

Stability Analysis of M -Dimensional Asynchronous Swarms With a Fixed Communication Topology

Yang Liu, *Member, IEEE*, Kevin M. Passino, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Marios M. Polycarpou, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Coordinated dynamical swarm behavior occurs when certain types of animals forage for food or try to avoid predators. Analogous behaviors can occur in engineering systems (e.g., in groups of autonomous mobile robots or air vehicles). In this paper, we study a model of an M -dimensional ($M \geq 2$) asynchronous swarm with a fixed communication topology, where each member only communicate with fixed neighbors, to provide conditions under which collision-free convergence can be achieved with finite-size swarm members that have proximity sensors, and neighbor position sensors that only provide delayed position information. Moreover, we give conditions under which an M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm with a fixed communication topology following an “edge-leader” can maintain cohesion during movements even in the presence of sensing delays and asynchronism. In addition, the swarm movement flexibility is analyzed. Such stability analysis is of fundamental importance if one wants to understand the coordination mechanisms for groups of autonomous vehicles or robots, where intermember communication channels are less than perfect and collisions must be avoided.

Index Terms—Asynchronism, discrete-event systems, fixed communication topology, stability, swarms.

I. INTRODUCTION

A VARIETY OF organisms have the ability to cooperatively forage for food while trying to avoid predators and other risks. For instance, when a school of fish searches for prey, or if it encounters a predator, the fish often make coordinated maneuvers as if the entire group were one organism [1]. Analogous behavior is seen in flocks of birds, herds of wildebeests, swarms of bees, groups of ants, and social bacteria [2]–[5]. We call this kind of aggregate motion “swarm behavior.” A high-level view of a swarm suggests that the organisms are cooperating to achieve some purposeful behavior and achieve some goal. Naturalists and biologists have studied such swarm behavior for decades. Moreover, computer scientists in the field of “artificial life” have studied how to model and simulate biological swarms to understand how such “social animals” interact, achieve goals, and evolve [6]–[8].

Recently, there has been a growing interest in biomimicry of the mechanisms of foraging and swarming for use in engineering applications since the resulting swarm intelligence can

be applied in optimization (e.g., in telecommunication systems) [2], [5], robotics [9], [10], traffic patterns in intelligent transportation systems [11]–[13], and military applications [14]. For instance, there has been a growing interest in groups (swarms) of flying vehicles [15]–[17]. Moreover, it has been proposed that swarms of robots may provide the possibility of enhanced task performance, high reliability (fault tolerance), low unit complexity, and decreased cost over traditional systems. Also, it has been argued that a swarm of robots can accomplish some tasks that would be impossible for a single robot to achieve. Particular research includes that of Beni [10] who introduced the concept of cellular robotic systems, and the related study in [18]. The behavior-based control strategy put forward by Brooks [19] is quite well known and it has been applied to collections of simple independent robots, usually for simple tasks. Mataric [20] describes experiments with a homogeneous population of robots acting under different communication constraints. Suzuki [21] considered a number of two-dimensional (2-D) problems of formation of geometric patterns with distributed anonymous mobile swarm robots, where point-size robots are studied and collisions are allowed. A preliminary study on applying social potential fields to distributed autonomous multirobot control was presented in [22]. A survey of autonomous search by robots and animals is provided in [23]. Decentralized control of a collective of autonomous robotic vehicles was discussed in [24], where stability of a linear chain of interdependent vehicles spreading out along a line was analyzed. Other approaches and results in this area are summarized in [9], [25].

In this paper, we are interested in mathematical modeling and analysis of stability properties of swarms. Stability is a basic qualitative property of swarms since if it is not present, then it may be impossible for the swarm to achieve any other group objective. Stability analysis of swarms is still an open problem but there have been several areas of relevant progress. In biology, researchers have used “continuum models” for swarm behavior based on nonlocal interactions, and have studied stability properties [26]. Jin *et al.* in [27] studied stability of synchronized distributed control of one-dimensional (1-D) and 2-D swarm structures. Interestingly, their model and analysis methods look similar to the model and proof of stability for the load balancing problem in computer networks [28], [29]. Moreover, swarm “cohesiveness” was characterized as a stability property and a 1-D asynchronous swarm model was constructed by putting many identical single finite-size vehicular swarm members together, which have proximity sensors and neighbor position sensors that only provide delayed position information in [30], [31]. For this model, in [30] and [31], the authors showed that for a 1-D stationary edge-member swarm, total

Manuscript received October 17, 2001; revised June 20, 2002. Recommended by Associate Editor M. Reyhanoglu. This work was supported by the DAGSI/AFRL and AFRL/VA/AFOSR Collaborative Center of Control Science at The Ohio State University.

Y. Liu and K. M. Passino are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210 USA (e-mail: passion@ee.eng.ohio-state.edu).

M. M. Polycarpou is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0030 USA.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2002.806657

asynchronism leads to asymptotic collision-free convergence and partial asynchronism leads to finite time collision-free convergence even with sensing delays. Furthermore, conditions were given in [31] and [32] under which an asynchronous mobile swarm (here, we mean the entire swarm is moving as an entity when we say a swarm is “mobile;” clearly, each member moves in order to achieve such mobility) following (pushed by) an “edge-leader” can maintain cohesion during movements even in the presence of sensing delays and asynchronism. In addition, similar results were presented in [33] for stability of a 1-D discrete-time asynchronous swarm via an different analysis method from [30]. Recently, in [34], a continuous-time synchronous swarm model has been introduced and conditions for stable cohesion and ultimate swarm member behavior were derived with point-sized agents with no concern for collisions. Next, we would note that there have been several investigations into the stability of intervehicle distances in “platoons” in intelligent transportation systems (e.g., in [35] and [36], or of the “slinky effect” in [37] and [38], and traffic flow in [11] and [13]). Finally, we would note that the study of stability properties of aircraft (spacecraft) formations is a relevant and active research area [15], [16].

Swarm stability for the $M \geq 2$ -dimensional case will be studied in this paper, where stability is used to characterize the cohesiveness of a swarm. Comparing with our earlier analysis for the 1-D case in [30]–[32], the $M \geq 2$ -dimensional case is more challenging. For example, each member in the 1-D swarm has only left and right neighbors, and it can only move to the right or to the left. However, in the $M \geq 2$ -dimensional case each member may have many neighbors (it depends on the definition of “neighbor”) and each of them has an infinite number of moving directions. Especially for the mobile case, there must exist some constraints for the moving direction of the “leader” besides the constraints on its step size in order to maintain swarm cohesion during movements and simultaneously avoid collisions. All of this significantly complicates the convergence analysis for the $M \geq 2$ -dimensional case. In this paper, we will present an M -dimensional asynchronous swarm model by putting many single finite-size swarm members together in an M -dimensional space, where we assume there exists a fixed “chain” communication topology among swarm members and each member only communicates with fixed neighbors via the topology. With the certain initial conditions of the swarm (which will be explained in Section II-B), the chain communication topology that specifies that swarm member i , $i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1$, only communicates with its two nearest neighbors $i - 1$ and $i + 1$ except that swarm member 1 and N which are on the two ends of the chain only communicate with one neighbor, members 2 and $N - 1$, respectively), is fixed. We will provide conditions under which an M -dimensional swarm will converge to be in a cohesive form even in the presence of sensing delays and asynchronism on the basis of such a swarm model. Furthermore, we consider an M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm, where member 1 (the “leader”) leads and all members communicate only with neighbors according to the chain communication topology, to present conditions under which it can maintain collision-free cohesion during movements even with sensing delays and asynchronism. Our

study uses a discrete time discrete event dynamical system [28] approach and unlike the studies of platoon stability in intelligent transportation systems we avoid detailed characteristics of low level “inner-loop control” and vehicle dynamics in favor of focusing on high-level mechanisms underlying qualitative swarm behavior when there are imperfect communications.

II. MODELING

First, we will explain the capabilities of a single swarm member and provide a mathematical model for an M -dimensional N -member asynchronous swarm with a communication topology, where $M \geq 2$ and $N \geq 2$ are fixed. Next, a mathematical model for an M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm with a communication topology following an “edge-leader” will be given.

A. Single Swarm Member Model

An M -dimensional swarm is a set of N swarm members that move in an M -dimensional space. Assume each swarm member has a finite physical size (diameter) $w > 0$. It has a “proximity sensor,” which has a sensing range with a radius $\varepsilon > w$ around each member. In the $M = 2$ case, it is a circular-shaped area with a radius $\varepsilon > w$ around each member. Once another swarm member reaches a distance of ε from it, the sensor *instantaneously* indicates the position of the other member. However, if its neighbors are not in its sensing range, the proximity sensor will return ∞ (or, practically, some large number). The proximity sensor is used to help avoid swarm member collisions and ensures that our framework allows for finite-size vehicles, not just points. Each swarm member also has a “neighbor position sensor” which can obtain the positions of neighbors around it. It performs this sensing via communications using a communication topology. We assume that there is no restriction on how close a neighbor must be for the neighbor position sensor to provide a sensed position. The sensed position information may be subjected to random communication delays (i.e., each swarm member’s knowledge about its neighbors’ positions may be outdated). Assume each swarm member knows its own position with no delay (note that even we assume each member knows its own position in the model, but in practice, it may not be necessary since it can move only using the relative positions to its neighbors obtained by its sensors). Note that we define the position, distance and sensor sensing range of the finite-size swarm member with respect to its center, not its edge.

Swarm members like to be close to each other, but not too close. Suppose d is the desired “comfortable distance” between two adjacent swarm neighbors (“neighbors” will be fully defined below in terms of the chain communication topology) known by every swarm member, and it satisfies $d > \varepsilon > w$ as shown in Fig. 3. Each swarm member senses the interswarm member distance via both neighbor position and proximity sensors and makes decisions for movements via some position updating algorithms, which is according to the error between the sensed distance and the comfortable distance d . And then, the decisions are input to its “driving device,” which provides locomotion for it. Each swarm member will try to move to maintain a comfortable distance to its neighbors. This will tend to make the group move together in a cohesive swarm.

B. Swarm Model With a Fixed Communication Topology

An M -dimensional swarm is formed by putting many of the above single swarm members together on an M -dimensional space. An example of an $M = 2$ -dimensional N -member swarm is shown in Fig. 1. Let $x^i(t)$ denote the position vector of swarm member i at time t . We have $x^i(t) = [x_1^i(t), x_2^i(t), \dots, x_M^i(t)]^\top \in R^M$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, where $x_m^i(t)$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$, is the m th position coordinate of member i . We assume that there is a set of times $T = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ at which one or more swarm members update their positions. Let $T^i \subseteq T$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, be a set of times at which the i th member's position $x^i(t)$, $t \in T^i$, is updated. Notice that the elements of T^i should be viewed as the indices of the sequence of physical times at which updates take place, not the real times. These time indexes are nonnegative integers and can be mapped into physical times. The T^i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, are independent of each other for different i . However, they may have intersections (i.e., it could be that $T^i \cap T^j \neq \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, so two or more swarm members may move simultaneously). Note that our model assumes that swarm member i , $i = 2, 3, \dots, N$, communicates with its neighbor member $i - 1$ via its neighbor position sensors within a communication topology (the communication topology will be explained later) to obtain the position information of member $i - 1$ (the position information obtained may be subjected to random delays). A variable $\tau_{i-1}^i(t) \in T$, $i = 2, 3, \dots, N$, is used to denote the time index of the real time at which position information of its communicating neighbor $i - 1$ is obtained by member i at $t \in T^i$ and it satisfies $0 \leq \tau_{i-1}^i(t) \leq t$ for $t \in T^i$. Of course, while we model the times at which neighbor position information is obtained as being the same times at which one or more swarm members decide where to move and actually move, it could be that the *real time* at which such neighbor position information is obtained is earlier than the real time where swarm members moved. The difference $t - \tau_{i-1}^i(t)$ between current time t and the time $\tau_{i-1}^i(t)$ can be viewed as a form of communication delay (of course the actual length of the delay depends on what real times correspond to the indices t , $\tau_{i-1}^i(t)$). Moreover, it is important to note that we assume that $\tau_{i-1}^i(t) \geq \tau_{i-1}^i(t')$ if $t > t'$ for $t, t' \in T^i$. This ensures that member i uses the most recently obtained communicating neighbor position information. Besides the neighbor position information obtained from its neighbor position sensors, swarm member i also gets some information from its proximity sensors. Assume that if its communicating neighbor $i - 1$ is beyond the sensing range of its proximity sensors, it uses the information $x^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))$ from its neighbor position sensors; if its neighbor $i - 1$ is inside the sensing range of its proximity sensors, it uses the real-time neighbor position information $x^{i-1}(t)$ provided by its proximity sensors. The information is used for position updating until member i gets more recent information, for example, from its neighbor position sensor. Notice that swarm member i updates its position only at time indices $t \in T^i$ and at all times $t \notin T^i$ its position $x^i(t)$ is left unchanged.

Next, we specify two assumptions that we use to characterize asynchronism for swarms according to [29].

Assumption 1. (Total Asynchronism): Assume the sets T^i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, are infinite, and if for each k , $t_k \in T^i$ and $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{i-1}^i(t_k) = \infty$, $i = 2, 3, \dots, N$.

This assumption guarantees that each swarm member moves infinitely often and the old position information of neighbors of each swarm member is eventually purged from it. More precisely, given any time t_1 , there exists a time $t_2 > t_1$ such that $\tau_{i-1}^i(t) \geq t_1$, for $i = 2, 3, \dots, N$ and $t \geq t_2$. On the other hand, the delays $t - \tau_{i-1}^i(t)$ in obtaining position information of neighbor of member i can become unbounded as t increases. Next, we specify a more restrictive type of asynchronism, but one which is usually easy to implement in practice.

Assumption 2. (Partial Asynchronism): There exists a finite-positive integer B (i.e., $B \in Z^+$, where Z^+ represents the set of positive integers) such that

- for every i and $t \geq 0$, $t \in T$, at least one of the elements of the set $\{t, t + 1, \dots, t + B - 1\}$ belongs to T^i ;
- there holds $t - B < \tau_{i-1}^i(t) \leq t$ for all $i = 2, 3, \dots, N$, and all $t \geq 0$ belonging to T^i .

Notice that for the partial asynchronism assumption each member moves at least once within B time indexes and the delays $t - \tau_{i-1}^i(t)$ in obtaining position information of neighbors of member i are bounded by B , i.e., $0 \leq t - \tau_{i-1}^i(t) < B$.

Next, in order to construct a swarm model we will first explain the chain communication topology. We will study an asynchronous swarm with certain initial conditions where the chain communication topology can exist. An example of such an $M = 2$ -dimensional swarm is shown in Fig. 1. Assume that there is a set of N swarm members distributed in an M -dimensional space. Assume $|x| = \sqrt{x^\top x}$ and $|x^i(0) - x^j(0)| > d$, for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, $i \neq j$ initially. Suppose one of the swarm members always remains stationary (note that it can be relatively stationary in the practical case of air or water vehicles), which we call member 1. Member 1's nearest neighbor, which we call member 2, is assumed to be initially located inside a sector area starting from the position of member 1 with a radius $L \gg d$ and a central angle $0 \leq \delta \leq \pi$ as shown in Fig. 1 (notice that it is a sector area for $M = 2$ case, and a cone for $M = 3$). Member 1 only communicates with member 2, and member 2 uses the information of member 1 to update its position. Assume member 2's nearest neighbor in the pool of *unchosen* members, which we call member 3, is located inside the *overlapping* area of the sector area starting from the position of member 1 and a equal-size sector area starting from the position of member 2, which is also symmetrical about the extension of the connected line between positions of members 1 and 2. Member 2 only communicates with members 1 and 3, and member 3 uses the information of member 2 to update its position. In the same way, assume the nearest neighbors of swarm member $i - 1$ in the pool of unchosen members, which we call member i , is only located inside the overlapping area of all the sector areas starting from positions of members $1, 2, \dots, i - 1$, respectively, where $i = 4, 5, \dots, N$. In addition, the sector area starting from the position of member $i - 1$ is symmetrical about the extension of the connected line between positions of members $i - 2$ and $i - 1$. Similarly, member $i - 1$ only communicates with members $i - 2$ and i , and member i uses the information of member




Fig. 1. M -dimensional ($M = 2$) N -member asynchronous swarm with a fixed communication topology (dashed line along the direction of the arrows), all members moving to be adjacent to the stationary member (member 1).

$i - 1$ to update its position. Therefore, there exists a fixed chain communication topology from member N to member 1 in such a swarm, which is represented by a dashed line along the direction of the arrows in Fig. 1.

We may think of the above swarm as a chain of intercommunicating single swarm members. With the topology, each member only communicates with the two nearest members to it (which we call “communicating neighbors”) except that members 1 and N only communicate with the nearest member to it. It updates its positions at its updating time indices using the most recent obtained position of its unique “reference neighbor” (the communicating neighbor which it uses as a reference) except the stationary member 1. In particular, swarm member i , $i = 2, 3, \dots, N$, tries to maintain a comfortable distance d to its reference neighbor $i - 1$ so that it moves only along the connection line of its position and the sensed position of member $i - 1$. With the choice of the aforementioned initial conditions, there will be no communication path (the line connecting positions of two communicating neighbors) overlapping in such a fixed communication topology during position updating of swarm members and collisions will never happen in the swarm. The underlying reasons will be explained below. Note that if $\delta = 0$, the

swarm which satisfies the above initial conditions is a one-dimensional swarm.

Of course, not all possible initial conditions of swarm members can fit in the above constraints. Two examples of $M = 2$ -dimensional swarms with illegal initial conditions are shown in Fig. 2. Obviously for the swarm in Fig. 2(a), it is impossible to build an overlap-free communication topology from member 3 to the stationary member 1. Considering the swarm in Fig. 2(b), clearly all members except the first three are not located in the overlapping area requested above so that it is possible to have communication paths overlapping during movements of swarm members although there may exist a communication topology from member 9 to member 1. Hence, the “overlapping” condition is needed due to the asynchronism and delays and our focus on collision avoidance. Next, note that we need the constraint $0 \leq \delta \leq \pi$ above to avoid situations like in Fig. 2(b). Why is the upper bound π ? This is due to the fact that only the communicating neighbors of each member are the nearest to it, and will be discussed more later.

Let $e^i(t) = x^i(t) - x^{i+1}(t)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ denote the intermember distance vector of communicating neighbors $i + 1$ and i . Assume the direction of $e^i(t)$ is from the posi-




Fig. 2. Examples of $M = 2$ -dimensional swarms with illegal initial conditions.

tion of member $i + 1$ to the position of member i and $|e^i(t)| = \sqrt{(e^i(t))^T e^i(t)}$, where $|e^i(t)|$ denotes its magnitude. We use “ g functions” $g_a(|e^i(t)| - d)$ and $g_f(|e^i(t)| - d)$ (see [30]–[32]) to denote two different kinds of attractive and repelling relationships between two swarm neighbors, where for a scalar $\beta > 1$, $g_a(|e^i(t)| - d)$ is such that

$$\frac{1}{\beta} (|e^i(t)| - d) < g_a(|e^i(t)| - d) < (|e^i(t)| - d) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{if } (|e^i(t)| - d) > 0$$

$$g_a(|e^i(t)| - d) = (|e^i(t)| - d) = 0$$

$$\text{if } (|e^i(t)| - d) = 0 \quad (2)$$

$$(|e^i(t)| - d) > g_a(|e^i(t)| - d) < \frac{1}{\beta} (|e^i(t)| - d)$$

$$\text{if } (|e^i(t)| - d) < 0. \quad (3)$$

and for some scalars β and η , such that $\beta > 1$, and $\eta > 0$, $g_f(|e^i(t)| - d)$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\beta} (|e^i(t)| - d) < g_f(|e^i(t)| - d) < (|e^i(t)| - d) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{if } (|e^i(t)| - d) > \eta$$

$$g_f(|e^i(t)| - d) = (|e^i(t)| - d)$$

$$\text{if } -\eta \leq (|e^i(t)| - d) \leq \eta \quad (5)$$

$$(|e^i(t)| - d) > g_f(|e^i(t)| - d) < \frac{1}{\beta} (|e^i(t)| - d)$$

$$\text{if } (|e^i(t)| - d) < -\eta. \quad (6)$$

Note that the aforementioned g functions (a scalar) only represents the amount of the attractive or repelling force between two communicating neighbors for a given distance vector. The moving direction of swarm members depends on the direction of the distance vector $e^i(t)$.

Next, we will show that in the above M -dimensional swarm, collisions will never happen even without proximity sensors.

From our assumption, $|e^i(0)| > d$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$, so that at the beginning the proximity sensor of member $i + 1$ cannot sense its neighbor i . So, swarm members only update their positions according to the chosen g function, which uses the sensed information provided by their neighbor position sensors. Particularly as shown in Fig. 3 which enlarges a part of Fig. 1, member 2 will move toward the stationary member 1 step by step along the connected line between members 1 and 2 via g function at $t \in T^2$ once it gets the unchanged position information of member 1, $x^1(t)$. From the definition of the g function, we have

$$g(|x^1(t) - x^2(t)| - d) \leq |x^1(t) - x^2(t)| - d$$

and so we get

$$|e^1(t)| \geq d \quad \forall t.$$

As we know, member 3's proximity sensors cannot sense member 2 since $|e^2(t)|$ is greater than d at the beginning. Therefore, member 3 updates its position at $t \in T^3$ only according to its sensed position information $x^2(\tau_2^3(t))$ and the update step is equal to $g(|x^2(\tau_2^3(t)) - x^3(t)| - d)$. According to our assumptions of asynchronism, we have $\tau_2^3(t) \leq t$. As shown in Fig. 3, member 2 already arrives at the point C at t , which is $x^2(t)$. However, due to communication delays, the position information of member 2 obtained by member 3 at $t \in T^3$ is $x^2(\tau_2^3(t))$, which is still at the point B (note that if there is no communication delay, i.e., $\tau_2^3(t) = t$, points B and C will overlap). Suppose α is the angle formed by lines of BC and AB in the clockwise direction, and then we have $\pi/2 \leq \alpha \leq 3\pi/2$ since $0 \leq \delta \leq \pi$ and member 3 is only located inside the overlapping area of the two sector areas starting from positions of members 1 and 2 with a central angle δ . Clearly, in the triangle ABC , $|AC| \geq |AB|$ ($|AC| = |AB|$ if points B and C overlap), i.e.,

$$|x^2(\tau_2^3(t)) - x^3(t)| \leq |x^2(t) - x^3(t)|. \quad (7)$$




Fig. 3. Enlargement of the part about members 1, 2, and 3 in Fig. 1.

According to the definition of the g function and (7), we have

$$g(|x^2(\tau_2^3(t)) - x^3(t)| - d) \leq |x^2(\tau_2^3(t)) - x^3(t)| - d \leq |x^2(t) - x^3(t)| - d. \quad (8)$$

From (8), we know the update step of member 3 is always less than or equal to the error between the real distance from member 3 to 2 and d (i.e., $|x^2(t) - x^3(t)| - d$). Hence, the intermember distance between members 3 and 2 is always greater than or equal to d . Clearly, a similar result holds for all other swarm members, so we have

$$|e^i(t)| \geq d \quad \forall t, i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1. \quad (9)$$

Equation (9) implies that all the swarm members' proximity sensors will never sense their nearest neighbor during movements. With the choice of initial conditions there always exists a fixed overlap-free communication topology during movements of swarm members so that each member always communicates with its nearest neighbor and try to maintain a comfortable distance to it. Equation (9) also implies that the distance between every member and its nearest neighbor is larger than or equal to d at any time. Therefore, members will never have collisions in the previous swarm even without proximity sensors.

Let $e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t)) = x^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t)) - x^{i+1}(t)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ denote the sensed intermember distance vector of communicating neighbors $i+1$ and i . Assume its direction is from the position of member $i+1$ to the sensed position of

member i and $|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| = \sqrt{(e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t)))^\top e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}$, where $|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|$ denotes its magnitude. So

$$|e^i(t)| \geq |e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| \geq d \quad \forall t, i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1. \quad (10)$$

A mathematical model for the previous M -dimensional swarm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} x^1(t+1) &= x^1(t) \quad \forall t \in T^1 \\ x^2(t+1) &= x^2(t) + g(|x^1(\tau_1^2(t)) - x^2(t)| - d) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{x^1(\tau_1^2(t)) - x^2(t)}{|x^1(\tau_1^2(t)) - x^2(t)|} \right] \quad \forall t \in T^2 \\ &\vdots \\ x^{N-1}(t+1) &= x^{N-1}(t) \\ &\quad + g(|x^{N-2}(\tau_{N-2}^{N-1}(t)) - x^{N-1}(t)| - d) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{x^{N-2}(\tau_{N-2}^{N-1}(t)) - x^{N-1}(t)}{|x^{N-2}(\tau_{N-2}^{N-1}(t)) - x^{N-1}(t)|} \right] \\ &\quad \forall t \in T^{N-1} \\ x^N(t+1) &= x^N(t) + g(|x^{N-1}(\tau_{N-1}^N(t)) - x^N(t)| - d) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{x^{N-1}(\tau_{N-1}^N(t)) - x^N(t)}{|x^{N-1}(\tau_{N-1}^N(t)) - x^N(t)|} \right] \\ &\quad \forall t \in T^N \\ x^i(t+1) &= x^i(t) \quad \forall t \notin T^i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Each item in brackets in (11) is a unit vector which represents the moving direction of each swarm member which is the direction of its sensed interneighbor distance vector, and each g function

item in front of the brackets is a scalar, which is the step size of each swarm member. In addition, $x^i(t)$ is the position vector of member i . Hence, “+” and “-” are the addition and subtraction of vectors.

From the previous assumptions, we can write the model of (11) into the following form; see (12) at the bottom of the page, where $e^i(t)$ is the interneighbor distance vector of members $i+1$ and i .

C. Mobile Swarm Model With an Edge-Leader

Assume that in a swarm with a fixed communication topology, a member will consider itself to be an edge-member if it only communicates with one neighbor, and a middle member if it communicates with two neighbors. Therefore, members 1 and N of the swarm in Fig. 1 are edge-members since they only communicate with members 2 and $N-1$, respectively. All other members i , $i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1$, are middle members since they communicate with both neighbors $i-1$ and $i+1$ assuming a fixed communication topology. Now, assume that member 1 (the edge member) moves to some direction with a bounded step as an edge-leader (we will explain the moving direction and step size of the edge-leader). Member $i+1$ will try to follow i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, and at the same time try to maintain a comfortable interneighbor distance.

Similar to [31], [32], we assume $[d - \gamma, d + \gamma]$ is a “comfortable distance neighborhood” relative to two communicating neighbors i and $i+1$ (i.e., when $|e^i(t)| \in [d - \gamma, d + \gamma]$, we say that they are in the comfortable distance neighborhood), where 2γ is the comfortable distance neighborhood size. Assume that $0 < \varepsilon < d - \gamma$ so that we do not consider swarm member $i+1$ to be at a comfortable distance to member i if it is too close to it, where ε is the sensing range of swarm members’ proximity sensors.

Clearly in the two assumptions of asynchronism we specified above, only Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) will result in cohesiveness for a mobile swarm since the delays in Assumption 1 (total asynchronism), which could be unbounded, will make swarm members lose track of their edge-leader or their neighbors during movements, i.e., the distance between swarm neighbors could become unbounded just because swarm members use arbitrarily old sensed information. Hence, we construct

the mobile swarm model based on Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism), which has a finite positive integer B as an “asynchronism measure.”

For convenience, assume that $|e^i(0)| = d$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ initially, i.e., at the beginning all swarm members are at a comfortable distance from their communicating neighbors. In addition, we assume that the initial positions of swarm members satisfy the constraints we explained for the stationary edge-member case except that all the sector areas starting from the position of member i , $i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1$ are formed by a line starting from the position of member i and the extension of the connected line between positions of members $i-1$ and i with a central angle $\delta/2$ as shown in Fig. 4, where $0 \leq \delta \leq \pi$ (note that actually these sector areas are all the left or right half parts of the corresponding sector areas we explained for the stationary edge-member case in Fig. 1; we will explain how the $\delta/2$ constraint arises below). Similarly, member $i+1$ only communicates with member i and there exists a fixed communication topology from member N to member 1 represented by a dashed line along the direction of the arrows as shown in Fig. 4.

Assume member 1 (the edge-leader) moves only in “legal directions” with a step vector $s(t)$ at time $t \geq 0$, $t \in T^1$, where $0 < |s(t)| \leq r$ (i.e., the step size is bounded by a finite positive scalar r). Here, “legal directions” means those directions to which the distances of member 1 to all other members will monotonically increase along each of its move steps if all other members are stationary and they are defined on the basis of the initial conditions we explained above. In fact, we assume member 1 will calculate the range of legal directions according to the position information of member 2 and 3 before each of its moving steps (note that here we assume there are at least three members in the swarm, and member 1 gets the position information of member 3 via member 2. The two-member case will be discussed in Corollaries 1 and 2). Assume that the moving direction of member 1 forms an angle θ with the connected line of positions of members 2 and 1 in the clockwise direction, and the connected line between positions of members 1 and 2 forms an angle ω with the connected line between positions of members 2 and 3 in the clockwise direction. Moreover, assume the connected line between positions of members 2 and 1 forms an

$$\begin{aligned}
 e^1(t+1) &= \begin{cases} e^1(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^2 \\ e^1(t) & \forall t \notin T^2 \end{cases} \\
 e^i(t+1) &= \begin{cases} e^i(t) + g(|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))}{|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))|} \right] \\ -g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^i \cap T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1 \\ e^i(t) - g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^{i+1}, t \notin T^i, i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1 \\ e^i(t) + g(|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))}{|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^i, t \notin T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1 \\ e^i(t) & \forall t \notin T^i \cup T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1 \end{cases} \quad (12)
 \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 4. An M -dimensional ($M = 2$) N -member asynchronous mobile swarm example with a fixed communication topology (dashed line along the direction of the arrows), all members following an edge-leader (member 1) (case (a): the edge-leader's moving direction satisfies $\pi - \sigma \leq \theta \leq \pi$ if $\omega > \pi$).

angle σ with the connected line between positions of members 1 and 3 in the clockwise direction. Then, legal directions are those directions satisfying

$$\pi - \sigma \leq \theta \leq \pi \text{ if } \omega > \pi$$

(the shaded region in Fig. 4) and

$$\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi + \sigma \text{ if } \omega \leq \pi$$

by symmetry, which are two different cases for the $M = 2$ -dimensional swarm (for $M = 3$ case, the shaded region becomes a one-fourth cone). Note that if members 3 and 2 are located in the same line with member 1, i.e., $\omega = \pi$, the unique legal moving direction for member 1 is $\theta = \pi$. Moreover, the $\delta/2$ constraint of initial conditions (compared to δ constraint in the stationary case) guarantees that the legal directions we defined always hold during movements of the swarm, i.e., with the choice of initial conditions member 1 will always move far away from all other members as long as it moves in legal directions. Clearly, with the constraint of legal directions and the choice of the aforementioned initial conditions, member 1 cannot make sharp turns or move toward member 2 during the moving process. It only moves far away from all other members so that collisions can be avoided and an overlap-free communication topology always exists in the swarm, which is a prerequisite for the mobile swarm to keep the cohesiveness. Obviously, you could define other strategies that would allow for sharper turns but this will come at the expense of the leader needing more position information from its followers.

From this, member 1 must have the position information of members 2 and 3 to decide its moving direction. At the beginning, members 3 and 2 are stationary with a comfortable distance to members 2 and 1, respectively. Therefore, member 1 starts its first move at $t \in T^1$, $t \geq 0$ after it obtains the position information of members 2 and 3, and all other members also start moving one by one at their updating time sets. However, member 1 cannot immediately use its neighbor position information to move further at the next $t \in T^1$, $t \geq 0$ since its information about member 2 obtained via its neighbor position sensor $x^2(\tau_2^1(t))$ may include random delays (at this time its proximity sensor doesn't work since the interneighbor distance is equal to or larger than d). In the same way, its information of member 3 passed by member 2 may include random delays, too. Therefore, we assume that member 1 has to use, we call, a "wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy" under Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) to get the information necessary for continuing its moving. Simply speaking, the "wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy" is that member 1 has to wait $4B - 1$ time indices to make another move step after its previous move, i.e., if member 1 moves at $t^1 \in T^1$, its next moving step will be at the first time index which satisfies $t \geq t^1 + 4B - 1$, $t \in T^1$. The underlying idea is that we assume at $t \in T^1$, member 1 moves with a step vector $s(t)$ only when it has enough information to decide its legal directions; otherwise, it remains stationary (waits). According to Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism), the maximum possible neighbor position delay is $B - 1$. On the basis of this, we can prove that the leader can be guaranteed to get the direction infor-

mation of the position information of members 2 and 3 within the $4B - 1$ time steps, which will be explained in detail later.

Furthermore, we assume that member 2 follows member 1 in order to be in a comfortable distance to member 1. It updates its position at $t \in T^2$ toward member 1 along the connected line of its current position and its obtained position of member 1. Similarly, all other swarm members $i, i = 3, 4, \dots, N$ move to follow their moving communicating neighbors $i - 1$ along the connected line of their positions and their obtained position of $i - 1$ and try to be at the comfortable distance to them. We think of the swarm as maintaining the cohesiveness if all the swarm members are in the comfortable distance neighborhood to their communicating neighbors during movements. Note that the leader's moving step size bound r and the asynchronism measure B can be used as a measure of how fast a cohesive asynchronous swarm moves.

Next, we will show that in the previous M -dimensional mobile swarm, collisions will never happen even without proximity sensors. From our assumption, $|e^i(0)| = d$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$, so that at the beginning the proximity sensor of member $i + 1$ cannot sense its neighbor i . So, swarm members only update their positions according to the g function, which uses the information provided by their neighbor position sensors. Moreover, member 1 always moves far away from all other members. Similar to the analysis for the stationary edge-member case in the last section, we can prove that (10) also holds for the above mobile case according to the definition of the g function and assumptions of asynchronism. This implies there will be no collisions in the above mobile swarm even without proximity sensors. Thus, we can write a model as in the below for the previous M -dimensional mobile swarm. For the edge-leader (member 1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^1(t+1) &= \begin{cases} x^1(t) + s(t), & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 4B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ x^1(t), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ t_p(t+1) &= \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 4B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ t_p(t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $B \in Z^+$ is the asynchronism measure in Assumption 2, and $t_p(t)$ denotes the last time index that member 1 moved to a new position at time $t \in T$. Furthermore, we assume that at $t = 0$ member 1 receives members 2 and 3's initial position information and $t_p(0) = -(4B - 1)$ so that member 1 will start to move at the first time index $t \in T^1, t \geq 0$.

For all other swarm members, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^2(t+1) &= x^2(t) + g(|x^1(\tau_1^2(t)) - x^2(t)| - d) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{x^1(\tau_1^2(t)) - x^2(t)}{|x^1(\tau_1^2(t)) - x^2(t)|} \right] \quad \forall t \in T^2 \\ &\quad \vdots \\ x^{N-1}(t+1) &= x^{N-1}(t) \\ &\quad + g(|x^{N-2}(\tau_{N-2}^{N-1}(t)) - x^{N-1}(t)| - d) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{x^{N-2}(\tau_{N-2}^{N-1}(t)) - x^{N-1}(t)}{|x^{N-2}(\tau_{N-2}^{N-1}(t)) - x^{N-1}(t)|} \right] \\ &\quad \forall t \in T^{N-1} \\ x^N(t+1) &= x^N(t) + g(|x^{N-1}(\tau_{N-1}^N(t)) - x^N(t)| - d) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{x^{N-1}(\tau_{N-1}^N(t)) - x^N(t)}{|x^{N-1}(\tau_{N-1}^N(t)) - x^N(t)|} \right] \\ &\quad \forall t \in T^N \\ x^i(t+1) &= x^i(t) \quad \forall t \notin T^i, i = 2, 3, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which is similar to the model of the stationary edge-member case in (11). Similar to the stationary edge-member case, we can write the model of (13) and (14) into the form of (15), shown at the bottom of the page, where $e^i(t)$ is the intermember distance vector between members $i + 1$ and i .

III. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS OF M -DIMENSIONAL SWARMS WITH A FIXED COMMUNICATION TOPOLOGY

In this section, we will study stability properties of M -dimensional asynchronous swarms with a fixed communication

$$\begin{aligned} e^1(t+1) &= \begin{cases} e^1(t) + s(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t - t_p(t) \geq 4B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ e^1(t) + s(t), & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 4B - 1, t \in T^1, t \notin T^2 \\ e^1(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t \notin T^1 \text{ or } t \in T^2 \cup T^1, t - t_p(t) < 4B - 1 \\ e^1(t), & \text{if } t \notin T^2 \cup T^1 \text{ or } t \notin T^2, t \in T^1, t - t_p(t) < 4B - 1. \end{cases} \\ t_p(t+1) &= \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 4B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ t_p(t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ e^i(t+1) &= \begin{cases} e^i(t) + g(|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))}{|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))|} \right] \\ \quad - g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^i \cap T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1 \\ e^i(t) - g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^{i+1}, t \notin T^i, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1 \\ e^i(t) + g(|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))}{|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^i, t \notin T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1 \\ e^i(t), & \text{if } t \notin T^i \cup T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

topology on the basis of mathematical models we built earlier and provide conditions under which the swarm will obtain and keep the cohesiveness even in the presence of sensing delays and asynchronism. First, we will consider a stationary edge-member asynchronous N -member swarm, and then we will investigate an N -member asynchronous mobile swarm following an edge-leader.

A. Convergence of a Stationary Edge-Member M -Dimensional Swarm

Here, we will provide conditions under which the swarm in Fig. 1 will converge to be adjacent to a stationary edge-member. We begin with the two-member case, then consider the general N -member case where the proofs will depend on the $N = 2$ case.

1) *Convergence for a Two-Member Swarm:* Suppose there is an M -dimensional two-member swarm, which has member i and $i + 1$, where member i always remains stationary and member $i + 1$ communicates with member i and tries to move to maintain a comfortable distance d to it.

Lemma 1: For an $N = 2$ M -dimensional totally asynchronous swarm modeled by

$$\begin{aligned} e^i(t+1) &= e^i(t) - g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right] \quad \forall t \in T^{i+1} \\ e^i(t+1) &= e^i(t) \quad \forall t \notin T^{i+1} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where member i remains stationary, $|e^i(0)| > d$, and $g = g_a$, it is the case that for any γ , $0 < \gamma \leq |e^i(0)| - d$, there exists a time t' such that $|e^i(t')| \in [d, d + \gamma]$ and also $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |e^i(t)| = d$.

Proof: Define a Lyapunov-like function

$$V_i(t) = |e^i(t)| - d \quad \forall t \in T^{i+1} \quad (17)$$

that measures how close swarm member $i + 1$ is to the comfortable distance from member i . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} V_i(t+1) &= |e^i(t+1)| - d \\ &= \left| e^i(t) - g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right] \right| - d \\ \forall t \in T^{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since member i remains stationary, we have

$$e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t)) = e^i(t) \quad \forall t \in T^{i+1}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} V_i(t+1) &= |e^i(t) - g(|e^i(t)| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(t)}{|e^i(t)|} \right]| - d \\ &= |e^i(t)| - g(|e^i(t)| - d) - d \\ \forall t \in T^{i+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

As we know, initially $|e^i(t)| > d$, and by (17) and (18)

$$\Delta V_i = V_i(t+1) - V_i(t) = -g_a(|e^i(t)| - d) < 0. \quad (19)$$

Moreover, if at some $t \in T^{i+1}$, $|e^i(t)| > d$, from (1) and (16), we have $|e^i(t+1)| > d$. So, (19) always holds in this case.

From (1) and (19), we know that if $|e^i(t)|$ is beyond the γ -range of d (i.e., $|e^i(t)| > d + \gamma$, where $0 < \gamma \leq |e^i(0)| - d$), we get

$$\frac{\gamma}{\beta} < \frac{1}{\beta} (|e^i(t)| - d) < g_a (|e^i(t)| - d).$$

So, member $i + 1$ will move toward member i with a moving step at least larger than γ/β . Hence, member $i + 1$ needs at most

$$\frac{\beta}{\gamma} (|e^i(0)| - d - \gamma)$$

update time steps, and at least one update time step, to make their intermember distance inside $[d, d + \gamma]$, where $|e^i(0)|$ is the initial intermember distance. So, there exists a time t' such that $|e^i(t')| \in [d, d + \gamma]$. Moreover, from (19), we know that for $t \in T^{i+1}$, $V_i(t)$ will asymptotically tend to zero (i.e., $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |e^i(t)| = d$). Q.E.D.

Lemma 2: For an $N = 2$ M -dimensional partially asynchronous swarm modeled by (16) but with $g = g_f$, where member i remains stationary, $|e^i(0)| > d$, the intermember distance of communicating neighbors $i + 1$ and i , $|e^i(t)|$ will converge to d in some finite time, that is bounded by $B[\beta/\eta (|e^i(0)| - d - \eta) + 2]$.

Proof: According to Assumption 2, we know that at most after time B from the beginning, member $i + 1$ will sense member i 's position. Then we get the results from the proof of Lemma 1 after replacing g_a with g_f and choosing $\gamma = \eta$.

For the case $0 < (|e^i(t)| - d) \leq \eta$, $|e^i(t)|$ will converge to d in *one* time step according to (5). Similar to the proof of Lemma 1 we can prove that if $|e^i(t)| > d + \eta$ (here $\eta = \gamma$), member $i + 1$ will move toward member i with a step at least larger than η/β . Hence, after at most $\beta/\eta (|e^i(0)| - d - \eta)$ update time steps, and at least one update time step, $|e^i(t)|$ will converge to be inside $[d, d + \eta]$. From Assumption 2, we know that for a partially asynchronous swarm, the maximum update time interval is B . Also, according to (5), member $i + 1$ will reach a comfortable distance to member i in the next update time step. So the total time, including delay time and moving time, needed to achieve convergence is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} B + B \left[\frac{\beta}{\eta} (|e^i(0)| - d - \eta) \right] + B \\ = B \left[\frac{\beta}{\eta} (|e^i(0)| - d - \eta) + 2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Q.E.D.

2) *Convergence for an N -member M -dimensional Swarm:* Here, we will show that all members in an N -member swarm with a fixed communication topology from members N to 1 will converge to be at the comfortable distance d from their communicating neighbors on the basis of the aforementioned analysis of a two-member swarm.

Theorem 1. (Partial Asynchronism, Finite Time Convergence): For an N -member M -dimensional swarm modeled by (12) with $g = g_f$, $N \geq 2$, Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) holds, and $|e^i(0)| > d$, all the intermember distances of communicating neighbors $|e^i(t)|$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$, will

converge to the comfortable distance d in some finite time, that is bounded by

$$B \left[\frac{\beta}{\eta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (|e^i(0)| - d) - \eta \right) + 2 \right]$$

where $|e^i(0)|$ are the initial intermember distances of communicating neighbors.

Proof: We will use a mathematical induction method, where our induction hypothesis will be that $|e^i(t)|$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, converge to the comfortable distance d in some finite time and from this we will show that $|e^{k+1}(t)|$ will converge to d after some finite time.

First, for $k = 1$, member 2 moves toward the stationary member 1 to be in a comfortable distance d from it, and we have (21), as shown at the bottom of the page. According to Lemma 2, $|e^1(t)|$ will converge to d in some finite time.

Next, we must show that given the induction hypothesis, the intermember distance of communicating neighbors $k + 1$ and $k + 2$, $|e^{k+1}(t)|$ in the N -member M -dimensional swarm will converge to d after some finite time.

According to our induction hypothesis we know that there exists a finite time t^* such that $|e^i(t)| = d$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, which means the first $k + 1$ members of the N -member swarm remains stationary since they already stay in a comfortable distance to their reference neighbors.

Now, considering the updating of $|e^{k+1}(t)|$, from (12), we have (22), as shown at the bottom of the page. After $t \geq t^*$, we have $|e^k(t)| = d$ so that after $t \geq t^* + B$, we have

$$|e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))| = |e^k(t)| = d$$

according to Assumption 2. From (5), we have

$$g(|e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))| - d) = 0, \quad t \geq t^* + B.$$

So, we can write (22) in the form of (23), shown at the bottom of the page.

Therefore, after $t \geq t^* + B$, member $k + 2$ moves toward member $k + 1$, which already remains stationary, to be in a comfortable distance d to it. Clearly, from Lemma 2, $|e^{k+1}(t)|$ will converge to d after some finite time. This ends the induction step.

Next, we will try to bound the amount of converging time for the N -member M -dimensional swarm. In Lemma 2, we deduce that for a two-member swarm the time needed to achieve convergence is bounded by

$$B \left[\frac{\beta}{\eta} (|e^i(0)| - d - \eta) + 2 \right].$$

For the N -member swarm, we already know that

$$|e^i(t)| \geq d \quad \forall t, i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$$

so that swarm members never hinder their neighbors' movements. As we know, swarm members move to their reference neighbors with a step at least larger than η/β when their interneighbor distance is beyond η -range of the comfortable distance due to the definition of g_f . Considering the worst case, all N members except the stationary one move to the same direction on a line. As we know, under Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) all the swarm members will converge to be in a comfortable distance to their reference neighbors one by one in this case. Therefore, we can use the total time in the worst case taken

$$e^1(t+1) = \begin{cases} e^1(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^2 \\ e^1(t) & \forall t \notin T^2. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

$$e^{k+1}(t+1) = \begin{cases} e^{k+1}(t) + g(|e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))}{|e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^{k+1} \cap T^{k+2} \\ -g(|e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))}{|e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^{k+1} \cap T^{k+2} \\ e^{k+1}(t) - g(|e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))}{|e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^{k+2}, t \notin T^{k+1} \\ e^{k+1}(t) + g(|e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))}{|e^k(\tau_k^{k+1}(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^{k+1}, t \notin T^{k+2} \\ e^{k+1}(t) & \forall t \notin T^{k+1} \cup T^{k+2}. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

$$e^{k+1}(t+1) = \begin{cases} e^{k+1}(t) - g(|e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))}{|e^{k+1}(\tau_{k+1}^{k+2}(t))|} \right] & \forall t \in T^{k+2}, t \geq t^* + B \\ e^{k+1}(t) & \forall t \notin T^{k+2}, t \geq t^* + B. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

by member N to reach its final position to bound the total converging time of the swarm, which is

$$B \left[\frac{\beta}{\eta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (|e^i(0)| - d) - \eta \right) + 2 \right].$$

Q.E.D.

Remark 1: Notice that for an N -member M -dimensional totally asynchronous swarm modeled by (12) with $g = g_a$, $N \geq 2$, Assumption 1 (total asynchronism) holds, and $|e^i(0)| > d$, similarly we can use Lemma 1 to prove that all the intermember distances of communicating neighbors $|e^i(t)|$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, will asymptotically converge to the comfortable distance d .

Remarks 2: Notice that the one-dimensional asynchronous swarm results in [30] and [31] can be seen as a special case of our results if we assume $|e^i(0)| > d$ initially.

B. Convergence of an M -Dimensional Mobile Swarm Following an Edge-Leader

Next, we will study cohesiveness of an M -dimensional mobile swarm. First, we will study the case of using the g_f function, and then what happens if a different g function is used that does not require a swarm member to move to be adjacent to its neighbor in one step if it gets very close to it.

1) *Convergence for an N -Member Asynchronous Mobile Swarm:* First, we choose g_f as the g function in (15) and assume $\gamma = \eta$ (η is used in the definition of g_f). We will show that all members in an N -member mobile swarm will be in a comfortable distance neighborhood from their communicating neighbors during movements if there are constraints on the leader's moving direction, moving frequency, and the partial asynchronism measure, and constraints on the leader's moving step bound, the number of swarm members, and the comfortable distance neighborhood size.

Theorem 2: For an N -member M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm with a fixed communication topology modeled by (15), where g is g_f , $N > 2$, Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) holds, $|e^i(0)| = d$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, and the edge-leader (member 1) only moves in legal directions defined above via the “wait $4B-1$ steps strategy,” if

$$0 < r \leq \frac{2\gamma}{N} \quad (24)$$

for a given γ , all the swarm members will be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ of their communicating neighbors during movements, where r is the upper bound of the edge-leader's moving step size $|s(t)|$, γ (choose $\gamma = \eta$) is the comfortable distance neighborhood size, and $B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the partial asynchronism measure.

Proof: For such an N -member mobile swarm, each swarm member follows its preceding communicating neighbor except the edge-leader. We know from (10) that there are no collisions between members. This decouples the problem so that we can consider each pair of neighboring swarm members individually.

First, we consider the relationship between members 1, 2, and 3 to explain why member 1 can get the position information of members 2 and 3 with the “wait $4B-1$ steps strategy” even in the “worst” case. Here, the worst case means that members

1 and 2 and member 2 and 3 have the maximum delay in obtaining each other's position information; member 1 updates its position to the direction of $\theta = \pi$ (which is the one-dimensional case) with a maximum possible step size r at the earliest time satisfying $t \in T^1$, $t - t_p(t) = 4B - 1$, where $T^1 = T$; members 2 and 3 only update their positions at one element of the time set $\{t, t+1, \dots, t+B-1\}$ for $t \in T$ so that they move as slowly as possible.

Consider the worst case. In the first time set $\{0, 1, \dots, B-1\}$, member 1 starts its first move step at $t = 0$ according to (13) since we assume it gets members 2 and 3's initial position information at $t = 0$ and $t_p(0) = -(4B - 1)$. At time $t = 1$, member 1 arrives its new position and remains stationary at least until at $t = 4B - 1$ from the “wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy.” So, in the worst case, we have

$$|e^1(1)| = d + r.$$

From Assumption 2, members 1 and 2's delay in knowing about the position information of each other can be as large as $B - 1$. Member 2 remains stationary at its updating time index of the first time set since it still thinks member 1 is still in the initial position due to the delay. However, in the second time set $\{B, B+1, \dots, 2B-1\}$ it at least receives the new position information of member 1 at $t = B$ since the maximum delay is $B - 1$. So, in the worst case, it moves toward the new position of member 1 via the g_f function at $t = 2B - 1$ in the second time set. From (15), we have

$$e^1(t+1) = e^1(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right] \quad (25)$$

where $e^1(\tau_1^2(2B-1)) = e^1(B) = d + r$. From (24) and the fact that $N > 2$, we have

$$|e^1(B)| - d = r \leq (N-1)r \leq \gamma. \quad (26)$$

Since we choose $\gamma = \eta$, from (26), and the definition of g_f , we then have

$$g_f(|e^1(B)| - d) = |e^1(B)| - d = r.$$

Therefore

$$|e^1(2B)| = d.$$

And then, member 2 remains stationary at its new position since it is already in a comfortable distance to member 1.

Similarly, in the third time set $\{2B, 2B+1, \dots, 3B-1\}$, member 3 at least knows member 2's new position at $t = 3B - 1$. In the worst case, assume member 3 just updates its position at $t = 3B - 2$ in the time set. Then, it has to wait to update its position again at the next time set $\{3B, 3B+1, \dots, 4B-1\}$, i.e., it moves toward member 2 at $t = 4B - 2$. So, at $t = 4B - 1$ members 2 and 3 are all at a new position which is in a comfortable distance to their communicating neighbors even in the worst case. Clearly, their new position information can be calculated by member 1, which is updated from their previous position information with only one moving step (via the g_f function). Therefore, at $t = 4B - 1$, member 1 has enough information to decide its legal moving directions and is ready to have another moving step. This explains that member 1 can get the

position information of members 2 and 3 with the “wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy” even in the worst case. In the future time set, all three members will repeat the above process. Moreover, we can conclude from the above that the maximum possible value of interneighbor distance $|e^1(t)|$ and $|e^2(t)|$ is $d + r$, which is in the range of comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ from (24).

Next, we try to find the maximum possible interneighbor distance between members 4 and 3 and members 5 and 4. For this purpose, a special case (that is different from the worst case for members 1, 2 and 3 above) is considered as follows. As we know, in the aforementioned worst case, at $t = 4B - 1$ member 3 reaches its new position, and member 1 starts its second moving step. Then, we have

$$|e^1(4B - 1)| = |e^2(4B - 1)| = d.$$

Assume member 4 also has the maximum delay about the position information of member 3, and so member 4 still remains stationary at its initial position. We have

$$|e^3(4B - 1)| = d + r.$$

Now, different from before, we assume that since $t = 4B - 1$, members 2 and 3 get the position information of their communicating neighbors without any delay, and they update their position synchronously in order to maintain a comfortable distance d at $t = 4B - 1$. Therefore, at $t = 4B$, we get

$$|e^1(4B)| = |e^2(4B)| = d$$

and

$$|e^3(4B)| = d + 2r.$$

Note that here we consider the one-dimensional case since we try to find the maximum possible interneighbor distance. Then, members 1, 2, and 3 remain stationary until $t = 8B - 2$ from the “wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy.” Due to the delay, member 4 knows member 3’s new position at $t = 5B - 1$ and adjusts its distance to member 3 to be comfortable via the g_f function at least at $t = 6B - 1$. Then, the interneighbor distance of members 4 and 3, $|e^3(t)|$ will bounce between d and $d + r$ in the future time sets even in the above special case. Similar to the previous analysis, we have the same conclusion for the interneighbor distance between members 5 and 4 as that for members 4 and 3. Therefore, the maximum possible value of interneighbor distance $|e^3(t)|$ and $|e^4(t)|$ is $d + 2r$, which is also in the range of comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ from (24). In the same way,

we can find that the maximum possible interneighbor distance between members $N - 1$ and N is $d + (N - 1)r/2$ if N is an odd number, and is $d + (Nr)/2$ if N is an even number, which is the largest of all possible interneighbor distances in the time set T . Hence, we conclude that the interneighbor distance bound for N members is $d + (Nr)/2$.

From (24), we have

$$d + \frac{(Nr)}{2} \leq d + \gamma$$

and from (10), we then have

$$d \leq |e^i(t)| \leq d + \frac{(Nr)}{2} \leq d + \gamma, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$$

which means all members will always be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ with their neighbors. So all members can keep the distance from their communicating neighbors in the range of comfortable distance neighborhood even in the worst case. Q.E.D.

Remark 3: Note that in Theorem 2, (24) provides a bound on how far the leader can move in one step for a given γ , and the “wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy” provides a bound on how frequent the leader can move for a given B . They work together to provide how fast a N -member swarm can move while still maintaining the type of cohesiveness characterized by γ .

Remark 4: From Theorem 1, we can see that if member 1 (the edge-leader) stops moving (i.e., $s(t) = 0$, for $t \in T^1$, $t - t_p(t) = 4B - 1$), all the interneighbor distances will converge to be the comfortable distance d .

In this, we study the convergence property of mobile swarms with at least three members. Now, we consider the $N = 2$ case, which is even simpler. In the two-member case, legal directions of the leader are defined as $\pi/2 \leq \theta \leq 3\pi/2$. Moreover, member 1 only needs the information about the connected line of its position and the position of member 2 to decide its moving direction before further moving so that it uses the “wait $2B - 1$ steps strategy,” which is the same as the “wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy” except the length of the waiting time. Similarly, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1: For a two-member M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm modeled by (27), as shown at the bottom of the page, where g is g_f , Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) holds, $|e^1(0)| = d$, $t_p(0) = -(2B - 1)$, and the edge-leader (member 1) only moves to legal directions via the “wait $2B - 1$ steps strategy,” if

$$0 < r \leq \gamma \quad (28)$$

$$e^1(t+1) = \begin{cases} e^1(t) + s(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t - t_p(t) \geq 2B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ e^1(t) + s(t), & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 2B - 1, t \in T^1, t \notin T^2 \\ e^1(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t \notin T^1 \text{ or } t \in T^2 \cup T^1, t - t_p(t) < 2B - 1 \\ e^1(t), & \text{if } t \notin T^2 \cup T^1 \text{ or } t \notin T^2, t \in T^1, t - t_p(t) < 2B - 1 \end{cases}$$

$$t_p(t+1) = \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 2B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ t_p(t), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

for a given γ , the two members will be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ during movements, where r is the upper bound of the edge-leader's moving step size $|s(t)|$, γ (choose $\gamma = \eta$) is the comfortable distance neighborhood size, and $B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the partial asynchronism measure.

Proof: Similar to the proof of Theorem 2, it is easy to find the maximum possible interneighbor distance of members 1 and 2 is equal to $d+r$ by analyzing the worst case. From (28), the two members always keep their distance in the range of comfortable distance neighborhood. Q.E.D.

2) *Analysis of Movement Flexibility:* In Theorem 2, we provide conditions under which an N -member mobile swarm can keep cohesion during movements and avoid collisions as long as the leader always moves in legal directions which has a σ -range, where σ is the angle formed by the two connected lines between positions of members 2 and 1 and between positions of members 1 and 3. Clearly, the movement flexibility depends on how large σ is since σ is the maximum possible turning angle that the swarm can make in one step. Therefore, we will analyze the change of σ during movements of the swarm.

Theorem 3: For an N -member M -dimensional asynchronous cohesive mobile swarm satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2, if initially $\sigma > 0$ and the swarm keeps moving, σ monotonically decreases and

$$\sigma \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

and if initially $\sigma = 0$

$$\sigma = 0 \quad \forall t$$

during movements of the swarm, where σ is the angle formed by the two connected lines between positions of members 2 and 1 and between positions of members 1 and 3.

Proof: For an N -member M -dimensional asynchronous cohesive mobile swarm satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2, member 1 has to obtain the position information of members 2 and 3 to calculate σ before it moves. It can decide its legal moving directions with σ . As shown in Fig. 5, assume at time t , $t \in T^1$, $t - t_p(t) = 4B - 1$, and members 1, 2, and 3 stay at positions A , B , and C , respectively (dashed circles). Assume the current σ is equal to $\sigma_{\text{old}} > 0$. Member 1 moves to a new position in a legal direction. At $t+1$, member 1 arrives at position E and waits until its next moving step from the “wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy.” Then, member 2 will update its position at $t = t + 2B - 1$ in the worst case (see the proof of Theorem 2) to maintain a comfortable distance with member 1, and assume it reaches the position F . Similarly, member 3 moves toward the new position of member 2 and reaches the position G . Therefore, at $t = t + 4B - 1$, members 2 and 3 are both at a new position. Member 1 can calculate a new σ (which we call σ_{new}) from these new positions to decide its next moving direction. Next, we will consider the relationship between σ_{old} and σ_{new} in Fig. 5.

In the triangle APQ , we have

$$\sigma_{\text{old}} = \angle APQ + \angle AQP \quad (29)$$

where we use \angle to represent the angle formed by two lines. For example, $\angle APQ$ is the angle formed by the lines AP and PQ .




Fig. 5. The change of σ during movements of the swarm.

Similarly, in the triangle BEQ

$$\angle EQO = \angle BEQ + \angle EBQ \quad (30)$$

and we also have

$$\sigma_{\text{new}} = \angle BEQ \quad (31)$$

$$\angle AQP = \angle EQO. \quad (32)$$

From (29)–(32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\text{old}} &= \angle EQO + \angle AQP = \angle BEQ + \angle EBQ + \angle AQP \\ &= \sigma_{\text{new}} + \angle EBQ + \angle AQP. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\Delta\sigma = \sigma_{\text{old}} - \sigma_{\text{new}} = \angle EBQ + \angle AQP \quad (33)$$

where $\angle AQP$ is the angle formed by the two connected lines between the new positions and the previous positions of members 1 and 2 (EF and AB), and $\angle EBQ$ is the angle formed by the two connected lines between the new positions and the previous positions of members 1 and 3 (EG and AC).

Obviously, we have

$$\angle AQP \geq 0 \quad (34)$$

and

$$\angle AQP = 0$$

if and only if member 1 moves along the extension of line AB (the one-dimensional case, where EF and AB are overlapped). Moreover, we have

$$\angle EBQ > 0 \text{ if } \sigma_{\text{old}} > 0 \quad (35)$$

and

$$\angle EBQ = 0 \text{ if and only if } \sigma_{\text{old}} = 0. \quad (36)$$

Then, from (33)–(35), we have

$$\Delta\sigma > 0 \text{ if } \sigma_{\text{old}} > 0. \quad (37)$$

Therefore, σ monotonically decreases and

$$\sigma \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

if initially $\sigma > 0$ and the swarm keeps moving.

If initially $\sigma = 0$ (the one-dimensional case, where AC and AB are overlapped and member 1 only moves along the extension of line AB), from (33), (34), and (36), we get

$$\Delta\sigma = 0. \quad (38)$$

Therefore

$$\sigma = 0 \quad \forall t$$

during movements of the swarm. Q.E.D.

Remark 5: Notice that from Theorem 3, an N -member $M \geq 2$ -dimensional asynchronous cohesive mobile swarm satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2 will gradually become a one-dimensional swarm as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ and its length is bounded by $(N - 1)(d + \gamma)$.

Remark 6: Notice that after an N -member $M \geq 2$ -dimensional asynchronous cohesive mobile swarm becomes a one-dimensional swarm, i.e., all members move along the same line, legal directions of the leader could be set to $\pi/2 \leq \theta \leq 3\pi/2$ so that the swarm could later make turns in ways that avoid collisions.

3) *Alternative Convergence Conditions:* Now, we consider the case of using another g function in (15). Assume that for a scalar $c > 0$, $g_c(|e^i(t)| - d)$ is such that

$$|e^i(t)| - d - c \leq g_c(|e^i(t)| - d) < |e^i(t)| - d, \text{ if } |e^i(t)| - d > c \quad (39)$$

$$g_c(|e^i(t)| - d) = 0, \text{ if } -c \leq |e^i(t)| - d \leq c \quad (40)$$

$$|e^i(t)| - d < g_c(|e^i(t)| - d) \leq |e^i(t)| - d + c \text{ if } |e^i(t)| - d < -c. \quad (41)$$

As shown in Fig. 6, these relationships are similar to those for the g_f function. However, the g_c function has two different bounds $|e^i(t)| - d - c$ and $|e^i(t)| - d + c$ in (39) and (41), which guarantee the following members are in the c -neighborhood of desired comfortable distance of their leading neighbors after each update step so that the following members can keep up with the movements of their leading neighbors. Moreover, the g_c function is equal to 0 when the interneighbor distance is already in the c -neighborhood of the comfortable distance. Note that here we assume $0 < c < \eta$ since we choose $\gamma = \eta$ before.

Similarly, we will show that with the g_c function, all members can also be in a comfortable distance neighborhood from their communicating neighbors during movements under some constraints on the leader's moving direction, moving frequency, and the partial asynchronism measure, and constraints on the leader's moving step bound, the number of swarm members, the comfortable distance neighborhood size, and the parameters of the g_c . Note that with the g_c function, member 1 has to use the "wait $5B - 2$ steps strategy" instead of the "wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy" since member 1 cannot calculate the position information of member 2 and 3 (it only knows they are inside the




Fig. 6. Function $g_c(e^i(t) - d)$ (solid) and $g_f(e^i(t) - d)$ (dashed).

c -neighborhood of the comfortable distance to their communicating neighbors). It has to wait $B - 1$ time indices more to receive the position information in the case of the maximum communication delay. In this case, we can modify the model in (15) as shown in (42) at the bottom of the next page.

Theorem 4: For an N -member M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm modeled by (42), where g is g_c , $N > 2$, Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) holds, $|e^i(0)| = d$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$, and the edge-leader (member 1) only moves in legal directions defined above via the "wait $5B - 2$ steps strategy," if

$$0 < r \leq \frac{2(\gamma - c)}{N} \quad (43)$$

for a given γ , all the swarm members will be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ of their communicating neighbors during the moving process, where r is the upper bound of the edge-leader's moving step size $|s(t)|$, γ is the comfortable distance neighborhood size, $B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the partial asynchronism measure, and c ($0 < c < \gamma$) is the parameter of g_c function.

Proof: Similar to the proof of Theorem 2, we can find that the maximum possible interneighbor distance between members $N - 1$ and N is $d + (N - 1)r/2 + c$ if N is an odd number, and is $d + (Nr)/2 + c$ if N is an even number, which is the largest of all possible interneighbor distances in the time set T . Hence, we conclude that the interneighbor distance bound for N members is $d + (Nr)/2 + c$.

From (43), we have

$$d + \frac{(Nr)}{2} + c \leq d + \gamma$$

and, from (10), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} d \leq |e^i(t)| &\leq d + \frac{(Nr)}{2} + c \\ &\leq d + \gamma, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1 \end{aligned}$$

which means all members will always be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ with their neighbors. So, all members can keep the distance to their communicating neighbors in the range of comfortable distance neighborhood even in the worst case. Q.E.D.

Now, we consider the $N = 2$ case with the g_c function. Similarly, member 1 only needs the information about the position of

member 2 to decide its moving direction before further moving. Therefore, it uses the “wait $3B - 1$ steps strategy.” So, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2: For a two-member M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm modeled by (44), as shown at the bottom of the page, where g is g_c , Assumption 2 (partial asynchronism) holds, $|e^1(0)| = d$, $t_p(0) = -(3B - 1)$, and the edge-leader (member 1) only moves to legal directions via the “wait $3B - 1$ steps strategy,” if

$$0 < r \leq \gamma - c \quad (45)$$

for a given γ , the two members will be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ during movements, where r is the upper bound of the edge-leader’s moving step size $|s(t)|$, γ is the comfortable distance neighborhood size, $B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the partial asynchronism measure, and c ($0 < c < \gamma$) is the parameter of g_c function.

Proof: Similar to the proof of Corollary 1, it is easy to find the maximum possible interneighbor distance of members 1 and 2 is equal to $d + r + b$ by analyzing the worst case. From (45), the two members always keep their distance in the range of comfortable distance neighborhood. Q.E.D.

Remarks 7: Notice that similar to Theorem 3, we can prove that σ monotonically goes to zero for an N -member $M \geq 2$ -dimensional asynchronous cohesive mobile swarm satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4.

Remarks 8: Notice that we can write equivalent theorems of Theorems 2 and 4 as follows.

- With the same conditions in Theorem 2, assume that the edge-leader (member 1) only moves to legal directions defined above via the “wait $2(N - 1)B - 1$ steps strategy.” Then, if

$$0 < r \leq \gamma \quad (46)$$

for a given γ , all members of the N -member $M \geq 2$ -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm will be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ of their communicating neighbors during movements.

- With the same conditions in Theorem 4, assume that the edge-leader (member 1) only moves to legal directions defined above via the “wait $2(N - 1)B - 1$ steps strategy.” Then, if

$$0 < r \leq \gamma - c \quad (47)$$

for a given γ , all members of the N -member $M \geq 2$ -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm will be in the comfortable distance neighborhood $[d, d + \gamma]$ of their communicating neighbors during movements.

Proofs of the aforementioned theorems are similar to those of Theorems 2 and 4. Comparing these theorems with Theorems 2 and 4, we can see that in order to keep cohesiveness of the N -member

$$\begin{aligned}
 e^1(t+1) &= \begin{cases} e^1(t) + s(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t - t_p(t) \geq 5B - 2, t \in T^1 \\ e^1(t) + s(t), & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 5B - 2, t \in T^1, t \notin T^2 \\ e^1(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t \notin T^1 \text{ or } t \in T^2 \cup T^1, t - t_p(t) < 5B - 2 \\ e^1(t), & \text{if } t \notin T^2 \cup T^1 \text{ or } t \notin T^2, t \in T^1, t - t_p(t) < 5B - 2. \end{cases} \\
 t_p(t+1) &= \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 5B - 2, t \in T^1 \\ t_p(t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\
 e^i(t+1) &= \begin{cases} e^i(t) + g(|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))}{|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))|} \right] \\ - g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^i \cap T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1 \\ e^i(t) - g(|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))}{|e^i(\tau_i^{i+1}(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^{i+1}, t \notin T^i, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1 \\ e^i(t) + g(|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))}{|e^{i-1}(\tau_{i-1}^i(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^i, t \notin T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1 \\ e^i(t), & \text{if } t \notin T^i \cup T^{i+1}, i = 2, 3, \dots, N - 1. \end{cases} \quad (42)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 e^1(t+1) &= \begin{cases} e^1(t) + s(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t - t_p(t) \geq 3B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ e^1(t) + s(t), & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 3B - 1, t \in T^1, t \notin T^2 \\ e^1(t) - g(|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))| - d) \left[\frac{e^1(\tau_1^2(t))}{|e^1(\tau_1^2(t))|} \right], & \text{if } t \in T^2, t \notin T^1 \text{ or } t \in T^2 \cup T^1, t - t_p(t) < 3B - 1 \\ e^1(t), & \text{if } t \notin T^2 \cup T^1 \text{ or } t \notin T^2, t \in T^1, t - t_p(t) < 3B - 1 \end{cases} \\
 t_p(t+1) &= \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t - t_p(t) \geq 3B - 1, t \in T^1 \\ t_p(t), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (44)
 \end{aligned}$$

mobile swarm in the presence of delays and asynchronism, if the leader uses a strategy of waiting more time steps at one position, it can move with a bigger step size in future updating time indexes. On the other hand, if the leader uses a strategy of waiting less time steps, it has to move with a smaller step size.

IV. SIMULATION STUDIES

Here, we will provide simulation examples to illustrate convergence properties of M -dimensional asynchronous swarms. First, we will simulate a three-dimensional swarm converging to be adjacent to a stationary member under the partial asynchronism assumption in some finite time, which is summarized in Theorem 1. Then, a simulation example of a three-dimensional cohesive asynchronous mobile swarm, which satisfies all the conditions in Theorem 2, will be given.

In the simulation, let $T = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ represent the indices of the sequence of real times. For convenience, we assume it corresponds to the real time set $\{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, \dots\}$ on a uniform grid of size 0.1 s at which one or more swarm members update their positions. And we randomly select the time index set $T^i \subseteq T$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, at which the i th member's position $x^i(t)$, $t \in T^i$, is updated. The T^i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, are independent of each other for different i . However, they may have intersections so that two or more swarm members may move simultaneously. Moreover, in order to satisfy the partial asynchronism assumption, we assume $B = 4$ and add constraints to the updating time index set T^i to guarantee each member updates at least once in the B time index interval and the index delays in obtaining neighbor positions are bounded by B .

A. Stationary Edge Member Asynchronous Swarms Simulation

Assume we have a three-dimensional ten-member asynchronous swarm and initially (i.e., $t = 0$ s), ten members from member 1 to member 10 with a physical size $w = 6$ are in order located at the positions of (70, 70, 70), (60, 68, 65), (55, 60, 50), (53, 50, 45), (30, 50, 40), (20, 36, 30), (18, 20, 25), (5, 20, 10), (-8, 10, 0), (-8, 0, -10) on a (x_1, x_2, x_3) space, respectively, at $t = 0$, as shown in Fig. 7. Note that their initial positions satisfy all the constraints required in Theorem 1. Assume the comfortable distance $d = 10$, and the sensing range of proximity sensors $\varepsilon = 4$. All members will update their positions in their updating time sets T^i except member 1 remains stationary. The communication topology from member 10 to member 1 is fixed according to their initial conditions. Assume the partial asynchronism assumption holds for this swarm with $B = 4$ and we choose a g_f function with a $\eta = 1$ satisfying (1)–(3) to define the attractive and repelling relationship. In particular, $g_f(|e^i(t)| - d) = |e^i(t)| - d$ if $||e^i(t)| - d| \leq \eta$, and $g_f(|e^i(t)| - d) = 0.4(|e^i(t)| - d)$ if $||e^i(t)| - d| > \eta$. Here, we choose $\beta = 10000$ since $|g_f(e^i(t) - d)| = 0.4(|e^i(t)| - d) > 1/\beta(|e^i(t)| - d)$ is required if $||e^i(t)| - d| > \eta$, where $\beta > 1$ and also we want to allow a very small movement at any step. With all the above conditions, we get the finite-time convergence according to Theorem 1.

The results of the simulation are given by providing eight plots of swarm member positions from $t = 0$ s to $t = 14.9$ s as shown in Fig. 7. In the $t = 3.6$ s plot, each member moves




Fig. 7. Simulation of $M = 3$ -dimensional asynchronous ten-member asynchronous swarm with a fixed communication topology converging behavior.

toward its communicating neighbor due to its attractive relationship. In the $t = 5.5$ s plot, the first six members already converged to be in a comfortable distance to their communicating neighbors. In the last two plots, all members already remain stationary at positions adjacent to the position of member 1. We provide all intermember distances of communicating neighbors during the convergence process in Fig. 8. Clearly, all interneighbor distances are larger than or equal to 10 (i.e., there are no collisions) and converged to the comfortable distance 10 after $t \geq 9$ s. It is interesting to note that the intermember distances do *not* asymptotically decrease at each step; sometimes the interneighbor distances could increase, then later decrease (this actually complicated the theoretical analysis in the last section), which is essentially due to asynchronism and communication delays.

B. Asynchronous Mobile Swarm With an Edge-Leader Simulation

Assume we have a three-dimensional ten-member asynchronous mobile swarm and at the beginning ten members from member 1 to member 10 with a physical size $w = 6$ are in order located at the positions of (71, 70, 70), (68.4, 61.4, 65.7), (62.8, 56.4, 59.1), (56.3, 51.5, 53.2), (49.7, 46.5, 47.6), (42.8, 41.8, 42), (35.8, 37.3, 36.6), (28.7, 32.8, 31.1), (21.4, 28.4, 25.9), (14, 24.1, 20.8) on a (x_1, x_2, x_3) space, respectively, at $t = 0$, as shown in Fig. 9. Note that their initial positions satisfy all




Fig. 8. Intermember distances of communicating neighbors in Fig. 7 during the convergence process.




Fig. 9. Simulation of $M = 3$ -dimensional asynchronous ten-member asynchronous mobile swarm with a fixed communication topology following an edge-leader.

the constraints required in Theorem 2. Assume the comfortable distance $d = 10$, and the comfortable distance neighborhood size $\gamma = 5$. Member 1 uses the “wait $4B - 1$ steps strategy” to move only in legal directions defined by σ . We use the same g_f function as before. According to Theorem 2, the edge-leader’s moving step is bounded by r , where $0 < r \leq 2\gamma/N = 1$, in




Fig. 10. Change of σ during movements of the swarm in Fig. 9.

order for the asynchronous mobile swarm to maintain cohesiveness, i.e., all mobile swarm members are at a comfortable distance neighborhood [10], [15] from their neighbors while the swarm moves. Hence, we choose $r = 1$.

The results of the simulation are given by providing eight plots of swarm member positions from $t = 0$ s to $t = 99.9$ s as shown in Fig. 9. We found that all mobile swarm members maintain a distance inside the comfortable neighborhood range [10], [15] from their neighbors in all time indexes. Clearly, there are no collisions during movements and the mobile swarm maintains cohesion. In addition, we show the change of σ during movements of the swarm in Fig. 10. Obviously, σ monotonically decreases to zero as time increases, which verifies the conclusion of Theorem 3. Also, note that at $t = 99.9$ s in Fig. 9, the first five members already move in the same dimension. If we extend the simulation time, all other members will gradually move on the same dimension as σ goes to zero so that the three-dimensional ten-member asynchronous swarm becomes a one-dimensional swarm.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We constructed a mathematical model for an M -dimensional asynchronous swarm with a fixed communication topology by putting N identical single swarm members together. We proved that all the intermember distances of communicating neighbors in an M -dimensional asynchronous swarm will converge to the comfortable distance so that it can obtain cohesion even in the presence of delays and asynchronism. Moreover, an M -dimensional asynchronous mobile swarm following an edge-leader with a fixed communication topology is modeled and different conditions under which it can maintain cohesion during movements are provided. In addition, the swarm movement flexibility is analyzed. Simulation studies are given to illustrate swarm convergence properties. Note that our analysis, which allows for finite-size swarm members and ensures collision-free swarming, significantly complicates the analysis compared to the case where point-size vehicles are studied and collisions are allowed (e.g., as in [21] and [34]) and,

in some cases, clearly cannot allow for as strong of stability results. That is, as you would intuitively expect, asynchronism and delays adversely affect swarm cohesion.

Swarm stability for the case where a communication topology is dynamically generated or updated in a distributed fashion according to the positions of swarm members will be studied in the future. In particular, an interesting problem is how to form and maintain an unbroken communication network dynamically for the entire swarm so that the information through the swarm can be always propagated effectively. Another possible direction is to consider using other possible communication protocols in the swarm model. For example, the token ring may be considered in the case of moderate numbers of swarm members. For the case of large number of swarm members, the idea of subnet may even be useful. Moreover, the study of the optimal motion control strategies under some criteria of specific tasks is also a potential research direction. It may be useful for a variety of applications since it provides how the swarm achieve some goal in a optimal way besides avoiding collisions and staying inside a comfort zone.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank V. Gazi at the Ohio State University, Columbus, for his helpful comments on this paper.


REFERENCES

- [1] E. Shaw, "The schooling of fishes," *Sci. Amer.*, vol. 206, pp. 128–138, 1962.
- [2] E. Bonabeau, M. Dorigo, and G. Theraulaz, *Swarm Intelligence: From Natural to Artificial Systems*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999.
- [3] C. D. Michener, *The Social Behavior of the Bees*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1974.
- [4] T. D. Seeley, R. A. Morse, and P. K. Visscher, "The natural history of the flight of honey bee swarms," *Psyche*, vol. 86, pp. 103–113, 1979.
- [5] K. Passino, "Biomimicry of bacterial foraging for distributed optimization and control," *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 22, pp. 52–67, June 2002.
- [6] C. Reynolds, "Flocks, herds, and schools: A distributed behavioral model," *Comp. Graph.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 25–34, 1987.
- [7] M. Millonas, "Swarms, phase transitions, and collective intelligence," in *Artificial Life III*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994, pp. 417–445.
- [8] D. Terzopoulos, X. Tu, and R. Grzeszczuk, "Artificial fishes: Autonomous ocomotion, perception, behavior, and learning in a simulated physical world," *Artificial Life*, vol. 1, pp. 327–351, Dec. 1994.
- [9] R. Arkin, *Behavior-Based Robotics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.
- [10] G. Beni and J. Wang, "Swarm intelligence in cellular robotics systems," in *Proc. NATO Advanced Workshop Robots Biological System*, 1, pp. 703–712.
- [11] R. Rule, "The dynamic scheduling approach to automated vehicle macroscopic control," Transport. Control Lab., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, OH, EES-276A-18, 1974.
- [12] R. Fenton and R. Mayhan, "Automated highway studies at the Ohio State University—An overview," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technol.*, vol. 40, pp. 100–113, Feb. 1991.
- [13] D. Swaroop and K. Rajagopal, "Intelligent cruise control systems and traffic flow stability," *Transport. Res. C: Emerging Technol.*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 329–352, 1999.
- [14] M. Pachter and P. Chandler, "Challenges of autonomous control," *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, pp. 92–97, Apr. 1998.
- [15] S. Singh, P. Chandler, C. Schumacher, S. Banda, and M. Pachter, "Adaptive feedback linearizing nonlinear close formation control of UAV's," in *Proc. 2000 Amer. Control Conf.*, Chicago, IL, 2000, pp. 854–858.
- [16] Q. Yan, G. Yang, V. Kapila, and M. Queiroz, "Nonlinear dynamics and output feedback control of multiple spacecraft in elliptical orbits," in *Proc. 2000 Amer. Control Conf.*, Chicago, IL, 2000, pp. 839–843.
- [17] M. Polycarpou, Y. Yang, and K. Passino, "A cooperative search framework for distributed agents," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Intelligent Control and IEEE Conf. Control Applications*, Mexico City, Mexico, Sept. 2001, pp. –6.
- [18] T. Fukuda, T. Ueyama, and T. Sugiura, "Self-organization and swarm intelligence in the society of robot being," in *Proc. 2nd Int. Symp. Measurement Control Robotics*, Tsukuba Science City, Japan, Nov. 1992, pp. 787–794.
- [19] R. Brooks, Ed., *Cambrian Intelligence: The Early History of the New AI*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.
- [20] M. Mataric, "Minimizing complexity in controlling a mobile robot population," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics Automation*, Nice, France, May 1992, pp. 830–835.
- [21] I. Suzuki and M. Yamashita, "Distributed anonymous mobile robots: Formation of geometric patterns," *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1347–1363, 1997.
- [22] J. Reif and H. Wang, "Social potential fields: A distributed behavioral control for autonomous robots," *Robot. Auton. Syst.*, vol. 27, pp. 171–194, 1999.
- [23] E. Gelenbe, N. Schmajuk, J. Staddon, and J. Reif, "Autonomous search by robots and animals: A survey," *Robot. Auton. Syst.*, vol. 22, pp. 23–34, 1997.
- [24] D. Schoenwald, J. Feddema, and F. Oppel, "Decentralized control of a collective of autonomous robotic vehicles," in *Proc. 2001 Amer. Control Conf.*, Arlington, VA, June 2001, pp. 2087–2092.
- [25] G. Dudek et al., "A taxonomy for swarm robots," in *Proc. IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. Intelligent Robots Systems*, Yokohama, Japan, July 1993, pp. 441–447.
- [26] A. Mogilner and L. Edelstein-Keshet, "A nonlocal model for a swarm," *J. Math. Biol.*, vol. 38, pp. 534–570, 1999.
- [27] K. Jin, P. Liang, and G. Beni, "Stability of synchronized distributed control of discrete swarm structures," in *IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics Automation*, San Diego, CA, May 1994, pp. 1033–1038.
- [28] K. Passino and K. Burgess, *Stability Analysis of Discrete Event Systems*. New York: Wiley, 1998.
- [29] D. Bertsekas and J. Tsitsiklis, *Parallel and Distributed Computation Numerical Methods*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [30] Y. Liu, K. Passino, and M. Polycarpou, "Stability analysis of one-dimensional asynchronous swarms," in *Proc. 2001 Amer. Control Conf.*, Arlington, VA, June 2001, pp. 716–721.
- [31] —, "Stability analysis of one-dimensional asynchronous swarms," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 2003, submitted for publication.
- [32] —, "Stability analysis of one-dimensional asynchronous mobile swarms," in *Proc. 40th IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, Orlando, FL, Dec. 2001, pp. 1077–1082.
- [33] V. Gazi and K. Passino, "Stability of a one-dimensional discrete-time asynchronous swarm," in *Proc. Joint IEEE Int. Symp. Intelligent Control/IEEE Conf. Control Applications*, Mexico, City, Mexico, Sept. 2001, pp. 19–24.
- [34] —, "Stability analysis of swarms," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 2003, to be published.
- [35] J. Bender and R. Fenton, "On the flow capacity of automated highways," *Transport. Sci.*, vol. 4, pp. 52–63, Feb. 1970.
- [36] D. Swaroop, "String stability of interconnected systems: An application to platooning in automated highway systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Mech. Eng., Univ. California, Berkeley, CA, 1995.
- [37] R. Fenton, "A highway safety policy for automated highway operation," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. VT-28, pp. 22–28, Feb. 1979.
- [38] J. Hedrick and D. Swaroop, "Dynamic coupling in vehicles under automatic control," *Veh. Syst. Dyn.*, vol. 23, no. SUPPL, pp. 209–220, 1994.



Yang Liu (S'98–M'02) received the B.S. degree in electrical engineering from Xidian University, Xi'an, China, the M.S. degree from the Chinese Academy of Space Technology, Beijing, China, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from The Ohio State University, Columbus, in 1995, 1998, and 2002, respectively.

He is currently working as a Senior Research Engineer for the Technical Center of Caterpillar, Inc., Peoria, IL. His research interests include distributed control and cooperation systems, neural networks and fuzzy learning systems, adaptive and intelligent control, fault diagnosis, and prognostics.



Kevin M. Passino (S'79–M'90–SM'96) received the Ph.D. in electrical engineering from the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, in 1989.

He is currently Professor of Electrical Engineering at The Ohio State University (OSU), Columbus, and Director of the OSU Collaborative Center of Control Science that is funded by AFRL/VA and AFOSR. He is coeditor (with P.J. Antsaklis) of the book *An Introduction to Intelligent and Autonomous Control* (Norwell, MA: Kluwer, 1993), and coauthor of the books *Fuzzy Control* (Reading, MA:

Addison-Wesley, 1998), *Stability Analysis of Discrete Event Systems* (New York: Wiley, 1998), *The RCS Handbook: Tools for Real Time Control Systems Software Development* (New York: Wiley, 2001), and *Stable Adaptive Control and Estimation for Nonlinear Systems: Neural and Fuzzy Approximator Techniques* (New York: Wiley, 2002).

Dr. Passino has served as the Vice President of Technical Activities of the IEEE Control Systems Society (CSS), was an elected Member of the IEEE Control Systems Society Board of Governors, and has been an Associate Editor for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON AUTOMATIC CONTROL. He was the Program Chair of the 2001 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, and is currently a Distinguished Lecturer for the IEEE CSS.



Marios M. Polycarpou (S'87–M'93–SM'98) received the B.A. (*cum laude*) degree in computer science and the B.Sc. (*cum laude*) degree in electrical engineering from Rice University, Houston, TX, in 1987, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, in 1989 and 1992, respectively.

In 1992, he joined the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, where he is currently an Associate Professor. He is also a

Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Cyprus, Nicosia. He teaches and conducts research in the areas of systems and control, adaptive and intelligent control, neural network learning, cooperative systems and control, and fault diagnosis.

Dr. Polycarpou is an Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON NEURAL NETWORKS and has served as Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON AUTOMATIC CONTROL. He is the elected Vice President for Conferences of the IEEE Neural Network Society, and served as the Program Chair of the 15th IEEE International Symposium on Intelligent Control (ISIC 2000).