



**Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive**  
**DSpace Repository**

---

NPS Scholarship

Publications

---

2020-02

## Partial Observability Analysis of an Adversarial Swarm Model

Gong, Qi; Kang, Wei; Walton, Claire; Kaminer, Isaac; Park, Hyeongjun  
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc.

---

Gong, Qi, et al. "Partial Observability Analysis of an Adversarial Swarm Model."  
Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics 43.2 (2020): 250-261.  
<https://hdl.handle.net/10945/64427>

---

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

*Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun*



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School**  
**411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle**  
**Monterey, California USA 93943**

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



# Partial Observability Analysis of an Adversarial Swarm Model

Qi Gong\*

University of California, Santa Cruz, California 95064

Wei Kang,<sup>†</sup> Claire Walton,<sup>‡</sup> and Isaac Kaminer<sup>§</sup>

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California 93940

and

Hyeongjun Park<sup>¶</sup>

New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

<https://doi.org/10.2514/1.G004115>

**This paper introduces a new concept of partial observability for nonlinear systems. This new approach enables a quantitative analysis on the observability of an individual state variable and unknown parameters of a nonlinear dynamics even when the system is not observable in the traditional sense. The paper develops theoretical properties of partial observability and its computational algorithms. These results are applied and validated on a nonstandard estimation problem of detecting the internal cooperating strategy of a particular adversarial swarm model. Partial observability analysis on the parameters that define the cooperating strategy reveals interesting findings. For example, some parameters are observable even when the swarm is at a steady state that is not observable in traditional sense. It is also shown that observability of the internal cooperating strategy depends on both the swarm trajectory and the time window of the measurement. Motivated by these findings, a variational method of estimation based on the dynamic optimization of a cost function is proposed. Simulation results show that the proposed estimation method outperforms Kalman filters. The results in this paper provide useful tools for applications involving adversarial swarms, including defense against swarm attacks and herding of biological swarms.**

## I. Introduction

**I**N THE past few decades, the research community has produced multiple models for simulating swarm behavior, such as those developed by Leonard and associates at Princeton University [1,2], Jadbabaie et al. [3], and Szwaykowska et al. at Naval Research Laboratory [4], and methods for implementing autonomous swarms, such as the autonomous swarms being flown by Chung et al. at Naval Postgraduate School [5]. The aforementioned models and methods consider challenges related to autonomous swarms from what could be termed an *insider's perspective*—that is, from the perspective of creating, controlling, and driving one's own autonomous or semi-autonomous swarm.

As applications of autonomous swarms become more widespread, how to analyze interactions with swarms emerges as an important research topic. Swarms may be indirectly adversarial—conflicting with objectives simply due to not being under our control, as would be the case interacting with a natural swarm such as a bird flock, or with an outside team of vehicles. Or these swarms may be directly adversarial, in competition or conflict with our goals, as will be faced in defense scenarios. An example of a goal action against an adversarial swarm is herding—guiding or containing a group through interaction with their innate reactive mechanisms. In [6], for instance, an aerial robot is used to guide a flock of birds away from a protected airspace. Another example is defense against attacks from an adversarial swarm. In [7], multivehicle trajectory optimization for defense

of an asset against an oncoming swarm of autonomous vehicles is considered.

In both these applications, identifying a model of an adversarial swarm is essential. Swarms' internal control strategies such as collision avoidance distances, swarm cohesion, and communication distances determine swarm behaviors and their responses to external disturbances. Without a pre-established swarm model, these strategies must be estimated through observation and/or interaction of the swarm. For example, in Ref. [6], where the problem of herding of a flock of birds was considered, the parameter of collision avoidance distance that defines the flock dynamics was estimated using real experimental data.

In this paper we address the problem of detecting the internal cooperating strategy of a particular adversarial swarm whose dynamics is subject to the swarm model developed by Leonard and associates [1,2]. This swarm model is based on a potential function and virtual leaders, which can be characterized by a set of parameters. Thus, by estimating those parameters one can identify the internal cooperating strategy of an adversarial swarm. Note that this is a nonstandard estimation problem—the estimation problem we address in this paper is not to estimate, for example, position and velocity of each member of the swarm; rather we are interested in understanding how individual agents cooperate to achieve the swarm behavior that is observed by outsiders.

Before actually designing an estimator a natural question is whether these parameters are in fact *observable*, that is, can be successfully estimated from the sensor measurement. The observability is an intrinsic property of a dynamical system with sensor information and user's knowledge. It defines the essential limitation in estimation and detection. The literature on observability analysis and observer design is quite extensive; see, for example, [8–13]. However, the classical observability analysis tools, including the rank conditions [8,9], do not apply to the observability analysis of an adversarial swarm cooperating strategy due to nonlinearities and discontinuities inherent in the model. In our previous work [14], the concepts of unobservability index and empirical observability Gramian [15–17] were used to analyze the observability of a potential function-based swarm model developed in [1,2]. It is shown in [14] that the steady state of the swarm is *unobservable*. To make the system observable, Ref. [14] proposes to use intruders as a possible agent provocateur disrupting the adversarial swarm and provoking

Received 26 October 2018; revision received 7 September 2019; accepted for publication 27 October 2019; published online 28 November 2019. Copyright © 2019 by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. All rights reserved. All requests for copying and permission to reprint should be submitted to CCC at [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com); employ the eISSN 1533-3884 to initiate your request. See also AIAA Rights and Permissions [www.aiaa.org/randp](http://www.aiaa.org/randp).

\*Professor, Department of Applied Mathematics; [qigong@soe.ucsc.edu](mailto:qigong@soe.ucsc.edu).

<sup>†</sup>Professor, Department of Applied Mathematics; [wkang@nps.edu](mailto:wkang@nps.edu).

<sup>‡</sup>Research Assistant Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; [cwalton1@nps.edu](mailto:cwalton1@nps.edu).

<sup>§</sup>Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; [kaminer@nps.edu](mailto:kaminer@nps.edu).

<sup>¶</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; [hjpark@nmsu.edu](mailto:hjpark@nmsu.edu).

the swarm into more revealing behaviors. While intruder perturbations make the system observable, the simulations in [14] also reveal that standard filtering techniques such as unscented Kalman filter (UKF) often fail to estimate the parameters that define the internal cooperating strategy. The failure of standard estimation algorithms can be attributed to the parameters in the swarm model that represent the range limit of communication and/or range of influence among agents. These parameters introduce discontinuity into the swarm dynamics. In the state-parameter space, they are observable in a zero measure set within a short time interval only, making the design of a convergent estimation algorithm very challenging.

In this paper, in contrast to [14], we introduce a new tool of partial observability to study the observability of any variable of interest in a nonlinear system. This new concept enables quantitative observability analysis for an individual state variable even when the system is *unobservable* in traditional sense. We derive theoretical results that reveal properties of partial observability and link it to other observability metrics. As a particular attractive feature, partial observability can be conveniently computed using empirical observability Gramian and optimization, making it suitable for analyzing complex nonlinear systems such as a swarm of autonomous agents. When applied to the swarm model studied in [1,2,14], partial observability analysis reveals that, even at steady state when the system is not observable in traditional sense as shown in [14], some parameters in the cooperating strategy are still observable and can be successfully estimated. Moreover, in the presence of intruders, our analysis shows the dependence of observability on the time window of the sensor measurements. Such feature imposes a fundamental challenge on Kalman filter type of sequential estimation techniques.

To address such issues in estimating parameters in an adversarial swarm, we propose a two-step dynamical-optimization-based method that processes the measurement in a batch fashion. The algorithm leverages on the results obtained by partial observability analysis to improve the computational efficiency. It also resolves the challenge of estimating parameters that are only observable on a zero measure set. As the number of agents increases, computational cost of the proposed two-step estimation algorithm also grows rapidly. Thus, the algorithm is most suitable for small swarms. Estimation of large swarms is an interesting topic for future research.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we define the concept of partial observability for nonlinear systems, prove some fundamental properties, and develop computational tools for analyzing partial observability. These concepts and tools are applied in Sec. III on an adversarial swarm model to analyze the observability of internal swarm cooperating strategies. Two baseline scenarios are studied in detail. One is when the swarm is at a steady state, and the other addresses the case when the swarm is perturbed by intruders. Based on the partial observability analysis, we propose a two-step estimation algorithm in Sec. IV and compare its performance with that of an UKF. Finally, some concluding remarks are given in Sec. V.

## II. Partial Observability

In this section, we develop the theoretical foundation and a computational method for the partial observability of nonlinear systems. In Sec. II.A, we introduce the concept of partial observability defined in [18]. The concept is closely related to the observability Gramian in the linear control theory. In Sec. II.B, we develop a new method of computing the partial observability of linear systems based on the optimization of a quadratic function and observability Gramian. It is proved that the unobservability index coincides with the Lagrangian multiplier of the optimization. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundedness of unobservability index are proved. If the system is nonlinear, its unobservability index is approximated using an empirical Gramian along a nominal trajectory. The method developed in this section is different from existing literature on this topic [15,16], in which either the full observability is computed or a more complicated optimization problem with dynamic constraints must be solved. In Sec. II.C, we provide a computational approach by introducing the norms and their weighting matrices for a family of

nonlinear problems that include the swarm examples studied in this paper.

### A. Concepts and Definitions

Consider a control system

$$\begin{aligned} x &= f(t, x, u, p), & x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, & u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}, & p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p} \\ y &= h(t, x, u, p), & y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y} \end{aligned}$$

where  $x$  is the state variable,  $u$  is the control input, and  $p$  represents the constant vector of parameters. The variable  $y$  is the output of the system, which can be measured using sensors. The time interval is  $[t_0, t_f]$ . Although differential equations are widely used as mathematical models of control systems, real-life operations are often subject to additional constraints. For instance, the following is a list of some examples:

$$\begin{aligned} E(x(t_0), x(t_f)) &\leq 0, && \text{end-point condition} \\ s(x(t), u(t)) &\leq 0, \forall t \in [t_0, t_f], && \text{state-control constraints} \\ p_1 &\leq p \leq p_2, && \text{model uncertainty} \\ d(x(t), p) &= 0, \forall t \in [t_0, t_f], && \text{differential-algebraic equations} \\ u &= u(t), && \text{known control input, an assumption} \\ &&& \text{often used in control theory} \end{aligned}$$

These additional constraints represent known information, or user's knowledge, about the system. In general, user's knowledge helps to improve observability. It is modeled as a subset in the space of state-control trajectories:

$$(x(\cdot), u(\cdot), p) \in \mathcal{C}$$

In partial observability, the goal is to estimate the projection of the state variable into a subspace. The variable to be estimated is denoted by  $z$ . It is modeled using a mapping, or projection  $\mathcal{P}$ :

$$z = \mathcal{P}(x(\cdot), u(\cdot), p)$$

For example, if we want to estimate  $x_1(0)$  only, then  $\mathcal{P}(x(\cdot), u(\cdot), p) = x_1(0)$ . We would like to point out that the definition of observability does not require a known control input; that is, the value of  $u(t)$  can be unknown. In the study of non-cooperative systems, the control input is not necessarily given or measurable. The entire system model is summarized as follows:

$$x = f(t, x, u, p), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}, \quad p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p} \quad (1a)$$

$$(x(\cdot), u(\cdot), p) \in \mathcal{C} \quad (1b)$$

$$y = h(t, x, u, p), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y} \quad (1c)$$

$$z = \mathcal{P}(x(\cdot), u(\cdot), p), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \quad (1d)$$

We assume that trajectories, as functions of  $t$ , have a norm in  $L^2$  space. The metrics used for  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  are denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_X$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_Y$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_Z$ , respectively. Let  $(x(t), u(t), p)$ ,  $t \in [t_0, t_f]$  be a nominal trajectory around which we study the system's observability. For nonlinear systems, changing the nominal trajectory or the time window may result in the change of the observability. Therefore, the observability computed for a nominal trajectory is valid only in a region around the nominal trajectory. Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be a small number. The set,  $\mathcal{E}$ , of trajectories is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{E} = \{(\hat{x}(\cdot), \hat{u}(\cdot), \hat{p}) \mid \text{it satisfies (1a) - (1b) and } \|\hat{y}(\cdot) - y(\cdot)\|_Y \leq \epsilon\} \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{y}(\cdot)$  is the output of  $(\hat{x}(\cdot), \hat{u}(\cdot), \hat{p})$  and  $y(\cdot)$  is the output of the nominal trajectory. If  $\epsilon$  represents the upper bound of sensor error, then the trajectories in  $\mathcal{E}$  are all similar to the nominal trajectory in the

sense that they are indistinguishable based on sensor data and user’s knowledge. Therefore, the size of  $\mathcal{E}$  determines the observability of the nominal trajectory. The observability of  $z$  is determined by the size of the set  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ . If this set is small, it means that the ambiguity in the estimation of  $z$  is small; that is,  $z$  is observable.

*Definition 1:* Let  $\rho$  be a metric that measures the size of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ ; then  $\rho$  is a measure of unobservability of  $z$ . It is called the estimation ambiguity.

There are different ways to measure the size of a set. In this paper, we use the radius as a metric.

*Definition 2:* The radius of  $\mathcal{E}$ , also a measure of estimation ambiguity, is defined as follows:

$$\rho = \max_{(\hat{x}(\cdot), \hat{u}(\cdot), \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{E}} \|\mathcal{P}(t, \hat{x}(\cdot), \hat{u}(\cdot), \hat{p}) - \mathcal{P}(t, x(\cdot), u(\cdot), p)\|_Z \quad (3)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_Z$  is the Euclidean norm if  $z$  is a vector and  $L^2$ -norm if  $z$  is a function. The ratio  $\rho/\epsilon$  is called the unobservability index

Unobservability index quantifies the observability of a nonlinear system. A small unobservability index implies strong observability of the system. The concept of unobservability index has been used in the literature for various applications [15,16,19].

**B. Linear Perspective**

This definition of observability is consistent with that in the classical control theory of linear systems. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Ax, & t \in [0, T] \\ y &= Cx, \\ z &= x(0) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  is the state variable and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  is the output variable. Let us consider the observability of the initial state,  $z = x(0)$ . Thus  $n_x = n_z$  and the mapping in Eq. (1d) is a simple projection

$$\mathcal{P}(x(\cdot)) = x(0)$$

In the linear control theory, the observability is determined by an observability Gramian, which is a nonnegative symmetric matrix:

$$G = \int_0^T e^{A^T \tau} C^T C e^{A \tau} d\tau \geq 0$$

In this case, the unobservability index is equivalent to the smallest eigenvalue of the observability Gramian as shown in the following result. Its proof is given in the Appendix.

*Proposition 1 ([18]):* Consider the observability of  $z$  in the linear system (4). Let  $G$  be the observability Gramian. Given  $\epsilon > 0$ . Let  $\lambda_{\min}$  and  $x_{\min}$  be the smallest eigenvalue and its associate eigenvector satisfying  $\lambda_{\min} \|x_{\min}\|_2^2 = \epsilon^2$ . Then,  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  is the following ellipsoid:

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}) = \{x(0) + \delta x(0) | \delta x(0)^T G \delta x(0) \leq \epsilon^2\} \quad (5)$$

The estimation ambiguity, that is, the radius of the ellipsoid, is  $\rho = \|x_{\min}\|_2$ . The unobservability index equals  $\rho/\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}}$ .

In general, the “size” of an ellipsoid can be measured using different metrics, such as the determinant of  $G$ , the trace of  $G$ , or the condition number of  $G$ . In [20], a comparison of various quantitative measures of observability is studied for power systems. For linear systems with sensor noise that follows a normal distribution, the observability Gramian coincides with the Fisher information matrix of the output function with respect to the initial state.

For partial observability, let us consider a special case where  $z = Px(0)$ . Matrix  $P$  is of dimension  $n_z$  by  $n_x$ , with  $n_z < n_x$ . The mapping in Eq. (1d) is a projection to subspace

$$\mathcal{P}(x(\cdot)) = Px(0)$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}) = \{Px(0) + P\delta x(0) | \delta x(0)^T G \delta x(0) \leq \epsilon^2\}$$

The radius of this set, or the estimation ambiguity (3), is equivalent to the following constrained maximization:

$$\rho^2 = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{ \|Px\|_2^2 \}$$

Subject to

$$x^T G x = \epsilon^2 \quad (6)$$

Define the Lagrangian function for solving Eq. (6):

$$L = x^T P^T P x - \lambda x^T G x$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  is the Lagrange multiplier. Then the maximization in Eq. (6) is achieved at points satisfying the following necessary conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} P^T P x &= \lambda G x \\ x^T G x &= \epsilon^2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

*Proposition 2:* The estimation ambiguity of  $z = Px(0)$  is the largest value of  $\rho = \|Px^*\|_2$  among all pairs  $(x^*, \lambda^*)$  that satisfy Eq. (7). The corresponding value of the Lagrange multiplier,  $\lambda^*$ , equals the square of the unobservability index.

*Proof:* The necessary condition (7) is obvious. If  $(x^*, \lambda^*)$  maximizes  $\rho$ , multiply  $(x^*)^T$  to the first equation in Eq. (7); we have

$$\|Px^*\|_2^2 = \lambda^* (x^*)^T G x^*$$

Because  $\rho^2 = \|Px^*\|_2^2$  and  $(x^*)^T G x^* = \epsilon^2$ , we have

$$\lambda^* = \rho^2 / \epsilon^2$$

that is, the square of the unobservability index equals the Lagrange multiplier.  $\square$

Proposition 2 links the concept of partial unobservability index to the Lagrange multiplier of the optimization problem (7). It is not surprising, because the Lagrange multiplier measures the sensitivity of the cost function to the variations of initial states. The following result establishes a sufficient condition under which the optimization problem (7) is well defined.

*Proposition 3:* Consider optimization problem (7). Let  $\text{Nul}(G)$  and  $\text{Nul}(P)$  be the null space of  $G$  and  $P$ , respectively.

1) If  $\text{Nul}(G) \subseteq \text{Nul}(P)$ , the unobservability index of  $z = P(x(0))$  is finite.

2) If  $\text{Nul}(G)$  is not a subset of  $\text{Nul}(P)$ , the unobservability index of  $z = Px(0)$  is  $\infty$ ; that is,  $z$  is unobservable.

*Proof:* Let  $r \leq n_x$  be the rank of the positive semidefinite matrix  $G$ , and denote the singular values of  $G$  as

$$\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r > 0$$

Consider the singular value decomposition  $G = U \Sigma U^T$ , where  $U$  is an orthogonal matrix and  $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r, 0, \dots, 0)$  is a diagonal matrix. Then, the null space of  $G$  is given by

$$\text{Nul}(G) = \text{span}\{u_{r+1}, u_{r+2}, \dots, u_n\}$$

where  $u_i$  is the  $i$ th column of  $U$ . For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying  $x^T G x = \epsilon^2$ , let  $\bar{x} = U^T x$ . We have

$$x^T G x = \bar{x}^T U^T G U \bar{x} = \bar{x}^T \Sigma \bar{x} = \sigma_1 \bar{x}_1^2 + \sigma_2 \bar{x}_2^2 + \dots + \sigma_r \bar{x}_r^2 = \epsilon^2 \quad (8)$$

where  $\bar{x}_i$  is the  $i$ th entry of vector  $\bar{x}$ . If  $\text{Nul}(G) = \text{span}\{u_{r+1}, u_{r+2}, \dots, u_n\} \subseteq \text{Nul}(P)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Px &= PU\bar{x} = [Pu_1, \dots, Pu_r, 0, \dots, 0]\bar{x} \\ &= \bar{x}_1 Pu_1 + \dots + \bar{x}_r Pu_r \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|Px\|_2 \leq |\bar{x}_1| \cdot \|Pu_1\| + \dots + |\bar{x}_r| \cdot \|Pu_r\|$$

where the right-hand side must be bounded because of Eq. (8) and the fact that  $\sigma_i > 0$  for all  $i \leq r$ .

If  $\text{Nul}(G)$  is not a subset of  $\text{Nul}(P)$ , there is a vector  $v \in \text{Nul}(G)$  such that  $Gv = 0$  and  $Pv \neq 0$ . Let  $x$  be an arbitrary vector satisfying  $x^T Gx = \epsilon^2$ . Then

$$(x+v)^T G(x+v) = x^T Gx = \epsilon^2$$

Therefore,  $x+v$  satisfies constraint in Eq. (6). The corresponding cost is  $\|P(x+v)\|_2^2 = \|Px + Pv\|_2^2$ , which can be arbitrarily large, since  $Pv \neq 0$  and  $v$  can be scaled to have an arbitrarily large length. Hence,  $\rho/\epsilon = \infty$ .  $\square$

In the traditional control theory, observability is analyzed with respect to the initial condition  $x(0)$ ; that is,  $P = I$ . If  $G$  has rank deficiencies,  $\text{Nul}(G)$  is clearly not a subspace of  $\text{Nul}(P)$ . Based on Proposition 3,  $\rho$  is infinity and  $x(0)$  is not observable, which is consistent with the classical observability theory. However, even for the case when  $G$  is not full rank, user's knowledge, such as the bounds of state variables, can be applied to still find a finite value of estimation ambiguity. In this case, a set of lower and upper bounds to  $x$  is added to the constraints of the maximization problem (6):

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^2 &= \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{ \|Px\|_2^2 \} \\ \text{Subject to } x^T Gx &= \epsilon^2 \\ m_i &\leq x_i \leq M_i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n_x \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $m_i$  and  $M_i$  are constants representing user's knowledge on the state variables.

### C. Computational Implementation

The general definition of observability is equivalent to a problem of constrained dynamical optimization (3). For linear systems, by using observability Gramian, optimization problem (3) can be reduced to a finite-dimensional optimization (6), which can be easily solved to obtain partial unobservability index. For nonlinear systems, one is unlikely to get an analytic solution for the nonlinear dynamic optimization (3). In this paper we adopt the concept of empirical Gramian to approximate nonlinear dynamic optimization (3) by a finite-dimensional optimization problem. As a first-order approximation, empirical Gramian was used to approximate the unobservability index in [15,16,19] for nonlinear systems. The empirical observability Gramian is defined using the original nonlinear dynamics along a nominal trajectory. It reflects the observability of the full nonlinear system in a region along the nominal trajectory. This is in sharp contrast to a traditional approach based on linearization of the system around an operating point.

Consider a control system:

$$x = f(t, x, u, p), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}, \quad p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p} \quad (10a)$$

$$y = h(t, x, u, p), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y} \quad (10b)$$

$$z = [x_1(0), \dots, x_{n_z}(0)]^T, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \quad (10c)$$

The individual state variables in a system may use different units. Their estimation error tolerances are different. Therefore we need a weighted norm as the metric of  $z$ . Let the error tolerance in the

estimation of  $z$  be a set of positive numbers  $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_{n_z}$  in their own units. Define an inner product using a diagonal matrix

$$\begin{aligned} W_Z &= \text{diag}(1, \delta_1/\delta_2, \dots, \delta_1/\delta_{n_z}) \\ \langle z_1, z_2 \rangle_Z &= z_1^T W_Z^T W_Z z_2 \\ \|z\|_Z &= \langle z, z \rangle_Z^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

This set of weights rescales  $z$  based on the error tolerance and the corresponding unit of  $z_1$ . The accuracy of estimation is justified by comparing the error to  $\delta_1$ . A standard orthogonal basis consists of the column vectors of  $W_Z^{-1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= e_1 \\ w_i &= \frac{\delta_i}{\delta_1} e_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n_z \end{aligned}$$

where  $e_i$ 's are the column vectors of the identity matrix. Choose a small  $\delta > 0$ ; consider

$$x^{\pm i}(0) = x(0) \pm \delta w_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n_x$$

Let  $y^{\pm i}(t)$  represent the corresponding output. To define a weighted inner product for  $y$ , one can use the sensor error covariance as the weight matrix. If sensor errors are not correlated, the matrix is diagonal. More specifically, suppose that the sensor error standard deviations are  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{n_y}$ . For some sensors, we may use error upper bounds in a similar way. Similar to  $W_Z$ , we define

$$W_Y = \text{diag}(1, \sigma_1/\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_1/\sigma_{n_y})$$

The empirical Gramian at  $x(0)$  is the  $n \times n$  matrix  $G_Y$ , whose  $(i, j)$  component is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i(t) &= \frac{1}{2\delta} (y^{+i}(t) - y^{-i}(t)), \\ \langle \Delta_i, \Delta_j \rangle_Y &= \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \Delta_i(t)^T W_Y^T W_Y \Delta_j(t) dt \\ G &= (\langle \Delta_i, \Delta_j \rangle_Y)_{i,j=1}^{n_x} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Using Eq. (6) as a first-order approximation of the estimation ambiguity,  $\rho$  is the solution of the following constrained maximization:


$$\begin{aligned} \rho^2 &= \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|W_Z z\|_2^2 \\ \text{Subject to } x^T Gx &= \epsilon^2 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The value of  $\rho$  can be interpreted as follows. If the sensor error is bounded by  $\epsilon$ , under the weighted norm, then  $\rho$  is approximately the worst estimation error of a maximum likelihood estimator that is based on the difference of the output function and the sensor data. The ratio,  $\rho/\epsilon$ , is approximately the unobservability index.

### III. Observability Analysis of an Adversarial Swarm

In this section we apply the concept of partial observability introduced in the previous section on analyzing cooperation strategies in adversarial swarms. As an illustrative example, we consider an adversarial swarm governed by a dynamical model proposed by Leonard and Fiorelli [1]. The model consists of multiple agents, including followers and virtual leaders. All agents are assumed as point masses in the  $xy$  plane with fully actuated dynamics.

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_k &= u_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, m, \\ \ddot{x}_i &= u_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$



**Fig. 1** Example of multiple agents (red circles) and a virtual leader (blue circle).

where  $x_{i_i} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $u_{i_i} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  are position and input vectors of virtual leaders,  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$  are position and input vectors of each agent, and  $m$  and  $n$  are the numbers of virtual leaders and followers. Figure 1 illustrates a swarm with multiple vehicles and a virtual leader.

The interaction force between two agents has magnitude  $f_I$  and is a gradient of an artificial potential  $V_I$ . Both the artificial potential  $V_I$  and force  $f_I$  depend on the distance  $\|x_{ij}\|$  between the vehicle  $i$  and its neighbor vehicle  $j$ . The artificial potential  $V_I$  is assumed to be in the form [1,2]

$$V_I = \begin{cases} \alpha \left( \ln(\|x_{ij}\|) + \frac{d_0}{\|x_{ij}\|} \right), & 0 < \|x_{ij}\| < d_1 \\ \alpha \left( \ln(d_1) + \frac{d_0}{d_1} \right), & \|x_{ij}\| \geq d_1 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a scalar control gain, and  $d_0$  and  $d_1$  are scalar constants for distance ranges. Then the magnitude of interaction force is given by


$$f_I = \begin{cases} \nabla_{\|x_{ij}\|} V_I, & 0 < \|x_{ij}\| < d_1 \\ 0, & \|x_{ij}\| \geq d_1 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Similarly, a potential  $V_h$  on a given agent  $i$  associated with the virtual leader  $k$  is defined with the distance  $\|h_{ik}\|$  between the agent  $i$  and virtual leader  $k$ .

A dissipative force  $f_{v_i} = -K[\dot{x}_i - (1/m) \sum_{k=1}^m \dot{x}_{i_k}]$  is employed to guarantee stability of the swarm system, where  $K$  is a positive constant. This dissipative force enables each agent to follow a desired velocity. The control law  $u_i$  for the vehicle  $i$  associated with  $m$  virtual leaders and  $p$  intruders is given by

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &= - \sum_{j \neq i}^n \nabla_{x_i} V_I(x_{ij}) - \sum_{k=1}^m \nabla_{x_i} V_h(h_{ik}) + f_{v_i} \\ &= - \sum_{j \neq i}^n \frac{f_I(x_{ij})}{\|x_{ij}\|} x_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{f_h(h_{ik})}{\|h_{ik}\|} h_{ik} - K \left( x_i - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m x_{i_k} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The cooperation strategy of an adversarial swarm with dynamics (13–16) is completely determined by the state (positions and velocities) of the virtual leaders, artificial potentials  $V_I$  and  $V_h$ , and the feedback gain  $K$ . The question of interest is to recover the unknown cooperation strategy from the measurement made on the adversarial swarm. In this section, we will formulate the problem based on the concept of partial observability introduced in the previous section, and analyze the observability of cooperation strategy through a sequence of numerical studies.



**Fig. 2** Interaction force magnitude.

In all simulations presented in this paper, we make the following assumptions:

1) The swarm consists of 5 followers and 1 virtual leader, that is,  $n = 5$  and  $m = 1$ . The virtual leader moves along a straight line with a constant velocity; thus its trajectory depends only on its initial position and initial velocity, which are unknown.

2) The artificial potentials  $V_I$  and  $V_h$  are identical. The values of the parameters that define the potential function are set to be  $\alpha = 150$ ,  $d_0 = 100$  m,  $d_1 = 200$  m, and  $K = 1$ . Figure 2 shows the interaction force magnitude with the chosen parameters. Note that those parameter values are used to simulate swarm trajectories, but they are assumed to be unknown.

3) All followers' states, that is, position,  $x_i(t)$ , and velocity,  $\dot{x}_i(t)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , are measurable.

The first assumption is the most restrictive one. Although the leaders' states are assumed to be unknown, we do require knowing the numbers of agents (followers and leaders) in an adversarial swarm. When this condition is not satisfied, the dimension of the dynamical system is unknown, making the observability analysis a challenging problem. A possible approach is to perform observability analysis for a subgroup of a swarm, and design distributed estimation algorithms. It is an important topic of future research and out of the scope of this paper.

Under these assumptions, the problem of identifying the cooperation strategy is reduced to the problem of estimating initial virtual leader state,  $(x_l(t_0), \dot{x}_l(t_0))$ , and parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_0$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$ . This problem is harder than it sounds. From an outsider's perspective, we do not have all the information like a controller. In fact, the overall system is unobservable in the conventional control theory as shown in [14]. The parameters can be partially observable, or some are observable only on a zero measure set, which makes Kalman filters fail to converge.

#### A. Partial Observability Analysis: Steady State

For nonlinear systems, as explained in Sec. II, observability depends on the nominal trajectory. We first analyze the observability of a baseline scenario, where the adversarial swarm is at a steady state moving at a constant speed as the virtual leader. The initial conditions of the swarm are given in Table 1 and illustrated in Fig. 3. Snapshots of the motion of the swarm are shown in Fig. 4.

**Table 1** Initial positions and velocities of the followers and the leader

Agent	Initial position, m	Initial velocity, m/s
Virtual leader	(0, 0)	(10, 0)
Follower 1	(0.0003, 79.21)	(10, 0)
Follower 2	(75.33, 24.48)	(10, 0)
Follower 3	(46.56, -64.08)	(10, 0)
Follower 4	(-46.56, -64.08)	(10, 0)
Follower 5	(-75.33, 24.48)	(10, 0)

To study the partial observability of the considered adversarial swarm, we first use the computation method presented in Sec. II.C to calculate the empirical Gramian matrix,  $G$ , with the dynamics  $\dot{x} = f(t, x, p)$  defined in Eqs. (13–16), where the state is

$$x(t) = [x_1^T(t), x_2^T(t), x_3^T(t), x_4^T(t), \dots, x_5^T(t), x_6^T(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{24}$$

and the parameter is  $p = [\alpha, d_0, d_1, K]$ . The output is all followers' state, that is,

$$y(t) = [x_1^T(t), x_2^T(t), \dots, x_5^T(t), x_6^T(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{20}, \quad t \in [0, 100] \quad (17)$$

To compute the empirical observability Gramian matrix, the following perturbation is introduced:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{\pm i}(0) &= x^{\text{nom}}(0) \pm \delta \cdot W_x E_x(i), & i &= 1, 2, \dots, 24 \\ p^{\pm i} &= p^{\text{nom}} \pm \delta \cdot W_p E_p(i), & i &= 1, \dots, 4 \end{aligned}$$

where  $x^{\text{nom}}(0)$  is the initial condition of the nominal trajectory (steady state) and

$$p^{\text{nom}} = [150, 100, 200, 1]^T$$

is the nominal value of the parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_0$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$ .  $E_x(i)$  and  $E_p(i)$  define the direction of the perturbations. In the simulation they are set to be the  $i$ th column of the identity matrices of appropriate dimensions. In simulations the size of the perturbation is set at  $\delta = 10^{-7}$ . The weight matrix,  $W_x$ , is a block diagonal matrix with six (five followers plus one leader) identical blocks. Each block is a diagonal matrix,  $\text{diag}(1, 1, 0.1, 0.1)$ . The parameter weight matrix  $W_p$  is set to be a diagonal matrix of  $\text{diag}(15, 10, 20, 0.1)$ . Each perturbed initial conditions and parameters are propagated




Fig. 3 Initial formation of the adversarial swarm.




Fig. 4 Steady-state motion of the adversarial swarm.

Table 2 Partial unobservability index of the steady state

Estimation variable ( $z$ )	Unobservability index ( $\rho/\epsilon$ )
Leader position	$1.779 \times 10^{-1}$
Leader velocity	$1.698 \times 10^{-2}$
Parameter $\alpha$	$9.640 \times 10^{+3}$
Parameter $d_0$	$6.208 \times 10^{-3}$
Parameter $d_1$	$2.000 \times 10^{+4}$
Parameter $K$	$1.000 \times 10^{+2}$

through the swarm dynamics for 100 s to generate perturbed output trajectory

$$y^{\pm i}(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 28$$

The empirical local observability Gramian is  $24 \times 24$  matrix  $G$  whose  $(i, j)$  components is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i(t) &= \frac{1}{2\delta} W_y (y^{+i}(t) - y^{-i}(t)), & i &= 1, \dots, 28 \\ G_{i,j} &= \int_0^{100} \Delta_i(t)^T \Delta_j(t) dt \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the weight matrix  $W_y$  is a block diagonal matrix with five identical blocks. Each block is a diagonal matrix  $\text{diag}(1, 1, 10, 10)$ .

The minimum eigenvalue of the computed empirical observability Gramian is 0, which implies that the unobservability index is  $+\infty$  when  $z$ , the variable to be estimated, includes all state variables and all unknown parameters. In other words, the parameters of coordinating controller around the nominal trajectory (steady state) are not observable in the classical sense. The same conclusion was reported in our previous work [14]. Using the concept of partial observability, however, we can now further analyze the observability of individual variables of interest even when the whole system itself is not observable. Such analysis reveals more insights of a dynamical system than binary conclusion (fully observable or fully unobservable) obtained using methods like the one reported in [14].

Based on the computed empirical observability Gramian, the optimization problem (12) can be formulated and solved numerically. The results for individual parameters are shown in Table 2. From the results it is clear that leader position, leader velocity, and parameter  $d_0$  are all observable, whereas parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$  are not. Intuitively, because the swarm is moving at a steady state, it is not surprising that virtual leader's velocity is observable, because they are the same as the followers' velocities. Our analysis shows that virtual leader's initial position and a part of the cooperation strategy, that is, parameter  $d_0$ , are also observable. Such insight revealed based on partial observability analysis is not obvious from the physics of the dynamics. Different from the classical observability analysis, where only binary conclusion of the entire system can be obtained, the proposed partial observability analysis provides quantitative and componentwise evaluation.






Fig. 5 UKF estimation errors of the leader state.

As a mean to validate our partial observability analysis results, we apply UKF [21] on the steady-state trajectory to estimate the unknown leader state and cooperation parameters  $p = [\alpha, d_0, d_1, K]$ . The results from a set of random UKF initial conditions are shown in Figs. 5 and 6. It is clear that UKF correctly identifies the leader state (position and velocity) and parameter  $d_0$ . However, the estimations for unobservable parameters,  $\alpha$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$ , do not converge.

#### B. Partial Observability Analysis: Intruder Perturbation

We have shown that, when a swarm has stabilized at an equilibrium configuration, some internal cooperation strategies are unobservable. Such conclusion is not surprising, because the measured followers' trajectories at the steady states (which are straight lines) are not rich

enough to reveal internal dynamics of the swarm. In this section, similar to Ref. [14], we introduce intruders as a possible *agent provocateur* to disrupt the adversarial swarm and provoke the swarm into more revealing behaviors. The agents in a non-cooperative swarm are assumed to treat an intruder as an obstacle with the interaction force between a vehicle and an intruder be expressed using an artificial potential  $V_r$ . Note that we assume that the adversarial swarm reacts to the intruder through a build-in obstacle avoidance algorithm. Such functionality may not be implemented in current autonomous swarms. However, given the rapid advancement of technology, it is reasonable to anticipate that obstacle avoidance algorithms such as those already implemented in autonomous driving cars may become available in future swarm applications.




Fig. 6 UKF estimations of the parameters  $p = [\alpha, d_0, d_1, K]$ . Red solid lines are true values of the parameters. The dashed lines are UKF estimations.






Fig. 7 Snapshots of positions of the swarm and intruder. Red  $\circ$ : position of the follower; black  $\times$ : position of the intruder.

For simplicity, we further assume that  $V_r$  is identical to potential  $V_l$  with the same parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_0$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$ . In the simulation, one intruder is initially at  $(-100, -100)$  m and moves at a constant velocity of  $(10, 2)$  m/s. Because the followers consider the intruder as a moving obstacle, they move around to avoid collision as the intruder penetrates the swarm; thus the steady-state trajectory is perturbed to excite much richer dynamical behavior. Figure 7 illustrates the trajectories of the perturbed swarm.

The empirical observability Gramian matrix of the intruder-perturbed swarm trajectory can be numerically computed using the same method as explained in the previous section. The minimum eigenvalue of the empirical observability Gramian is 0.4931; therefore, according to Proposition 1, the unobservability index with respect to all state variables and all unknown parameters is  $1/\sqrt{0.4931} \approx 1.424$ . With the intruder perturbing the steady state, the system becomes observable. Next, following the same process as in the case of steady state, we perform partial observability analysis on individual states. The results are shown in Table 3. Compared with Table 2, it is clear that introducing intruder significantly reduces the unobservability index of parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$  by several magnitudes.

#### IV. Estimation of an Adversarial Swarm's Cooperation Strategy

Equipped with the results from partial observability analysis, we now address the problem of detecting the cooperating strategy of an adversarial swarm by estimating the leader states and parameters that define the internal interactive force among the agents in the swarm.

As shown in the previous section, when the steady state is perturbed by intruders, the entire system, including all parameters, is fully observable. Therefore, standard filtering techniques for nonlinear estimation can potentially be applied to estimate the four parameters in the swarm system control architecture  $(\alpha, d_0, d_1, K)$  and the virtual leader information, that is, its initial position and velocity.

Table 3 Partial unobservability index of the swarm with intruder perturbation

Estimation variable ( $z$ )	Unobservability index ( $\rho/\epsilon$ )
Leader position	$2.231 \times 10^{-1}$
Leader velocity	$2.355 \times 10^{-2}$
Parameter $\alpha$	$1.958 \times 10^{-1}$
Parameter $d_0$	$5.628 \times 10^{-3}$
Parameter $d_1$	$1.099 \times 10^{-2}$
Parameter $K$	$1.927 \times 10^{-1}$

However, when applying standard filtering techniques such as the UKF to estimate these parameters, we have discovered that the estimates often fail to converge; see Fig. 8 for a typical performance of an UKF.

A couple of inherent challenges may contribute to the failure of the UKF in the estimation of the parameters. First, we have shown that all four parameters  $(\alpha, d_0, d_1, K)$  and the virtual leader's position and velocity are observable based on the intruder perturbed trajectory; however, after the intruder passes through the region, the swarm will settle down to a new steady state, whose observability property can be fundamentally different to the intruder perturbed trajectory. To illustrate the change of unobservability indices, we computed the empirical observability Gramian matrices and the corresponding unobservability indices of parameters  $(\alpha, d_0, d_1, K)$  over a sequence of moving observation windows of 100 s long:

$$[t_k, t_k + 100], \quad t_k = 10k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

The results are shown in Fig. 9. It is clear that, except for  $d_0$ , which remains observable for all  $t$ , the observability of other three parameters is subject to fundamental changes. As the intruder exits the swarm, parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$  become unobservable. Such switch of observability introduces a fundamental challenge to UKF type of *sequential* estimation methods. If the filter has not converge before the swarm settles down to an unobservable steady state, all new measurements will not provide enough information for UKF to update its estimations, therefore putting the convergence of the UKF in jeopardy. For complex and high-dimensional nonlinear systems such as the adversarial swarm considered here, producing a fast convergent estimation (before the observability of the trajectory changes) by UKF is not straightforward and may require a labor-intensive process to tune UKF parameters.

*Remark 1:* The concept of observability introduced in Sec. II.A clearly depends on the trajectory of the interest. Different trajectories of the same dynamical system may have different observability. Exemplified by the results in Fig. 9, we see that even different observation windows of the same trajectory can have completely different observability property.

The issue of UKF estimation is further complicated by another nontrivial challenge associated with parameter  $d_1$ , which represents the range limit of communication and/or range of influence among agents [see Eq. (14)]. Parameter  $d_1$  is fundamentally different from other parameters of the swarm. More specifically, if none of the relative distances between vehicles is equal to  $d_1$ , then a small perturbation around  $d_1$  has no impact on the trajectory. Thus  $d_1$  is not observable. Its value becomes observable only if the relative distance of at least one pair of vehicles passes across  $d_1$ . Therefore,  $d_1$  is observable in a subset of parameter-state space. This subset is a




Fig. 8 Typical performance of an UKF. Red solid lines are true values of the parameters. The dashed lines are the estimates.

surface that has zero measure. Such property makes the design of a convergent estimation algorithm a demanding task. To illustrate the challenge, we consider a simplified problem of estimating  $d_1$  only with all other unknowns being fixed at their true values. Figure 10 shows a typical result. The trajectory of the swarm is affected when the relative distances among the agents cross the threshold defined by  $d_1$ . Therefore, the value of  $d_1$  is locally distinguishable only in a zero measure subset of the state-parameter space, which causes the step-like behavior of the UKF estimation. The gray curves in the figure are the relative distances between agents. Note that the correction happens when the relative distance crosses the “fake” value assumed by the UKF. However, the filter fails to make correction when the relative distances cross the true value of  $d_1$ .

To overcome the inherent challenges of the considered estimation problem, we propose a two-stage algorithm using dynamical optimization.

*Step 1:* Based on the *unperturbed steady-state trajectory*, construct the following dynamical optimization problem to estimate leader initial position,  $x_l(0) \in R^2$ , leader initial velocity,  $\dot{x}_l(0) \in R^2$ , and parameter  $d_0$ .

$$\begin{cases} \text{Find} & \hat{x}_l(0) \in R^2, \hat{\dot{x}}_l(0) \in R^2, \text{ and } \hat{p} = [\hat{\alpha}, \hat{d}_0, \hat{d}_1, \hat{K}] \in \mathbb{R}^4 \text{ to} \\ \text{minimize} & J(\hat{x}_l(0), \hat{\dot{x}}_l(0), \hat{p}) = \log\left(1 + \int_0^{100} \|\hat{y}(t) - y(t)\|_{W_y}^2 dt\right) \\ \text{subject to} & \hat{\dot{x}} = f(\hat{x}, \hat{p}, t), \\ & \hat{x}(0) = [\hat{x}_1^T(0), \hat{x}_2^T(0), x_1^T(0), x_1^T(0), \dots, x_5^T(0), x_5^T(0)]^T, \\ & \hat{y}(t) = [\hat{x}_1^T(t), \hat{x}_1^T(t), \dots, \hat{x}_5^T(t), \hat{x}_5^T(t)]^T \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where dynamics  $f$  is defined in Eqs. (13–16),  $y(t)$  is the measured followers’ states defined in Eq. (17), and the weight matrix  $W_y$  is given in Eq. (18).





Fig. 9 Change of unobservability indices with respect to time.



**Fig. 10** UKF estimation of  $d_1$ , where all other parameters are given. Red solid line and blue dashed line are true and estimated values, respectively. The gray lines are the relative distances between agents.

Problem (19) is an optimization problem with nonlinear dynamical constraint but finite-dimensional decision variables. As shown in Sec. III.A, although the full system is not observable from the unperturbed steady-state trajectory, the leader initial state and parameter  $d_0$  are partially observable. Thus, problem (19) is well-defined. Moreover, from the optimal solution, we obtain the estimates,  $(\hat{x}_l(0), \hat{\dot{x}}_l(0), \hat{d}_0)$ , of the true value of the leader initial state and parameter  $d_0$ . The estimation results are used in the next step. The other part of the optimal solution, that is,  $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{d}_1, \hat{K})$ , is discarded. Because of the nonlinear dynamical constraints, problem (19) needs to be solved numerically. This can be done by incorporating an numerical integrator with a finite-dimensional constraint optimization solver.

*Step 2:* Based on the intruder perturbed swarm trajectory, the following dynamical optimization is formulated for estimating parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_0$ , and  $K$ .

$$\begin{cases} \text{Find} & \hat{\alpha}, \hat{d}_1, \text{ and } \hat{K} \text{ to} \\ \text{minimize} & J(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{d}_1, \hat{K}) = \log\left(1 + \int_0^{100} \|\hat{y}(t) - y(t)\|_{W_y}^2 dt\right) \\ \text{subject to} & \hat{x} = f(\hat{x}, \hat{p}, t) \\ & \hat{x}(0) = [\hat{x}_1^T(0), \hat{x}_2^T(0), \hat{x}_3^T(0), \hat{x}_4^T(0), \dots, \hat{x}_5^T(0), \hat{x}_5^T(0)]^T \\ & \hat{y}(t) = [\hat{x}_1^T(t), \hat{x}_1^T(t), \dots, \hat{x}_5^T(t), \hat{x}_5^T(t)]^T \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where dynamics  $f$  is defined in Eqs. (13–16),  $\hat{p} = [\hat{\alpha}, \hat{d}_0, \hat{d}_1, \hat{K}]$ ,  $y(t)$  is the measured followers' states defined in Eq. (17), and the weight matrix  $W_y$  is given in Eq. (18). Note that, in this optimization problem, the decision variables are  $\hat{\alpha}$ ,  $\hat{d}_1$ , and  $\hat{K}$ . The leader initial state and parameter  $d_0$  are fixed at their estimated values, that is,  $(\hat{x}_l^T(0), \hat{\dot{x}}_l^T(0), \hat{d}_0)$ , from step 1.

*Remark 2:* Both dynamical optimization problems (19) and (20) process entire measured trajectory at once and thus circumvent some challenges associate with UKF type of sequential estimation tools. The partial observability of parameters depends on the time window. Step 1 can be applied to find the observable parameters only, without the help of the intruder. Its computation can be carried out before the intruder enters the region of action. However, step 2 must be done using the data collected during the time window when the intruder passes through the swarm.

The optimization problems (19) and (20) are solved numerically using nonlinear programming solver SNOPT. The estimation errors of the virtual leader state and the parameters in step 1 are reported in Table 4. These errors are averaged over 10 runs from random initial guesses range from  $\pm 50\%$  of the true values. Average runtime in

MATLAB is 247 s on a MacBook Pro with 2.3 GHz i7 CPU and 8 GB memory. Although the system is not fully observable, the leader initial states and parameter  $d_0$  can indeed be estimated with high accuracy as predicted in the partial observability analysis. Furthermore, the optimal cost is in the order of  $10^{-8}$ , indicating that different cooperation parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$  can generate identical follower trajectories; thus  $\alpha$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$  cannot be observable from the considered steady state.

Numerical estimations,  $(\hat{x}_l(0), \hat{\dot{x}}_l(0), \hat{d}_0)$ , from step 1 are used to construct optimization problem (20) in step 2, which is again solved numerically using SNOPT. From the optimal estimation errors reported in Table 5, it is clear that all three parameters,  $\alpha$ ,  $d_1$ , and  $K$ , have been identified. These errors are averaged over 10 runs from random initial guesses within  $\pm 50\%$  of the true values. Average runtime in MATLAB is 398 s on a MacBook Pro with 2.3 GHz i7 CPU and 8 GB memory. It is worth pointing out that the discontinuous parameter  $d_1$  is estimated with higher accuracy than the other two parameters  $\alpha$  and  $K$ , which is consistent to the partial unobservability indices reported in Table 3.

*Remark 3:* Instead of the proposed two-step algorithm, it is possible to formulate a single dynamical optimization problem to estimate all variables of interest, that is, adding  $\hat{p} = [\hat{\alpha}, \hat{d}_0, \hat{d}_1, \hat{K}]$  as

**Table 4** Estimation errors of step 1

Estimation variable ( $z$ )	Estimation error	Relative estimation error
$x_l(0) = (0, 0)$	$2.395 \times 10^{-4}$	N/A
$\dot{x}_l(0) = (10, 0)$	$2.991 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.991 \times 10^{-7}$
$\alpha = 150$	21.76	0.1451
$d_0 = 100$	$2.967 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.967 \times 10^{-7}$
$d_1 = 200$	19.104	$9.552 \times 10^{-2}$
$K = 1$	7.190	7.190

The errors are averaged over 10 runs from random initial guesses. The relative errors are scaled by the corresponding true values.

**Table 5** Estimation errors of step 2

Estimation variable ( $z$ )	Estimation error	Relative estimation error
$\alpha = 150$	$1.117 \times 10^{-2}$	$7.447 \times 10^{-5}$
$d_1 = 200$	$2.915 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.458 \times 10^{-6}$
$K = 1$	$6.610 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.610 \times 10^{-5}$

The errors are averaged over 10 runs from random initial guesses. The relative errors are scaled by the corresponding true values.

decision variables into problem (20). However, based on our numerical tests, the proposed two-step algorithm is more efficient in terms of runtime and robustness to the initial guess. Comparing with the single-step optimization that involves all unknowns, the proposed two-step algorithm based on observability analysis effectively reduces the dimension of the dynamical optimization problem and thus improves the numerical performance.

*Remark 4:* It is worth pointing out that computational cost in the proposed two-step estimation algorithm grows rapidly as the size of the swarm increases. Such phenomenon appears also in sequential estimation techniques, including UKF and extended Kalman filter. How to design computationally efficient estimation algorithms for high-dimensional systems, for example, adversarial swarms with a large number of agents, is an important subject of ongoing research. In particular, distributed and parallel computational tools that explicitly explore partial observability of nonlinear system have great potential to lift the curse of dimensionality. However, this is beyond the scope of this paper.

## V. Conclusions

This paper applies the concept of partial observability and its associated computational tools for analyzing the observability of the internal cooperating strategy of an adversarial swarm model. This new approach allows quantitative observability analysis on individual state even when the whole system is not observable in traditional sense. Our simulations reveal that when an adversarial swarm is at a steady state that is not fully observable, some parameters that define the internal cooperating strategy can still be partially observable and thus be accurately estimated while the overall system is unobservable. When intruder perturbation is introduced, the computation of partial observability indices clearly shows the dependence of observability on the swarm's trajectory, as well as the time window during which the swarm reacts to the intruder. To address convergence issues of UKF for estimating parameters that are observable on a zero measure subset, a two-step estimation algorithm was developed based on dynamical optimization. The proposed algorithm uses the concept of partial observability to circumvent some fundamental challenges associated with UKF types of sequential estimation tools. The results in this paper provide useful tools for further study on the estimation of adversarial swarms in more realistic scenarios, for example, large swarms with unknown number of agents, swarms with different potential functions, and non-potential-based swarm models.

## Acknowledgment

This work was supported in part by Office of Naval Research under grants N0001418WX01204 and N0001419WX00155.

## Appendix : Proof of Proposition 1

Given is a nominal trajectory of Eq. (4) with initial state  $x(0)$ . Given is a variation  $\delta x(0)$ . Let  $y(t)$  and  $\hat{y}(t)$  be the corresponding outputs. Then

$$\hat{y}(t) - y(t) = Ce^{At} \delta x(0)$$

It is easy to verify

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{y}(\cdot) - y(\cdot)\|_{L^2} &= \int_0^T \delta x(0)^T e^{A^T \tau} C^T C e^{A\tau} \delta x(0) d\tau \\ &= \delta x(0)^T G \delta x(0) \end{aligned}$$

The projection of  $\mathcal{E}$  to the initial state space is an ellipsoid in  $\mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  centered around  $x(0)$

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}) = \{x(0) + \delta x(0) | \delta x(0)^T G \delta x(0) \leq \epsilon^2\} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Let  $\lambda_{\min}$  be the smallest eigenvalue of  $G$  with an associated eigenvector  $x_{\min}$  on the surface

$$x_{\min}^T G x_{\min} = \epsilon^2 \quad (\text{A2})$$

Then  $x_{\min}$  is the major principle axis of the ellipsoid (A1). Denote

$$\rho = \|x_{\min}\|_2$$

then  $\rho$  is the radius of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ , that is,

$$\rho = \max_{x(0) + \delta x(0) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})} \|\delta x(0)\|_2$$

From Eq. (A2), we have

$$\epsilon^2 = \lambda_{\min} \|x_{\min}\|_2^2$$

Thus the unobservability index is  $\rho/\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}}$ .

## References

- [1] Leonard, N., and Fiorelli, E., "Virtual Leaders, Artificial Potentials and Coordinated Control of Groups," *Proceedings of the 40th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Vol. 3, IEEE, New York, 2001, pp. 2968–2973. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2001.980728>
- [2] Ogren, P., Fiorelli, E., and Leonard, N., "Cooperative Control of Mobile Sensor Networks: Adaptive Gradient Climbing in a Distributed Environment," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 49, No. 8, 2004, pp. 1292–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2004.832203>
- [3] Jadbabaie, A., Lin, J., and Morse, A. S., "Coordination of Groups of Mobile Autonomous Agents Using Nearest Neighbor Rules," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 48, No. 6, 2003, pp. 988–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2003.812781>
- [4] Szwajkowska, K., Heckman, C., Mier-y-Teran-Romero, L., and Schwartz, I., "Pattern-Acquisition in Finite, Heterogenous, Delay-Coupled Swarms," arXiv preprint, arXiv:1502.07978, 2015.
- [5] Chung, T., Clement, M., Day, M., Jones, K., Davis, D., and Jones, M., "Live-Fly, Large-Scale Field Experimentation for Large Numbers of Fixed-Wing UAVs," *Proceedings of 2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, IEEE, New York, 2016, pp. 1255–1262. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA.2016.7487257>
- [6] Paranjape, A. A., Chung, S. J., Kim, K., and Shim, D. H., "Robotic Herding of a Flock of Birds Using an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, Vol. 34, No. 4, 2018, pp. 901–915. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TRO.2018.2853610>
- [7] Walton, C., Lambrianides, P., Kaminer, I., Roysset, J. O., and Gong, Q., "Optimal Motion Planning in Rapid-Fire Combat Situations with Attacker Uncertainty," *Naval Research Logistics*, Vol. 65, No. 2, 2018, pp. 101–119. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nav.21790>
- [8] Kailath, T., *Linear Systems*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1980, Chap. 4.
- [9] Diopand, S., and Fliess, M., "Nonlinear Observability, Identifiability, and Persistent Trajectories," *Proceedings of 30th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Vol. 1, IEEE, New York, 1991, pp. 714–719. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.1991.261405>
- [10] Hermann, R., and Krener, A., "Nonlinear Controllability and Observability," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 22, No. 5, 1977, pp. 728–740. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.1977.1101601>
- [11] Gauthier, J. P., and Kupka, I. A. K., "Observability and Observers for Nonlinear Systems," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 1994, pp. 975–994. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0363012991221791>
- [12] Xia, X., and Gao, W., "Nonlinear Observer Design by Observer Error Linearization," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1989, pp. 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0327011>
- [13] Zheng, G., Driss, B., and Barbot, J. P., "Single Output-Dependent Observability Normal Form," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimiza-*

- tion, Vol. 46, No. 6, 2007, pp. 2242–2255.  
<https://doi.org/10.1137/050627137>
- [14] Park, H., Gong, Q., Kang, W., Walton, C., and Kaminer, I., “Observability Analysis of an Adversarial Swarm’s Cooperation Strategy,” *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Control and Automation (ICCA)*, IEEE, New York, June 2018, pp. 992–997.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCA.2018.8444217>
- [15] Krener, A., and Ide, K., “Measures of Unobservability,” *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, IEEE, New York, 2009, pp. 6401–6406.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2009.5400067>
- [16] Kang, W., and Xu, L., “A Quantitative Measure of Observability and Controllability,” *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, IEEE, New York, 2009, pp. 6413–6418.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2009.5399945>
- [17] Powel, N., and Morgansen, K., “Empirical Observability Gramian Rank Condition for Weak Observability of Nonlinear Systems with Control,” *IEEE 54th Annual Conference on Decision and Control*, IEEE, New York, 2015, pp. 6342–6348.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2015.7403218>
- [18] Kang, W., and Xu, L., “Computational Analysis of Control Systems Using Dynamic Optimization,” arXiv preprint, arXiv:0906.0215, 2009.
- [19] Qi, J., Sun, K., and Kang, W., “Optimal PMU Placement for Power System Dynamic State Estimation by Using Empirical Observability Gramian,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, Vol. 30, No. 4, 2015, pp. 2041–2054.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2014.2356797>
- [20] Qi, J., Sun, K., and Kang, W., “Adaptive Optimal PU Placement Based on Empirical Observability Gramian,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, Vol. 49, No. 18, 2016, pp. 482–487.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2016.10.211>
- [21] Julier, S., and Uhlmann, J., “A New Extension of the Kalman Filter to Nonlinear Systems,” *Proceedings of SPIE 3068, Signal Processing, Sensor Fusion, and Target Recognition VI*, SPIE, Washington, D.C., July 1997.  
<https://doi.org/10.1117/12.280797>