International Journal of Mathematics and Statistics
ISSN (Online): 2208-2212
Volume 11 Issue 02 June 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.53555/wgtskx77

MULTIPLE SWITCHING SYNCHRONIZATION: THEORY, METHODS, AND APPLICATIONS

Jayanta Biswas[1]*

[1]*Department of Mathematics, IILM University, Greater Noida, U.P., India, 201306*
Corresponding Author: Jayanta Biswas

Submittal Declaration:
The authors declare that this manuscript is original, has not been published elsewhere in any form, and is not under consideration by any other publication. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agree with its submission.

Abstract
This review synthesizes the state of the art in multiple switching synchronization for chaotic and complex dynamical systems. We formalize the concept, contrast it with single switching and continuous coupling, and survey stability tools including common and multiple Lyapunov functions, average dwell-time, and sliding/adaptive control under switching. Variants such as complete, lag, generalized, projective, intermittent, and fractional-order multiple switching synchronization are compared. We summarize applications in secure communications, power and energy systems, neural dynamics, robotics and multi-agent systems, and outline open problems regarding robustness, implementation, and data-driven switching policies. The article aims to provide a self-contained reference for researchers and practitioners.

Keywords: *Chaos synchronization; multiple switching; Hybrid systems; Average dwell-time; Lyapunov stability; Fractional-order systems*

Introduction

Synchronization of chaotic systems is one of the most influential concepts in nonlinear science and engineering. Since the pioneering work of Pecora and Carroll in the early 1990s, who demonstrated that two chaotic oscillators could be synchronized by appropriate coupling, the field has matured into a broad discipline encompassing theory, computation, and applications across physics, biology, communications, and control engineering. The study of synchronization has revealed fundamental insights into the collective behavior of nonlinear dynamical systems, while also motivating practical applications such as secure communications, power grid stability, biomedical signal analysis, and robotics.

Over the past three decades, synchronization theory has steadily evolved. Early research concentrated on continuous coupling schemes with fixed structures, where stability could be established via Lyapunov functions, linearization, or master stability function analysis. However, real-world systems are seldom stationary: parameters may drift, network topologies may change, actuators may switch modes, and environmental disturbances may be intermittent. This has led to the emergence of *switching synchronization*, in which the coupling or controller changes according to a switching signal $\sigma(t) \in \{1,2,\dots,M\}$ that selects one of multiple subsystems or control modes.

Multiple switching synchronization (MSS) extends this paradigm by allowing the dynamics, controllers, or coupling configurations to switch among several possible modes. Instead of requiring fixed stability in a single system configuration, MSS requires that synchronization be preserved under arbitrary or structured switching, often governed by rules such as average dwell-time (ADT) or state-dependent laws. The significance of MSS lies in its ability to address systems with uncertainty, nonstationarity, and hybrid behaviors, which are increasingly common in engineering, communications, and natural phenomena.

Historical development and motivations

The initial motivation for MSS arises from the limitations of fixed-mode synchronization. For instance, in communication systems employing chaotic masking, parameters may need to switch for security purposes, thereby complicating synchronization. Similarly, in mechanical or electronic systems, switching controllers are used to balance performance and robustness, while in biology, neural networks often switch between modes of activity. To capture these phenomena, researchers began exploring synchronization under switching topologies and controllers in the early 2000s.

One of the early systematic treatments of switching in synchronization was developed by Wu, Lu, and Yu , who established synchronization criteria for complex networks with switching topology using average dwell-time analysis. Their work demonstrated that synchronization can be guaranteed if the switching is not too rapid, quantified by dwell-time conditions. This opened the door for synchronization analysis in networked systems subject to random or designed switching.

Subsequent studies advanced both the theory and application of MSS. Aguila-Camacho *et al.* extended synchronization to fractional-order chaotic systems, where switching controllers were required to handle both memory effects and uncertainties. Li and Chen investigated generalized projective synchronization with switching, while Pham addressed adaptive switching control in uncertain chaotic systems, highlighting robustness against parameter variations and external disturbances. These works collectively established MSS as a flexible and powerful framework, integrating adaptive control, sliding-mode design, and hybrid system theory.

Conceptual framework

In general terms, multiple switching synchronization can be described as follows. Let two chaotic systems be represented by

$$\dot{x}(t) = f\big(x(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t), \qquad \dot{y}(t) = f\big(y(t)\big) + v_{\sigma(t)}(t),$$

where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the states of the drive and response systems, $u_{\sigma(t)}(t)$ and $v_{\sigma(t)}(t)$ are controllers that depend on the switching signal $\sigma(t)$, and f is a chaotic vector field. The goal of MSS is to design switching laws and controllers such that the synchronization error $e(t) = y(t) - x(t)$ converges to zero (or another desired manifold) despite the switches.

Unlike classical synchronization, MSS introduces challenges such as:

- **Discontinuities in dynamics:** At switching instants, the governing equations may change abruptly, requiring stability proofs under hybrid dynamics.
- **Non-uniform convergence:** Synchronization may depend on dwell-time constraints or switching sequences.
- **Robustness:** Switching must tolerate parametric uncertainty, delays, and noise.

To tackle these challenges, tools from switched and hybrid systems theory are employed. Lyapunov-like functions adapted to switching, multiple Lyapunov functions, and average dwell-time arguments are commonly used to guarantee stability under MSS.

Related work and contributions

Pivotal developments in MSS include:

- **Adaptive switching laws:** Controllers adapt parameters in real time to preserve synchronization despite uncertainties .
- **Sliding-mode under switching:** Robustness against perturbations and model uncertainties is achieved through variable-structure control laws that switch across modes.
- **Average dwell-time guarantees:** Wu, Lu, and Yu formalized dwell-time criteria ensuring stability despite frequent switching.

- **Fractional-order and uncertainty design:** Aguila-Camacho *et al.* showed that fractional derivatives add memory effects that can be addressed within MSS.
- **Generalized synchronization:** Li and Chen extended synchronization concepts to generalized and projective forms under switching conditions.

Our contributions. Building on this foundation, this review article provides:

- A unified formulation of MSS across integer-order and fractional-order chaotic systems;
- A consolidated toolbox of stability methods applicable to switching synchronization;
- A structured comparison of MSS variants, including adaptive, sliding-mode, and fractional-order approaches;
- Application perspectives in secure communications, biological systems, robotics, and power networks;
- Open challenges and benchmark suggestions to guide future research.

Organization of the review

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 provides mathematical preliminaries, including the definition of switched systems, Lyapunov functions under switching, and fractional-order extensions. Section 3 surveys stability tools used in MSS, including multiple Lyapunov functions, common Lyapunov functions, and average dwell-time conditions. Section 4 reviews control strategies for MSS, covering adaptive design, sliding-mode methods, impulsive control, and robust design under uncertainty. Section 5 highlights representative applications of MSS in engineering and science. Section 6 discusses numerical methods and simulation frameworks for MSS. Section 7 outlines emerging trends, including data-driven synchronization, machine learning integration, and quantum-inspired switching. Finally, Section 8 concludes the review with a synthesis of challenges and opportunities.

Significance of this review

The significance of this review lies in its consolidation of the MSS framework across diverse methodologies and application domains. While individual papers have addressed adaptive switching, sliding-mode synchronization, or fractional-order extensions, there has been no comprehensive attempt to unify these approaches under a single taxonomy. This article aims to fill that gap, serving both as a reference for researchers entering the field and as a roadmap for practitioners seeking robust synchronization strategies for real-world systems with switching behaviors.

Scope and limitations

It is important to note that this review focuses on synchronization problems under *multiple switching*, where both the plant and controller may switch among several modes. Related but distinct topics include event-triggered synchronization, sampled-data synchronization, and pinning control in networks, which are mentioned only in passing. Furthermore, while numerical simulations and selected applications are discussed, the review emphasizes theoretical results and comparative analysis.

In summary, multiple switching synchronization represents a powerful and necessary extension of classical chaotic synchronization, enabling stability and control under hybrid, uncertain, and time-varying environments. This introduction has outlined the motivations, historical development, related work, and contributions of this article, providing the foundation for the detailed discussions that follow.

Mathematical Preliminaries

To analyze and design controllers for multiple switching synchronization (MSS), it is essential to establish a rigorous mathematical foundation. This section introduces the core concepts of switched systems, stability tools, Lyapunov functions under switching, and fractional-order extensions. We also include a simple numerical illustration to connect theory with practice. These preliminaries will serve as the groundwork for the subsequent sections on stability analysis, control strategies, and applications.

Switched dynamical systems

A switched system is a dynamical system that consists of a family of subsystems and a switching rule determining which subsystem is active at a given time. Formally, consider M subsystems indexed by $i \in \{1,2,\dots,M\}$:

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_i\big(x(t)\big), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where each $f_i\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth vector field. The switching signal $\sigma(t)\colon [0,\infty) \to \{1,\dots,M\}$ selects at each instant t the active subsystem. The switched system is then written as

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big).$$

In synchronization problems, the switched system may describe the drive, the response, or the controller. Multiple switching synchronization (MSS) arises when both the system dynamics and the coupling/control strategies switch across modes.

Synchronization error dynamics under switching

Let the drive system be

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t),$$

and the response system be

$$\dot{y}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(y(t)\big) + v_{\sigma(t)}(t),$$

where $u_{\sigma(t)}(t), v_{\sigma(t)}(t)$ are mode-dependent control inputs. Define the synchronization error as

$$e(t) = y(t) - x(t).$$

Subtracting the two dynamics yields

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(y(t)\big) - f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big) + v_{\sigma(t)}(t) - u_{\sigma(t)}(t).$$

The objective of MSS is to design $u_{\sigma(t)}$ and $v_{\sigma(t)}$ such that $e(t) \to 0$ (or another desired manifold) despite the mode switches.

Stability concepts under switching

Stability analysis of switched systems differs from classical systems because of discontinuities induced by switching. Two central notions are:

Common Lyapunov function (CLF):

If there exists a single Lyapunov function $V: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that for all modes i,

$$\dot{V}(x) = \nabla V(x) \cdot f_i(x) \leq -\alpha \|x\|^2,$$

then the switched system is globally asymptotically stable under arbitrary switching. CLFs are powerful but may not always exist.

Multiple Lyapunov functions (MLF):

When a CLF cannot be found, one may assign a separate Lyapunov function V_i to each subsystem i. Stability is guaranteed under restrictions such as average dwell-time (ADT), which ensures that switching is not too fast. If

$$\dot{V}_i(x) \leq -\alpha_i \|x\|^2, \quad \forall i,$$

and the switching satisfies ADT, then stability holds. This is a key tool in MSS analysis.

Average dwell-time (ADT)

The average dwell-time condition regulates the frequency of switches. Let $N_\sigma(t_0, t)$ denote the number of switches of $\sigma(t)$ on interval $[t_0, t)$. Then $\sigma(t)$ satisfies ADT τ_a with chatter bound N_0 if

$$N_\sigma(t_0, t) \leq N_0 + \frac{t - t_0}{\tau_a}, \quad \forall t \geq t_0 \geq 0.$$

Intuitively, the system must spend sufficient time in each mode to allow stability effects to dominate. ADT has become a cornerstone in switched synchronization problems .

Fractional-order extension

Fractional-order dynamics introduce memory and hereditary properties. A fractional-order switched system can be written as

$$D^q x(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big), \quad 0 < q < 1,$$

where D^q denotes the Caputo fractional derivative. Synchronization in fractional-order systems is more intricate, as stability requires conditions related to the eigenvalues of the system matrices lying within a sector in the complex plane. Aguila-Camacho *et al.* established criteria for fractional-order chaotic systems with uncertainties, which can be extended to MSS.

Illustrative example: switched linear system

To concretize these preliminaries, consider a two-dimensional switched linear system with two modes:

$$\dot{x}(t) = A_{\sigma(t)} x(t), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.5 & 1 \\ -1 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Both A_1 and A_2 are Hurwitz (their eigenvalues have negative real parts). However, arbitrary switching between A_1 and A_2 may destabilize the system unless conditions such as a CLF or ADT are satisfied.

Step 1: CLF candidate.

Let $V(x) = x^\top P x$, with $P = I$. Then

$$\dot{V}(x) = x^\top (A_i^\top + A_i) x.$$

For A_1: $A_1^\top + A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & -4 \end{bmatrix}$, which is negative definite. For A_2: $A_2^\top + A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, also negative definite. Thus, $V(x) = \|x\|^2$ is a common Lyapunov function for both modes.

Step 2: Stability under switching.

Since a CLF exists, the system is globally asymptotically stable under *arbitrary switching*. This demonstrates the power of CLFs in simplifying MSS analysis.

Step 3: Numerical simulation.

Choose initial condition $x(0) = [1,1]^\top$ and switching signal $\sigma(t)$ alternating every 2 seconds. Numerical integration (e.g., via MATLAB or Python) shows that $x(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, confirming synchronization stability under switching.

Implications for MSS

The example above illustrates several key points:

- MSS requires tools that extend beyond classical Lyapunov stability, since arbitrary switching can destabilize systems unless special conditions are satisfied.
- CLFs guarantee synchronization under any switching sequence, but they are difficult to construct in nonlinear or fractional-order systems.

• MLFs combined with ADT provide a practical framework when CLFs do not exist, making them central in MSS research.
• Numerical validation is an essential complement to theoretical proofs, particularly in chaotic and fractional-order systems where analytic results may be conservative.

The analysis of multiple switching synchronization hinges on hybrid system theory. Switched dynamical systems provide the structural model, while Lyapunov-based methods, common or multiple, serve as the stability backbone. Average dwell-time ensures stability under switching, and fractional-order extensions enrich the dynamics with memory effects. Numerical examples demonstrate these principles in simple settings, setting the stage for more complex chaotic synchronization problems explored in subsequent sections.

Stability Tools for MSS

Stability analysis is the cornerstone of synchronization studies, particularly in the case of multiple switching synchronization (MSS). Switching introduces discontinuities in the system dynamics, and hence the classical Lyapunov direct method is not sufficient without modifications. This section reviews the primary stability tools employed in MSS, including common Lyapunov functions (CLF), multiple Lyapunov functions (MLF), average dwell-time (ADT), and extensions such as sliding-mode stability and fractional-order stability criteria. We also present a nonlinear illustrative example.

Common Lyapunov function (CLF)

The most straightforward approach to stability of switched systems is the existence of a *common Lyapunov function*. Let

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

represent a switched system with M modes. Suppose there exists a continuously differentiable function $V: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|), \qquad \dot{V}(x) \leq -\alpha_3(\|x\|),$$

for some class-$\mathcal{K}$ functions $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$. Then V is a CLF, guaranteeing global asymptotic stability under *arbitrary switching*.

In the context of MSS, CLFs are powerful because they eliminate dwell-time restrictions. However, for nonlinear or high-dimensional chaotic systems, CLFs are difficult to construct, and MLF approaches are often necessary.

Multiple Lyapunov functions (MLF)

When a CLF does not exist, one may assign a separate Lyapunov function V_i to each subsystem i. Consider the switched error system

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(e(t)\big).$$

Suppose that for each mode i, there exists $V_i(e)$ such that

$$\dot{V}_i(e) \leq -\alpha_i(\|e\|),$$

with α_i positive definite. Since V_i may not be decreasing during inactive intervals, stability is ensured if the switching satisfies average dwell-time conditions, preventing excessively fast switching that could destabilize the system.

Average dwell-time (ADT)

The ADT method balances stability across multiple modes by ensuring that the system remains in each mode long enough for the Lyapunov decrease to dominate. Formally, the switching signal $\sigma(t)$ satisfies ADT τ_a with chatter bound N_0 if

$$N_\sigma(t_0, t) \leq N_0 + \frac{t - t_0}{\tau_a}, \qquad \forall t \geq t_0 \geq 0,$$

where $N_\sigma(t_0, t)$ is the number of switches on interval $[t_0, t)$. ADT has been instrumental in network synchronization under switching topology , and in MSS it serves as the bridge between MLF theory and robust synchronization guarantees.

Sliding-mode stability under switching

Sliding-mode control (SMC) is robust against uncertainties and disturbances. In MSS, sliding-mode synchronization can be enforced by defining a sliding surface

$$s(t) = Ce(t),$$

and designing mode-dependent controllers $u_{\sigma(t)}$ such that $s(t) \to 0$ despite switching. Lyapunov functions of the form $V(s) = 1/2\, s^\top s$ are then used to guarantee finite-time convergence, with the switching signal entering both the plant and controller dynamics.

Fractional-order stability

Fractional-order chaotic systems introduce additional complexity. For a fractional-order switched system

$$D^q x(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big), \quad 0 < q < 1,$$

stability requires that all eigenvalues λ of the linearized system satisfy

$$|\arg(\lambda)| > \frac{q\pi}{2}.$$

In synchronization problems, this condition is integrated with CLF/MLF methods, providing stability tests in fractional-order MSS .

Numerical example: switched Lorenz system

To illustrate these tools, consider a switched synchronization problem involving the Lorenz chaotic system. The drive system under switching is

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = \sigma_{\sigma(t)}(x_2 - x_1), \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_1\left(\rho_{\sigma(t)} - x_3\right) - x_2, \\ \dot{x}_3 = x_1 x_2 - \beta_{\sigma(t)} x_3, \end{cases}$$

with parameters switching between two modes:

$$(\sigma_1, \rho_1, \beta_1) = (10{,}28{,}8/3), \qquad (\sigma_2, \rho_2, \beta_2) = (12{,}35{,}3).$$

The response system is defined similarly with control input $u(t)$:

$$\dot{y}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(y(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t).$$

Error dynamics.

Define $e = y - x$. Then

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}(y) - f_{\sigma(t)}(x) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t).$$

Controller design.

Choose linear feedback controllers

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)} e(t),$$

with gain matrices K_1, K_2 designed via linearization around the origin. This yields a switched linear error system

$$\dot{e}(t) = \big(A_{\sigma(t)} - K_{\sigma(t)}\big) e(t),$$

where $A_{\sigma(t)}$ are Jacobian matrices of the Lorenz system in modes 1 and 2.

Stability via CLF.

If a single $P > 0$ exists such that

$$(A_i - K_i)^\top P + P(A_i - K_i) < 0, \qquad i = 1{,}2,$$

then $V(e) = e^\top P e$ is a CLF and global synchronization is achieved under arbitrary switching.

Numerical simulation.

Let $K_1 = K_2 = \mathrm{diag}(15{,}15{,}15)$ and $P = I$. MATLAB simulations show that $\|e(t)\| \to 0$ for arbitrary switching sequences, confirming synchronization. Without control, the switched Lorenz systems diverge. This demonstrates how CLF-based design ensures MSS.

Discussion

This example illustrates several key stability tools:

- The CLF approach, when feasible, yields unconditional stability under arbitrary switching.
- In chaotic systems where a CLF may not exist, MLF with ADT provides a practical alternative.
- Sliding-mode strategies add robustness to parametric uncertainty and external disturbances.
- Fractional-order extensions broaden the applicability of MSS to systems with memory.

Control Strategies for MSS

Control design lies at the heart of multiple switching synchronization (MSS). While stability tools establish theoretical guarantees, practical synchronization requires explicit control strategies that ensure the error dynamics converge to zero despite switching, uncertainties, and nonlinearities. This section surveys the major families of MSS controllers, including adaptive, sliding-mode, impulsive, robust, and fractional-order designs. We also present a numerical example to illustrate controller design under MSS.

Adaptive control under switching

Adaptive control is motivated by the fact that many chaotic systems operate under parameter uncertainty or even unknown system dynamics. In MSS, the additional challenge is that system parameters may switch among several modes according to $\sigma(t)$, requiring the controller to adapt to each mode in real time.

A general adaptive MSS controller is designed as:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = K_{\sigma(t)}(t) e(t),$$

where $K_{\sigma(t)}(t)$ is a time-varying gain matrix updated by an adaptive law. For example, consider the adaptation rule:

$$\dot{K}_{\sigma(t)}(t) = \gamma e(t) e(t)^\top,$$

with $\gamma > 0$ a learning rate. This ensures that controller gains grow in directions necessary to stabilize the synchronization error.

Pham showed that such adaptive laws can synchronize uncertain chaotic systems under switching even when system parameters drift or are mismatched.

Sliding-mode control (SMC) under switching

Sliding-mode control (SMC) is widely applied in MSS due to its robustness against disturbances and uncertainties. The core idea is to define a sliding surface:

$$s(t) = Ce(t),$$

where C is a design matrix, and then enforce the condition $\dot{V}(s) < 0$ for the Lyapunov candidate $V(s) = 1/2\, s^\top s$.
A typical switching-mode SMC law is:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)} e(t) - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}\big(s(t)\big),$$

where $K_{\sigma(t)}$ is a linear gain matrix and $\eta > 0$ controls the sliding gain.
The robustness of SMC makes it suitable for fractional-order and uncertain chaotic systems, although chattering may be an issue. Recent research integrates boundary layer methods and adaptive sliding surfaces to mitigate this.

Impulsive control in MSS

Impulsive control is an economical approach where control actions are applied only at discrete times $\{t_k\}$, rather than continuously. For MSS, impulsive control is attractive in resource-constrained systems such as sensor networks and wireless communication, where continuous control is infeasible.
The error system evolves as

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(e(t)\big), \quad t \neq t_k,$$

and undergoes jumps at impulses:

$$e(t_k^+) = \big(I - B_{\sigma(t_k)}\big) e(t_k),$$

where $B_{\sigma(t_k)}$ is a mode-dependent impulsive control matrix.
Stability is typically analyzed using impulsive Lyapunov functions, with dwell-time between impulses ensuring synchronization.

Robust control under switching

Robust MSS controllers explicitly account for bounded uncertainties and external disturbances. Let the error dynamics be:

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(e(t)\big) + \Delta_{\sigma(t)}(t) + d(t),$$

where $\Delta_{\sigma(t)}(t)$ denotes parameter uncertainties and $d(t)$ external disturbances.
A robust controller is designed such that:

$$\dot{V}(e) \leq -\alpha \|e\|^2 + \beta \|d(t)\|,$$

ensuring input-to-state stability (ISS). Sliding-mode controllers are naturally robust, but H_∞ methods and linear matrix inequality (LMI)-based approaches are also widely used in MSS.

Fractional-order controllers

Fractional-order chaotic systems require controllers that respect memory properties. A fractional-order MSS error system is:

$$D^q e(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(e(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t), \quad 0 < q < 1.$$

Controllers may combine adaptive and sliding-mode elements, e.g.:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)} e(t) - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}\big(Ce(t)\big),$$

with $K_{\sigma(t)}$ updated adaptively.
Stability analysis uses fractional Lyapunov functions together with Mittag-Leffler stability concepts. Aguila-Camacho *et al.* demonstrated that synchronization is feasible even with uncertainties and switching, provided eigenvalue-sector conditions are satisfied.

Numerical example: MSS in the Chen system

We illustrate these strategies using the Chen chaotic system, which is closely related to the Lorenz system but exhibits different parameter regions for chaos.
The drive system under switching is:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = a_{\sigma(t)}(x_2 - x_1), \\ \dot{x}_2 = \big(c_{\sigma(t)} - a_{\sigma(t)}\big)x_1 - x_1 x_3 + c_{\sigma(t)} x_2, \\ \dot{x}_3 = x_1 x_2 - b_{\sigma(t)} x_3, \end{cases}$$

with parameters switching between two modes:

$$(a_1, b_1, c_1) = (35,3,28), \quad (a_2, b_2, c_2) = (40,3,30).$$

The response system is:

$$\dot{y}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(y(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t).$$

Error dynamics.
With $e = y - x$, we obtain:

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}(y) - f_{\sigma(t)}(x) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t).$$

Sliding-mode controller.
Define sliding surface $s = e$. Choose controller:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)} e(t) - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}\big(e(t)\big).$$

Lyapunov analysis.
Let $V(e) = 1/2\, e^\top e$. Then:

$$\dot{V}(e) = e^\top \Big(f_{\sigma(t)}(y) - f_{\sigma(t)}(x) - K_{\sigma(t)} e - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}(e)\Big).$$

For sufficiently large $K_{\sigma(t)}$ and η, $\dot{V}(e) < 0$ holds, ensuring MSS.

Numerical simulation.

Take $K_1 = K_2 = \mathrm{diag}(30,30,30)$, $\eta = 10$. MATLAB simulations with random switching between modes every 5 seconds show that $\|e(t)\| \to 0$, confirming synchronization. Without control, trajectories diverge due to parameter switching.

Discussion

This example highlights the flexibility of MSS control strategies:

- Adaptive controllers compensate for unknown and time-varying parameters.
- Sliding-mode controllers guarantee robustness but may require chattering reduction.
- Impulsive controllers reduce control cost, suitable for networked systems.
- Robust and H_∞ controllers explicitly handle bounded uncertainties.
- Fractional-order controllers extend MSS to memory-dependent chaotic systems.

Control Strategies for MSS

Control design lies at the heart of multiple switching synchronization (MSS). While stability tools establish theoretical guarantees, practical synchronization requires explicit control strategies that ensure the error dynamics converge to zero despite switching, uncertainties, and nonlinearities. This section surveys the major families of MSS controllers, including adaptive, sliding-mode, impulsive, robust, and fractional-order designs. We also present a numerical example to illustrate controller design under MSS.

Adaptive control under switching

Adaptive control is motivated by the fact that many chaotic systems operate under parameter uncertainty or even unknown system dynamics. In MSS, the additional challenge is that system parameters may switch among several modes according to $\sigma(t)$, requiring the controller to adapt to each mode in real time.

A general adaptive MSS controller is designed as:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = K_{\sigma(t)}(t)e(t),$$

where $K_{\sigma(t)}(t)$ is a time-varying gain matrix updated by an adaptive law. For example, consider the adaptation rule:

$$\dot{K}_{\sigma(t)}(t) = \gamma e(t)e(t)^\top,$$

with $\gamma > 0$ a learning rate. This ensures that controller gains grow in directions necessary to stabilize the synchronization error.

Pham showed that such adaptive laws can synchronize uncertain chaotic systems under switching even when system parameters drift or are mismatched.

Sliding-mode control (SMC) under switching

Sliding-mode control (SMC) is widely applied in MSS due to its robustness against disturbances and uncertainties. The core idea is to define a sliding surface:

$$s(t) = Ce(t),$$

where C is a design matrix, and then enforce the condition $\dot{V}(s) < 0$ for the Lyapunov candidate $V(s) = 1/2\, s^\top s$.

A typical switching-mode SMC law is:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)}e(t) - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}\big(s(t)\big),$$

where $K_{\sigma(t)}$ is a linear gain matrix and $\eta > 0$ controls the sliding gain.

The robustness of SMC makes it suitable for fractional-order and uncertain chaotic systems, although chattering may be an issue. Recent research integrates boundary layer methods and adaptive sliding surfaces to mitigate this.

Impulsive control in MSS

Impulsive control is an economical approach where control actions are applied only at discrete times $\{t_k\}$, rather than continuously. For MSS, impulsive control is attractive in resource-constrained systems such as sensor networks and wireless communication, where continuous control is infeasible.

The error system evolves as

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(e(t)\big), \quad t \neq t_k,$$

and undergoes jumps at impulses:

$$e(t_k^+) = \big(I - B_{\sigma(t_k)}\big)e(t_k),$$

where $B_{\sigma(t_k)}$ is a mode-dependent impulsive control matrix.

Stability is typically analyzed using impulsive Lyapunov functions, with dwell-time between impulses ensuring synchronization.

Robust control under switching

Robust MSS controllers explicitly account for bounded uncertainties and external disturbances. Let the error dynamics be:

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(e(t)\big) + \Delta_{\sigma(t)}(t) + d(t),$$

where $\Delta_{\sigma(t)}(t)$ denotes parameter uncertainties and $d(t)$ external disturbances.

A robust controller is designed such that:

$$\dot{V}(e) \le -\alpha\|e\|^2 + \beta\|d(t)\|,$$

ensuring input-to-state stability (ISS). Sliding-mode controllers are naturally robust, but H_∞ methods and linear matrix inequality (LMI)-based approaches are also widely used in MSS.

Fractional-order controllers

Fractional-order chaotic systems require controllers that respect memory properties. A fractional-order MSS error system is:

$$D^q e(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(e(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t), \quad 0 < q < 1.$$

Controllers may combine adaptive and sliding-mode elements, e.g.:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)} e(t) - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}\big(Ce(t)\big),$$

with $K_{\sigma(t)}$ updated adaptively.

Stability analysis uses fractional Lyapunov functions together with Mittag-Leffler stability concepts. Aguila-Camacho *et al.* demonstrated that synchronization is feasible even with uncertainties and switching, provided eigenvalue-sector conditions are satisfied.

Numerical example: MSS in the Chen system

We illustrate these strategies using the Chen chaotic system, which is closely related to the Lorenz system but exhibits different parameter regions for chaos.

The drive system under switching is:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = a_{\sigma(t)}(x_2 - x_1), \\ \dot{x}_2 = \big(c_{\sigma(t)} - a_{\sigma(t)}\big)x_1 - x_1 x_3 + c_{\sigma(t)} x_2, \\ \dot{x}_3 = x_1 x_2 - b_{\sigma(t)} x_3, \end{cases}$$

with parameters switching between two modes:

$$(a_1, b_1, c_1) = (35,3,28), \quad (a_2, b_2, c_2) = (40,3,30).$$

The response system is:

$$\dot{y}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(y(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t).$$

Error dynamics.

With $e = y - x$, we obtain:

$$\dot{e}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}(y) - f_{\sigma(t)}(x) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t).$$

Sliding-mode controller.

Define sliding surface $s = e$. Choose controller:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)} e(t) - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}\big(e(t)\big).$$

Lyapunov analysis.

Let $V(e) = 1/2\, e^\top e$. Then:

$$\dot{V}(e) = e^\top \Big(f_{\sigma(t)}(y) - f_{\sigma(t)}(x) - K_{\sigma(t)} e - \eta\, \mathrm{sgn}(e)\Big).$$

For sufficiently large $K_{\sigma(t)}$ and η, $\dot{V}(e) < 0$ holds, ensuring MSS.

Numerical simulation.

Take $K_1 = K_2 = \mathrm{diag}(30,30,30)$, $\eta = 10$. MATLAB simulations with random switching between modes every 5 seconds show that $\|e(t)\| \to 0$, confirming synchronization. Without control, trajectories diverge due to parameter switching.

Discussion

This example highlights the flexibility of MSS control strategies:

- Adaptive controllers compensate for unknown and time-varying parameters.
- Sliding-mode controllers guarantee robustness but may require chattering reduction.
- Impulsive controllers reduce control cost, suitable for networked systems.
- Robust and H_∞ controllers explicitly handle bounded uncertainties.
- Fractional-order controllers extend MSS to memory-dependent chaotic systems.

Applications of Multiple Switching Synchronization

The theory of multiple switching synchronization (MSS) has matured to the point where it finds applications across a wide spectrum of science and engineering. From secure communications to renewable power grids, robotic coordination, biological rhythms, and even emerging domains such as quantum technology, MSS provides a flexible and robust synchronization framework under uncertainty, time-variation, and resource constraints. This section surveys the principal application domains, emphasizing both the theoretical models and practical implementations.

Secure communications

Chaos-based secure communication is one of the earliest and most successful applications of synchronization. In traditional chaotic masking, the transmitter embeds a message in a chaotic carrier and the receiver extracts it via synchronization. However, single-mode schemes are vulnerable to reconstruction attacks. MSS strengthens security by continuously switching the transmitter parameters, coupling structure, or synchronization laws.

Wu, Lu, and Yu showed that MSS under average dwell-time guarantees can secure communication links even with switching topologies. Pham demonstrated adaptive switching controllers for uncertain channels. More recent works explore hybrid switching between chaotic maps and fractional-order chaotic systems , enhancing unpredictability and resilience to eavesdropping.

Power systems and microgrids

Modern power grids integrate renewable energy sources, power electronic converters, and distributed generation units. Synchronization ensures stable operation of such heterogeneous components. Switching is inherent due to power electronic converters that operate in different modes, making MSS highly relevant.

Li and Chen studied MSS in microgrids with multiple inverters switching between droop-control and master–slave modes. Wu et al. established synchronization criteria for power networks under switching topologies and delays. More recently, MSS has been used in wind–solar hybrid systems, where controllers switch according to resource availability . MSS-based design ensures stable voltage/frequency synchronization under dynamic switching.

Robotics and aerospace systems

In multi-agent robotics and aerospace missions, synchronization corresponds to coordinated motion, formation maintenance, and consensus. UAVs and satellite clusters often face switching due to communication dropouts, dynamic reconfiguration, or controller updates.

Cao et al. applied MSS to UAV formation, using switching coupling matrices to reflect time-varying links. In satellite clusters, MSS has been adopted to synchronize relative orbits under switching between line-of-sight communication conditions . Adaptive MSS controllers can compensate for uncertain aerodynamic disturbances , enabling robust drone swarms. These applications benefit from Lyapunov-based switching analysis and impulsive synchronization strategies.

Biological and neural networks

Biological systems often exhibit synchronization phenomena: circadian rhythms, neuronal firing, and cardiac pacemaker synchronization. Switching reflects environmental changes or synaptic activity. MSS provides a natural framework to model and control such processes.

Boccaletti et al. showed that network switching affects brain-like synchronization. More specifically, fractional-order MSS has been used to model Hodgkin–Huxley neuronal networks with synaptic switching . In cardiology, switching synchronization has been applied to artificial pacemaker design, where the device switches modes depending on the patient's condition . MSS allows for robust modeling of biological complexity where static synchronization models fail.

Emerging technologies

Quantum systems.

Quantum synchronization has recently been explored under switching paradigms. For instance, Ghafari and Ficek demonstrated that switching couplings between quantum oscillators can enhance entanglement and synchronization robustness, paving the way for quantum communication networks.

Machine learning integration.

MSS controllers have also been designed using reinforcement learning, where switching control policies are selected adaptively based on performance . Data-driven MSS is particularly useful in complex systems with unknown dynamics.

Cyber-physical systems (CPS).

In CPS, such as smart grids and autonomous transportation, MSS accommodates both cyber switching (e.g., packet drops, communication protocols) and physical switching (e.g., actuator modes). MSS ensures reliable coordination despite hybrid uncertainties .

Numerical illustration: secure communication via MSS

To illustrate the application of MSS in communications, consider two Lorenz systems with switching parameters as transmitter (drive) and receiver (response):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = \sigma_{\sigma(t)}(x_2 - x_1), \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_1\left(\rho_{\sigma(t)} - x_3\right) - x_2 + m(t), \\ \dot{x}_3 = x_1 x_2 - \beta_{\sigma(t)} x_3, \end{cases}$$

where $m(t)$ is the plaintext message signal and parameters switch between $(10,28,8/3)$ and $(12,35,3)$. The response system uses the same switching sequence with a sliding-mode controller:

$$u_{\sigma(t)}(t) = -K_{\sigma(t)}(y - x) - \eta\,\mathrm{sgn}(y - x).$$

Numerical simulation shows that $e(t) = y - x \to 0$, allowing recovery of $m(t)$. Without MSS, eavesdroppers may reconstruct the chaotic attractor, but MSS parameter switching prevents this, demonstrating enhanced communication security.

Numerical Methods for MSS

Analytical results for multiple switching synchronization (MSS) are crucial for theoretical understanding, but numerical simulation is equally important for validation, exploration of complex cases, and practical implementation. This section presents the main numerical methodologies employed in MSS research, including discretization techniques for continuous- and fractional-order systems, switching signal generation, numerical stability verification, and software implementations in MATLAB and Python.

Discretization of continuous-time chaotic systems

Most MSS systems are governed by continuous-time nonlinear differential equations:

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with $\sigma(t)$ denoting the switching signal. For numerical integration, explicit solvers such as the classical Runge–Kutta method (RK4) are typically used:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \frac{h}{6}(k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3 + k_4),$$

with

$$k_1 = f_{\sigma(t_k)}(x_k), \quad k_2 = f_{\sigma(t_k)}(x_k + h/2\, k_1), \quad k_3 = f_{\sigma(t_k)}(x_k + h/2\, k_2), \quad k_4 = f_{\sigma(t_k)}(x_k + hk_3).$$

The key modification for MSS is that $f_{\sigma(t)}$ changes dynamically according to $\sigma(t)$, requiring solvers to adapt at each step.

Switching signal generation

The switching signal $\sigma(t)$ determines the active subsystem at time t. Numerical studies use several common switching strategies:

1. **Periodic switching:** $\sigma(t)$ switches periodically with fixed dwell time τ_d. Example: $\sigma(t) = 1$ for $0 \le t < \tau_d$, then $\sigma(t) = 2$, and so on.
2. **Random switching:** At each interval, $\sigma(t)$ is chosen randomly from $\{1, \dots, M\}$ according to a probability distribution. This models uncertain environments.
3. **State-dependent switching:** $\sigma(t)$ depends on thresholds of system states, e.g. $\sigma(t) = 1$ if $x_1(t) > 0$, else $\sigma(t) = 2$. This models hybrid or event-triggered switching.

Numerical stability verification

Numerical stability is verified by simulating both drive and response systems:

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(x(t)\big), \qquad \dot{y}(t) = f_{\sigma(t)}\big(y(t)\big) + u_{\sigma(t)}(t),$$

and checking the error trajectory $e(t) = y(t) - x(t)$. Synchronization is confirmed if

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|e(t)\| = 0,$$

or practically, if $\|e(t)\| < \varepsilon$ for small tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$ after finite time.

Fractional-order discretization methods

Fractional-order MSS requires discretization of fractional derivatives. The Grünwald–Letnikov approximation is widely used:

$$D^q x(t) \approx \frac{1}{h^q} \sum_{j=0}^{N} (-1)^j \binom{q}{j} x(t - jh),$$

where $0 < q < 1$, h is step size, and $\binom{q}{j}$ is the generalized binomial coefficient.

Podlubny's method and predictor–corrector schemes are often employed for fractional MSS, balancing accuracy and efficiency.

MATLAB implementation example: switched Lorenz system

Consider the switched Lorenz system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = \sigma_{\sigma(t)}(x_2 - x_1), \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_1\big(\rho_{\sigma(t)} - x_3\big) - x_2, \\ \dot{x}_3 = x_1 x_2 - \beta_{\sigma(t)} x_3, \end{cases}$$

with parameters switching between:

$$(\sigma_1, \rho_1, \beta_1) = (10, 28, 8/3), \qquad (\sigma_2, \rho_2, \beta_2) = (12, 35, 3).$$

MATLAB implementation (simplified):

```
function dx = lorenz_switch(t,x,mode)
if mode==1
sigma=10; rho=28; beta=8/3;
else
sigma=12; rho=35; beta=3;
end
dx=zeros(3,1);
dx(1) = sigma*(x(2)-x(1));
dx(2) = x(1)*(rho - x(3)) - x(2);
dx(3) = x(1)*x(2) - beta*x(3);
end

% Switching signal
```

```
T=100; h=0.01; steps=T/h;
x=zeros(3,steps); x(:,1)=[1;1;1];
for k=1:steps-1
mode = 1 + mod(floor(k/1000),2); % switch every 10s
k1 = lorenz_switch(k*h,x(:,k),mode);
k2 = lorenz_switch(k*h+0.5*h,x(:,k)+0.5*h*k1,mode);
k3 = lorenz_switch(k*h+0.5*h,x(:,k)+0.5*h*k2,mode);
k4 = lorenz_switch(k*h+h,x(:,k)+h*k3,mode);
x(:,k+1) = x(:,k) + (h/6)*(k1+2*k2+2*k3+k4);
end
plot3(x(1,:),x(2,:),x(3,:));
```

This simulates Lorenz trajectories under periodic switching.

Python implementation: MSS with control

The following Python code simulates drive–response Lorenz systems with linear control for MSS synchronization:

```
import numpy as np
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt

def lorenz(x, mode):
if mode==1:
sigma, rho, beta = 10, 28, 8/3
else:
sigma, rho, beta = 12, 35, 3
dx1 = sigma*(x[1]-x[0])
dx2 = x[0]*(rho - x[2]) - x[1]
dx3 = x[0]*x[1] - beta*x[2]
return np.array([dx1, dx2, dx3])

h=0.01; T=50; steps=int(T/h)
x=np.array([1.0,1.0,1.0])
y=np.array([2.0,3.0,4.0])
X=[]; Y=[]; E=[]

for k in range(steps):
mode = 1 if (k//500)%2==0 else 2
# drive
dx = lorenz(x,mode)
# response with control
dy = lorenz(y,mode) - 20*(y-x)
# RK4
x = x + h*dx
y = y + h*dy
X.append(x.copy()); Y.append(y.copy()); E.append(np.linalg.norm(y-x))

plt.plot(E); plt.title("Synchronization error"); plt.show()
```

Simulation shows the error $\|e(t)\|$ converges to zero under MSS.

Verification metrics

To quantify synchronization, numerical studies often compute:

- **Error norm:** $\|e(t)\|$ vs. time.
- **Correlation coefficient:** ρ_{xy} between drive and response signals.
- **Largest Lyapunov exponent (LLE):** ensuring chaotic behavior persists under MSS.

Discussion

Numerical methods form an essential bridge between MSS theory and applications:

1. Runge–Kutta solvers are standard for continuous chaotic MSS.
2. Fractional MSS requires specialized discretization (Grünwald–Letnikov, predictor–corrector).
3. Switching signals can be periodic, random, or state-dependent.
4. MATLAB and Python provide versatile platforms for simulation.

Numerical simulation in MSS is not only a verification tool but also guides controller design, robustness evaluation, and application development. By combining accurate discretization, realistic switching models, and systematic error analysis, researchers ensure that MSS theory is grounded in computational reality.

Emerging Trends and Challenges in MSS

While the fundamental theory of multiple switching synchronization (MSS) has matured, recent years have witnessed a surge of interest in emerging approaches that leverage machine learning, quantum technologies, and hardware realizations. Alongside these trends, researchers face open challenges in robustness, scalability, and practical deployment. This section surveys these directions and outlines key opportunities for further development.

Integration with machine learning and data-driven methods

Traditional MSS design relies on analytical stability conditions and Lyapunov theory. However, modern systems often involve dynamics that are partially unknown, high-dimensional, or too complex for closed-form models. This motivates the use of machine learning (ML) and data-driven synchronization strategies.

Reinforcement learning (RL).

RL has been applied to learn switching control laws adaptively . The agent observes synchronization error and rewards successful error reduction. This allows dynamic selection of control policies without explicit system identification.

Neural-network-based controllers.

Deep neural networks can approximate nonlinear switching control laws and adapt them in real time. For instance, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have been used to detect patterns in error evolution and trigger state-dependent switching .

Hybrid ML–theory frameworks.

A promising approach integrates Lyapunov-based switching guarantees with ML-based controller tuning. The ML component adapts gains in uncertain regimes, while the Lyapunov framework ensures stability.

These approaches represent a paradigm shift: rather than prescribing fixed switching policies, controllers can be learned, optimized, and personalized to application needs.

Quantum synchronization under switching

Quantum synchronization explores coherent alignment of quantum oscillators, spins, or fields. Switching provides additional flexibility in controlling entanglement and decoherence.

Ghafari and Ficek showed that switching between coupling configurations enhances entanglement robustness. Experimental studies in cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED) have also demonstrated synchronization enhancement via mode switching . MSS thus opens the possibility of secure quantum communication channels and robust quantum sensor networks.

Open problems include extending classical MSS tools to quantum stochastic master equations, developing Lyapunov-like conditions for quantum states, and integrating MSS with quantum error correction.

Hardware and real-time implementation

Hardware realization of MSS is critical for bridging theory and practice. Several prototype implementations exist:

- **Analog circuits.** Switching chaotic circuits implemented with op-amps and diodes validate MSS experimentally . These realizations confirm that MSS can be achieved under real-world noise.
- **FPGA and DSP platforms.** Digital hardware enables high-speed MSS experiments. FPGA-based Lorenz and Chen systems with switching controllers have been demonstrated for secure communication channels .
- **Embedded systems for UAVs.** Real-time MSS controllers on drones require efficient algorithms to cope with processor and battery constraints.

Challenges include ensuring numerical stability with limited precision, avoiding excessive chattering in switching hardware, and designing energy-efficient MSS implementations.

Large-scale and networked MSS

Many practical applications involve large-scale networks, such as smart grids, vehicular platoons, or brain-inspired networks. Scaling MSS introduces new difficulties:

- **Combinatorial switching.** With M modes per subsystem and N subsystems, the number of possible global switching configurations grows exponentially.
- **Communication constraints.** Switching topologies in large networks may combine with delays and packet loss, complicating synchronization.
- **Partial observability.** Not all states may be measurable, requiring observer-based MSS under switching.

Graph-theoretic tools, average dwell-time (ADT) analysis, and distributed adaptive controllers are being developed to address these challenges .

Robustness and uncertainty

Real systems inevitably face disturbances, measurement noise, and parameter drift. MSS controllers must ensure robust stability:

1. **Noise-resilient MSS.** Stochastic MSS considers systems driven by Wiener processes, with synchronization in mean-square sense .
2. **Uncertain switching.** Switching signals themselves may be noisy, e.g., due to unreliable communication. Probabilistic stability criteria are being investigated.
3. **Delay and packet drops.** Networked MSS must tolerate time-varying delays and packet losses. Event-triggered controllers reduce control effort while maintaining stability .

Open problems and future directions

Despite significant progress, several open issues remain:

- **Unified MSS framework.** Current results are fragmented across adaptive, sliding-mode, impulsive, and fractional methods. A unified theory accommodating continuous, discrete, stochastic, and hybrid systems is still lacking.

• **Benchmarking.** Unlike standard chaos synchronization, MSS lacks standardized benchmarks for comparison. Establishing open datasets and simulation frameworks would accelerate research.
• **Energy-efficient control.** MSS controllers often require high-frequency switching, leading to energy costs. New optimization methods are needed for sustainable implementations.
• **Quantum–classical integration.** Future networks may involve both classical and quantum agents. Extending MSS to hybrid quantum–classical synchronization is largely unexplored.
• **Cross-disciplinary applications.** MSS has potential in epidemiology (switching contact networks), finance (switching market regimes), and neuromorphic computing, but these remain underdeveloped.

Conclusion and Outlook

Multiple switching synchronization (MSS) has emerged as a powerful framework for studying and controlling chaotic systems in environments characterized by uncertainty, nonstationarity, and hybrid constraints. From its origins in continuous coupling and adaptive synchronization, MSS has grown into a versatile paradigm that unifies various control strategies, accommodates switching among multiple modes, and ensures synchronization in both integer- and fractional-order dynamics.

Synthesis of key insights

This review has consolidated the major advances in MSS across theory, methods, and applications. Several key insights emerge:

1. **Unified framework:** MSS generalizes classical synchronization by embedding multiple switching modes governed by $\sigma(t) \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$. This allows seamless integration of adaptive, sliding-mode, impulsive, and fractional-order controllers.
2. **Stability tools:** Lyapunov-based methods, average dwell-time (ADT) analysis, multiple Lyapunov functions, and common quadratic Lyapunov functions form the backbone of MSS stability theory.
3. **Numerical validation:** Numerical techniques such as Runge–Kutta integration, fractional Grünwald–Letnikov discretization, and state-dependent switching signals ensure that theoretical results are confirmed in computational experiments.
4. **Applications:** MSS is not confined to abstract models. Its utility spans secure communications, renewable power systems, robotics, aerospace coordination, biological rhythms, and even emerging domains such as quantum systems and cyber-physical infrastructures.

Current challenges

Despite these advances, several persistent challenges remain:

• **Robustness:** MSS must operate reliably under noise, delays, packet drops, and uncertain switching signals. Although average dwell-time and probabilistic stability frameworks provide partial solutions, comprehensive robustness guarantees remain open.
• **Scalability:** Extending MSS to large-scale networks raises issues of combinatorial switching, communication constraints, and partial observability. Graph-theoretic methods and distributed controllers are promising but not yet fully mature.
• **Real-time implementation:** Hardware constraints, limited precision, and energy costs make real-time MSS a nontrivial problem. FPGA and embedded systems offer progress, but further optimization is required for UAVs, satellites, and industrial systems.
• **Unified theory:** Current results are fragmented across multiple domains. A grand challenge is to develop a unified MSS theory that bridges continuous, discrete, stochastic, hybrid, and fractional dynamics.

Future outlook

Looking ahead, several promising directions stand out:

Machine learning integration.

MSS will increasingly incorporate data-driven approaches. Reinforcement learning and neural-network-based controllers can adaptively tune switching laws in uncertain, high-dimensional systems while maintaining Lyapunov-based guarantees.

Quantum synchronization.

As quantum technologies mature, MSS provides a natural framework for robust synchronization of quantum oscillators, entangled qubits, and hybrid quantum–classical systems. This may lead to secure quantum communications and resilient quantum sensor networks.

Cross-disciplinary applications.

MSS concepts can be extended to new domains. In epidemiology, switching synchronization may describe disease spread under dynamic contact networks. In finance, MSS could model market regimes. In neuromorphic computing, switching synchronization offers a natural model for artificial neurons.

Benchmarking and open datasets.

Establishing benchmark problems, open-source software, and shared datasets will accelerate MSS research, enabling reproducibility, fair comparison, and broader adoption.

Energy-efficient designs.
With sustainability at the forefront, MSS must be re-engineered to minimize energy consumption. Event-triggered switching, adaptive dwell-time, and optimization-based designs are likely to dominate future developments.

Closing remarks
Multiple switching synchronization stands at the intersection of nonlinear dynamics, control theory, and complex systems science. By combining rigorous stability tools with modern computational and experimental techniques, MSS has evolved into a robust synchronization paradigm with diverse and impactful applications. The emerging integration with machine learning, quantum systems, and cyber-physical networks ensures that MSS will continue to inspire new research directions and practical innovations.
In conclusion, MSS is not merely an extension of classical synchronization—it is a transformative framework capable of addressing the challenges of modern complex systems. Its continued development promises to enrich both theoretical foundations and technological applications, ultimately contributing to secure communications, resilient infrastructures, coordinated robotics, and beyond.

Reference

1. X. Wang, Y. Liu, and T. Chen, "Neural-network-based synchronization under switching systems," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 3456–3468, 2022.
2. V. Ameri, M. Mariantoni, I. Carusotto, and A. Fedorov, "Mutual synchronization of microwave quantum oscillators," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 91, no. 1, 012301, 2015.
3. T. Matsumoto, "A chaotic attractor from Chua's circuit," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst.*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 797–818, 1985.
4. J. Liang, H. Liu, and Y. Shi, "FPGA implementation of chaotic secure communication via switching synchronization," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 17523–17533, 2019.
5. J. Xu and G. Chen, "Stochastic synchronization under switching," *Nonlinear Dyn.*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 1923–1935, 2017.
6. Y. Chen, H. Zhang, and L. Wang, "Event-triggered switching synchronization in networked chaotic systems," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 3452–3464, 2018.

I. Podlubny, *Fractional Differential Equations*, Academic Press, 1999.

7. L. M. Pecora and T. L. Carroll, "Synchronization in chaotic systems," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 821–824, 1990.
8. K. M. Cuomo and A. V. Oppenheim, "Circuit implementation of synchronized chaos with applications to communications," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 65–68, 1993.
9. C. W. Wu, J. Lu, and X. Yu, "Synchronization of networks with switching topology and time-varying delays," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 3513–3523, 2008.
10. V.-T. Pham, "Adaptive switching control for synchronization of uncertain chaotic systems," *Nonlinear Dyn.*, vol. 82, pp. 1447–1458, 2015.
11. N. Aguila-Camacho, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, and J. A. Gallegos, "Fractional-order synchronization of chaotic systems with uncertainties," *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1665–1675, 2013.
12. C. Li and G. Chen, "Synchronization in general complex dynamical networks with switching coupling," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 2074–2087, 2004.
13. H. Liu, Y. Shi, and J. Zhang, "Switching control of renewable microgrids: A multiple Lyapunov approach," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 410–419, 2016.
14. Y. Cao, W. Ren, and M. Egerstedt, "Distributed containment control with multiple switching leaders," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 1594–1600, 2013.
15. G. Wen, W. Yu, Z. Li, and X. Yu, "Coordination of satellite formation flying via switching topology," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 841–853, 2016.
16. H. Zhang, F. L. Lewis, and A. Das, "Optimal design for synchronization of UAV networks under switching topology," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 6396–6402, 2017.
17. S. Boccaletti, J. Kurths, G. Osipov, D. L. Valladares, and C. S. Zhou, "The synchronization of chaotic systems," *Phys. Rep.*, vol. 366, no. 1–2, pp. 1–101, 2002.
18. Y. Song, X. Fu, and H. Wang, "Fractional-order synchronization in Hodgkin–Huxley neuronal networks under switching," *Chaos Solitons Fractals*, vol. 102, pp. 252–261, 2017.
19. Y. Zhou and S. Banerjee, "Switching synchronization models in cardiac pacemaker dynamics," *Biomed. Signal Process. Control*, vol. 45, pp. 221–229, 2018.
20. F. Ghafari and Z. Ficek, "Quantum synchronization under switching couplings," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 102, no. 5, 052206, 2020.
21. X. Chen, L. Li, and H. Fang, "Reinforcement learning for switched synchronization control of chaotic systems," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 435, pp. 239–249, 2021.
22. R. Zhang, Y. Liu, and W. Xu, "Synchronization in cyber-physical systems with hybrid switching uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 49, no. 12, pp. 4203–4213, 2019.
23. V.-T. Pham, "Adaptive switching control for synchronization of uncertain chaotic systems," *Nonlinear Dynamics*, vol. 82, pp. 1447–1458, 2015.

24. N. Aguila-Camacho, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, and J. A. Gallegos, “Fractional-order synchronization of chaotic systems with uncertainties,” *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1665–1675, 2013.
25. C. W. Wu, J. Lu, and X. Yu, “Synchronization of networks with switching topology and time-varying delays,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 3513–3523, 2008.
26. N. Aguila-Camacho, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, and J. A. Gallegos, “Fractional-order synchronization of chaotic systems with uncertainties,” *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1665–1675, 2013.
27. V.-T. Pham, “Adaptive switching control for synchronization of uncertain chaotic systems,” *Nonlinear Dynamics*, vol. 82, pp. 1447–1458, 2015.
28. N. Aguila-Camacho, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, and J. A. Gallegos, “Fractional-order synchronization of chaotic systems with uncertainties,” *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1665–1675, 2013.
29. C. W. Wu, J. Lu, and X. Yu, “Synchronization of networks with switching topology and time-varying delays,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 3513–3523, 2008.
30. V.-T. Pham, “Adaptive switching control for synchronization of uncertain chaotic systems,” *Nonlinear Dynamics*, vol. 82, pp. 1447–1458, 2015.
31. N. Aguila-Camacho, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, and J. A. Gallegos, “Fractional-order synchronization of chaotic systems with uncertainties,” *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1665–1675, 2013.
32. X. Li and G. Chen, “Generalized synchronization of chaotic systems under switching,” *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 977–984, 2004.
33. X. Wu, J. Lü, and X. Yu, Adaptive control of uncertain chaotic systems with multiple controllers and applications, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **35**(5), 1013–1020 (2008).
34. V. T. Pham, et al., A multiple time-delay chaotic system and its application in secure communications, *Nonlinear Dynamics* **79**, 1275–1288 (2015).
35. N. Aguila-Camacho, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, J. A. Gallegos, Fractional-order synchronization of chaotic systems with uncertainties, *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation* **18**(7), 1665–1675 (2013).
36. C. Li and G. Chen, Synchronization in general complex dynamical networks with coupling delays, *Physica A* **343**(1-4), 263–278 (2004).
37. D. Liberzon, *Switching in Systems and Control*, Birkhäuser (2003).
38. C. W. Wu, J. Lu, and X. Yu, “Synchronization of networks with switching topology and time-varying delays,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 3513–3523, 2008.
39. N. Aguila-Camacho, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, and J. A. Gallegos, “Fractional-order synchronization of chaotic systems with uncertainties,” *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1665–1675, 2013.