODEL AND ROBUST STABILITY ANALYSIS

In this section, the network model and robust stability analysis from [6] is recalled first. A new result is then derived to underpin the aforementioned neighbourhood decomposition, which is subsequently developed in Section IV.

Consider a network of $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ dynamic agents, coupled according to the simple graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. The vertex set $\mathcal{V} = [1 : n]$ corresponds to a fixed enumeration of the agents, and $m := |\mathcal{E}|$ is the number of edges, defined according to $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$ if the output of agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is shared as an input to agent $j \in \mathcal{V}$, and vice-versa. It is assumed that the number of neighbours $m_i := |\mathcal{N}_i| \geq 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Note that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} m_i = 2m$. To tame the notation, each agent has a single output and dynamics corresponding to the system $H_i: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}$, which is taken to be linear and stable, with the vector input signal coordinate order fixed by the neighbourhood edge-set enumerations $\kappa_{\mathcal{E}_i}: \mathcal{E}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i$.

Define the block diagonal systems

$$H := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n H_i: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^n, \quad T := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{m_i \times 1}: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m}, \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{and } R := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \left(\bigoplus_{k=1}^{m_i} R_{i,k} \right): \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m}, \quad (4b)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{m_i \times 1}: \mathbf{L}_{2e} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{m_i}$ denotes pointwise multiplication by $\mathbf{1}_{m_i \times 1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times 1}$, and the system $R_{i,k}: \mathbf{L}_{2e} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}$ represents the stable but possibly nonlinear and time-varying dynamics of the link from agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$ to its neighbour $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ with $\{i, j\} = \kappa_{\mathcal{E}_i}^{-1}(k)$. Given these components, the networked system can be modelled as the structured feedback interconnection $\llbracket P, R \circ T \circ H \rrbracket$, where $P: \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m}$ is pointwise multiplication by a permutation matrix arising from the structure of \mathcal{G} . More specifically, for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $k \in \mathcal{M}_i$, and $r \in [1 : 2m]$, the corresponding entry of this permutation matrix is given by

$$P_{(\sum_{h \in [1:i-1]} m_h + k, r)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = \sum_{h \in [1:j-1]} m_h + \kappa_{\mathcal{E}_j}(\{i, j\}) \\ & \text{with } j \in \kappa_{\mathcal{E}_i}^{-1}(k) \setminus \{i\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where by convention the sum over an empty index set is zero. See [6] for more details about the model and its components.

The ‘routing’ matrix $P = P' = P^{-1}$ is the adjacency matrix of an undirected 1-regular sub-system graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} := (\tilde{\mathcal{V}}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}})$, with $2m$ vertices and m edges, corresponding to the disjoint union of the two-vertex subgraphs $\mathcal{G}[e]$ induced by each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ in the network graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. As such,

$$P = D - L = I_{2m} - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k, \quad (6)$$




Fig. 2: Networked system model $[[P, R \circ T \circ H]]$, and loop transformations for robust stability analysis.

where the degree matrix $D = I_{2m}$ since $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is 1-regular, and the Laplacian decomposes as

$$L = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} B_{(\cdot, k)} B'_{(\cdot, k)} = BB', \quad (7)$$

where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times m}$ is the incidence matrix defined by $B_{(r, k)} = 1 = -B_{(s, k)}$ for $\{r, s\} = \kappa_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^{-1}(k)$, and $B_{(t, k)} := 0$ for each $t \in [1 : 2m] \setminus \{r, s\}$, over $k \in \mathcal{M}$; the enumeration $\kappa_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}$ is taken to be compatible with the enumerations $\kappa_{\mathcal{E}_i}$ and the definition of P in (5). The edge orientation is arbitrary.

Assumption 1. *The network with ideal links (i.e., $R = I_{2m}$) is stable in the sense that $[[P, T \circ H]]$ is stable.*

As detailed in [6], one can leverage Assumption 1 in the analysis of $[[P, R \circ T \circ H]]$ by considering uncertainty in the links R relative to ideal unity gain links. Indeed, as illustrated in Figure 2, to verify robust stability of the networked system $[[P, R \circ T \circ H]]$ it is sufficient to verify that $[[G, \Delta]]$ is stable, where

$$\Delta := (R - I_{2m}) \circ T, \quad (8)$$

and

$$G := H \circ (P - T \circ H)^{-1}, \quad (9)$$

with the stable systems R , H , and T as per (4), and P as per (6). Since $(P - T \circ H)^{-1}$ is stable by Lemma 1 in [6], $G : \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^n$, and the uncertain $\Delta : \mathbf{L}_{2e}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{2e}^{2m}$, are both stable.

Theorem 2. (*[6, Thm. 2]*) *Under Assumption 1, if $[[G, \Delta]]$ is stable, with G as per (9), and Δ as per (8), then the networked system model $[[P, R \circ T \circ H]]$ is stable. Further, when Δ is also linear, stability of $[[P, R \circ T \circ H]]$ implies stability of $[[G, \Delta]]$.*

Suppose, for all $(y, \alpha) \in \mathbf{L}_2^n \times [0, 1]$,

$$\langle (y, u), \Phi(y, u) \rangle \geq 0, \quad u = \alpha \Delta(y), \quad (10)$$

where the given bounded linear self-adjoint operator $\Phi : (\mathbf{L}_2^n \times \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{L}_2^n \times \mathbf{L}_2^{2m})$ is structured according to

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1 & \Phi_2 \\ \Phi_2^* & \Phi_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Phi_{1,i} & \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Phi_{2,i} \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Phi_{2,i}^* & \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Phi_{3,i} \end{bmatrix}; \quad (11)$$

the superscript $*$ denotes Hilbert adjoint. For example, this IQC holds by selecting each

$$\Phi_i := \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{1,i} & \Phi_{2,i} \\ \Phi_{2,i}^* & \Phi_{3,i} \end{bmatrix} : \mathbf{L}_2 \times \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2 \times \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i}, \quad i \in \mathcal{V},$$

such that $\langle (y_i, u_i), \Phi_i(y_i, u_i) \rangle \geq 0$, $u_i = \alpha \Delta_i(y_i)$, for all $(y_i, \alpha) \in \mathbf{L}_2 \times [0, 1]$, with local $\Delta_i = (\bigoplus_{k=1}^{m_i} R_{i,k} - I_{m_i}) \circ \mathbf{1}_{m_i \times 1}$. Then, by Theorem 1, the stability of $[[G, \Delta]]$ is implied by the existence of $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$,

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} N \\ M \end{bmatrix} z, \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1 & \Phi_2 \\ \Phi_2^* & \Phi_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} N \\ M \end{bmatrix} z \right\rangle \leq -\varepsilon \|z\|_2^2, \quad (12)$$

where

$$N := H, \quad \text{and} \quad M := (P - T \circ H) = I_{2m} - L - T \circ H, \quad (13)$$

with T , H , and P , as per (4) and (5). Importantly, N and M are structured coprime factors of $G = NM^{-1}$, as discussed in [6, Rem. 4]. Also refer to [6, Sec. IV] for more on the use of Theorem 1 to arrive at (12), and discussion of the obstacle to direct application of the decomposition method proposed in [11] to the equivalent condition

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ L \end{bmatrix} z, \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_1 & \Xi_2 \\ \Xi_2^* & \Xi_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ L \end{bmatrix} z \right\rangle \leq -\varepsilon \|z\|_2^2, \quad (14)$$

where $L = \sum_{k \in [1:m]} L_k$ is the sub-system graph Laplacian in (7),

$$\Xi_1 := N^* \Phi_1 N + N^* \Phi_2 J + J^* \Phi_2^* N + J^* \Phi_3 J, \quad (15a)$$

$$\Xi_2 := -N^* \Phi_2 - J^* \Phi_3, \quad (15b)$$

$$\Xi_3 := \Phi_3, \quad (15c)$$

and $J := I_{2m} - T \circ H$. The block-diagonal structure of N , J , Φ_1 , Φ_2 , Φ_3 , and the Hilbert adjoints when restricted to \mathbf{L}_2 , is such that $\Xi_1 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Xi_{1,i}$, $\Xi_2 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Xi_{2,i}$, and $\Xi_3 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Xi_{3,i}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_{1,i} &:= H_i^* \Phi_{1,i} H_i + (I_{m_i} - \mathbf{1}_{m_i} H_i)^* \Phi_{3,i} (I_{m_i} - \mathbf{1}_{m_i} H_i) \\ &\quad + H_i^* \Phi_{2,i} (I_{m_i} - \mathbf{1}_{m_i} H_i) + (I_{m_i} - \mathbf{1}_{m_i} H_i)^* \Phi_{2,i}^* H_i, \\ \Xi_{2,i} &:= -H_i^* \Phi_{2,i} - (I_{m_i} - \mathbf{1}_{m_i} H_i)^* \Phi_{3,i}, \\ \Xi_{3,i} &:= \Phi_{3,i}.\end{aligned}$$

For context, an existing link-wise decomposition of (14) is first recalled from [6].

Lemma 2. ([6, Lem. 3]) *Let $W = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} W_k \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}$ be such that $W_k \succeq 0$ and $W \succ 0$. Suppose there exist $X_k = X_k^* : \mathbf{L}_2^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, $Z_k = Z_k^* : \mathbf{L}_2^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, and $\varepsilon_k > 0$, $k \in \mathcal{M}$, such that for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$,*

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ L_k \end{bmatrix} z, \begin{bmatrix} X_k + \varepsilon_k W_k & \Xi_2 \\ \Xi_2^* & Z_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ L_k \end{bmatrix} z \right\rangle \leq 0, \quad k \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (16)$$

$$\langle z, \Xi_1 z \rangle - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \langle z, X_k z \rangle \leq 0, \quad (17)$$

$$\langle Lz, \Xi_3 Lz \rangle - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \langle L_k z, Z_k L_k z \rangle \leq 0, \quad (18)$$

with L_k as per (7). Then, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (14) for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$.

The $m = |\mathcal{E}|$ conditions in (16) enable use of the structure of each $L_k = B_{(\cdot,k)} B'_{(\cdot,k)}$ for link-wise decentralized verification of (14), although this can be conservative. An alternative is to decompose according to the broader structure of each

$$K_i = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_k, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (19)$$

which encompasses the neighborhood of agent i .

Lemma 3. *Let $W = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}$ be such that $W_i \succeq 0$ and $W \succ 0$. Suppose there exist $X_i = X_i^* : \mathbf{L}_2^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, $Y_i : \mathbf{L}_2^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, $Z_i = Z_i^* : \mathbf{L}_2^{2m} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, and $\varepsilon_i > 0$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$, such that for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$,*

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ K_i \end{bmatrix} z, \begin{bmatrix} X_i + \varepsilon_i W_i & Y_i \\ Y_i^* & Z_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ K_i \end{bmatrix} z \right\rangle \leq 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (20a)$$

$$\langle z, \Xi_1 z \rangle - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \langle z, X_i z \rangle \leq 0, \quad (20b)$$

$$\langle z, \Xi_2 Lz \rangle - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \langle z, Y_i K_i z \rangle \leq 0, \quad (20c)$$

$$\langle Lz, \Xi_3 Lz \rangle - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \langle K_i z, Z_i K_i z \rangle \leq 0, \quad (20d)$$

with K_i as per (19). Then, there exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that (14) for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$.

Proof. For all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, (20a) implies

$$\langle z, X_i z \rangle + \langle z, Y_i K_i z \rangle + \langle K_i z, Y_i^* z \rangle + \langle K_i z, Z_i K_i z \rangle \leq -\varepsilon_i \langle z, W_i z \rangle,$$

for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \left(\langle z, X_i z \rangle + \langle z, Y_i K_i z \rangle + \langle K_i z, Y_i^* z \rangle + \langle K_i z, Z_i K_i z \rangle \right) \\ \leq - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \varepsilon_i \langle z, W_i z \rangle \leq -\varepsilon \|z\|_2^2,\end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\varepsilon = (\min_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \varepsilon_i) \cdot (\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} x^T W x / x^T x) > 0$; note that $W = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} W_i \succ 0$ implies $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \varepsilon_i W_i \succeq (\min_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \varepsilon_i) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} W_i \succ 0$, because each $W_i \succeq 0$. Combining (20b), (20c), (20d), and (21), gives

$$\langle z, \Xi_1 z \rangle + \langle z, \Xi_2 Lz \rangle + \langle Lz, \Xi_2^* z \rangle + \langle Lz, \Xi_3 Lz \rangle \leq -\varepsilon \|z\|_2^2, \quad (22)$$

as claimed. \square

As with [6, Lem. 1], the proof of Lemma 3 expands upon ideas from the proof of [11, Thm. 1], which is not directly applicable here for the reasons elaborated in [6, Rem. 4]. Considering K_i as per Lemma 3, instead of L_k as per Lemma 2, makes each instance of (20a) depend on more network model data, which provides scope for reducing the conservativeness of Lemma 2. This comes at the cost of the additional inequality (20c), which has no counterpart in Lemma 2 since $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k = L$, whereas $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} K_i \neq L$.

IV. MAIN RESULT: NEIGHBOURHOOD CONDITIONS

A possible selection of W_i , X_i , Y_i , Z_i , $i \in \mathcal{V}$, is devised for Lemma 3. It yields a decentralized collection of conditions that together imply the stability of $[[G, \Delta]]$, and thus, stability of the network by Theorem 2. The conditions are decentralized in the sense that each depends on model data that is local to the neighbourhood of a specific agent, including corresponding components of the IQC based uncertainty description of the local links.

The subsequent matrix definitions, and related properties, lead to the proposed selection of W_i , X_i , Y_i and Z_i in Lemma 3. The definitions pertain to the structure of the networked system model, encoded by the network graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and corresponding sub-system graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{V}}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}})$, with $\mathcal{V} = [1 : n]$, $m = |\mathcal{E}| = |\tilde{\mathcal{E}}|$, $|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}| = 2m = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} m_i$, and $m_i = |\mathcal{N}_i|$, as per Section III. First, for each $k \in \mathcal{M} = [1 : m]$, define

$$A_k := (\text{diag}(B_{(\cdot,k)}))^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}, \quad (23)$$

where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}$ is the incidence matrix of the sub-system graph Laplacian matrix $L = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} B_{(\cdot,k)} B'_{(\cdot,k)}$ in (7). The matrix A_k is diagonal, with $\{0, 1\}$ entries, and

$$(A_k)_{(r,r)} = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad r \in \kappa_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}^{-1}(k);$$

i.e., the value is 1 only in the two locations corresponding to the sub-systems in $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ associated with link k , as per the definition of the incidence matrix B below (7). Indeed, since $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{V}}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}})$ is 1-regular, direct calculation gives $A_k B_{(\cdot,k)} = B_{(\cdot,k)} A_k$, $B'_{(\cdot,k)} A_k = B'_{(\cdot,k)}$, $A_k B_{(\cdot,\ell)} = \mathbf{0}_{2m}$, $B'_{(\cdot,\ell)} A_k = \mathbf{0}'_{2m}$,

$$A_k L_k = (\text{diag}(B_{(\cdot,k)}))^2 B_{(\cdot,k)} B'_{(\cdot,k)} = L_k = L'_k = L_k A_k \quad (24a)$$

$$\text{and } A_k L_\ell = (\text{diag}(B_{(\cdot,k)}))^2 B_{(\cdot,k)} B'_{(\cdot,\ell)} = \mathbf{0}_{2m} = L_\ell A_k \quad (24b)$$

for all $k \neq \ell \in \mathcal{M}$. As such, given $i \in \mathcal{V}$, for $k \in \mathcal{K}_i$,

$$\left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_\ell \right) A_k = L_k = A_k \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_\ell \right), \quad \text{and} \quad (24c)$$

$$\left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} A_k \right) \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_\ell \right) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_k = \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_\ell \right) \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} A_k \right), \quad (24d)$$

where the set \mathcal{K}_i of edge indexes associated with agent i is defined as per Section II-C. Finally, for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, define

$$C_i := \text{diag}(T_{(\cdot, i)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}, \quad (25)$$

where T is given in (4a). As such, $C_i = C_i'$ is a diagonal matrix with $\{0, 1\}$ entries. Composing it with Ξ_1 in (15) isolates only the model data related to the agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$. It can be shown by direct calculation that

$$C_i \Xi_1 = \Xi_1 C_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} C_i = I_{2m}. \quad (26)$$

The following is used to prove the subsequent main result.

Lemma 4. For arbitrary linear $\Gamma = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, $\Gamma_i : \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i}$, and the sub-system graph Laplacian $L = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k$ in (7),

$$L\Gamma L = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k \Gamma L_k + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_k} L_k \Gamma L_\ell,$$

where \mathcal{L}_k collects the edge indexes associated with the two agents linked by edge k , excluding the latter, as per the definition in Section II-C.

Proof. See Appendix. \square

Proposition 1. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let

$$W_i := C_i, \quad (27a)$$

$$X_i := C_i \Xi_1 = \Xi_1 C_i, \quad (27b)$$

$$Y_i := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \frac{1}{2} \Xi_2 A_k, \quad (27c)$$

$$Z_i := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \frac{1}{2} A_k \Xi_3 A_k + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \{k\}} A_k \Xi_3 A_\ell, \quad (27d)$$

with A_k as per (23), C_i as per (25), and the linear block diagonal Ξ_1, Ξ_2, Ξ_3 as per (15). If for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists $\varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$,

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ K_i \end{bmatrix} z, \begin{bmatrix} X_i + \varepsilon_i W_i & Y_i \\ Y_i^* & Z_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ K_i \end{bmatrix} z \right\rangle \leq 0, \quad (28)$$

with K_i as per (19), then there exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that (14) for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$.

Proof. With Z_i as per (27d),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \langle K_i z, Z_i K_i z \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \left\langle z, K_i \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \frac{1}{2} A_k \Xi_3 A_k + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \{k\}} A_k \Xi_3 A_\ell \right) K_i z \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \left\langle z, \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \frac{1}{2} L_k \Xi_3 L_k + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \{k\}} L_k \Xi_3 L_\ell \right) z \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle z, \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \frac{1}{2} L_k \Xi_3 L_k + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \{k\}} L_k \Xi_3 L_\ell \right) z \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle z, \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k \Xi_3 L_k + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_k} L_k \Xi_3 L_\ell \right) z \right\rangle = \langle Lz, \Xi_3 Lz \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (20d). The second equality holds by the definition of K_i in (19), and the identity (24c), whereby $(\sum_{l \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_l) A_k = L_k$ and $A_\ell (\sum_{l \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_l) = L_\ell$ whenever $k, \ell \in \mathcal{K}_i$.

Both parts of Lemma 1 are used for the fourth equality, and Lemma 4 for the final equality.

Similarly, with X_k as per (27b), given (26), $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} X_i = (\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} C_i) \Xi_1 = \Xi_1$. As such, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \langle z, X_i z \rangle = \langle z, \Xi_1 z \rangle$ for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, which implies (20b). Further, with Y_k as per (27c), in view of the identity (24d), linearity of Ξ_2 , and part i) of Lemma 1, for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} Y_i K_i &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{2} \Xi_2 \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} A_k \right) \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_\ell \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{2} \Xi_2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} L_k \\ &= \Xi_2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (20c). Finally, with $W_i \succeq 0$ as per (27a), $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} W_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} C_i = I_{2m} \succ 0$; see (26). As such, Lemma 3 applies, and therefore, (14) for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$, as claimed. \square

For comparison, the link-wise decomposition from [6] is recalled below.

Proposition 2. ([6, Prop. 1]) For each $k \in [1 : m]$, let

$$W_k := A_k, \quad (29)$$

$$X_k := \frac{1}{2} (A_k \Xi_1 + \Xi_1 A_k), \quad (30)$$

$$Y_k := \Xi_2 A_k, \quad (31)$$

$$Z_k := A_k \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n D_i \right) A_k, \quad (32)$$

where A_k is defined in (23), and diagonal $D_i : \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i}$ is such that $\Xi_{3,i} = D_i + S_i$ for some negative semi-definite $S_i : \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_2^{m_i}$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$, with Ξ_1, Ξ_2, Ξ_3 as per (15). If for all $k \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists $\varepsilon_k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ L_k \end{bmatrix} z, \begin{bmatrix} X_k + \varepsilon_k W_k & Y_k \\ Y_k^* & Z_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{2m} \\ L_k \end{bmatrix} z \right\rangle \leq 0, \quad (33)$$

then there exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that (14) for all $z \in \mathbf{L}_2^{2m}$.

In Proposition 1, Z_i is not restricted to depend on only a suitable diagonal component D_3 of Ξ_3 . This is one aspect of Proposition 1 that helps mitigate potential conservativeness of the link-based decomposition in Proposition 2. Further, the determination of X_i, Y_i , and Z_i in Proposition 1 depends on model data available to the neighbors of agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$. More specifically, each depends on the dynamics of agent i , and its neighbours in \mathcal{N}_i , as well as the associated neighbourhood links corresponding to the index set \mathcal{K}_i . This stems from the block-diagonal structure of the linear Ξ_p , $p \in [1 : 3]$, in (15), and the network structure in each component L_k , $k \in \mathcal{M}$, of the sub-system graph Laplacian $L = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k$. Indeed, the positions and values of the non-zero elements in $K_i Z_i K_i$ reflect the nonzero pattern corresponding to each L_k for $k \in \mathcal{K}_i$, and the same for $Y_i K_i$; see the proof of Lemma 4 for further detail. The definition of X_i , on the other hand, only depends on model data specific to agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$. This additional aspect of Proposition 1 could potentially reduce the conservativeness of the decentralized conditions, compared to those in Proposition 2, as each of the latter

relies on more localized information that pertains only to each link $k \in \mathcal{M}$. Since the conditions in Proposition 1 do not require the network to have any particular interconnection structure, the result is generally applicable for the scalable robust stability analysis of sparsely interconnected large-scale systems.

To illustrate the scope for reduced conservativeness provided by Proposition 1, consider the following path graph network example with $n = 10$ agents; i.e., $m = 9$, $m_1 = m_{10} = 1$ and $m_i = 2$ for $i \in [2 : 9]$. Suppose that the agent dynamics is such that the non-zero entries of H in (4) are identical and linear time-invariant, with transfer function $1/(s+25)$. Further, suppose the links R are such that the block elements of the block diagonal $\Delta = (R - I_{18}) \circ T$ are sector bounded, with $\Phi_{1,i} = -2m_i\alpha\beta$, $\Phi_{2,i} = 1m_i(\alpha + \beta)$ and $\Phi_{3,i} = -2I_{m_i}$, with $\alpha = -2$, $\beta = 0.15$. Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI) conditions for semi-definite programming-based verification of the monolithic IQC (12), or (28) in Proposition 1, or verifying (33) in Proposition 2, can be derived, respectively, via the well-known Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov (KYP) Lemma [12], given a state-space model for the agent dynamics. The details have been omitted due to space limitations. The LMIs obtained for (28) in Proposition 1, and those for (14), are demonstrably feasible, thereby successfully guaranteeing the robust stability of the network. By contrast, the LMIs for (33) in Proposition 2 fail to be feasible for a suitable selection of parameters $\varepsilon_k > 0$, $k \in [1 : m]$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Neighbourhood decentralized robust stability conditions are devised for networked systems in the presence of link uncertainty. This result is based on input-output IQCs that are used to describe the link uncertainties, and ultimately the structured robust stability certificate. An example is used to illustrate the scope for reduced conservativeness compared to existing results. Future work will explore alternative decompositions and comparisons. It is also of interest to apply the main result to study specific network scenarios where information exchange is impacted by asynchronous time-varying delays, and dynamic quantization (e.g., see [13].)

APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 1. Item i) holds because $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{X}_i = \mathcal{M}$, and for $k \in \mathcal{M}$, the cardinality of $\mathcal{V}_k := \{i \in \mathcal{V} \mid k \in \mathcal{X}_i\}$ is exactly 2, so that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{X}_i} \frac{1}{2} F_k = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} (\frac{1}{2} F_k + \frac{1}{2} F_k) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} F_k$.

Further, for all $k \in \mathcal{M}$, the edge index set

$$\mathcal{L}_k = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{k\},$$

and $(\mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{k\}) \cap (\mathcal{X}_j \setminus \{k\}) = \emptyset$ whenever $i, j \in \mathcal{V}_k$ with $i \neq j$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{X}_i} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{k\}} E_k \circ F_\ell &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_k} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{k\}} E_k \circ F_\ell \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_k} E_k \circ F_\ell, \end{aligned}$$

which is item ii). \square

Proof of Lemma 4. First note that $L_k \Gamma L_\ell = O_{2m}$ for every $k \in \mathcal{M}$, and $\ell \in \mathcal{M} \setminus (\mathcal{L}_k \cup \{k\})$. Indeed, given the definition of \mathcal{L}_k , and the block diagonal structure of $\Gamma = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, if the sub-system graph vertex index $r \in [1 : 2m]$ is such $(\Gamma B_{(\cdot, \ell)})_r \neq 0$, then

$$r \notin \left[\sum_{h \in [1:i-1]} m_h + 1 : \sum_{h \in [1:i]} m_h \right] \cup \left[\sum_{h \in [1:j-1]} m_h + 1 : \sum_{h \in [1:j]} m_h \right]$$

with $\{i, j\} = \kappa_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^{-1}(k)$, whereby $B_{(r,k)} = 0$. Therefore, $(B_{(\cdot, k)})' (\Gamma B_{(\cdot, \ell)}) = 0$, and thus,

$$L_k \Gamma L_\ell = B_{(\cdot, k)} B'_{(\cdot, k)} \Gamma B_{(\cdot, \ell)} B'_{(\cdot, \ell)} = O_{2m}.$$

Since Γ is linear by hypothesis, and pointwise multiplication by each L_k is linear, it follows from the preceding observation that

$$\begin{aligned} L \Gamma L &= \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} L_k \right) \Gamma \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{M}} L_\ell \right) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{M}} L_k \Gamma L_\ell \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_k \cup \{k\}} L_k \Gamma L_\ell \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M}} \left(L_k \Gamma L_k + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_k} L_k \Gamma L_\ell \right) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. D. Siljak, *Large-Scale Dynamic Systems: Stability and Structure*. North-Holland, 1978.
- [2] M. Arcak, C. Meissen, and A. Packard, *Networks of Dissipative Systems: Compositional Certification of Stability, Performance, and Safety*. Springer, 2016.
- [3] P. Moylan and D. Hill, "Stability criteria for large-scale systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 23, pp. 143–149, 1978.
- [4] M. Vidyasagar, *Input-Output Analysis of Large-Scale Interconnected Systems: Decomposition, Well-posedness and Stability*. Springer, 1981.
- [5] A. Megretski and A. Rantzer, "System analysis via integral quadratic constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 819–830, 1997.
- [6] S. Mariano and M. Cantoni, "Structured stability analysis of networked systems with uncertain links," in *2024 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 1222–1227, IEEE (DOI 10.23919/ECC64448.2024.10591047), 2024.
- [7] I. Lestas and G. Vinnicombe, "Scalable decentralized robust stability certificates for networks of interconnected heterogeneous dynamical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 1613–1625, 2006.
- [8] U. T. Jönsson and C.-Y. Kao, "A scalable robust stability criterion for systems with heterogeneous LTI components," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 2219–2234, 2010.
- [9] M. Andersen, S. Pakazad, A. Hansson, and A. Rantzer, "Robust stability analysis of sparsely interconnected uncertain systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, pp. 2151–2156, 2014.
- [10] S. Khong and A. Rantzer, "Scalable stability conditions for heterogeneous networks via integral quadratic constraints," in *2014 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 2863–2867, IEEE, 2014.
- [11] R. Pates and G. Vinnicombe, "Scalable design of heterogeneous networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2318–2333, 2016.
- [12] A. Rantzer, "On the Kalman—Yakubovich—Popov lemma," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 7–10, 1996.
- [13] J. Baillieul and P. Antsaklis, "Control and communication challenges in networked real-time systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 9–28, 2007.