

Distributed Time-Varying Coverage Control via Singular Perturbations

Brandon Bao Jorge Cortés Sonia Martínez

Abstract—This paper presents a novel dynamic coverage control algorithm allowing a group of robots to track an optimal-deployment configuration for arbitrary time-varying density functions. Building on singular perturbation theory, the proposed design employs a two-time scale separation approach, with a fast time scale corresponding to communication and a slow time scale corresponding to agent motion. The resulting algorithm is distributed over the 2-hop Delaunay graph and, for small enough values of the perturbation parameter, achieves the same performance as its centralized counterpart. We also introduce three discrete-time versions that rely only on 1-hop communication at the cost of having to use delayed information and formally establish their asymptotic convergence properties. Our technical approach combines computational geometry, singular perturbation theory, generating functions, and linear iterations with delayed updates. Various simulations illustrate the performance of the proposed algorithms.

I. INTRODUCTION

Coverage control [1], [2] is a coordination task where a multi-agent system is optimally deployed over a spatial domain to provide for a service. A well-established approach to achieving this task employs the so-called Lloyd’s algorithm, which drives the agents to specific spatial locations according to a static density function. This density function is used to model e.g., the most probable locations of targets, general external-service demands, or human-generated commands. As practical applications involve revising priorities when new information is revealed, a solution to a dynamic version of this problem becomes relevant. However, finding a distributed algorithm to dynamic coverage control becomes challenging, as the natural extension of Lloyd’s algorithm requires all-to-all communication among the agents. In this note, we propose a solution to circumvent this problem via singular perturbation theory.

Background. Coverage control problems have received wide attention in the literature. The work [1] formulates it as a locational optimization problem [3], [4] where the objective function is minimized via a gradient descent algorithm that leads to the Lloyd’s algorithm. The algorithm is naturally decentralized over the so-called Delaunay graph, which is the dual of the Voronoi partition associated with the robots’ positions. By means of it, each agent sequentially updates its region, then its position to approach its centroid. The algorithm is robust to errors, works under asynchronous interactions, and adapts to agent arrivals and departures. The Lloyd’s algorithm converges to the set of Centroidal Voronoi Configurations (CVT) for static densities, which correspond

to critical points of the objective function.

The dynamic coverage problem was initially studied in [5] by assuming a constraint on the time-varying density (TVD) function; namely, that the cost covered by an agent in a CVT configuration remains constant when the density evolves in time. Furthermore, [6] provided simulations of a dynamic coverage control law that tracked Voronoi partition centroids over time. The work [7] proposed a more general and less density restrictive approach, where time-varying coverage is achieved by following a CVT over time. This work showed that all-to-all communication is needed to achieve perfect tracking performance, but nonetheless proposed a power series approximation that generates a trade-off between tracking and decentralization. Considering more terms of the power series results in a better approximation of the centralized control law, at the expense of communication with agents that are farther-hops away. Subsequent work extended TVD methods to evolving environments [8], [9].

In our technical approach, we rely on singular perturbation theory [10], [11]. These methods have been used in other multi-agent control problems, such as dynamic average consensus [12], distributed optimization [13], and networked dynamical systems [14], but have not been employed in the context of coverage control. We are also inspired by the analysis of discrete-time stochastic gradient iterations with delayed updates presented in [15], in particular the use of generating functions and formal power series [16], [17].

Statement of Contributions. Our main contribution is the design of a new motion coordination algorithm to solve dynamic coverage control problems. Notably, the performance of the proposed algorithmic solution is close to its centralized counterpart to an arbitrary degree of accuracy while maintaining decentralization. To this end, we rely on singular perturbation theory and employ a two time-scale separation approach: in this way, a slow time-scale dynamics realizes the agents’ motion, while the fast time-scale dynamics is used to update the agents’ controls via a distributed gradient algorithm that solves a least-squares problem. The resulting distributed coordination algorithm relies on communication with 2-hop neighbors in the Delaunay graph and can be implemented in either continuous- or discrete-time. To further keep interactions limited among agents, we propose discrete-time versions that rely only on 1-hop communication at the cost of having to use information delayed by one timestep, resulting in the all-neighbors- (delayed information from both 1-hop and 2-hop neighbors), 2 \ 1-neighbors- (delayed information from 2-hop neighbors that are not 1-hop neighbors), and 2-neighbors-delayed (delayed information from all 2-hop neighbors) variants. We formally establish their asymptotic convergence guarantees

The authors are with the Contextual Robotics Institute at UC San Diego, USA (emails:bbao200905@gmail.com, cortes@ucsd.edu; soni-amd@ucsd.edu).

The authors would like to thank to Victor Gandarillas and Melcior Pijoan for early work on the simulations in this manuscript.

and evaluate their performance in simulation. The obtained results confirm that all algorithms converge, and that those that employ fresher information result in faster convergence. We also run comparisons with respect to previous baselines and implement it on a group of differential-drive robots in the Robotarium testbed.

II. PRELIMINARIES

This section introduces basic notation and provides a quick review of singular perturbation theory.

Voronoi Partitions and Delaunay Graph. We denote by \mathbb{R}^d the d -dimensional real vector space and its Euclidean 2-norm by $\|\cdot\|$. Consider a multi-agent system composed of n agents (or sensors) with positions $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, in a convex set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For convenience, we denote by $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ the vector comprising the positions of all the agents. Given $p \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, the standard Voronoi partition of Q is given by $\mathcal{V}(p) = (V_1(p), \dots, V_n(p))$ such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:

$$V_i(p) = \{q \in Q : \|q - p_i\| \leq \|q - p_j\|, \forall j \neq i\}. \quad (1)$$

Each Voronoi region or cell contains $p_i \in V_i(p)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and as a partition, it holds that $\cup_{i=1}^n V_i(p) = Q$. Observe that $V_i \cap V_j \neq \emptyset$ only at their boundaries and, if this is the case, we say that agents i, j are Voronoi (or Delaunay) neighbors. The set of neighbors of an agent i in the Delaunay graph is denoted by N_i , and does not include i . In the particular case that Q is a polyhedron, the Voronoi cells are polyhedra and can be computed easily. We refer the reader to [3], [18] for further treatment of Voronoi diagrams.

Singular Perturbation Theory. We provide here a brief description of singular perturbation theory following [10], [11]. Consider a dynamical system of the form

$$\dot{p} = f(p, u, t), \quad (2a)$$

$$\epsilon \dot{u} = g(p, u, t), \quad (2b)$$

with $p(t_0) = p_0$ and where $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ is a small parameter. This system is singularly perturbed because the parameter ϵ multiplies the derivative of u in the dynamics. As a result, the solution in the limit $\epsilon = 0$ may approximate those of (2) for small ϵ only under some conditions. More precisely, taking $\epsilon = 0$ in (2), we obtain the reduced model:

$$\dot{p} = f(p, u, t), \quad (3a)$$

$$0 = g(p, u, t). \quad (3b)$$

Under the implicit function theorem, it is possible to solve for u in the last algebraic equation, and obtain an expression of a root as $u = h(p, t)$. Plugging it in (3a) yields $\bar{p}(t)$ as the solution to

$$\dot{\bar{p}} = f(\bar{p}, h(\bar{p}, t), t), \quad (4)$$

with $\bar{p}(0) = p_0$. This equation is called the *quasi steady-state model* or *slow model*. Complementary to this, define a fast time scale $(t - t_0)/\epsilon = \eta$, and rewrite (2) as

$$\frac{dp}{d\eta} = \epsilon f(p, u, t_0 + \epsilon\eta),$$

$$\frac{du}{d\eta} = g(p, u, t_0 + \epsilon\eta).$$

As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ above, meaning that $t = t_0 + \epsilon\eta \approx t_0$ and $p = p(t_0 + \epsilon\eta, \epsilon) \approx p_0$ (i.e., the variables t and p become slowly varying as $\epsilon \approx 0$), we obtain the so-called *boundary layer dynamics* given by:

$$\frac{dp}{d\eta} = 0, \quad (5a)$$

$$\frac{du}{d\eta} = g(p, u, t_0). \quad (5b)$$

Further, by taking $u = y + h(p, t)$, and using that $\frac{\partial h}{\partial p} \frac{dp}{d\eta} = 0$, the boundary layer dynamics becomes:

$$\frac{dy}{d\eta} = g(p, y + h(p, t_0), t_0). \quad (6)$$

In this way, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ the dynamics of $\bar{p}(t)$ and $y(t/\epsilon)$, the slow model and the boundary layer model, become decoupled.

A powerful tool to study (2) via boundary layer and slow model dynamics is the non-smooth Tikhonov's Theorem, which we recall next.

Theorem 2.1 (Tikhonov's theorem [19]): Assume that $u = h(p, t)$ is an isolated root of the equation (3b), and that the functions f , g , and h are Lipschitz, and g is bounded. Assume that the origin is a uniformly, asymptotically stable equilibrium of the dynamics (4), and that the boundary layer dynamics (6) is globally attractive for any fixed slow variable; see [19, Prop. 1]. Then, there is $\epsilon^* > 0$, and compact sets Ω_p and Ω_u such that, for all $t_0 \geq 0$, $p_0 \in \Omega_p$, $y_0 = u_0 - h(p_0, t_0) \in \Omega_u$, and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon^*$, there is a unique solution of the dynamic system (2), $p(t, \epsilon)$ (resp. $u(t, \epsilon)$) on $[0, \infty)$, which is uniformly approximated by the solution of the reduced model (4), $\bar{p}(t)$, with initial condition p_0 , as $\|p(t, \epsilon) - \bar{p}(t)\| = O(\epsilon)$ (resp. by the solution $\hat{y}(t/\epsilon)$ to (6) with initial condition $y_0 = h(p_0, t_0) + u_0$, as $\|u(t, \epsilon) - h(\bar{p}(t), t) - \hat{y}(t/\epsilon)\| = O(\epsilon)$), as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Moreover, there is a $t_b > t_0$ and $\bar{\epsilon}^* \leq \epsilon^*$ such that $\|u(t, \epsilon) - h(\bar{p}(t), t)\| = O(\epsilon)$ uniformly on $[t_b, \infty)$ for $\epsilon < \bar{\epsilon}^*$.

This result plays a key role in our ensuing technical analysis of the convergence properties of decentralized time-varying coverage control.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

In this section, we define the dynamic coverage control problem that we aim to solve. Consider a time-varying density function $\phi : Q \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, defined over a convex polygonal region $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. This density function models the importance of each point in space at each time instant. Define the coverage control metric

$$H(p, t) = \int_Q \min_{i=1, \dots, n} \|q - p_i\|^2 \phi(q, t) dq. \quad (7)$$

At any given time t , we say that Q is optimally covered by the agents located at $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ if $p(t)$ is a minimizer of (7). It can be shown that local minima consist of centroidal

Voronoi configurations defined as follows. Let the partition of Q be the Voronoi (1) tessellation $\mathcal{V}(p) = (V_1(p), \dots, V_n(p))$. With this choice of partition, we simplify the cost as

$$H(p, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{V_i(p)} \|q - p_i\|^2 \phi(q, t) dq. \quad (8)$$

Following [1], the partial derivatives of H wrt p_i are

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} = \int_{V_i(p)} -2(q - p_i)^\top \phi(q, t) dq. \quad (9)$$

This expression can be further simplified as follows. Define the mass and centroid of Voronoi region $V_i(p)$ as

$$m_i = \int_{V_i(p)} \phi(q, t) dq, \quad c_i = \frac{1}{m_i} \int_{V_i(p)} q \phi(q, t) dq. \quad (10)$$

Then, it holds that

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} = -2m_i(p_i - c_i)^\top, \quad (11)$$

which leads to the characterization of critical points

$$p_i(t) = c_i(p, t), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

The locations $p(t)$ and Voronoi partition for which these conditions hold result into Centroidal Voronoi Tessellations (CVT). In [1], [5], the stability and convergence to CVT for static densities (i.e., $\phi(q, t) = \phi(q)$) were studied via asynchronous implementations of the celebrated Lloyd's algorithm,

$$\dot{p}_i(t) = -\kappa(p_i(t) - c_i(p)), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (13)$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is a proportional gain. Note that the dynamics (13) is distributed in the sense of the Delaunay graph [2]. However, for dynamic densities, (13) does not generally guarantee convergence to CVT because it does not account for the effect of the time-dependency of the evolution of centroid locations. Our aim in this paper is to synthesize a novel distributed algorithm that guarantees $\|p_i(t) - c_i(p, t)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

IV. TIME-VARYING COVERAGE CONTROL VIA SINGULAR PERTURBATIONS

In this section, we propose a novel coordination algorithm to solve the time-varying coverage control problem using ideas from singular perturbation theory. Consider the dynamics

$$\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right) \dot{p} = -\kappa(p - c) + \frac{\partial c}{\partial t}, \quad (14)$$

where $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ denotes the collection of centroids and I is the $nd \times nd$ identity matrix. Note that, under (14), one can easily show that $\|p(t) - c(p, t)\|$ decreases exponentially fast (with rate κ) to 0. However, implementing (14) requires computing the inverse of the matrix $\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd \times nd}$, which is non-sparse, and this results in a centralized dynamic coverage control algorithm, which we denote TVD-C. We note that the matrix is in general invertible when agents are close to their centroids, but it can be ill-conditioned.

One way to get around the centralized computation problem is to resort to a Neumann series approximation $(I - A)^{-1} = I + A + A^2 + \dots$ of the inverse $\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)^{-1}$, and multiply both sides of (14) with it to obtain an approximation. This approach, proposed in [7], results in the class of algorithms denoted by TVD-D $_k$, where $k + 1$ is the number of terms in the series expansion. The accuracy of the approximation increases with k , but so does the communication overhead of executing the resulting coordination algorithm, as individual agents require information from their k -hop neighbors.

Here, we propose an exact reformulation of (14) based on singular perturbation theory that is amenable to distributed computation. Consider the control u that results from solving a least-squares problem optimizing the difference between the left and right-hand sides of (14). Formally, choose u minimizing

$$F(u) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right) u - \left(-\kappa(p - c) + \frac{\partial c}{\partial t}\right) \right\|^2. \quad (15)$$

We design a dynamics that finds this u from any arbitrary initial condition by following a gradient descent scheme. Note that

$$\nabla F(u) = \left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)^\top \left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right) u - \left(-\kappa(p - c) + \frac{\partial c}{\partial t}\right) \right).$$

The component of the gradient that corresponds to agent i can be computed with information provided by 2-hop neighbors in the Delaunay graph, and hence the resulting dynamics can be implemented in a distributed fashion. Our basic idea is then to have this dynamics, which only involves peer-to-peer communication run at a much faster time timescale than the physical evolution of the agents. Formally, we write

$$\dot{p} = u, \quad (16a)$$

$$\epsilon \dot{u} = -\nabla F(u). \quad (16b)$$

We refer to this algorithm as TVD-SP $_\epsilon$, where SP $_\epsilon$ comes from the singularly perturbed dynamics with parameter $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. The following result characterizes the algorithm convergence properties.

Theorem 4.1: Assume $I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}(p, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd \times nd}$ is invertible and its inverse is locally Lipschitz for all t . Then, a unique solution $\bar{p}(t)$ of TVD-C exists and asymptotically converges to $c(t)$ exponentially fast. In addition, there exists $\epsilon^* > 0$ such that, for all $\epsilon < \epsilon^*$, the unique solution $p(t, \epsilon)$ to TVD-SP $_\epsilon$ approaches $\bar{p}(t)$ uniformly in time, i.e., $\|p(t, \epsilon) - \bar{p}(t)\| = O(\epsilon)$, uniformly in $t \geq 0$, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

Proof: We rewrite (16) as

$$\dot{p} = u,$$

$$\dot{u} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)^\top \left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right) u - \left(-\kappa(p - c) + \frac{\partial c}{\partial t}\right) \right).$$

From the assumptions, this dynamics is locally Lipschitz, and hence unique solutions of TVD-SP $_\epsilon$, with $\epsilon > 0$, exist from every initial condition.

Since the matrix $M = \left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)$ is invertible, $\nabla F(u) = 0$ has a unique solution, which can be expressed as $u = h(p, t) \triangleq -M^{-1}(\kappa(p - c) + \frac{\partial c}{\partial t})$. Then, it immediately follows that the slow model, cf. (4), of TVD-SP $_\epsilon$ corresponds

to the TVD-C dynamics (14). As M is invertible, there is a well defined solution $\bar{p}(t)$ to this dynamics from every initial condition. Define $e(t) = \bar{p}(t) - c(t)$, then (14) is equivalent to $\dot{e} = -ke$, which has a globally exponentially stable equilibrium point. Thus, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{p}(t) - c(t)\| = 0$ exponentially fast. On the other hand, the boundary layer system of TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dp}{d\eta} &= 0, \\ \frac{du}{d\eta} &= -\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)^{\top} \left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)u - \left(-\kappa(p - c) + \frac{\partial c}{\partial t}\right) \right) \\ &= -\nabla F(u), \end{aligned}$$

with $d\eta = dt/\epsilon$. For any fixed slow variable p_0 , this dynamics has the unique solution of $\nabla F(u) = 0$ as a globally exponentially stable equilibrium. Finally, note that the functions h , as well as $f(p, u, t) = u$ and $g = -\nabla F(u)$, are locally Lipschitz, as the centroids of a Voronoi partition are locally Lipschitz, cf. [20]. Thus, these functions are globally Lipschitz and bounded over compact domains. Collecting all the above arguments, we can apply Theorem 2.1 to conclude the statement. ■

The advantage of the proposed method TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$ is that it is 2-hop distributed for any ϵ , whereas TVD-C requires centralized information and TVD-D $_k$ requires k -hop neighbor information. The parameter ϵ has the intuitive interpretation of the timescale of communication, so more accurately approximating the flow TVD-C requires larger communication overhead.

Example 4.2: We compare here the performance of Lloyd's algorithm (cf. eq. (13)), the centralized algorithm TVD-C (cf. eq. (14)), the power series approximation TVD-D $_k$ (cf. [7]), and the singular perturbation algorithm TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$ (cf. eq. (16)). We consider¹ 10 agents performing dynamic coverage control in $Q = [-10, 10]^2$ for the following time-varying densities

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(q, t) &= e^{-((q_x - 2 \sin(\frac{t}{5}))^2 + (q_y)^2)}, \\ \phi_2(q, t) &= e^{-((q_x - \sin(\frac{t}{5}))^2 + (q_y + \sin(\frac{2t}{5}))^2)}, \\ \phi_3(q, t) &= e^{-((q_x - 2 \cos(\frac{t}{5}))^2 + (q_y - 2 \sin(\frac{t}{5}))^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

representing different moving targets. As a measure of performance, we use the integral $\int_0^T H(p(t), t) dt$ of the coverage cost (8) over the duration of the simulation. We set $\kappa = 1$, $T = 31.5s$, and $dt = 0.1s$.

We simulate the Neumann series approximation algorithm TVD-D $_k$ for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 3\}$ and the proposed singular perturbation algorithm TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$ with $\epsilon \in \{0.1, 0.05, 0.01\}$. Table I presents the results. One can see that as ϵ gets smaller (i.e., more rounds of communication take place to decide the control action for agent motion), the performance of TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$ improves. TVD-D $_k$ and TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$ both perform better than Lloyd's algorithm, and both TVD-SP $_{0.01}$ and TVD-D $_3$ (requiring 3-hop neighbor information) achieve

¹Simulations are implemented on python.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF TOTAL COSTS FOR 10 AGENTS.

Algorithm	ϕ_1	ϕ_2	ϕ_3
Lloyd	52.11	50.57	62.82
TVD-D $_0$	49.10	48.55	55.41
TVD-D $_1$	44.39	44.23	47.90
TVD-D $_2$	42.68	42.70	44.75
TVD-D $_3$	41.95	41.97	43.23
TVD-SP $_{0.1}$	46.26	46.26	53.29
TVD-SP $_{0.05}$	42.49	43.07	42.93
TVD-SP $_{0.01}$	41.40	41.45	41.48
TVD-C	41.84	42.47	41.46

costs comparable to the cost of TVD-C, with TVD-SP $_{0.01}$ performing slightly better. •

V. 1-HOP DISTRIBUTED DISCRETE-TIME IMPLEMENTATIONS WITH DELAYED INFORMATION

In this section, we study discretizations of the dynamics TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$ that require communication only with 1-hop neighbors at the cost of using partially delayed information.

A. 2-Hop Distributed Discretization of TVD-SP $_{\epsilon}$

For convenience, we use the notation $u^k = u(kt)$, for a discretization step δt . A simple forward Euler integration in p gives

$$p^{k+1} = p^k + u^k \delta t, \quad (17a)$$

for each $k \geq 0$. The control u^k is given by a discretization of the boundary layer dynamics $du/d\eta = -\nabla F(u)$ of (16), where $p \equiv p^k$ is held constant. Since η is a much faster time scale than t , for each update of t , we need to implement $N \approx 1/\epsilon$ updates in η . We assume that ϵ is chosen so that N is an integer value, and index the fast updates in u as $u_{\ell} = u(\ell\eta)$. In this way, $u_{Nk} \equiv u^k$, for each k . The undelayed, discretized gradient-descent dynamics of the boundary layer equation is simply

$$u_{\ell+1} = u_{\ell} - \delta\eta \nabla F(u_{\ell}), \quad \ell \geq 0. \quad (17b)$$

We next investigate the information exchange among agents required to execute this algorithm.

For convenience, we write $\nabla F(u)$ as

$$\nabla F(u) = Au + b, \quad (18a)$$

where

$$A = \left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)^{\top} \left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd \times nd}, \quad (18b)$$

$$b = -\left(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p}\right)^{\top} \left(-\kappa(p - c) + \frac{\partial c}{\partial t}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}. \quad (18c)$$

The following result provides an explicit description of the entries of A and b .

Lemma 5.1: The block entries of A and b in (18) are, for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ii} &= \left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^{\top} \left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right) + \sum_{j \in N_i} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i}^{\top} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \\ A_{ij} &= -\left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^{\top} \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_j} + \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i}^{\top} \left(I - \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_j}\right)\right) \mathbb{1}_{N_i}(j) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{k \in N_i \cap N_j} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_j} \mathbb{1}_{N_i^2}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \\
b_i & = -\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \left(-\kappa(p_i - c_i) + \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t}\right) \\
& + \sum_{j \in N_i} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \left(-\kappa(p_j - c_j) + \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial t}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^d,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1}_S(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function for the set S .

Proof: The component corresponding to agent i is

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_i F(u) & = \left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right) + \sum_{j \in N_i} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i}\right) u_i \\
& - \sum_{j \in N_i} \left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_j} + \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \left(I - \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_j}\right)\right) u_j \\
& + \sum_{j \in N_i} \left(\sum_{k \in N_j} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_k}\right) u_k + b_i.
\end{aligned}$$

By interchanging the indices j and k in the last term, and describing all agents such that $k \in N_i$ and $j \in N_k$ as $j \in N_i^2$ and $k \in N_i \cap N_j$ instead (here, N_i^2 denotes the 2-hop Delaunay neighbors of i), the equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_i F(u) & = \left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right) + \sum_{j \in N_i} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i}\right) u_i \\
& - \sum_{j \in N_i} \left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_j} + \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \left(I - \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_j}\right)\right) u_j \\
& + \sum_{j \in N_i^2} \left(\sum_{k \in N_i \cap N_j} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_j}\right) u_j + b_i.
\end{aligned}$$

The expression for A_{ii} and A_{ij} then readily follows. Finally, the expression for b_i follows from its definition in (18). ■

The result in Lemma 5.1 is useful to understand the intricacies of the information exchange required to implement the discretization of TVD-SP $_\epsilon$. With the notation of this result, we rewrite (17b) as

$$u_{\ell+1} = u_\ell - \delta\eta(Au_\ell + b), \quad \ell \geq 1. \quad (19)$$

First, note that the matrix A is symmetric. Second, the computation of the blocks of the matrix A requires 2-hop position neighbor information. Since during the N steps of the discretized boundary layer dynamics (17b) that correspond to the 1 step of the slow dynamics (17a), the agents' position is held constant, the transmission of *agent position information* only needs to occur once.

Theorem 5.2: Assume $\nabla F(u_*) = 0$ has a unique solution u_* and $A \succ 0$. Then, for $\delta\eta \in (0, 1/(2\lambda_{\max}(A)))$, the dynamics (19) satisfy $u_\ell \rightarrow u_*$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that, since the update (19) requires 2-hop *control neighbor information* at every step, each agent cannot execute it if only communication with 1-hop neighbors is possible at every step. Instead, to address this, agents could explore the use delayed information about its 2-hop neighbors: essentially, this corresponds to the information that its 1-hop neighbor received the previous step, which is relayed at the current step. This is what we discuss in the following.

B. 1-Hop Distributed Implementation with Delayed Updates

The discussion above justifies why in the following we investigate partially-delayed gradients versions of (17b). Set initially $u_{i,0} = u_{i,1} = 0$, for all i . Assume that, at each round $\ell \geq 2$, agent i transmits information about its current $u_{i,\ell}$ as well as relays the values $u_{j,\ell-1}$ received from its 1-hop neighbors at the previous round $\ell-1$. Then, each agent receives information from its 2-hop neighbors with 1 time-step delay. With this information exchange, one can write the *all-neighbors-delayed* update as,

$$u_{\ell+1} = u_\ell - \delta\eta(Au_{\ell-1} + b), \quad \ell \geq 1. \quad (20)$$

In this case, all agents keep in memory their previous values $u_{i,\ell-1}$ and update the gradient with a delay of 1 time step across all agents (even though they have more up to date information about their 1-hop neighbors and themselves). The next result characterizes the convergence properties of (20).

Theorem 5.3: Assume $\nabla F(u_*) = 0$ has a unique solution u_* and $A \succ 0$. Then, for $\delta\eta \in (0, 1/(4\lambda_{\max}(A)))$, the dynamics (20) satisfy $u_\ell \rightarrow u_*$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: The result follows by rewriting (20) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{\ell+1} \\ u_\ell \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & -\delta\eta A \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_\ell \\ u_{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -\delta\eta b \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and noting that the eigenvalues of the system matrix are of the form $\frac{1 \pm \sqrt{1 - 4\delta\eta\mu}}{2}$, with μ an eigenvalue of A . ■

According to [21, Lemma 1], if the locational cost is locally strongly convex at the CVT, then there exists a constant such that, if the distance between the agents and their CVT is below it, then $\text{eig}(\frac{\partial c}{\partial p}) < 1$ (recall from the proof of Theorem 4.1 that, if $(I - \frac{\partial c}{\partial p})$ is invertible, then $\nabla F(u) = 0$ has a unique solution). In our numerical simulations, eigenvalues of A are in the range $(0, 1]$ when agents are near their time-varying centroids.

The update (20) uses only delayed information to evaluate the term Au in $\nabla F(u)$. However, this can be refined to employ the up-to-date information that each agent actually has about itself and its 1-hop neighbors. To formalize these, we next describe equivalent forms of writing $\nabla F(u)$.

Lemma 5.4: Define the matrices² \mathcal{A}^f and \mathcal{A}^d block-wise as follows: for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{ii}^f & = A_{ii}, \\
\mathcal{A}_{ij}^f & = -\left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_j} + \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \left(I - \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_j}\right)\right), \quad \text{if } j \in N_i \setminus N_i^2, \\
\mathcal{A}_{ij}^f & = -\left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_j} + \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \left(I - \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_j}\right)\right) \\
& + \sum_{k \in N_i \cap N_j} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_j}, \quad \text{if } j \in N_i \cap N_i^2, \\
\mathcal{A}_{ij}^f & = 0, \quad \text{otherwise,} \\
\mathcal{A}_{ij}^d & = \sum_{k \in N_i \cap N_j} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_j}, \quad \text{if } j \in N_i^2 \setminus N_i, \\
\mathcal{A}_{ij}^d & = 0, \quad \text{otherwise.}
\end{aligned}$$

²The superindex f stands for 'fresh' and d stands for 'delayed'.

Then, $\nabla F(u)$ can be expressed as $\nabla F(u) = \mathcal{A}^f u + \mathcal{A}^d u + b$.

Also, define the matrices \mathcal{A}^f and \mathcal{A}^d block-wise as follows: for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{ii}^f &= A_{ii}, \\ \mathcal{A}_{ij}^f &= -\left(\left(I - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_i}\right)^\top \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial p_j} + \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_i} \left(I - \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial p_j}\right)\right), \quad \text{if } j \in N_i, \\ \mathcal{A}_{ij}^f &= 0, \quad \text{otherwise,} \\ \mathcal{A}_{ij}^d &= \sum_{k \in N_i \cap N_j} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial c_k}{\partial p_j}, \quad \text{if } j \in N_i^2, \\ \mathcal{A}_{ij}^d &= 0, \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\nabla F(u)$ can be expressed as $\nabla F(u) = \mathcal{A}^f u + \mathcal{A}^d u + b$.

Note that the matrices \mathcal{A}^f , \mathcal{A}^d , \mathcal{A}^f , and \mathcal{A}^d are all symmetric. Motivated by the decompositions in Lemma 5.4, we consider the generic update

$$u_{\ell+1} = u_\ell - \delta\eta(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f u_\ell + \overline{\mathcal{A}}^d u_{\ell-1} + b), \quad \ell \geq 2, \quad (21)$$

with $u_0 = u_1 = 0$. Note that u_* is still a fixed point of (21) as long as $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f + \overline{\mathcal{A}}^d = A$.

According to the first decomposition of the gradient ∇F in Lemma 5.4, we choose $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f = \mathcal{A}^f$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^d = \mathcal{A}^d$ in (21) to obtain the $2 \setminus 1$ -neighbors-delayed update

$$u_{\ell+1} = u_\ell - \delta\eta(\mathcal{A}^f u_\ell + \mathcal{A}^d u_{\ell-1} + b), \quad \ell \geq 2, \quad (22)$$

with $u_0 = u_1 = 0$. According to this update, delayed information is only used for those 2-hop neighbors that are not 1-hop neighbors too. According to the second decomposition of the gradient ∇F in Lemma 5.4, we choose $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f = \mathcal{A}^f$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^d = \mathcal{A}^d$ in (21) to obtain the 2 -neighbors-delayed update

$$u_{\ell+1} = u_\ell - \delta\eta(\mathcal{A}^f u_\ell + \mathcal{A}^d u_{\ell-1} + b), \quad \ell \geq 2, \quad (23)$$

with $u_0 = u_1 = 0$. This update does not distinguish among 2-hop neighbors that are/are not also 1-hop neighbors, and delays all the information of the 2-hop neighbors. Observe that both dynamics use more up-to-date neighbor information than (20), with dynamics (22) being the one that takes full advantage of it. The following result characterizes the convergence properties of updates of the form (21) (and hence, of (22) and (23)) employing the theory of generating functions, cf. [16], [17].

Theorem 5.5: Assume $(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f + \overline{\mathcal{A}}^d)u + b = 0$ has a unique solution u_* , $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{f,\top} = \overline{\mathcal{A}}^f \succ 0$, and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{d,\top} = \overline{\mathcal{A}}^d$. Then, if $\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f) > \max\{\lambda_{\max}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^d), |\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^d)|\}$, there is a sufficiently small $\delta\eta$ such that the dynamics (21) satisfy $u_\ell \rightarrow u_*$, as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: The proof proceeds by showing that $e_\ell = u_\ell - u_* \rightarrow 0$, as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. The error dynamics is given by $e_{\ell+1} = e_\ell - \delta\eta(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f e_\ell + \overline{\mathcal{A}}^d e_{\ell-1})$, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, starting at some $e_1, e_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$. Denote by $B = I - \delta\eta\overline{\mathcal{A}}^f$, and $\Lambda = \delta\eta\overline{\mathcal{A}}^d$, and define the formal power series expansion

$$f(z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} e_\ell z^\ell \in \mathbb{R}[[z]]^{nd},$$

where z is the formal series expansion variable, and $\mathbb{R}[[z]]$ is the ring of formal power series expansions with coefficients in \mathbb{R} .³ In the following, we will aim to obtain bounds of e_ℓ so that $\|e_\ell\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Note that it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= e_0 + e_1 z + \sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty} (B e_{\ell-1} - \Lambda e_{\ell-2}) z^\ell \\ &= e_0 + e_1 z + B z \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} e_\ell z^\ell - \Lambda \sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty} e_{\ell-2} z^\ell \\ &= e_0 + e_1 z + [B z f(z) - B e_0 z] - \Lambda z^2 f(z). \end{aligned}$$

From here, we obtain:

$$(I - B z + \Lambda z^2) f(z) = e_0 + (e_1 - B e_0) z.$$

Define $\pi(z) \triangleq I - B z + \Lambda z^2$, which is an invertible formal series expansion in the ring $\mathbb{R}^{nd \times nd}[[z]]$ with inverse $\pi^{-1}(z)$ (or $\frac{1}{\pi(z)}$ in the sequel.⁴) Therefore,

$$f(z) = \pi^{-1}(z)(e_0 + (e_1 - B e_0)z).$$

Denote the coefficients of a formal series $S(z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} a_\ell z^\ell$ as $[z^\ell]S(z) \triangleq a_\ell$. One can show that

$$[z^\ell]f(z) \triangleq e_\ell = [z^\ell](\pi^{-1}(z)(e_0 + (e_1 - B e_0)z)), \quad \ell \geq 2,$$

Thus, the coefficient of z^ℓ of $f(z)$, $[z^\ell]f(z)$, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} [z^\ell]f(z) &= e_\ell = [z^\ell](\pi^{-1}(z)(e_0 + (e_1 - B e_0)z)) \\ &= [z^\ell]\pi^{-1}(z)e_0 + [z^{\ell-1}]\pi^{-1}(z)(e_1 - B e_0). \end{aligned}$$

To calculate this expression, we first find $[z^\ell](\pi^{-1}(z))$. Under the assumptions, there is a sufficiently small $\delta\eta$ such that $B^2 - 2\Lambda = (B^2 - 2\Lambda)^\top > 0$; cf. Lemma 1.1 in the Appendix. Therefore, the matrix roots of $\pi(z) = I - B z + \Lambda z^2 = 0$, must satisfy

$$\Lambda M_\pm = \frac{B \pm \sqrt{B^2 - 2\Lambda}}{2}.$$

Note that a root M_\pm (also denoted individually as M_+ , M_-) must be invertible since $I - B M_\pm + \Lambda M_\pm^2 = 0$ implies $I = (B - \Lambda M_\pm)M_\pm$, therefore $\det(M_\pm) \neq 0$. It also holds that $\pi'(M_\pm) = -B + 2\Lambda M_\pm = \pm\sqrt{B^2 - 2\Lambda}$ is invertible, for a sufficiently small $\delta\eta$. Observe that the inverse of the root matrices, M_\pm^{-1} , must also be roots of the matrix polynomial $p(z) = \pi(z^{-1})z = z^2 - B z + \Lambda$. Therefore, a partial fraction expansion of $\pi^{-1}(z)$ can be obtained in terms of these invertible matrices as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi(z)} &= \frac{\pi'(M_+)^{-1}}{(z - M_+)} + \frac{\pi'(M_-)^{-1}}{(z - M_-)} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi'(M_+)M_+(1 - M_+^{-1}z)} - \frac{1}{\pi'(M_-)M_-(1 - M_-^{-1}z)} \end{aligned}$$

³The above can be understood as a formal series expansion vector the entries of which are given by formal series expansions in real coefficients; that is, if $e = (e_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, then $\sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} e_\ell z^\ell = (\sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} e_{i,\ell} z^\ell)$. Induced operations of this formal series expansion vector with a matrix formal power series expansion allow us to carry out the operations that follow.

⁴The formal series expansion $\pi(z)$ is invertible in the ring $\mathbb{R}^{nd \times nd}[[z]]$ since I is invertible. The coefficients of such an inverse $\mu(z)$ can be found from the identity $\pi(z)\mu(z) = 1$, and by solving recursively for the coefficients of $\mu(z)$.

$$= -\pi'(M_+)^{-1}M_+^{-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}M_+^{-\ell}z^\ell - \pi'(M_-)^{-1}M_-^{-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}M_-^{-\ell}z^\ell,$$

where we have employed the geometric series expression $1/(1-a) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} a^\ell$. Plugging this into $[z^\ell]f(z)$ above,

$$\begin{aligned} [z^\ell]f(z) &= [z^\ell]\left(\frac{1}{\pi(z)}e_0\right) + [z^{\ell-1}]\left(\frac{1}{\pi(z)}(e_1 - Be_0)\right) \\ &= -(\pi'(M_+)^{-1}M_+^{-1}M_+^{-\ell} + \pi'(M_-)^{-1}M_-^{-1}M_-^{-\ell})e_0 \\ &\quad - (\pi'(M_+)^{-1}M_+^{-1}M_+^{-\ell+1} + \\ &\quad + \pi'(M_-)^{-1}M_-^{-1}M_-^{-\ell+1})(-e_1 + Be_0), \ell \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

To prove convergence, we need a bit more work to bound the eigenvalues of each M_\pm^{-1} . First, note that

$$M_\pm^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \left(B \pm \sqrt{B^2 - 2\Lambda} \right).$$

thus, $(M_\pm^{-1})^\top = M_\pm^{-1}$ have real eigenvalues. Any of these roots, R , satisfies

$$p(R) = R^2 - BR + \Lambda = 0.$$

Therefore, for each eigenvector x of R such that $x^\top x = 1$, it holds that

$$x^\top R^2 x - x^\top B R x + x^\top \Lambda x = 0.$$

which implies

$$\lambda^2 - \lambda x^\top B x + x^\top \Lambda x = 0,$$

for the associated eigenvalue. From Lagrange's theorem [22], the absolute values of the roots of this polynomial will be bounded by the sum of the coefficients $|x^\top (I - \delta\eta \bar{A}^f)x| + |x^\top \delta\eta \bar{A}^d x|$. Further, from Courant-Fischer's theorem, and for $\delta\eta$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x^\top (I - \delta\eta \bar{A}^f)x| + |x^\top \delta\eta \bar{A}^d x| &\leq 1 - \delta\eta \lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}^f) \\ &\quad + \delta\eta \max\{\lambda_{\max}(\bar{A}^d), |\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}^d)|\} \triangleq \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the previous inequality is less than one if $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}^f) > \max\{\lambda_{\max}(\bar{A}^d), |\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}^d)|\}$.

From here, one can take the norm of each coefficient, e_ℓ and upper-bound it in terms of the eigenvalues of the matrix roots of $\pi(z)$, which are related to those of \bar{A}^f and \bar{A}^d . Putting $M_1 \equiv M_+$, and $M_2 \equiv M_-$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_\ell\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(-\pi'(M_i)^{-1}M_i^{-(\ell+1)}e_0 + \pi'(M_i)^{-1}M_i^{-\ell}(e_1 - Be_0) \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\|e_0\| \|\pi'(M_i)^{-1}\| \|M_i^{-1}\|^{\ell+1} + \dots \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots + \|e_1 - Be_0\| \|\pi'(M_i)^{-1}\| \|M_i^{-1}\|^\ell \right) \\ &= O(\max\{\lambda(M_+^{-1})\}^\ell) \leq O(\gamma^\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Example 5.6: (Numerical simulation of 1-hop distributed algorithms with delayed updates): We illustrate here the performance of the various 1-hop distributed algorithms

TABLE II
1-HOP DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHMS WITH DELAYED UPDATES.

Update	Equation	Description of delay
all-neighbors-delayed	(20)	Control information from both 1-hop and 2-hop neighbors delayed by 1 timestep
$2 \setminus 1$ -neighbors-delayed	(22)	Control information from 2-hop neighbors that are not 1-hop too delayed by 1 timestep
2-neighbors-delayed	(23)	Control information from all 2-hop neighbors delayed by 1 timestep

with delayed updates discussed in this section, summarized for convenience in Table II. We again consider 10 agents, this time deployed over a set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ with 20 by 20 by 20 units and with density $\phi_4(q, t) = e^{-((q_x - 4 \cos(\frac{t}{5}))^2 + (q_y - 4 \sin(\frac{t}{5}))^2 + (q_z)^2)}$. We set $\epsilon = 0.05$, $\kappa = 1$, $T = 31.5s$, and $dt = 0.1s$. Figure 1 shows the result of the simulations. Consistent with the use of the control information of each algorithm, cf. Table II, we observe that the coordination algorithms with the $2 \setminus 1$ -neighbors-delayed update converges faster than the 2-neighbors-delayed update, which in turn converges faster than the all-neighbors-delayed one. This is also verified by the total costs for each run. •

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a novel class of multi-agent coordination algorithms for dynamic coverage control with time-varying density functions. Our approach is based on singular perturbation theory, specifically on having agent position and control decision updates run at two different timescales. The ratio between the (slow) timescale for agent motion and the (fast) timescale for control updates is the perturbation parameter. The inverse of this parameter has the natural interpretation of the relative speed of the communication service with respect to physical motion. The resulting algorithm can be implemented either in continuous or discrete time and is 2-hop distributed over the Delaunay graph. We have shown that, for small enough values of the perturbation parameter, it achieves the same performance as its centralized counterpart, i.e., tracking of a centroidal Voronoi tessellation. We have also proposed discrete-time versions that rely only on 1-hop communication at the cost of having to use delayed information, resulting in the all-neighbors-, $2 \setminus 1$ -neighbors-, and 2-neighbors-delayed variants, and have formally established their asymptotic convergence guarantees.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Cortés, S. Martínez, T. Karatas, and F. Bullo, "Coverage control for mobile sensing networks," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 243–255, 2004.
- [2] F. Bullo, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez, *Distributed Control of Robotic Networks*, ser. Applied Mathematics Series. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [3] A. Okabe, B. Boots, K. Sugihara, and S. N. Chiu, *Spatial Tessellations: Concepts and Applications of Voronoi Diagrams*, 2nd ed., ser. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley, 2000.
- [4] Z. Drezner and H. W. Hamacher, Eds., *Facility Location: Applications and Theory*. Springer, 2001.
- [5] J. Cortés, S. Martínez, T. Karatas, and F. Bullo, "Coverage control for mobile sensing networks: variations on a theme," in *Mediterranean*




Fig. 1. Evolution of the coverage control metric (7) with $n = 10$ agents and dynamic density function ϕ_4 under the (a) all-neighbors-delayed update (20), with total cost 3687.5 (b) $2 \setminus 1$ -neighbors-delayed update (22), with total cost 2876.11, and (c) 2-neighbors-delayed update (23), with total cost 3175.49.




Fig. 2. Hardware experiments with $n = 8$ differential drive robots performing time-varying coverage control in the Robotarium, a remotely accessible swarm robotics testbed [23]. The robots execute the TVD- SP_ϵ coordination algorithm with the $2 \setminus 1$ -neighbors-delayed update (22). (a) initialization, (b)-(d) snapshots during the execution.

Conf. on Control and Automation, Lisbon, Portugal, July 2002, Electronic Proceedings.

- [6] L. Pimenta, M. Schwager, Q. Lindsey, V. Kumar, D. Rus, R. C. Mesquita, and G. Pereira, “Simultaneous coverage and tracking (SCAT) of moving targets with robot networks,” in *Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics VIII*, ser. Springer Tracts in Advanced Robotics, G. S. Chirikjian, H. Choset, M. Morales, and T. Murphey, Eds. New York: Springer, 2008, vol. 57, pp. 85–99.
- [7] S. G. Lee, Y. Diaz-Mercado, and M. Egerstedt, “Multirobot control using time-varying density functions,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 489–493, 2015.
- [8] X. Xu and Y. Diaz-Mercado, “Multi-agent control using coverage over time-varying domains,” in *American Control Conference*, Denver, CO, USA, 2020, pp. 2030–2035.
- [9] E. Teruel, R. Aragues, and G. López-Nicolás, “A distributed robot swarm control for dynamic region coverage,” *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 119, pp. 51–63, 2019.
- [10] P. V. Kokotovic, H. K. Khalil, and J. O’Reilly, *Singular Perturbation Methods in Control: Analysis and Design*. SIAM Academic Press, 1986.
- [11] H. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [12] S. S. Kia, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez, “Singularly perturbed algorithms for dynamic average consensus,” in *European Control Conference*, Zurich, Switzerland, July 2013, pp. 1758–1763.
- [13] F. Zanella, D. Varagnolo, A. Cenedese, G. Pillonetto, and L. Schenato, “Newton-Raphson consensus for distributed convex optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 4, p. 994–1009, 2016.

- [14] A. Chapman and M. Mesbahi, “Multiple time-scales in network-of-networks,” in *American Control Conference*, Boston, MA, USA, July 2016, pp. 5563–5568.
- [15] Y. Arjevani, O. Shamir, and N. Srebro, “A tight convergence analysis for stochastic gradient descent with delayed updates,” in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 117, 2020, pp. 111–132.
- [16] H. S. Wilf, *Generatingfunctionology*, 2nd ed. New York: Academic Press, 1994.
- [17] P. Flajolet and R. Sedgewick, *Analytic Combinatorics*, 1st ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [18] M. de Berg, O. Cheong, M. van Kreveld, and M. Overmars, *Computational Geometry: Algorithms and Applications*. Springer, 1997.
- [19] V. Veliov, “A generalization of the Tikhonov theorem for singularly perturbed differential inclusions,” *Journal of Dynamical & Control Systems*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 291–319, 1997.
- [20] J. Cortés, S. Martínez, and F. Bullo, “Spatially-distributed coverage optimization and control with limited-range interactions,” *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation & Calculus of Variations*, vol. 11, pp. 691–719, 2005.
- [21] Y. Diaz-Mercado, S. G. Lee, and M. Egerstedt, “Distributed dynamic density coverage for human-swarm interactions,” in *American Control Conference*, Chicago, IL, USA, July 2015, pp. 353–358.
- [22] P. Batra, M. Mignotte, and D. Stefanescu, “Improvements of Lagrange’s bound for polynomial roots,” *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, vol. 82, pp. 19–25, 2017.
- [23] S. Wilson, P. Glotfelter, L. Wang, S. Mayya, G. Notomista, M. M. Mote, and M. Egerstedt, “The robotarium: Globally impactful opportunities, challenges, and lessons learned in remote-access, distributed control of multirobot systems,” *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 26–44, 2020.

APPENDIX

Lemma 1.1: Consider the matrices $B = I - \delta\eta\bar{A}^f$ and $\Lambda = \delta\eta\bar{A}^d$, where $\bar{A}^f \succ 0$, and both \bar{A}^f, \bar{A}^d are symmetric. Then $B^2 - 2\Lambda \succ 0$ for $\delta\eta$ sufficiently small.

Proof: Note that $B^2 - 2\Lambda = I - 2\delta\eta\bar{A}^f + (\delta\eta)^2(\bar{A}^f)^2 - 2\delta\eta\bar{A}^d$ is symmetric and has real eigenvalues. By the Courant-Fischer’s theorem, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(B^2 - 2\Lambda) &= \min_{x: \|x\|=1} x^\top (B^2 - 2\Lambda) x \\ &= \min_{x: \|x\|=1} \{1 - 2\delta\eta x^\top \bar{A}^f x + (\delta\eta)^2 x^\top (\bar{A}^f)^2 x - 2\delta\eta x^\top \bar{A}^d x\} \\ &\geq 1 - 2\delta\eta \lambda_{\max}(\bar{A}^f) + (\delta\eta)^2 \lambda_{\min}((\bar{A}^f)^2) - 2\delta\eta \lambda_{\max}(\bar{A}^d), \end{aligned}$$

as all involved matrices are symmetric. Thus, if $\delta\eta$ is sufficiently small, then $B - 2\Gamma \succ 0$. ■