

Switched Linear Ensemble Systems and Structural Controllability

Haoyu Yin, Yi Li, Ouyang Du, Bruno Sinopoli, and Xudong Chen*

Abstract

This paper introduces and solves a structural controllability problem for ensembles of switched linear systems. All individual subsystems in the ensemble are sparse, governed by the same sparsity pattern, and undergo switching at the same sequence of time instants. The controllability of an ensemble system describes the ability to use a common control input to simultaneously steer every individual system. A sparsity pattern is called structurally controllable for pair (k, q) if it admits a controllable ensemble of q individual systems with at most k switches. We derive a necessary and sufficient condition for a sparsity pattern to be structurally controllable for a given (k, q) , and characterize when a sparsity pattern admits a finite k that guarantees structural controllability for (k, q) for arbitrary q . Compared with the linear time-invariant ensemble case, this second condition is strictly weaker. We further show that these conditions have natural connections with maximum flow, and hence can be checked by polynomial algorithms. Specifically, the time complexity of deciding structural controllability is $O(n^3)$ and the complexity of computing the smallest number of switches needed is $O(n^3 \log n)$, with n the dimension of each individual subsystem.

1 Introduction

An ensemble system comprises a large number of individual (sub-)systems, and ensemble control deals with the problem of using a common, finite-dimensional control input to simultaneously steer all the individual systems. It originated from quantum control [1, 2, 3] where one uses radio frequency impulses to steer an ensemble of spin dynamics, and finds applications in many other disciplines, ranging from neuroscience [4, 5], learning and neural ODEs [6, 7], to multi-agent control [8, 9].

A distinctive feature of ensemble control is that the dynamics of the individual systems are independent of each other (precisely, the dynamics of any given individual system do not depend on the states of the others), and the coupling is through the common control input only. Controllability of the whole ensemble is attained by variations in parameters of the individual systems [2, 10, 11]. This is in contrast with network control where controllability of a networked system relies often on a certain leader-follower hierarchy.

All the authors are with the Electrical and Systems Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis. Emails: {h.yin, lyi1, d.ouyang, bsinopoli, cxudong}@wustl.edu.

*Corresponding author: X. Chen.

Ensemble control thus provides an alternative approach for controlling large-scale systems: Instead of controlling a large networked systems, one controls a population of small ones, which is by nature resilient and scalable; indeed, malfunction of a few individual systems do not affect the others and one is free to add into or remove from the ensemble an arbitrary number of individual systems [12].

A main challenge of ensemble control stems from the requirement that the control input be generated irrespective of the individual system. Controllability of each individual system is necessary for the ensemble to be controllable, yet far from being sufficient. For example, an ensemble of integrators is not controllable as a whole, regardless of their respective actuation gains. Necessary and/or sufficient conditions have been obtained for ensemble controllability, yet open questions still remain. See, for example, [13, 14, 11] and the references therein.

In the recent work [12], we considered continuum ensembles of linear *time-invariant* (LTI) systems, whose (A, B) pairs share a common sparsity pattern. We investigated what type of sparsity pattern can sustain controllability of such ensemble system, i.e., we address the structural controllability problem for linear ensemble systems. Amongst others, we have provided a necessary and sufficient condition [12, Theorem 1] for the sparsity pattern to be structurally ensemble controllable. Without recalling the full and precise statement, we note here that if a sparsity pattern is structurally ensemble controllable, then the digraph corresponding to the sparsity pattern of the A -matrix must have a node-wise disjoint cycle cover (node-wise Hamiltonian decomposition). In particular, the condition for structural ensemble controllability is strictly stronger than the one for structural controllability (for LTI systems).

In this paper, we follow the research line of [12] and continue to investigate ensemble controllability from the perspective of structural system theory. A major motivation of the current work is rooted in the following question: To what extent can we relax the condition established in [12]? Said in other words, if a sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} cannot sustain controllability for any LTI ensemble system, then is it possible that we find another class of ensemble systems that are controllable and, at the same time, compliant with the sparsity pattern? We provide an affirmative answer to the question.

Specifically, we consider in this paper the class of *switched*, linear ensemble systems and address the associated structural controllability problem. The main contributions of this work are the following:

1. Given a pair (k, q) of integers, where k is the number of allowable switches and q is the number of individual systems, we provide in Theorem 1 a necessary and sufficient condition for a sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} to sustain controllability for switched, linear q -ensemble systems (i.e., an ensemble of q switched, linear systems with the same switch instants). For convenience, we call any such sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} structurally controllable for (k, q) .
2. Leveraging the above result, we provide in Proposition 2 a necessary and sufficient condition for a sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} to admit a finite k such that \mathbb{S} is structurally controllable for (k, q) for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$ (with k fixed). Compared with the condition for LTI ensemble system, the condition for the switched, linear ensemble systems is

strictly weaker, requiring only that sparsity pattern of the A -matrix be such that every column of A contains at least one \star -entry. The same condition, said in graphical terms, is that the digraph corresponding to the A -matrix has the property that each node has at least one in-neighbor.

3. In addition to the two necessary and sufficient conditions, we further present in Section 3.3 polynomial algorithms for checking the conditions. This is done by relating the conditions to appropriately defined maximum flow problems (Theorem 3). The time complexity of checking whether a sparsity pattern is structurally controllable for a given pair (k, q) is $O(n^3)$ where n is the dimension of the *individual* system (not the dimension of the ensemble system), independent of k or q (note that the setting of our interest is such that $q \gg 1$). The time complexity for checking whether there exists a finite k such that \mathbb{S} is structurally controllable for (k, q) for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$ is also $O(n^3)$. Finally, if such k exists, then the time complexity for computing the smallest value k^* is $O(n^3 \log n)$.

Since the seminal work of Lin [15], there have been many efforts and progress made in structural system theory. We will not enumerate all the work in this area, but instead only mention the ones that are relevant to this paper. We will focus on two areas, namely, structural system theory in ensemble systems and in switched systems. The problem of structural ensemble controllability was initiated and addressed in [12] as mentioned above. More recently, the problem of structural averaged controllability has been addressed in [16, 17], where the goal of that research line is to understand to what extent can we relax the condition on the sparsity pattern if only certain output functions (e.g., average and higher moments of an ensemble) are of one's interest? The class of ensemble dynamics considered in the above work are LTI ensemble systems. Next, for the relevant work about (finite dimensional) switched systems, we first mention [18] where the authors considered switched linear systems, with heterogeneous sparsity patterns over different time periods. Given the number k of switches, the authors provided a necessary and sufficient condition (see Theorems 9 and 11 of their work) for the sequence of sparsity patterns to be structurally controllable. The authors have also articulated an algorithm for checking the condition, with time complexity $O(\sqrt{(k+1)n}(k+1)n^2)$. We also mention [19, 20] where the authors considered a similar setting, but with the focus on computing the smallest value k^* (note that such k^* always exists for a single linear system, but is not the case for the ensemble setting). The authors have also provided an algorithm to obtain k^* with time complexity $O(n^4)$. To the best of our knowledge, there has not been any work in the literature that addresses structural controllability for switched, ensemble systems.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we gather key notions and preliminaries for our discussion. The main results of the paper are presented in Section 3, in which we present the two necessary and sufficient conditions (Theorem 1 and Proposition 2), connections with maximum flow (Theorem 3), and the polynomial algorithms to check the conditions. We provide the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 4, and the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 5. The paper ends with conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Switched linear ensemble systems

Consider a finite ensemble of linear time-varying control systems:

$$\dot{x}_p(t) = A_p(t)x_p(t) + B_p(t)u(t), \quad \text{for } p = 1, \dots, q, \quad (1)$$

where $x_p(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state of the p th individual system, with $A_p(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B_p(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the common control input. We call (1) a *time-varying linear q -ensemble system*. We consider in this paper switched ensemble systems, i.e., the matrix pairs $(A_p(t), B_p(t))$ are piecewise constant in time. Precisely, we have

Definition 1. *System (1) is a k -switched linear q -ensemble system over $[0, T]$, for $k \geq 0$, $q \geq 1$, and $T > 0$, if there exists a time sequence $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{k+1} = T$, and matrix pairs $(A_p[\ell], B_p[\ell])$, for $1 \leq p \leq q$ and $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, such that*

$$(A_p(t), B_p(t)) = (A_p[\ell], B_p[\ell]), \quad \text{for all } t \in [t_\ell, t_{\ell+1}) \text{ and for all } \ell = 0, \dots, k.$$

For convenience, let $\sigma : [0, T] \rightarrow \{0, \dots, k\}$ be defined as $\sigma(t) := \ell$ for $t \in [t_\ell, t_{\ell+1})$, and let

$$A[\ell] := \begin{bmatrix} A_1[\ell] & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & A_q[\ell] \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B[\ell] := \begin{bmatrix} B_1[\ell] \\ \vdots \\ B_q[\ell] \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, a k -switched linear ensemble system can be expressed as

$$\dot{x}(t) = A[\sigma(t)]x(t) + B[\sigma(t)]u(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T]. \quad (2)$$

System (2) is said to be *controllable over $[0, T]$* if for any pair of initial state $x(0)$ and target state x^* , there exists an integrable function $u : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ such that the solution of (2) generated by $u(t)$ satisfies $x(T) = x^*$. The following lemma [21] provides a necessary and sufficient condition for (2) to be controllable:

Lemma 1. *The k -switched linear system (2) is controllable over $[0, T]$ if and only if the columns of the matrices $[A[\ell]^d \ B[\ell]]$, for $0 \leq \ell \leq k$ and for $1 \leq d \leq qn$, span \mathbb{R}^{qn} .*

It should be clear from Lemma 1 that controllability of a k -switched linear system does not depend on the exact value of the time instants t_ℓ 's. Precisely, let $0 = t'_0 < t'_1 < \dots < t'_k = T'$ be another time sequence and $\sigma' : [0, T'] \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ be similarly defined. Then, the k -switched system $\dot{x}(t) = A[\sigma'(t)]x(t) + B[\sigma'(t)]u(t)$ is controllable over $[0, T']$ if and only if system (2) is controllable over $[0, T]$.

2.2 Sparsity pattern, graph representation, and maximum flow

In this paper, a **sparsity pattern** \mathbb{S} refers to a vector subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+m)}$ such that it admits a basis consisting only of matrices E_{ij} 's, i.e., matrices with 1 on the (i, j) th entry and 0 elsewhere. One can represent \mathbb{S} by a matrix with \star - and 0-entries. The (i, j) th entry is a \star -entry if $E_{ij} \in \mathbb{S}$ and is, otherwise, a 0-entry.

The sparsity pattern $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+m)}$ induces a directed graph $G = (V, E)$ whose node and edge sets are defined as follows:

1. The node set V is a union of two sets $V^\alpha := \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ and $V^\beta := \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$. We call the nodes in V^α the **state nodes** and the nodes in V^β the **control nodes**;
2. The edge set E is defined as follows: There exists an edge from α_j to α_i (resp., from β_j to α_i) if the (i, j) th (resp., $(i, j + n)$ th) entry of \mathbb{S} is a \star -entry.

An example of a sparsity pattern and its associated digraph for $n = 5$ and $m = 2$ is shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: *Left:* A sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} . *Right:* The digraph G associated with \mathbb{S} .

For any subset $V' \subseteq V^\alpha$, the **in-neighbor set** of V' in G is defined as

$$N_{\text{in}}(V') := \{v \in V \mid \exists w \in V' \text{ such that } (v, w) \in E\}.$$

We further define

$$N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V') := N_{\text{in}}(V') \cap V^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad N_{\text{in}}^\beta(V') := N_{\text{in}}(V') \cap V^\beta.$$

Similarly, the **out-neighbor set** of V' in G is defined as

$$N_{\text{out}}(V') := \{w \in V \mid \exists v \in V' \text{ such that } (v, w) \in E\}.$$

We now introduce a class of maximum flow problems that are relevant to the main results. Given the digraph G associated with \mathbb{S} , we construct a weighted digraph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, c)$ on which a maximum flow problem is defined. Let

$$\mathcal{V} := \{s, t\} \cup V_L \cup V_R,$$

where s and t are the source and sink nodes, respectively, and

$$V_L := \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n\}, \quad V_R := \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}.$$

Here, λ_i is a copy of the control node β_i , while ν_j and μ_j are two disjoint copies of the state node α_j , for $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We define the edge set as

$$\mathcal{E} := E_{sL} \cup E_{LR} \cup E_{Rt},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_{LR} &:= \{(\lambda_i, \mu_j) \mid (\beta_i, \alpha_j) \in E\} \cup \{(\nu_i, \mu_j) \mid (\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \in E\}, \\ E_{sL} &:= \{(s, v) \mid v \in V_L\}, \\ E_{Rt} &:= \{(v, t) \mid v \in V_R\}. \end{aligned}$$

Each edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ is assigned a capacity $c(e)$, the value of which will be specified later.

Given the weighted digraph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, c)$, a function $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a **flow** on \mathcal{G} if it satisfies:

1. **Capacity constraint:** For every edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$f(e) \leq c(e). \quad (3)$$

2. **Conservation of flow:** For every node $v \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{s, t\}$,

$$\sum_{u \in N_{\text{in}}(v)} f(u, v) = \sum_{w \in N_{\text{out}}(v)} f(v, w). \quad (4)$$

The *value* of a flow f on \mathcal{G} is defined as

$$|f| := \sum_{v \in N_{\text{out}}(s)} f(s, v) = \sum_{w \in N_{\text{in}}(t)} f(w, t). \quad (5)$$

Let \mathcal{F} denote the set of all flows on \mathcal{G} satisfying (3) and (4). The so-called maximum flow problem [22] is the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f|,$$

which can be solved in polynomial time.

3 Main Results

In this section, we present the main results. In Subsection 3.1, we formulate the structural controllability problem for switched, linear ensemble systems and provide in Theorem 1 a necessary and sufficient condition for a sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} to be structurally controllable for a given pair (k, q) . In Subsection 3.2, we present in Proposition 2 a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a finite k such that \mathbb{S} is structurally controllable for (k, q) for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, in Subsection 3.3, we relate the two conditions to some maximum flow problem, which enables us to use polynomial algorithms to check the two conditions and to compute the smallest value k^* .

3.1 Necessary and sufficient condition

We start with the following definition:

Definition 2. A sparsity pattern $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+m)}$ is **structurally controllable** for (k, q) , with $k \geq 0$ and $q \geq 1$, if there exist matrices

$$[A_p[\ell] \quad B_p[\ell]] \in \mathbb{S}, \quad \text{for all } \ell = 0, \dots, k \text{ and for all } p = 1, \dots, q,$$

such that system (2) is controllable.

Note that if G is structurally controllable for some (k, q) , then by the above definition and Lemma 1 it is structurally controllable for any (k', q') for $k' \geq k$ and $q' \leq q$.

The first main result of the paper provides a necessary and sufficient condition for a sparsity pattern to be structurally controllable.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+m)}$ be a sparsity pattern and G be the associated digraph. Then, G is structurally controllable for a given $(k, q) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}$ if and only if the following two items hold:*

1. *For every state node α_i , there exist a control node β_j and a path from β_j to α_i .*
2. *For any subset $V' \subseteq V^\alpha$,*

$$(k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^\beta(V')| + (k+1)q|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')| \geq q|V'|. \quad (6)$$

The above result generalizes known results in the literature for the special case where $q = 1$. First, note that if $(k, q) = (0, 1)$, then the problem of structural controllability is reduced to the standard one for linear time-invariant systems [15]. In particular, item 2 of Theorem 1 is nothing but $|N_{\text{in}}(V')| \geq |V'|$ for all $V' \subseteq V^\alpha$ [23]. Next, note that for $q = 1$ but with k arbitrary, the structural controllability problem has been investigated in [24], where the authors derived a necessary and sufficient condition (see, Theorem 9 of their paper) using the so-called colored union graphs.

Next, we specialize Theorem 1 to the case $k = 0$, i.e., we deal with structural controllability problem for time-invariant linear ensemble systems. The second item of Theorem 6 is then reduced to

$$|N_{\text{in}}^\beta(V')| + q|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')| \geq q|V'|, \quad \text{for all } V' \subseteq V^\alpha. \quad (7)$$

Note, in particular, that (7) holds for *any* sufficiently large q if and only if

$$|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')| \geq |V'|, \quad \text{for all } V' \subseteq V^\alpha.$$

It is well known (as a consequence of the Hall's marriage theorem) that the above condition holds if and only if the subgraph G^α induced by V^α has a node-wise disjoint cycle cover. This condition, together item 1 of Theorem 1, coincides with the necessary and sufficient condition obtained in [12] which deals with the structural controllability problem for continuum of linear ensemble systems.

3.2 Toward infinite q with finite k

In this subsection, we address the following question: *When can a sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} sustain an arbitrarily large number q of individual systems with only a fixed number k of switches?* Specifically, for a given \mathbb{S} , we define

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S}) := \{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid G \text{ is structurally controllable for } (k, q) \text{ for any } q \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (8)$$

We provide below a complete characterization of the set $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$, which follows as a consequence of Theorem 1:

Proposition 2. *Given a sparsity pattern $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+m)}$, let G be the associated digraph and $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ be given as in (8). Let $k^* \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ be given as follows:*

$$k^* := \max_{V' \subseteq V^\alpha} \left\lceil \frac{|V'|}{|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')|} \right\rceil - 1. \quad (9)$$

Then, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S}) = \{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid k \geq k^*\}$.

Remark 1. By Proposition 2, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ is nonempty if and only if k^* is finite, which holds if and only if $N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V') \neq \emptyset$ for any $V' \subseteq V^\alpha$. If k^* is finite, then it is bounded above by $(n-1)$.

Proof. We re-write (6) as follows

$$k \geq \frac{|V'|}{|N_{\text{in}}^\beta(V')|/q + |N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')|} - 1, \quad (10)$$

which must hold for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, where the right hand side is infinity if $N_{\text{in}}(V')$ is empty. Note that the denominator is monotonically decreasing in q and converges to $|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')|$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that if (10) holds for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, then we must have that

$$k \geq \frac{|V'|}{|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')|} - 1.$$

Consequently, the minimal $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfying the above equation for any subset $V' \subseteq V^\alpha$ is exactly k^* given in (9). \square

3.3 Polynomial algorithms for Theorem 1 and Proposition 2

In this subsection, we present a polynomial algorithm, with time complexity $O(|V|^3)$, for checking the necessary and sufficient condition in Theorem 1, and a polynomial algorithm, with time complexity $O(|V|^3 \log |V|)$, to compute the value of k^* introduced in Proposition 2.

3.3.1 Algorithm for Theorem 1

Note that the first item of Theorem 1 can be checked by applying, e.g., the breadth-first search (BFS) algorithm. Specifically, one can augment the graph G by adding a new node γ and m new edges $(\gamma, \beta_1), \dots, (\gamma, \beta_m)$. Using BFS with γ the starting vertex, we check whether every node of V^α is reachable from γ . Thus, the time complexity for checking item 1 is $O(|V| + |E|)$. For the remainder of the subsection, we exhibit a polynomial algorithm for checking the second item of Theorem 1. We do so by relating the condition (6) to the solution of a relevant maximum flow problem.

Given $G = (V, E)$ and given $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct a weighted digraph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, c)$, with $c : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ specifying the edge weights, as follows:

1. The node set \mathcal{V} is given by

$$\mathcal{V} = \{s\} \cup \mathcal{V}_L \cup \mathcal{V}_R \cup \{t\},$$

where $\mathcal{V}_L := \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_R := \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n\}$.

2. The edge set \mathcal{E} is given by

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{sL} \cup \mathcal{E}_{LR} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Rt},$$

where \mathcal{E}_{sL} , \mathcal{E}_{LR} , and \mathcal{E}_{Rt} are defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_{sL} = \{(s, v) \mid v \in \mathcal{V}_L\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{LR} = \{(\lambda_i, \mu_j) \mid (\lambda_i, \mu_j) \in E\} \cup \{(\nu_i, \mu_j) \mid (\mu_i, \mu_j) \in E\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{Rt} = \{(\mu_j, t) \mid \mu_j \in \mathcal{V}_R\}. \end{cases}$$

3. The weight $c : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is given by

$$\text{On } \mathcal{E}_{sL} : \quad c(s, \lambda_i) := k + 1, \quad \text{for all } i \in [m], \quad (11a)$$

$$c(s, \nu_j) := q(k + 1), \quad \text{for all } j \in [n], \quad (11b)$$

$$\text{On } \mathcal{E}_{LR} : \quad c(\lambda_i, \mu_j) := k + 1, \quad \text{for all } (\lambda_i, \mu_j) \in \mathcal{E}_{LR}, \quad (11c)$$

$$c(\nu_i, \mu_j) := q(k + 1), \quad \text{for all } (\nu_i, \mu_j) \in \mathcal{E}_{LR}, \quad (11d)$$

$$\text{On } \mathcal{E}_{Rt} : \quad c(\mu_j, t) := q, \quad \text{for all } j \in [n]. \quad (11e)$$

See Figure 2b for an illustration.




Figure 2: Illustration of the graph G (left) and the corresponding flow graph \mathcal{G} (right).

It is clear that \mathcal{G} has $(2n + m + 2)$ nodes and $(2n + m + |E|)$ edges, so the time complexity for constructing \mathcal{G} is $O(|V| + |E|)$.

We now state the third main result of the paper:

Theorem 3. *Given G and (k, q) , let the weighted digraph \mathcal{G} be given as above. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of flows on \mathcal{G} , where s is the source, t is the sink, and the edge weights are the capacities. Consider the maximum flow problem:*

$$\theta(k, q) := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f|. \quad (P_1)$$

Then, condition (6) holds if and only if the solution to the above problem is nq , i.e., $\theta(k, q) = nq$.

The class of maximum flow problems can be solved efficiently in polynomial time. See, for example, algorithms [25, 26, 27] with complexity $O(|V|^3)$ and algorithm [28] with complexity $O(\sqrt{|E|}|V|^2)$, all of which are *independent* of k and q .

It is also clear that the time complexity of the maximum flow problem (P_1) dominates over all the other steps (i.e., checking item 1 and construction of the weighted digraph \mathcal{G}) for checking the necessary and sufficient condition in Theorem 1. We summarize the above discussions in Algorithm 1.

Finally, we note that for the special case $q = 1$, the authors outlined in [24] an algorithm by relating their necessary and sufficient condition to the solution of a maximal matching problem defined on a larger graph whose order is $O((k+1)|V|)$ and whose size is $O((k+1)|E|)$. Using the algorithm in [29], the time complexity of their algorithm is then $O(\sqrt{(k+1)|V|}(k+1)|E|)$.

Algorithm 1: Check whether G is structurally controllable for a given (k, q)

Input: sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} , $(k, q) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}$

```

1 use BFS to check item 1 of Theorem 1                                // BFS:  $O(|V| + |E|)$ 
2 if item 1 of Theorem 1 is not satisfied then
3   | return False
4 else
5   | construct the weighted digraph  $\mathcal{G}$       // graph construction:  $O(|V| + |E|)$ 
6   | solve Problem ( $P_1$ ) for  $(k, q)$           // maximum flow:  $O(|V|^3)$ 
7   | if  $\theta(k, q) = nq$  then
8   |   | return True
9   | else
10  |   | return False

```

3.3.2 Algorithm for Proposition 2

As mentioned above, if $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ is nonempty, then k^* is bounded above by $(n - 1)$. In particular, $\theta(n - 1, q) = nq$, for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ is empty, then there must exist a $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (6) is not satisfied. We show below that one can always choose $q = nm + 1$ (regardless of the sparsity pattern). Moreover, we show that the integer k^* coincides with the smallest integer k such that $\theta(k, nm + 1) = nq$.

Precisely, we establish the following result:

Proposition 4. *Suppose that the sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} satisfies item 1 of Theorem 1; then, an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$, belongs to $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ if and only if $\theta(k, mn + 1) = nq$.*

Proof. First, note that if $k \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$, then by (8) and by item 2 of Theorem 1, we have that (6) is satisfied for the given k and for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, which include the case $q = nm + 1$. By Theorem 3, $\theta(k, mn + 1) = nq$.

We now show that if $\theta(k, mn + 1) = nq$, then $k \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$. By Theorem 3, we have that (6) is satisfied for $(k, q) = (k, mn + 1)$:

$$(k + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')| + (k + 1)(mn + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V')| \geq (mn + 1)|V'|, \text{ for all } V' \subseteq V^{\alpha}. \quad (12)$$

We claim that

$$|V'| - (k + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V')| \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } V' \subseteq V^{\alpha}. \quad (13)$$

To wit, we assume to the contrary that there exists a $V' \subseteq V^{\alpha}$ such that $|V'| - (k + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V')| > 0$. But then, using (12) and the fact that $k \leq n - 1$, we obtain that

$$nm + 1 \leq \frac{(k + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')|}{|V'| - (k + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V')|} \leq (k + 1)m < mn + 1,$$

which is a contradiction. We have thus established the claim. It then follows from (13) that for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(k + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')| \geq 0 \geq q(|V'| - (k + 1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V')|), \text{ for all } V' \subseteq V^{\alpha}, \quad (14)$$

so (6) holds for the given k and for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies that $k \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$. \square

Algorithm 2: Compute k^*

Input: sparsity pattern \mathbb{S}

1 use BFS to check item 1 of Theorem 1 // BFS: $O(|V| + |E|)$

2 **if** item 1 of Theorem 1 is not satisfied **then**

3 **return** $k^* = \infty$

4 solve Problem (P_1) for $(n - 1, mn + 1)$ // maximum flow: $O(|V|^3)$

5 **if** $\theta(n - 1, mn + 1) \neq nq$ **then**

6 **return** $k^* = \infty$

7 **else**

8 $k_{\min} \leftarrow 1, \quad k_{\max} \leftarrow n - 1$

9 **while** $k_{\min} < k_{\max}$ **do**

10 $k \leftarrow \left\lfloor \frac{k_{\min} + k_{\max}}{2} \right\rfloor$

11 solve Problem (P_1) for $(k, mn + 1)$

12 **if** $\theta(k, mn + 1) = nq$ **then**

13 $k_{\max} \leftarrow k$

14 **else**

15 $k_{\min} \leftarrow k + 1$

16 $k^* \leftarrow k_{\min}$ // Binary Search: $O(|V|^3 \log(|V|))$

17 **return** $k^* = k_{\min}$

Output: k^*

With the result above, we now present an algorithm for computing the value of k^* . The algorithm comprises two parts: The first part checks whether $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ is nonempty. If $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ is nonempty, then the second part computes the exact value of k^* .

Part 1: Check nonemptiness of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$. We use BFS to check whether item 1 of Theorem 1 is satisfied and use the maximum flow algorithm to check whether the solution $\theta(n-1, mn+1)$ to Problem (P_1) is nq . If either one of the two conditions is not satisfied, then $k^* = \infty$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$.

Part 2: Compute the value of k^ .* If $k^* < \infty$, we then proceed to computing its exact value. Using binary search, we find the largest k such that the solution $\theta(k, nm+1)$ to Problem (P_1) is nq .

The complete procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

Note that if G is structurally controllable for some (k, q) , then it is necessary that for every node α_i , there exists at least a node β_j and a path from β_j to α_i . This holds because otherwise, one can relabel the α -nodes (if necessary) in a way such that any matrix pair (A', B') , with $[A' \ B'] \in \mathbb{S}$, is in the form:

$$A' = \begin{bmatrix} A'_{11} & A'_{12} \\ 0 & A'_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B' = \begin{bmatrix} B'_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, consider the ensemble system (1), with $(A_p[\ell], B_p[\ell]) \in \mathbb{S}$ for all $p = 1, \dots, q$ and $\ell = 0, \dots, k$. We decompose the state of the individual system $x_p(t) = (x_{p,1}(t), x_{p,2}(t))$ in accordance with the decomposition of the pair (A_p, B_p) . Then, the dynamics of $x_p(t)$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_{p,1}(t) \\ \dot{x}_{p,2}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{p,11}[\sigma(t)] & A_{p,12}[\sigma(t)] \\ 0 & A_{p,22}[\sigma(t)] \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{p,1}(t) \\ x_{p,2}(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_{p,1}[\sigma(t)] \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u(t).$$

It should be clear the sub-state $x_{p,2}(t)$ is not controllable. Thus, any individual system and hence, the ensemble system is not controllable.

The above arguments imply that the first item of Theorem 1 is necessary for G to be structurally controllable for (k, q) , for any $(k, q) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}$. In the sequel, we assume that this item is satisfied and show that the second item is necessary and sufficient for G to be structurally controllable for a given pair (k, q) .

Given the sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} and the integer q , we let $\hat{\mathbb{S}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{nq \times (nq+m)}$ be the sparsity pattern associated with the q -ensemble system. Precisely, we define:

$$\hat{\mathbb{S}} := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & & B_1 \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & A_q & B_q \end{bmatrix} \left| [A_p \ B_p] \in \mathbb{S} \text{ for all } p = 1, \dots, q \right. \right\}. \quad (15)$$

Let $\hat{G} = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ be the digraph associated with $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$, and let \hat{V}^α and \hat{V}^β be similarly defined. Naturally, we can decompose

$$\hat{V}^\alpha = \cup_{p=1}^q \hat{V}_p^\alpha,$$

such that the subgraph \hat{G}_p of \hat{G} induced by $\hat{V}^\beta \cup \hat{V}_p^\alpha$ corresponds to the p th individual system (note that all the G_p 's are isomorphic to G). More specifically, we write

$$\hat{V}^\beta = \{\hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{V}_p^\alpha = \{\hat{\alpha}_{p,1}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{p,n}\}, \quad \text{for } p = 1, \dots, q.$$

The nodes are labeled such that the edge set \hat{E}_p of \hat{G}_p can be expressed as

$$\hat{E}_p := \{(\hat{\alpha}_{p,i}, \hat{\alpha}_{p,j}) \mid (\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \in E\} \cup \{(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\alpha}_{p,j}) \mid (\beta_i, \alpha_j) \in E\}.$$

It should be clear that the edge set \hat{E} of \hat{G} is the union of the \hat{E}_p 's. Denoted by $\pi_p : G \rightarrow \hat{G}_p$ the isomorphism, which sends α_i (resp. β_i) to $\hat{\alpha}_{p,i}$ (resp. $\hat{\beta}_i$). We need the following result, which is an immediate consequence of the above construction:

Lemma 2. *For any $V' \subseteq V^\alpha$ and for any $p', p \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, $N_{\text{in}}^\beta(\pi_p(V')) = N_{\text{in}}^\beta(\pi_{p'}(V'))$.*

It should be clear that G is structurally controllable for (k, q) if and only if \hat{G} is structurally controllable for $(k, 1)$. The following result can be adapted from [24]:

Lemma 3. *The sparsity pattern $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ is structurally controllable for $(k, 1)$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*

1. *For every node $\hat{\alpha}_{p,i}$, there exist a node $\hat{\beta}_j$ and a path from $\hat{\beta}_j$ to $\hat{\alpha}_{p,i}$.*
2. *We have that*

$$(k+1) |N_{\text{in}}(\hat{V}')| \geq |\hat{V}'|, \quad \text{for any } \hat{V}' \subseteq \hat{V}^\alpha. \quad (16)$$

Now, to establish Theorem 1, it remains to show the following result:

Proposition 5. *Condition (6) holds if and only if (16) holds.*

Proof. We first show that (16) implies (6) and then establish the converse.

Proof that (16) implies (6). Given an arbitrary $V' \subseteq V^\alpha$, let

$$\hat{V}'_p := \pi_p(V'), \quad \hat{V}' := \cup_{p=1}^q \hat{V}'_p.$$

Since \hat{G}_p is isomorphic to G , we have

$$N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(\hat{V}'_p) = \pi_p(N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')).$$

It follows that

$$|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(\hat{V}'_p)| = |N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')|, \quad \text{for all } p = 1, \dots, q,$$

and hence,

$$|N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(\hat{V}')| = q |N_{\text{in}}^\alpha(V')|. \quad (17)$$

Next, by Lemma 2, we have

$$N_{\text{in}}^\beta(\hat{V}') = N_{\text{in}}^\beta(\hat{V}'_p) = \pi_p(N_{\text{in}}^\beta(V')), \quad \text{for all } p = 1, \dots, q,$$

and hence,

$$|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(\hat{V}')| = |N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')|. \quad (18)$$

Using (17) and (18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}(\hat{V}')| &= (k+1) \left[|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(\hat{V}')| + |N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(\hat{V}')| \right] \\ &= (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')| + (k+1)q|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V')|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, assuming that (16) holds, we get

$$(k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')| + (k+1)q|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V')| = (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}(\hat{V}')| \geq |\hat{V}'| = \sum_{p=1}^q |\hat{V}'_p| = q|V'|.$$

This completes the proof that (16) implies (6).

Proof that (6) implies (16). Now, let $\hat{V}' = \cup_{p=1}^q \hat{V}'_p$ be an arbitrary subset of \hat{V}^{α} , with $\hat{V}'_p \subseteq \hat{V}_p^{\alpha}$. We define

$$V' := \cup_{p=1}^q V'_p, \quad \text{with } V'_p := \pi_p^{-1}(\hat{V}'_p).$$

Note that V' is a subset of V^{α} . We have that

$$|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(\hat{V}')| = |N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(\cup_{p=1}^q \hat{V}'_p)| = |N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(\cup_{p=1}^q V'_p)| = |N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')|. \quad (19)$$

Since each V'_p is a subset of V' , we have that $N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V') \supseteq N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V'_p)$ and hence,

$$|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')| \geq |N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V'_p)| \quad \text{for any } p = 1, \dots, q. \quad (20)$$

Next, let

$$p^* \in \arg \min_p \{ (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(\hat{V}'_p)| - |\hat{V}'_p| \}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(\hat{V}')| - |\hat{V}'| &= \sum_{p=1}^q \left[(k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(\hat{V}'_p)| - |\hat{V}'_p| \right] \\ &\geq q \left[(k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(\hat{V}'_{p^*})| - |\hat{V}'_{p^*}| \right] = q \left[(k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V'_{p^*})| - |V'_{p^*}| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Combining the above arguments, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}(\hat{V}')| - |\hat{V}'| &= (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(\hat{V}')| + (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(\hat{V}')| - |\hat{V}'| \\ &\geq (k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\beta}(V')| + q \left[(k+1)|N_{\text{in}}^{\alpha}(V'_{p^*})| - |V'_{p^*}| \right] \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use (19), (20), and (21) to establish the first inequality and the second inequality follows from the hypothesis that (6) holds. This completes the proof. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 3

Given the digraph $G = (V, E)$ and the pair $(k, q) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}$, we introduce below another weighted digraph $\hat{G} = (\hat{V}, \hat{E}, \hat{c})$:

1. The node set \hat{V} is given by

$$\hat{V} = \{s\} \cup \hat{V}_L \cup \hat{V}_R \cup \{t\},$$

where s and t are the source and sink of \hat{G} , respectively, and \hat{V}_L and \hat{V}_R are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{V}_L &:= \{\lambda_{\ell i} \mid \ell \in [k+1] \text{ and } i \in [m]\} \cup \{\nu_{\ell p j} \mid \ell \in [k+1], p \in [q], \text{ and } j \in [n]\}, \\ \hat{V}_R &:= \{\mu_{p j} \mid p \in [q] \text{ and } j \in [n]\},\end{aligned}$$

so $|\hat{V}_L| = (k+1)(m+nq)$ and $|\hat{V}_R| = nq$.

2. The edge set \hat{E} is given by

$$\hat{E} = \hat{E}_{sL} \cup \hat{E}_{LR} \cup \hat{E}_{Rt},$$

where \hat{E}_{sL} , \hat{E}_{LR} , and \hat{E}_{Rt} are defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{E}_{sL} := \{(s, v) \mid v \in \hat{V}_L\}, \\ \hat{E}_{LR} := \{(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{p j}) \mid \ell \in [k+1], p \in [q], \text{ and } (\lambda_i, \mu_j) \in E\} \cup \\ \quad \{(\nu_{\ell p i}, \mu_{p j}) \mid \ell \in [k+1], p \in [q], \text{ and } (\mu_i, \mu_j) \in E\}, \\ \hat{E}_{Rt} := \{(v, t) \mid v \in \hat{V}_R\}. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

3. The weight $\hat{c} : \hat{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is defined as

$$\hat{c}(e) := 1, \quad \text{for all } e \in \hat{E}. \quad (23)$$

See Figure 3 for an illustration.

We have the following result:

Theorem 6. *Given G and (k, q) , let \hat{G} be given as above. Let $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ be the set of flows on \hat{G} . Consider the following maximum flow problem P_2 on \hat{G} :*

$$\hat{\theta}(k, q) := \max_{\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}} |\hat{f}|. \quad (P_2)$$

Then, the solution to P_2 is the same as the solution to (P_1) , i.e., $\hat{\theta}(k, q) = \theta(k, q)$.

It is well known [30] that the solution $\hat{\theta}(k, q)$ to (P_2) is the same as the solution to the maximal matching problem for the bipartite graph $(\hat{V}_L, \hat{V}_R, \hat{E}_{LR})$, which in turn decides whether (6) is satisfied. We elaborate below on this fact:




Figure 3: Illustration of the digraph $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ for G given in Figure 2a and $(k, q) = (1, 3)$. Edges are colored according to their corresponding edges in the digraph \mathcal{G} in Fig. 2b. For any edge (u, v) in \mathcal{G} , all edges in $\phi^{-1}(u, v)$, with ϕ the graph homomorphism defined in (24), are plotted in the same color. Specifically, the red edges are those in $\phi^{-1}(s, \lambda_1)$, the blacks are in $\phi^{-1}(s, \nu_1)$, the blues are in $\phi^{-1}(s, \nu_2)$, the greens are in $\phi^{-1}(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$, the grays are in $\phi^{-1}(\lambda_1, \mu_2)$, the magentas are in $\phi^{-1}(\nu_1, \mu_2)$, the browns are in $\phi^{-1}(\mu_1, t)$, and the oranges are in $\phi^{-1}(\mu_2, t)$. For each color, the number of edges in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ is determined by the weight of the corresponding edge in \mathcal{G} . Every edge of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ has weight 1.

Proof of Theorem 3. For the given G and (k, q) , let \hat{G} be given as in Section 4. By Proposition 5, (6) holds if and only if (16) holds. Also, by Theorem 6, $\theta(k, q) = nq$ if and only if $\hat{\theta}(k, q) = nq$. Thus, to establish Theorem 3, it suffices to show that (16) holds if and only if $\hat{\theta}(k, q) = nq$. But it follows from [24] (see Definition 11, Theorem 11, and the arguments in Section 3.3 of their paper) that (16) holds if and only if the bipartite graph $(\hat{\mathcal{V}}_L, \hat{\mathcal{V}}_R, \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{LR})$ has a right perfect matching, which holds if and only if $\hat{\theta}(k, q) = nq$. \square

The remainder of the section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 6, which is divided into two parts. In Subsections 5.1 and 5.2, we establish the two inequalities $\theta(k, q) \geq \hat{\theta}(k, q)$ and $\theta(k, q) \leq \hat{\theta}(k, q)$, respectively.

5.1 Proof that $\theta(k, q) \geq \hat{\theta}(k, q)$

We show that for any flow $\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$, there exists a flow $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $|f| = |\hat{f}|$. The proof is constructive.

To proceed, we first introduce the map $\phi : \hat{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ defined as follows:

$$\phi(s) := s, \quad \phi(\lambda_{\ell i}) := \lambda_i, \quad \phi(\nu_{\ell p j}) := \nu_j, \quad \phi(\mu_{p j}) := \mu_j, \quad \phi(t) := t. \quad (24)$$

The following lemma follows directly from the construction of \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, and its proof is omitted.

Lemma 4. *The map ϕ is a full graph homomorphism, i.e., if (u, v) is (resp. is not) an edge of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, then $(\phi(u), \phi(v))$ is (resp. is not) an edge of \mathcal{G} .*

By Lemma 4, we can extend the domain of ϕ to include the edge set $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and write $\phi : (\hat{\mathcal{V}}, \hat{\mathcal{E}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. Also, note that for any $e \in \mathcal{E}$, we have that $\sum_{\hat{e} \in \phi^{-1}(e)} \hat{c}(\hat{e}) = c(e)$. Now, given the flow $\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$, we define $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as follows:

$$f(e) := \sum_{\hat{e} \in \phi^{-1}(e)} \hat{f}(\hat{e}), \quad \text{for all } e \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (25)$$

We have the following lemma:

Lemma 5. *The map f defined in (25) is a flow.*

Proof. We will first show that f satisfies the conservation of flow and then show that f satisfies the capacity constraint. For ease of presentation, we extend the domain of f (resp., \hat{f}) to $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ (resp., $\hat{\mathcal{V}} \times \hat{\mathcal{V}}$) by setting $f(u, v) := 0$ if $(u, v) \notin \mathcal{E}$ (resp., $\hat{f}(u, v) := 0$ if $(u, v) \notin \hat{\mathcal{E}}$).

Proof that f satisfies the conservation of flow. We show below that (4) is satisfied for every node in $\mathcal{V}_L \cup \mathcal{V}_R$:

1. For any $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{V}_L$, the only incoming neighbor is the source s . Also, note that

$$\phi^{-1}(s, \lambda_i) = \{(s, \lambda_{\ell i}) \mid \ell \in [k+1]\}, \quad (26)$$

$$\phi^{-1}(\lambda_i, \mu_j) = \{(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{p j}) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}} \mid \ell \in [k+1] \text{ and } p \in [q]\}. \quad (27)$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f(s, \lambda_i) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \hat{f}(s, \lambda_{\ell i}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \left[\sum_{p=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{p j}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{p j}) \right] = \sum_{j=1}^n f(\lambda_i, \mu_j), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the first equality follows from (25) and (26), the second equality follows from the fact that \hat{f} satisfies the conservation of flow at the node $\lambda_{\ell i}$ for any $\ell \in [k+1]$, and the last equality follows from (25) and (27).

2. Similarly, for any $\nu_i \in \mathcal{V}_L$, the only incoming neighbor is the source s and, moreover,

$$\phi^{-1}(s, \nu_i) = \{(s, \nu_{\ell pi}) \mid \ell \in [k+1] \text{ and } p \in [q]\}, \quad (29)$$

$$\phi^{-1}(\nu_i, \mu_j) = \{(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}} \mid \ell \in [k+1] \text{ and } p \in [q]\}. \quad (30)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f(s, \nu_i) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(s, \nu_{\ell pi}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \left[\sum_{p=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) \right] = \sum_{j=1}^n f(\nu_i, \mu_j), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (25) and (29), the second equality holds due to the conservation of flow at node $\nu_{\ell pi}$, for any $\ell \in [k+1]$ and $p \in [q]$, and the last equation follows from (25) and (30).

3. Finally, for any $\mu_j \in \mathcal{V}_R$, the only outgoing neighbor is the sink t and

$$\phi^{-1}(\mu_j, t) = \{(\mu_{pj}, t) \mid p \in [q]\}. \quad (31)$$

We then obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mu_j, t) &= \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(\mu_{pj}, t) = \sum_{p=1}^q \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m f(\lambda_i, \mu_j) + \sum_{i=1}^n f(\nu_i, \mu_j), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (25) and (31), the second equality follows from the conservation of flow at node μ_{pj} , for any $p \in [q]$, and the last equality follows from (25), (27) and (30).

Proof that f satisfies the capacity constraint. We show below that f satisfies $f(e) \leq c(e)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$, with c defined in (11). First, using (25) and (26), and the fact that $\hat{f}(\hat{e}) \leq 1$ for all $\hat{e} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$, we obtain that

$$f(s, \lambda_i) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \hat{f}(s, \lambda_{\ell i}) \leq k+1. \quad (32)$$

Using the same arguments, but with (26) replaced by (29), (30), and (31), respectively, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} f(s, \nu_j) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(s, \nu_{\ell p i}) \leq q(k+1), \\ f(\nu_i, \mu_j) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell p i}, \mu_{p j}) \leq q(k+1), \\ f(\mu_j, t) &= \sum_{p=1}^q \hat{f}(\mu_{p j}, t) \leq q. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the edges $(\lambda_i, \mu_j) \in \mathcal{E}$, we have that

$$f(\lambda_i, \mu_j) \leq f(s, \lambda_i) \leq k+1 \quad (33)$$

where the first inequality follows from (28) and the second inequality follows from (32). \square

With the lemmas above, we can now show that $\theta(k, q) \geq \hat{\theta}(k, q)$. Let f be given as in (25). By Lemma 5, $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Moreover,

$$|f| = \sum_{j=1}^n f(\mu_j, t) = \sum_{p=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\mu_{p j}, t) = |\hat{f}|,$$

where the first and the last equality follow from the definition 5, and the second equality follows from (25) and (31). \square

5.2 Proof that $\theta(k, q) \leq \hat{\theta}(k, q)$

Similarly, in this subsection, we show that for any flow $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists a flow $\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ such that $|\hat{f}| = |f|$. To this end, we consider the following map $\hat{f} : \hat{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as follows:

$$\hat{f}(\hat{e}) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k+1} f(\phi(\hat{e})) & \text{if } \hat{e} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{sL}, \\ \frac{1}{(k+1)q} f(\phi(\hat{e})) & \text{if } \hat{e} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{LR}, \\ \frac{1}{q} f(\phi(\hat{e})) & \text{if } \hat{e} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{Rt}. \end{cases} \quad \begin{aligned} (34a) \\ (34b) \\ (34c) \end{aligned}$$

We need the following lemma:

Lemma 6. *The map \hat{f} defined in (34) is a flow.*

Proof. We follow the same procedure as in Lemma 5 and show that \hat{f} satisfies the conservation of flow and the capacity constraint.

Proof that \hat{f} satisfies the conservation of flow. We show that (4) holds for every node in $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_L \cup \hat{\mathcal{V}}_R$:

1. For any given $\lambda_{\ell i} \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}_L$, the only incoming neighbor is s and the set of outgoing neighbors is

$$N_{\text{out}}(\lambda_{\ell i}) = \{(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) \mid p \in [q] \text{ and } (\lambda_i, \mu_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(s, \lambda_{\ell i}) &= \frac{1}{k+1} f(s, \lambda_i) = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^n f(\lambda_i, \mu_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{k+1} (k+1)q \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) = \sum_{p=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where the first equality follows from (22), (24), and (34a), the second equality holds due to the conservation of flow at node λ_i , for any $i \in [m]$, the third equality follows from (22), (24), and (34b), and the last equality holds because all $\hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj})$, for $\ell \in [k+1]$ and $p \in [q]$, are identical with each other (see (34b)).

2. For any given $\nu_{\ell pi} \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}_L$, the only incoming neighbor is s and the set of outgoing neighbors is

$$N_{\text{out}}(\nu_{\ell pi}) = \{(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) \mid (\nu_i, \mu_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

We then have that

$$\hat{f}(s, \nu_{\ell pi}) = \frac{1}{(k+1)q} f(s, \nu_i) = \frac{1}{(k+1)q} \sum_{j=1}^n f(\nu_i, \mu_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}),$$

where the first equality follows from (22), (24) and (34a), the second equality holds due to the conservation of flow at node ν_i , for any $i \in [n]$, and the last equality follows from (22), (24) and (34b).

3. Finally, for any $\mu_{pj} \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}_R$, the only outgoing neighbor is the sink t and the set of incoming neighbors is

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\text{in}}(\mu_{pj}) &= \{(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) \mid \ell \in [k+1] \text{ and } (\nu_i, \mu_j) \in \mathcal{E}\} \cup \\ &\quad \{(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) \mid \ell \in [k+1] \text{ and } (\lambda_i, \mu_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(\mu_{pj}, t) &= \frac{1}{(k+1)q} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} f(\mu_j, t) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{(k+1)q} f(\lambda_i, \mu_j) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(k+1)q} f(\nu_i, \mu_j) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (22), (24) and (34c), the second equality holds due to the conservation of flow at node μ_j , for any $j \in [n]$, and the last equality follows from (22), (24) and (34b).

Proof that \hat{f} satisfies the capacity constraint. We show below that $\hat{f}(e) \leq \hat{c}(e)$ for all $e \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$, with \hat{c} defined in (23). First, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}(s, \lambda_{\ell i}) &= \frac{1}{k+1} f(s, \lambda_i) \leq \frac{1}{k+1} \cdot (k+1) = 1, \\ \hat{f}(s, \nu_{\ell pi}) &= \frac{1}{(k+1)q} f(s, \nu_i) \leq 1, \\ \hat{f}(\nu_{\ell pi}, \mu_{pj}) &= \frac{1}{(k+1)q} f(\nu_i, \mu_j) \leq 1, \\ \hat{f}(\mu_{pj}, t) &= \frac{1}{q} f(\mu_j, t) \leq 1,\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

where the equalities follow from (22), (24), and (34) and the inequalities follow from the fact that $f(e) \leq c(e)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$, with $c(e)$ defined given in (11). Finally, for the edges $(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$, we have that

$$\hat{f}(\lambda_{\ell i}, \mu_{pj}) \leq \hat{f}(s, \lambda_{\ell i}) \leq 1.$$

where the first inequality follows from (35) and the second inequality follows from (36). \square

With the above lemma, we show that $\theta(k, q) \leq \hat{\theta}(k, q)$. Let f be given as in (34). By Lemma 6, $\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$. Moreover,

$$|\hat{f}| = \sum_{p=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}(\mu_{pj}, t) = \sum_{j=1}^n f(\mu_j, t) = |f|,$$

where the first and the last equality follow from definition (5), and the second equality follows from (34c) and (24). \square

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have addressed structural controllability for ensembles of switched, sparse linear systems where all individual systems share a common sparsity pattern \mathbb{S} . For a prescribed pair (k, q) , with k the number of allowable switches and q the number of individual systems, we derived a necessary and sufficient condition for \mathbb{S} to be structurally controllable. We have also provided a complete characterization of the sparsity patterns \mathbb{S} that are structurally controllable for (k, q) , for some finite k and for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$. We have further presented polynomial algorithms for checking the conditions and for computing the smallest value k^* . These results are given in Section 3, and their proofs are given in Sections 4 and 5.

References

- [1] R. Brockett and N. Khaneja. “On the stochastic control of quantum ensembles”. *System theory: modeling, analysis and control*. Springer, 2000, pp. 75–96.

- [2] J.-S. Li and N. Khaneja. “Control of inhomogeneous quantum ensembles”. *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* 73.3 (2006), p. 030302.
- [3] X. Chen. “Ensemble observability of Bloch equations with unknown population density”. *Automatica* 119 (2020), p. 109057.
- [4] S. Ching and J. T. Ritt. “Control strategies for underactuated neural ensembles driven by optogenetic stimulation”. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits* 7 (2013), p. 54.
- [5] A. Zlotnik, R. Nagao, I. Z. Kiss, and J.-S. Li. “Phase-selective entrainment of non-linear oscillator ensembles”. *Nature Communications* 7.1 (2016), p. 10788.
- [6] P. Tabuada and B. Gharesifard. “Universal approximation power of deep residual neural networks through the lens of control”. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 68.5 (2022), pp. 2715–2728.
- [7] E. Bayram, M.-A. Belabbas, and T. Başar. “Geometric foundations of tuning without forgetting in neural ODEs”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.03474* (2025).
- [8] A. T. Becker. “Controlling swarms of robots with global inputs: Breaking symmetry”. *Microbiorobotics*. Elsevier, 2017, pp. 3–20.
- [9] X. Chen. “Controllability of continuum ensemble of formation systems over directed graphs”. *Automatica* 108 (2019), p. 108497.
- [10] U. Helmke and M. Schönlein. “Uniform ensemble controllability for one-parameter families of time-invariant linear systems”. *Systems & Control Letters* 71 (2014), pp. 69–77.
- [11] X. Chen. “Structure theory for ensemble controllability, observability, and duality”. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems* 31.2 (2019), pp. 1–40.
- [12] X. Chen. “Sparse Linear Ensemble Systems and Structural Controllability”. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 67.7 (2022), pp. 3337–3348.
- [13] G. Dirr and M. Schönlein. “Uniform and L^q -ensemble reachability of parameter-dependent linear systems”. *Journal of Differential Equations* 283 (2021), pp. 216–262.
- [14] X. Chen. “Controllability issues of linear ensemble systems over multidimensional parameterization spaces”. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 61.4 (2023), pp. 2425–2447.
- [15] C. T. Lin. “Structural controllability”. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 19.3 (1974), pp. 201–208.
- [16] B. Gharesifard and X. Chen. “Structural averaged controllability of linear ensemble systems”. *IEEE Control Systems Letters* 6 (2021), pp. 518–523.
- [17] X. Chen and B. Gharesifard. “Structural Averaged Controllability for Linear Ensemble Systems: Single-input Case”. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems* (2025).
- [18] X. Liu, H. Lin, and B. M. Chen. “Graph-theoretic characterisations of structural controllability for multi-agent system with switching topology”. *International Journal of Control* 86.2 (2013), pp. 222–231.

- [19] Y. Cui, S. He, M. Wu, C. Zhou, and J. Chen. “Improving the Controllability of Complex Networks by Temporal Segmentation”. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering* 7.4 (2020), pp. 2765–2774.
- [20] Y. Cui, M. Wu, C. Shao, and S. He. “A temporal segmentation algorithm for restoring the controllability of networked control systems”. *IET Control Theory & Applications* 16.3 (2022), pp. 318–329.
- [21] Z. Sun, S. Ge, and T. Lee. “Controllability and reachability criteria for switched linear systems”. *Automatica* 38.5 (2002), pp. 775–786.
- [22] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT press, 2022.
- [23] A. Olshevsky. “Minimum input selection for structural controllability”. *2015 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE. 2015.
- [24] X. Liu, H. Lin, and B. M. Chen. “Structural controllability of switched linear systems”. *Automatica* 49.12 (2013), pp. 3531–3537.
- [25] A. V. Karzanov. “Determining the maximal flow in a network by the method of preflows”. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* Vol. 15. 1974, pp. 434–437.
- [26] A. V. Goldberg. “A new max-flow algorithm” (1985).
- [27] R. E. Tarjan. “A simple version of Karzanov’s blocking flow algorithm”. *Operations Research Letters* 2.6 (1984), pp. 265–268.
- [28] B. V. Cherkassky. “Algorithm for construction of maximal flows in networks with complexity of $O(V^2\sqrt{E})$ operations”. *Mathematical Methods of Solution of Economical Problems* 7 (1977), pp. 112–125.
- [29] S. Micali and V. V. Vazirani. “An $O(\sqrt{|V|}|E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs”. *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 1980)*. IEEE. 1980, pp. 17–27.
- [30] M. Hall. *Combinatorial theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.