Event-triggered communication for passivity and synchronization of multi-weighted coupled neural networks with and without parameter uncertainties
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Abstract: A multi-weighted coupled neural networks (MWCNNs) model with event-triggered communication is studied in this paper. On the one hand, the passivity of the presented network model is studied by utilizing Lyapunov stability theory and some inequality techniques, and a synchronization criterion based on the obtained output-strict passivity condition of MWCNNs with event-triggered communication is derived. On the other hand, some robust passivity and robust synchronization criteria based on output-strict passivity of the proposed network with uncertain parameters are presented. At last, two numerical examples are provided to testify the effectiveness of the output-strict passivity and robust synchronization results.

1 Introduction

In recent decades, plenty of scholars have attracted widespread concern about dynamical behaviors of complex networks, e.g., passivity, synchronization, and stability, due to their extensive applications in various domains such as secure communication, brain science, pattern recognition and so on [1]. Recently, a lot of research achievements have been given on synchronization and passivity in complex networks [2–11]. Wang et al. [11] proposed a network model that is complex dynamical network with time-varying delay, and the passivity-based synchronization problem for this network was studied. With in-depth research of complex networks, more and more fresh elements are being added. For example, event-triggered control is a very effective strategy in complex networks, which is a discrete-time control method. It can conquer the shortcomings of the continuous control method and reduce the unnecessary transmission of the communication media during the process of information exchanging. In recent years, some interesting results on event-triggered passivity and synchronization of complex networks have been gained [12–27]. The authors in [16] designed two kinds of distributed event-triggering laws and some criteria that ensure the event-based exponential synchronization were established.

Coupled neural networks (CNNs), as a special complex networks, have received the concern of scholars from different domains, and passivity and synchronization of CNNs have become hot issues [28–42]. The finite-time passivity problem for adaptive CNNs with undirected and directed topologies was studied in [28]. Zhang et al. [30] considered the memristor-based coupling recurrent neural networks with time-varying delays and impulses, some sufficient conditions for synchronization were obtained by means of a generalized Halanay differential inequality. In [40], the authors put forward a network model of partially CNNs with event-triggered communication and gave some conditions for solving the synchronization and passivity problems of this kind of network.

In practice, many systems, such as transportation networks, social networks, and so on, in the real world should be modeled by multi-weighted complex networks (MWCNs). In recent years, the passivity and synchronization for MWCNs have been considered [43–47]. In [46], Wang et al. established some conditions about passivity and passivity-based synchronization for MWCNs by employing some inequality techniques and Lyapunov functional approach. Moreover, multi-weighted CNNs (MWCNNs) have become a very hot topic due to their broad application foreground. Some standards were established to ensure passivity and synchronization for MWCNNs [48–50]. Tang et al. [49] investigated the passivity and exponential synchronization for two classes of MWCNNs with and without time delays. It is regrettable that the passivity and synchronization for MWCNNs with event-triggered communication have rarely been considered.

Due to the effect of environmental noise and model error, it is usually impossible to obtain the accurate value of parameters in CNNs in many cases. Therefore, it is of great significance and interesting to research the dynamical behaviors of CNNs with parameter uncertainties [51–54]. The authors [51] concerned the problems of generalized synchronization and pinning control for delayed CNNs with and without parameter uncertainties. Similarly, the environmental noise and model error also exist in the MWCNNs. Thus, it is worthwhile taking uncertain parameters into account when researching MWCNNs. Unfortunately, the event-triggered synchronization and passivity of MWCNNs with parameter uncertainties have not yet been investigated.

Inspired by the above discussion, this paper aims to study the event-triggered passivity and passivity-based synchronization problems of MWCNNs with and without parameter uncertainties. The main contributions of our work can be outlined as follows.

1) By employing some new inequality techniques and designing appropriate event-triggered condition and Lyapunov functional, some sufficient conditions for passivity of MWCNNs with event-triggered communication are established.

2) Considering the precise parameter values of network cannot be obtained in some situations, we also pursue the study on the robust passivity of MWCNNs with parameter uncertainties, and present several event-triggered robust passivity criteria for the considered network.

3) Based on the obtained output-strict passivity results, two sufficient conditions for ensuring the event-triggered synchronization and robust synchronization of MWCNNs without and with parameter uncertainties are derived respectively.
\textbf{2 Preliminaries}

\textbf{2.1 Definitions and Notations}

Let $G = (\alpha, \delta, \hat{G})$ be a weighted directed digraph, where $\delta \subseteq \alpha \times \alpha$ is directed set of edge and $\alpha = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ is a set of nodes, $(i, j) \in \delta$ represents an edge of graph $F$. $N_i = \{j \in \alpha | (i, j) \in \delta\}$ is the neighbor instant of node $i$. The connection adjacency matrix $G = (G_{ij})_{N \times N}$ of the graph $F$ satisfies $G_{ii} = 0$ and $G_{ij} > 0 \iff j \in N_i$, $\|\|_2$ is the Euclidean is.

\textbf{Definition 2.1. (See [3])} A system with output $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and input $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is called to be dissipative if there is a storage function $\Pi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ satisfying
\[
\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \frac{\Pi(u(t), y(t))}{dt} \geq \Pi(t_b) - \Pi(t_a)
\]
for any $t_a, t_b \in [0, +\infty)$ and $t_0 \leq t_b$, where $\Pi(u, y)$ is supply rate.

\textbf{Definition 2.2. (See [3])} The system is called to be passive if it is dissipative and
\[
\Pi(u(t), y(t)) = y^T(t)u(t).
\]

\textbf{Definition 2.3. (See [3])} If a system is dissipative and
\[
\Pi(u(t), y(t)) = y^T(t)u(t) - \kappa_1 y^T(t)g(t) - \kappa_2 u^T(t)u(t),
\]
where $\kappa_1 > 0$, $\kappa_2 > 0$ and $\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 > 0$, then the system is called to be strictly passive. In addition, the system is called to be input-strictly passive if $\kappa_2 > 0$ and output-strictly passive if $\kappa_1 > 0$.

\section{3 Event-triggered passivity analysis of MWCNNs}

\subsection{3.1 Network model}

The MWCNNs to be studied in this section is described by
\[
\dot{w}_i(t) = -A w_i(t) + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{s} G_{ij}^{s} w_j(t) + L + H f(w_i(t)) + B x(t) - \tau(t) w_i(t) + v_i(t),
\]

(1)

where $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$; $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$; the state vector of the ith node is $w_i(t) = (w_{i1}(t), w_{i2}(t), \ldots, w_{in}(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$; $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ signifies the input vector; $A = diag(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) > 0$; $L = (L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_N)^T$ means the external input; $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are known matrices; the inner coupling matrix of the sth coupling form is $\Gamma^s \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$; $0 < d_s \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < \delta_s \in \mathbb{R}$ represent the overall coupling strength of the sth coupling form for no event-triggered configuration and event-triggered one; $f(w_i(t)) = (f_1(w_{i1}(t)), f_2(w_{i2}(t)), \ldots, f_n(w_{in}(t)))^T$, $x(t) = (x_1(t), x_2(t), \ldots, x_n(t), x_{n+1}(t), \ldots, x_{2n}(t), \ldots, x_{n^2}(t))^T$ for the activation functions; $\tau(t)$ signifies the time varying delay which meets $0 \leq \tau(t) \leq \tau$ and $\tau \leq \tau \leq 1$; $G^2 = (G_{ij}^2)_{N \times N}$ with $G_{ij}^2 = 0, G_{ij}^2 > 0$ is the weight matrix of the controller in the sth coupling form; the element in the matrix $G^2$ is $G_{ij}^2 = (G_{ij}^2)_{N \times N}$ in the sth coupling form has the following definition: if there exists a connection between node $i$ and node $j$, then $G_{ij} > 0$ and $G_{ji} < G_{ij}$, otherwise $G_{ij} = 0 (i \neq j)$, and $G_{ii} = - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} G_{ij}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$; $v_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the control input, which is given as follows:

\[
v_i(t) = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{d}_s G_{ij}^s (w_i(t) - w_j(t)).
\]

The increasing event-triggered time sequence is denoted by $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, where $t_{k+1} - t_k > 0, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. According to the event-triggered method, the control input $v_i(t)$ can be rewritten as:

\[
v_i(t) = \sum_{s=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{d}_s G_{ij}^s (w_i(t_k^s) - w_j(t_k^s)),
\]

(2)

where $t \in [t_k^s, t_{k+1}^s)$, $w_i(t_k^s)$ represents the state of node $i$ at $t_k^s$, $t_k^s$ is the event-triggered time instant of node $i$.

\textbf{Remark 1.} As is well known, we can get in touch with others through various contact ways such as facebook, wechat, email, QQ, message and so on. Each contact method has different weights which stands for different coupling form. Therefore, the social network can be reflected more accurately by the model of MWCNs. Actually, many networks can be modeled by MWCNs, such as communication networks, complex biology networks, transportation networks. As a special type of MWCNs, MWCNs received more and more attention in recent years. More exactly, the nodes in the MWCNs are coupled by multiple coupling forms compared with the traditional CNNs with single weight. Therefore, it is more reasonable to describe some real-world networks by utilizing the MWCNs. However, there are only a few results reported on the passivity and synchronization of MWCNs [48, 49], and it is worth devoting more efforts on this topic. As far as we know, the event-triggered passivity and synchronization for MWCNs have not been considered before, which motivates our research work in this paper. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper toward studying the passivity and synchronization of MWCNs based on event-triggered mechanism.

The event-triggered measure error can be defined as $\vartheta_i(t) = w_i(t_k^s) - w_i(t)$ and

\[
t_{k+1}^s = \inf \left\{ t : t > t_k^s, ||\vartheta_i(t)||_2 > \sigma \right\}
\]

(3)

for any $t \in [t_k^s, t_{k+1}^s)$ and the constant $\sigma > 0$.

The activation functions $f_i(\cdot)$ and $x_i(\cdot)$ are assumed to meet global Lipschitz condition in this paper. In other words, there exist $0 < \omega_i \in \mathbb{R}, 0 < \chi_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

\[
|f_i(b) - f_i(a)| \leq \omega_i |b - a|,
\]

\[
|x_i(b) - x_i(a)| \leq \chi_i |b - a|
\]

for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Denote $\hat{\omega} = diag(\omega_1^2, \omega_2^2, \ldots, \omega_n^2)$, $\hat{\chi} = diag(\chi_1^2, \chi_2^2, \ldots, \chi_n^2)$.

\subsection{3.2 Passivity analysis}

Assume that an equilibrium solution vector of network (1) is $r^* = (r_1^*, r_2^*, \ldots, r_n^*)^T$. Then, we can get

\[
0 = -Ar^* + L + Bx(r^*) + H f(r^*)
\]

Letting $z_i(t) = w_i(t) - r^*$, we have

\[
\dot{z}_i(t) = -A z_i(t) + H \tilde{f}(z_i(t)) + \sum_{s=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{s} G_{ij}^{s} z_j(t) + u_i(t)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{s=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{d}_s G_{ij}^s (z_i(t_k^s) - z_j(t_k^s)) + B \tilde{x}(z_i(t) - r^*),
\]

(4)

in which $t \in [t_k^s, t_{k+1}^s)$, $\tilde{x}(z_i(t) - r^*) = x_i(w_i(t) - r^*) - x_i(r^*) = (x_1(w_1(t) - r^*)) - x_1(r_1^*), x_2(w_2(t) - r^*)) - x_2(r_2^*), \ldots,$
Remark 2. In this paper, the Zeno behavior can be excluded. In other words, the inter-event intervals $t_{k+1}^{i} - t_{k}^{i}$ have a positive lower bound for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, where $k > 0$. Actually, for $t \in [t_{k}^{i}, t_{k+1}^{i}]$ and the constant $\sigma > 0$, we have

$$\|\tilde{\vartheta}_{i}(t)\|_{2} \leq \left\| -A_{i}z_{i}(t) + \sum_{s=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{s}G_{i}\varpi z_{j}(t) + Hf(z_{i}(t)) \right\|_{2} + B\tilde{\varrho}(z_{i}(t - \tau(t))) + \hat{U}_{i}(t_{k}^{i}, t_{k}^{i})$$

$$\leq \left( \lambda_{\max}(A) + \lambda_{\max}(H) \varpi \right) \|\vartheta_{i}(t)\|_{2} + \left( \lambda_{\max}(A) + \lambda_{\max}(H)\varpi \right) |w_{i}(t_{k}^{i}) - r^{\ast}|_{2} + \lambda_{\min}(B)|\varpi|_{2} z_{i}(t - \tau(t))_{2} + \hat{U}_{i}(t_{k}^{i}, t_{k}^{i})$$

$$\leq \left( \lambda_{\max}(A) + \lambda_{\max}(H)\varpi \right) \|\vartheta_{i}(t)\|_{2} + \left( \lambda_{\max}(A) + \lambda_{\max}(H)\varpi \right) |w_{i}(t_{k}^{i}) - r^{\ast}|_{2} + \lambda_{\min}(B)|\varpi|_{2} z_{i}(t - \tau(t))_{2} + \hat{U}_{i}(t_{k}^{i}, t_{k}^{i})$$

By solving the inequality $\|\tilde{\vartheta}_{i}(t)\|_{2} \leq \alpha \|\vartheta_{i}(t)\|_{2} + \beta$. Then, we can get

$$\|\vartheta_{i}(t)\|_{2} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} (e^{\alpha(t - t_{k}^{i})} - 1).$$

According to the event-triggered condition (3), when the event of node $i$ is triggered, we have

$$\|\vartheta_{i}(t_{k+1}^{i})\|_{2} \geq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{G}_{i}G_{j}(w_{j}(t_{k}^{i}) - w_{j}(t_{k}^{i})) \right\|_{2}.$$

So, one obtains

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{G}_{i}G_{j}(w_{j}(t_{k}^{i}) - w_{j}(t_{k}^{i})) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} (e^{\alpha(t_{k+1}^{i} - t_{k}^{i})} - 1).$$

After simple calculation, one can get

$$\alpha(t_{k+1}^{i} - t_{k}^{i}) \geq \frac{\ln 1 + \ln \left( \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} (e^{\alpha(t_{k+1}^{i} - t_{k}^{i})} - 1) \right)}{\beta} > 0,$$

which implies the network does not exhibit Zeno behavior.
Theorem 3.1. The error system (5) with the event-triggered condition (3) realizes output-passive strict passivity if there are a constant 0 < σ < \( \bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} g_i \), a real number \( \kappa_1 > 0 \) and a matrix 0 < \( \Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) such that
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\Psi_1 \\
\Xi_1 \\
\Psi_2
\end{pmatrix} \leq 0,
\]
(8)
where
\[
\Psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Omega \ & \ & \ \\ H & \ & \ \\ 0 & \ & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_N \ & \ & \ \\ H & \ & \ \\ 0 & \ & \end{pmatrix} = I_N \otimes \left( \Omega HH^T \Omega + \Omega BB^T \Omega + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i \Omega^2 + \nabla \right) + \nabla \end{pmatrix}
\]
and
\[
\Psi_2 = I_N \otimes \left( \kappa_1 Q_i^T Q_2 - Q_i^T Q_2 \right)
\]

Proof: The Lyapunov functional \( V(t) \) for network (5) is chosen as:
\[
V(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega z_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\chi_j^2}{1-\varepsilon} \int_{t-\tau(t)}^{t} z_j^2(s) ds,
\]
(9)
Take the upper right derivative of \( V(t) \) with regard to \( t \), we have
\[
D^+ V(t) = - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( 1-\varepsilon(t) \right)^x_2 \frac{\chi_j^2}{1-\varepsilon} \int_{t-\tau(t)}^{t} z_j^2(s) ds,
\]
(10)
By utilizing some related inequalities, we can get
\[
2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega H \dot{f}_i(z_i(t)) \leq z_i^T(t) \left[ I_N \otimes \left( \Omega HH^T \Omega + \nabla \right) \right] z_i(t),
\]
(11)
\[
2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega B \ddot{x}(z_i(t-\tau(t))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega B B^T \Omega z_i(t)
\]
(12)
\[
= z_i^T(t-\tau(t)) (I_N \otimes \chi) z_i(t-\tau(t)) + z_i^T(t) \Omega B B^T \Omega z_i(t)
\]
(13)
Based on (6), we can get
\[
2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega \sum_{j=1}^{m} d_j G_i^T (z_i(t) - z_j(t))
\]
(14)
According to (7), we have
\[
\frac{m}{N} \sum_{s=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_s \tilde{G}_i^T (z_i(t) - \vartheta_j(t))
\]
(15)
It follows from (9)-(15) that
\[
D^+ V(t) \leq z^T(t) \left( I_N \otimes \left( \Omega HH^T \Omega + \Omega BB^T \Omega + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i \Omega^2 + \nabla \right) + \nabla \right) z(t)
\]
(16)
Furthermore,
\[
D^+ V(t) + \kappa_1 y^T(t) y(t) - 2y^T(t) u(t) \leq \hat{z}^T(t) \left( I_n \otimes \left( -2\Omega A + \Omega H H^T \Omega + \Omega B B^T \Omega + \hat{\sigma} \right) \right) + 2\sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2 + 4N \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s (\hat{\gamma}_s)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{(\sigma - \hat{\sigma})^2} \right) I_n + \hat{\beta} \left[ \sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s [G^s \otimes (\Omega^s + \hat{\Gamma}^s)] \right] \hat{\gamma}_s^2 \hat{z}(t) + 2z^T(t) \left( I_n \otimes \left( -Q_1^T \right) \right) u(t) + \kappa_2 u^T(t) u(t) - 2u^T(t) \left( I_n \otimes Q_2^T \right) u(t) \leq \zeta^T(t) \left( \Psi_3 \otimes \Psi_2 \right) \zeta(t),
\]
where
\[
\Psi_1 = I_n \otimes \left( \Omega H H^T \Omega + \Omega B B^T \Omega + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2 + \hat{\sigma} \right) + 2\Omega A + \hat{\beta} \sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s \hat{\gamma}_s^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{(\sigma - \hat{\sigma})^2} \right) I_n + \kappa_1 Q_1^T Q_1 - Q_2^T Q_2 - Q_2^T Q_2.
\]
Therefore,
\[
D^+ V(t) \leq 2y^T(t) u(t) - \kappa_1 y^T(t) y(t).
\]
One obtains
\[
V(t_b) - V(t_a) \leq 2\int_{t_a}^{t_b} y^T(z) u(z) dz - \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \kappa_1 y^T(z) y(z) dz
\]
for any \(t_a, t_b \in [0, +\infty)\) and \(t_b \geq t_a\). Namely,
\[
\bar{V}(t_b) - \bar{V}(t_a) \leq \int_{t_a}^{t_b} y^T(z) u(z) - \kappa_1 y^T(z) y(z) dz,
\]
where \(\bar{V}(t) = \frac{V(t)}{2}\). □

**Theorem 3.2.** The error system (5) realizes input-strict passivity under the condition (3), if there are a constant \(0 < \sigma < \bar{\sigma} = \frac{\bar{\gamma}_s^2}{4N \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2} \), a real number \(\kappa_2 > 0\) and a matrix \(0 < \Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) such that
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\Psi_3 & \Xi_2 \\
\Xi_2 & \Psi_4
\end{pmatrix} \leq 0,
\]
where
\[
\Psi_3 = I_n \otimes \left( -2\Omega A + \Omega H H^T \Omega + \Omega B B^T \Omega + \hat{\sigma} \right) + 2\sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2 + 4N \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s (\hat{\gamma}_s)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{(\sigma - \hat{\sigma})^2} \right) I_n + \sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s [G^s \otimes (\Omega^s + \hat{\Gamma}^s)] \Xi_2 = I_n \otimes \left( -Q_1^T \right) \Psi_4 = I_n \otimes \left( \kappa_2 I_n - Q_2^T \right). \]  

**Proof:** Selecting the same Lyapunov functional as (9), one can get
\[
D^+ V(t) + \kappa_2 u^T(t) u(t) - 2y^T(t) u(t) \leq \hat{z}^T(t) \left( I_n \otimes \left( -2\Omega A + \Omega H H^T \Omega + \Omega B B^T \Omega + \hat{\sigma} \right) \right) + 2\sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2 + 4N \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s (\hat{\gamma}_s)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{(\sigma - \hat{\sigma})^2} \right) I_n + \hat{\beta} \left[ \sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s [G^s \otimes (\Omega^s + \hat{\Gamma}^s)] \right] \hat{\gamma}_s^2 \hat{z}(t) + 2z^T(t) \left( I_n \otimes \left( \Omega - Q_1^T \right) \right) u(t) + \kappa_2 u^T(t) u(t) - 2u^T(t) \left( I_n \otimes Q_2^T \right) u(t) \leq \zeta^T(t) \left( \Psi_3 \otimes \Psi_2 \right) \zeta(t),
\]
where
\[
\Psi_3 = I_n \otimes \left( -2\Omega A + \Omega H H^T \Omega + \Omega B B^T \Omega + \hat{\sigma} \right) + 2\sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2 + 4N \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s (\hat{\gamma}_s)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{(\sigma - \hat{\sigma})^2} \right) I_n + \sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s [G^s \otimes (\Omega^s + \hat{\Gamma}^s)] \Xi_2 = I_n \otimes \left( \Omega - Q_1^T \right) \Psi_4 = I_n \otimes \left( \kappa_2 I_n - Q_2^T \right). \]

As a special case of input-strict passivity, it is very easy to deduce the following passivity criterion. To avoid repetition, we omit the proof for this result.

**Theorem 3.3.** The system (5) with the condition (3) realizes passivity if there are a constant \(0 < \sigma < \bar{\sigma} = \frac{\bar{\gamma}_s^2}{4N \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2} \) and a matrix \(0 < \Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) such that
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\Psi_3 & \Xi_2 \\
\Xi_2 & \Psi_4
\end{pmatrix} \leq 0,
\]
where
\[
\Psi_3 = I_n \otimes \left( -2\Omega A + \Omega H H^T \Omega + \Omega B B^T \Omega + \hat{\sigma} \right) + 2\sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \hat{\sigma}^2 + 4N \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s (\hat{\gamma}_s)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{(\sigma - \hat{\sigma})^2} \right) I_n + \sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s [G^s \otimes (\Omega^s + \hat{\Gamma}^s)] \Xi_2 = I_n \otimes \left( \Omega - Q_1^T \right) \Psi_4 = I_n \otimes \left( \kappa_2 I_n - Q_2^T \right). \]

### 3.3 Synchronization analysis

**Definition 3.1.** The network (1) is synchronized under the event-triggered condition (3), if
\[
\lim_{t \to +\infty} ||u_i(t) - r^*||_2 = 0,
\]
under the condition \(u_i(t) = (0, 0, \cdots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n\), for all \(i = 1, 2, \cdots, N\).

**Theorem 3.4.** Assume that \(\mathcal{R} : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)\) is continuously differentiable and meets
\[
u_1(||z(t)||_2) \leq \mathcal{R}(t) \leq \nu_2(||z(t)||_2),
\]
where \( ||z(t)||_2 = \sup_{-\theta \leq \theta \leq 0} ||z(t + \theta)||_2 \), the continuous functions \(\nu_1, \nu_2 : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)\) are strictly monotonically
increasing, \( \nu_1(e) \) and \( \nu_2(e) \) are positive for \( e > 0 \) with \( \nu_1(0) = \nu_2(0) = 0 \), then the network (1) is synchronized under the event-triggered condition (3) if it is output-strictly passive with regard to \( \mathcal{R}(t) \) and matrix \( Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m 	imes m} \) is nonsingular.

**Proof:** If system (5) is output-strictly passive with regard to storage function \( \mathcal{R}(t) \), then there is a positive constant \( \kappa_1 \) satisfying

\[
\mathcal{R}(t+c) - \mathcal{R}(t) \leq \int_t^{t+c} y^T(z)u(z)dz - \int_t^{t+c} \kappa_1 y^T(z)y(z)dz,
\]

where \( c \in [0, +\infty) \) and \( 0 < \kappa < \infty \). Hence,

\[
\mathcal{R}(t+c) - \mathcal{R}(t) \leq \int_t^{t+c} y^T(z)u(z)dz - \int_t^{t+c} \kappa_1 y^T(z)y(z)dz.
\]

Let \( \varsigma \to 0 \), we can get

\[
D^+ \mathcal{R}(t) \leq y^T(t)u(t) - \kappa_1 y^T(t)y(t).
\]

Since \( u(t) = 0 \), we have

\[
D^+ \mathcal{R}(t) \leq -\kappa_1 z^T(t)(I_N \otimes (Q_1^T Q_1))z(t)
\]

\[
\leq -\kappa_1 \lambda_{\min}(1) \|z(t)\|^2.
\]

where \( D^+ \mathcal{R}(t) \) is the upper right derivative of \( \mathcal{R}(t) \) along the solution of error system (5). From (21) and (22), we can get that the system (5) is asymptotically stable. Therefore, the network (1) is synchronized under the event-triggered condition (3) in the sense of Definition 3.1.

Based on Theorems 3.1 and 3.4, we can obtain the conclusion as follows.

**Corollary 3.1.** If there exist a constant \( 0 < \sigma < \bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2N \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{ij}} \), a real number \( \kappa_1 > 0 \), two matrices \( 0 < \Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) and \( Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \) such that

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\Psi_1 & \Xi_1 \\
\Xi_1^T & \Psi_2
\end{pmatrix} \leq 0,
\]

where \( Q_1 \) is a nonsingular matrix, \( \Psi_1 = I_N \otimes (2\Omega^2 + \Omega H \Omega^T \Omega + \Omega B B^T \Omega + \sigma + \frac{\Omega^2}{\sigma^2} + 2\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i\omega_i^2 + 4\Omega \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \bar{g}_i^2)^{1/2} \).

Then the network (1) is synchronized under the event-triggered condition (3).

**Remark 3.** Generally speaking, most of CNNs cannot achieve passivity and synchronization by themselves in many situations. Thus, it is necessary to adopt some control methods in these cases. Recently, event-triggered control method has been turned out a successful strategy for achieving passivity and synchronization of networks, which has many advantages, such as less data transfer, better resource utilization, smaller state error and so on. Therefore, some scholars have investigated event-triggered passivity and synchronization of CNNs [40–42]. Due to the above mentioned advantages of event-triggered control strategy, it is also meaningful to investigate passivity and synchronization of MWCNNs based on event-triggered mechanism. However, there is no results reported on this topic until now. In this section, several event-triggered passivity and passivity-based synchronization criteria are firstly established for MWCNNs by employing some new inequality techniques and Lyapunov functional method.

**Remark 4.** Due to the introduction of multi-weighted coupling term in the network model, the problem for achieving the event-triggered passivity and synchronization of the considered network becomes more complex, which cannot be dealt with by using the traditional event-triggered control techniques for CNNs with single weights. For overcoming this difficulty, a novel event-triggered condition (3) is designed by utilizing the own characteristics of our network model, which is an improvement of the existing event-triggered condition in literatures [13, 16]. Moreover, some new inequality techniques need to be employed in (6) and the proof of our theoretical results because of the multi-weighted coupling term and the new designed event-triggered condition. In Theorems 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and Corollary 3.1, several criteria are proposed for achieving the passivity and synchronization of MWCNNs under the event-triggered condition (3), which are dependent on the multi-weighted coupling term.

### 4. Event-triggered robust passivity analysis of MWCNNs

#### 4.1. Network model

In this section, we study the network model (1), in which the parameters \( A, B, H \) are changed within a certain range of accuracy as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
A_T & := \{ A = \text{diag}(a_i) : A^- \leq A \leq A^+, 0 < a_i^- < a_i^+ \} \\
B_T & := \{ B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n}, B^- \leq B \leq B^+, b_{ij} \in b_{ij} \} \\
H_T & := \{ H = (h_{ij})_{n \times n} : H^- \leq H \leq H^+, h_{ij} \in h_{ij} \}
\end{align*}
\]

(24)

Additionally, for convenience, we denote

\[
\hat{b}_{ij} = \max\{|b_{ij}|, |b_{ij}^+|\}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n;
\]

\[
\hat{h}_{ij} = \max\{|h_{ij}|, |h_{ij}^+|\}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n;
\]

\[
\xi_B = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{b}_{ij}^2, \quad \xi_H = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{h}_{ij}^2.
\]

4.2. Robust passivity analysis

**Theorem 4.1.** The system (5) with the ranges of parameters defined by (24) realizes robust output-strict passivity under the condition (3), if there exist a constant \( 0 < \sigma < \bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{g}_i^2}} \), a real number \( \kappa_1 > 0 \) and a matrix \( 0 < \Omega = \text{diag}(\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) such that

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\Psi_1 & \Xi_1 \\
\Xi_1^T & \Psi_2
\end{pmatrix} \leq 0,
\]

(25)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\Psi_1 & = I_N \otimes (-2\Omega^2 + (\xi_H + \xi_B) \Omega^2 + \sigma + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \bar{d}_i \omega_i^2 + 4\Omega \sum_{i=1}^{m} \bar{d}_i \bar{g}_i^2)^{1/2} I_N \\
\Xi_1 & = I_N \otimes (\kappa_1 Q_1^T Q_1 - Q_1^2 - Q)^T, \\
\Psi_2 & = I_N \otimes (\kappa_1 Q_1^2 Q_2 - Q_2^2 - Q_2^2).
\end{align*}
\]
Proof: Choose the same Lyapunov functional $V(t)$ as (9). Similarly, one has

$$D^TV(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\chi^2}{1-\varepsilon} z_{ij}^2(t) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{(1-\hat{\tau}(t))\chi^2}{1-\varepsilon} z_{ij}^2(t-\tau(t)) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega \left[ -Az_i(t) + H\hat{f}(z_i(t)) + u_i(t) + B\hat{\chi}(z_i(t-\tau(t))) + \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s G_{ij} \Gamma^s z_j(t) \right] + \sum_{s=1}^{m} \sum_{i,j \in N_i} \tilde{d}_s \tilde{G}_{ij} \left( z_i(t) + \psi_i(t) - z_j(t) - \psi_j(t) \right). \quad (26)$$

Obviously, we have

$$-2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega A z_i(t) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{p=1}^{n} \omega_p a_p z_{ip}^2(t) \leq -2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{p=1}^{n} \omega_p a_p \tilde{z}_{ip}^2(t) = z_i^T(t) \left[ I_N \otimes \left( -2\Omega A^\top \right) \right] z(t), \quad (27)$$

$$2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega H \hat{f}(z_i(t)) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega_p a_p z_{ip}^2(t) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega_p a_p \tilde{z}_{ip}^2(t) = \hat{z}^T(t) \left[ I_N \otimes \left( \xi H \Omega^2 + \hat{\omega} \right) \right] \hat{z}(t), \quad (28)$$

$$2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega B \tilde{\chi}(z_i(t-\tau(t))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t-\tau(t)) \tilde{\chi} z_i(t-\tau(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^T(t) \Omega B B^\top \Omega z_i(t) = z_i^T(t-\tau(t))(I_N \otimes \hat{\chi}) z(t-\tau(t)) + z_i^T(t) \left[ I_N \otimes \left( \xi B \Omega^2 \right) \right] z(t). \quad (29)$$

By (13)-(15), (27)-(29), we know that

$$D^TV(t) \preceq z^T(t) \left\{ I_N \otimes \left( -2\Omega A^\top + (\xi_H + \xi_B) \Omega^2 + \hat{\omega} \right) + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \tilde{G}_{ij} \Gamma^s z_j(t) \right\} z(t) + 2z^T(t)(I_N \otimes \hat{\chi}) z(t) \preceq 2z^T(t)(I_N \otimes \hat{\chi}) z(t) \preceq 2z^T(t)(I_N \otimes \hat{\chi}) z(t). \quad (30)$$

Furthermore,

$$D^TV(t) - 2y^T(t)u(t) + \kappa_1 y^T(t)y(t) \preceq z^T(t) \left\{ I_N \otimes \left( -2\Omega A^\top + (\xi_H + \xi_B) \Omega^2 + \hat{\omega} \right) + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \tilde{G}_{ij} \Gamma^s z_j(t) \right\} z(t) - 2u^T(t) \left( I_N \otimes Q^2 \right) u(t) + \kappa_1 \left[ z^T(t) \left( I_N \otimes (Q^2 Q_1) \right) z(t) + u^T(t) \left( I_N \otimes (Q^2 Q_1) \right) u(t) \right] = \hat{z}^T(t) \left\{ \hat{\Psi}_1 \hat{\xi}_1 \hat{\Omega}_1 \hat{\Psi}_2 \right\} \hat{z}(t). \quad (31)$$

where $\hat{\Psi}_1 = I_N \otimes \left( -2\Omega A^\top + (\xi_H + \xi_B) \Omega^2 + \hat{\omega} \right) + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{m} \tilde{d}_s \tilde{G}_{ij} \Gamma^s z_j(t)$, $\hat{\Omega}_1 = I_N \otimes \left( \Omega - Q^T \right)$, $\hat{\xi}_1 = I_N \otimes (Q^2 Q_1)$, and $\hat{\Psi}_2 = I_N \otimes (Q^2 Q_2)$. By referring to the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can get

$$V(t_0) - \tilde{V}(t_0) \leq \int_{t_0}^{t} \left( y^T z \right) u(z) - \frac{\kappa_1}{2} y^T(z) y(z) \right) dz, \quad (32)$$

where $\tilde{V}(t) = \frac{V(t)}{2}$. \hfill \Box

Theorem 4.2. The system (5) with the parameter uncertainties given by (24) under the event-triggered condition (3) realizes robust input-strict passivity, if there exist a constant $0 < \sigma < \epsilon$
Choose the same Lyapunov functional as (9), we get
\[
\dot{V}(t) = -2\alpha A^2 + (\xi H + \xi B)\Omega^2 + \omega + 2\sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s\Omega^2 + 4N\sum_{s=1}^{m} \Delta_s(g_s)^2\left(1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma - \sigma}\right)I_n + m\sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s(G^s \\
\otimes(\Omega^s + \Gamma^s)) \dot{\xi}_s = I_N \otimes (\Omega - Q_1^T), \quad \dot{\varphi}_4 = I_N \otimes (\kappa_2 I_n - Q_2^T).
\]

Proof: Choose the same Lyapunov functional as (9), we get
\[
\dot{V}(t) = -2\alpha A^2 + (\xi H + \xi B)\Omega^2 + \omega + 2\sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s\Omega^2 + 4N\sum_{s=1}^{m} \Delta_s(g_s)^2\left(1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma - \sigma}\right)I_n + m\sum_{s=1}^{m} d_s(G^s \\
\otimes(\Omega^s + \Gamma^s)) \dot{\xi}_s = I_N \otimes (\Omega - Q_1^T), \quad \dot{\varphi}_4 = I_N \otimes (\kappa_2 I_n - Q_2^T).
\]

Similarly, we have the following conclusion.

**Theorem 4.3.** The system (5) with the ranges of parameters given by (24) realizes robust passivity under the condition (3), if there exist a constant \(0 < \sigma < \bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2N\sum_{s=1}^{m} g_s}\) and a matrix \(0 < \Omega = \text{diag}(\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\varphi}_3 \\
\dot{\varphi}_4
\end{bmatrix} \leq 0.
\]

**4.3 Robust synchronization analysis**

**Definition 4.1.** If for all \(A \in A_1, B \in B_1, H \in H_1\),
\[
\lim_{t \to +\infty} \| u(t) - r \|_2 = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N
\]
holds, then the network (1) with the parameter uncertainties given by (24) realizes robust synchronization under the conditions (3) and \((u(t) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N)\).

**Theorem 4.4.** Assume that \(\tilde{\rho} : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)\) is continuously differentiable and meets
\[
\nu_1(\|z\|_2) \leq \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{\rho}(\|z\|_2)), \quad (36)
\]
where \(\|z\|_2 = \sup_{-\tau < \theta < 0} \|z(t + \theta)\|_2\), the continuous functions \(\nu_1, \nu_2 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)\) are strictly monotonically increasing and \(\nu_1(e)\), \(\nu_2(e)\) are positive for \(e > 0\) with \(\nu(e) = 0\). Then, the MWCNNs (1) with the uncertain parameters defined by (24) under the event-triggered condition (3) is robustly synchronized if it is output-strictly passive with regard to \(\tilde{\rho}(\cdot)\) and matrix \(Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) is nonsingular.

**Proof:** If system (5) with the uncertain parameters defined by (24) is robustly output-strictly passive with regard to storage function \(\tilde{\rho}(\cdot)\), then
\[
\tilde{\rho}(t + \gamma) - \tilde{\rho}(t) \leq \int_t^{t+\gamma} y^T(z)u(z)dz - \int_t^{t+\gamma} \nu_1(y^T(z))y(z)dz,
\]
where \(t \in [0, +\infty), 0 < \gamma \in \mathbb{R}\). Thus,
\[
\tilde{\rho}(t + \gamma) - \tilde{\rho}(t) \leq \int_t^{t+\gamma} y^T(z)u(z)dz - \int_t^{t+\gamma} \nu_1(y^T(z))y(z)dz.
\]
Let \(\gamma \rightarrow 0\), one has
\[
D^+ \tilde{\rho}(\nu_1(\|z\|_2)), \quad (37)
\]
where \(u(t) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n\), we can get
\[
D^+ \tilde{\rho}(\nu_1(\|z\|_2)), \quad (37)
\]
which follows from (36) and (37) that the system (5) with the uncertain parameters given by (24) is robustly asymptotically stable. Then, the network (1) with the uncertain parameters defined by (24) is robustly synchronized under the event-triggered condition (3) in the sense of Definition 4.1.

Based on Theorems 4.1 and 4.4, we can obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.1.** If there exist a constant \(0 < \sigma < \bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2N\sum_{s=1}^{m} g_s}\), a real number \(\kappa_1 > 0\), two matrices \(0 < \Omega = \text{diag}(\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) and \(Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\varphi}_3 \\
\dot{\varphi}_4
\end{bmatrix} \leq 0.
\]

The change processes
\begin{equation}
\tilde{\sigma}_{j} = \text{diag}(0.25, 0.25, 0.25), \quad \tilde{x} = \text{diag}(0.0625, 0.0625, 0.0625) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho^* = (0, 0, 0)^T. \quad \text{Take} \quad \sigma = 0.054 \quad \text{in the triggering event condition (3). By making use of MATLAB, the following matrix} \quad \Omega \quad \text{and a constant} \quad \kappa_1 \quad \text{satisfying} \quad (8) \quad \text{can be computed:} \\
\kappa_1 = 0.0081, \\
\Omega = \begin{pmatrix}
1.5575 & -0.7689 & 0.4317 \\
-0.7689 & 1.9896 & 0.5151 \\
0.4317 & 0.5151 & 1.8167
\end{pmatrix}.
\end{equation}

In light of Theorem 3.1, the system (39) is event-triggered output-strictly passive in the sense of Definition 2.3. The change processes of state, input, output and event-triggered time instants are shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 respectively.  Fig. 3 shows the related dynamical change processes of the storage function} \quad \tilde{V}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}_{j} \tilde{x}^2
\text{and the integral of} \quad \int_0^t \left( y^T(z)u(z) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}_{j} \tilde{x}^2 \right) dz
\text{, which is an intuitive reflection of output-strict passivity in the sense of Definition 2.3.}
The evolution of the event-triggered time instants of the state vectors $\|w_i(t)\|$ and input vector $\|u_i(t)\|$, $(i = 1, 2, \cdots, 6)$.

**Example 5.2.** Given the following MWCNNs with event-triggered communication:

$$w_i(t) = - Aw_i(t) + \sum_{s=1}^{3} \sum_{j \in N_i} \delta_x G_{ij} (w_i(t) - w_j(t)) + L$$

$$+ H f(w_i(t)) + \sum_{s=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{6} d_s G_{ij} \Gamma^a w_j(t)$$

$$+ Bu_i(t - \tau(t)), \tag{40}$$

where $i = 1, 2, \cdots, 6$; $d_1 = 0.3, d_2 = 0.6, d_3 = 0.7; \delta_1 = 0.01, \delta_2 = 0.02, \delta_3 = 0.03; \tau(t) = 0.08 - 0.06e^{-t}, \varepsilon = 0.06; L = (0, 0, 0)^T$; $f_i(a) = [a+1] - [a-1], \ v_i(a) = [a+1] - [a-1], \ \iota = 1, 2, 3; \Gamma^1 = \text{diag}(0.01, 0.05, 0.06), \Gamma^2 = \text{diag}(0.04, 0.07, 0.08), \Gamma^3 = \text{diag}(0.01, 0.09, 0.03)$; and the parameters $A, B, H$ are given as the following ranges:

$$A_I := \{A = \text{diag}(a_i) : A^{-} \leq A \leq A^{+}, 0 < a_i \leq a_i \leq 6i, i = 1, 2, 3, \forall A \in A^I\};$$

$$B_I := \{B = (b_{ij}^k)_{n \times n} : B^{-} \leq B \leq B^{+}, \frac{1}{\tau+\varepsilon} \leq b_{ij} \leq \frac{1}{\tau+\varepsilon} i = 1, 2, 3 \}, \forall B \in B_I\};$$

$$H_I := \{H = (h_{ij})_{n \times n} : H^{-} \leq H \leq H^{+}, \frac{1}{\tau+\varepsilon} \leq h_{ij} \leq \frac{1}{\tau+\varepsilon} i = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, 2, 3, \forall H \in H_I\}.$$
Evidently, $\dot{\sigma} = \text{diag}(0.25, 0.25, 0.25)$, $\dot{\chi} = \text{diag}(0.0625, 0.0625, 0.0625)$ and $r^* = (0, 0, 0)^T$. Take $\sigma = 0.059$ in the triggering event condition (3). By making use of MATLAB, the following matrix $\Omega$ and a constant $\kappa_1$ satisfying (38) can be computed:

$$\kappa_1 = 0.0833,$$

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 2.5325 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.4540 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1.0882 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Fig. 4: The evolution of the state vectors $\|w_i(t)\|$, $(i = 1, 2, \cdots, 6)$.  

Fig. 5: The evolution of the event-triggered time instants of the state vectors $w_i(t)$, $(i = 1, 2, \cdots, 6)$.  

According to Corollary 4.1, the system (40) is event-triggered robustly synchronized in the sense of Definition 4.1. The change processes of the state vectors and event-triggered time instants are shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 respectively.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, the event-triggered passivity and synchronization of MWCNNs with and without parameter uncertainties have been studied. Under the help of the Lyapunov functional method, we have provided several sufficient conditions to ensure the passivity of the proposed network model and have acquired a synchronization criterion based on the obtained output-strict passivity condition for the presented network model. Besides, the robust passivity and robust synchronization have also been investigated for the MWCNNs with event-triggered communication and uncertain parameters. Finally, two illustrative examples have been shown to testify the validity of the passivity and synchronization conditions.
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