

# Do the Contemporary Cubature and Unscented Kalman Filtering Methods Outperform Always the Traditional Extended Kalman Filter?

G.Yu. Kulikov and M.V. Kulikova \*

## Abstract

This brief technical note elaborates three well-known state estimators, which are used extensively in practice. These are the rather old-fashioned extended Kalman filter (EKF) and the recently-designed cubature Kalman filtering (CKF) and unscented Kalman filtering (UKF) algorithms. Nowadays, it is commonly accepted that the contemporary techniques outperform always the traditional EKF in the accuracy of state estimation because of the higher-order approximation of the mean of propagated Gaussian density in the time- and measurement-update steps of the listed filters. However, the present paper specifies this commonly accepted opinion and shows that despite the mentioned theoretical fact the EKF may outperform the CKF and UKF methods in the accuracy of state estimation when the stochastic system under consideration exposes a stiff behavior. That is why stiff stochastic models are difficult to deal with and require effective state estimation techniques to be designed yet.

**Keywords:** Continuous-discrete stochastic state-space system, stiff model, continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter, continuous-discrete cubature Kalman filter, continuous-discrete unscented Kalman filter.

## 1 Introduction

The focus of our research is the accuracy of state estimation in the so-called *continuous-discrete stochastic state-space* systems. This means that their process models are presented in the form of the following Itô-type *Stochastic Differential Equation* (SDE):

$$dx(t) = F(t, x(t))dt + Gdw(t), \quad t > 0, \quad (1)$$

---

\*The authors are with CEMAT (Center for Computational and Stochastic Mathematics), Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Rovisco Pais 1, 1049-001 LISBOA, Portugal; Emails: gkulikov@math.ist.utl.pt; maria.kulikova@ist.utl.pt

where  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $F : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a nonlinear sufficiently smooth drift function,  $G$  is a time-invariant matrix of dimension  $n \times q$  and  $\{w(t), t > 0\}$  is a Brownian motion with a fixed square diffusion matrix  $Q > 0$  of size  $q$ . The initial state  $x_0$  of SDE (1) is supposed to be a random variable, i.e.  $x_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{x}_0, \Pi_0)$  with  $\Pi_0 > 0$ , where the notation  $\mathcal{N}(\bar{x}_0, \Pi_0)$  stands for the normal distribution with mean  $\bar{x}_0$  and covariance  $\Pi_0$ . We point out that only *additive-noise* SDE models are studied in this paper. At the same time, the utilized measurement models are discrete-time and given by the formula

$$z_k = h(x_k) + v_k, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (2)$$

where  $k$  stands for a discrete time index (i.e.  $x_k$  means  $x(t_k)$ ),  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a sufficiently smooth function and the measurement noise is  $v_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R_k)$  with  $R_k > 0$ . We remark that the *sampling period* (or *waiting time*)  $\delta := t_k - t_{k-1}$ , i.e. when the additional information  $z_k$  comes to consideration, is assumed to be constant, below. In addition, all realizations of the noises  $w(t)$ ,  $v_k$  and the initial state  $x_0$  are assumed to be taken from mutually independent Gaussian distributions. The continuous-discrete stochastic system (1), (2) is a usual state estimation problem arisen in many areas of study as diverse as target tracking, navigation, stochastic control, chemistry and finance [1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 32, 33, 34, 36, 40, 39, 43]. Strong arguments for using the discussed mathematical model in practical estimation tasks are outlined in [35].

The key issue of our research is to identify changes in performances of filters, which are core state estimation tools in practice, when they are applied for treating stiff SDE models of the form (1). Our first state estimator is the traditional EKF designed long ago and presented, for example, in [14]. Despite its simplicity and the old-fashioned nature it has been a successful filtering means in the realm of nonlinear stochastic systems for decades [8, 9, 14, 28, 38]. Nevertheless, the first-order approximation provided by the EKF has been criticized in many studies, which have resulted in the development of more accurate UKF [17, 18, 41, 42, 15, 16] and CKF [2, 3] methods. We point out that a lot of evidence confirming the superiority of the latter filters towards the EKF in estimating various continuous- and discrete-time stochastic state-space systems have been presented in [17, 18, 41, 42, 15, 16, 2, 3, 33, 34] and in other literature. However, all published proofs in the cited papers relate to estimation of nonstiff stochastic systems and, hence, the success of the UKF and CKF for treating stiff ones is questionable. Below, we address this issue on two stochastic models whose dynamic behavior may be both nonstiff and stiff.

To estimate these nonstiff and stiff examples of the form (1), (2), we utilize filters designed in the frame of the so-called *discrete-discrete* approach [7, 20, 26], also known as *linearized discretization* in [11, 37]. Nevertheless, all methods used below are abbreviated to: *Continuous-Discrete Extended Kalman Filter* (CD-EKF), *Continuous-Discrete Unscented Kalman Filter* (CD-UKF) and *Continuous-Discrete Cubature Kalman Filter* (CD-CKF), because of the continuous-discrete fashion of the state estimation task under consideration. It is also worthwhile to emphasize that the time-invariant form of the matrices  $G$  and  $Q$  in SDE (1) is crucial in our research. This requirement is imposed by the CD-CKF and CD-UKF method developments in [3, 23], which are grounded in the Itô-Taylor expansion of order 1.5 (IT-1.5). In the case of the variable matrices, the underlying

stochastic discretization method IT-1.5 has a much more complicated form in comparison to that utilized in the latter papers (see further details in [19, Sec. 10.4]). Thus, the cited CD-CKF and CD-UKF methods are not applicable to such models.

## 2 The State-of-the-art State Estimation Methods

In this section, we present all technical particulars of the used state estimators. They allow for an independent inspection of all calculations presented in Sec. 3. We begin with the classical EKF.

### 2.1 Continuous-Discrete Extended Kalman Filter

As said in Sec. 1, all filters considered in our study are obtained within the discrete-discrete (or linearized discretization) approach and, hence, they are fixed-stepsize. The latter means that an  $m$ -step equidistant mesh is introduced in the sampling interval  $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$  of size  $\delta$  for approximating SDE (1) with the following formula:

$$x_{k-1}^{l+1} = x_{k-1}^l + \tau F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l) + G \tilde{w}_{k-1}^l \quad (3)$$

where the mesh's nodes  $t_{k-1}^l := t_{k-1} + l\tau$ ,  $l = 0, 1, \dots, m$ , the mesh's step size  $\tau := \delta/m$  and the discretized noise  $\tilde{w}_{k-1}^l \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau Q)$ . We point out that the utilized discretization (3) is derived with the use of the conventional Euler-Maruyama method, which is known to be convergent of order 0.5 [19, Sec. 10.2]. Then, the subdivision number  $m$  (or the step size  $\tau$ ) plays an important role in the above discrete-time stochastic model because it is responsible for the accuracy of approximation of the original continuous-time model (1). In other words, raising this number of steps increases the accuracy of formula (3) and reduces the corresponding discretization error. In turn, the latter boosts the accuracy and robustness of filtering techniques grounded in this discretization and implemented for treating SDE models (1) [20, 26, 23].

It follows from formula (3) that taking the expectation yields

$$\mathbf{E}\{x_{k-1}^{l+1}\} = \mathbf{E}\{x_{k-1}^l\} + \tau \mathbf{E}\{F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l)\} \quad (4)$$

with  $\mathbf{E}\{x_{k-1}^{l+1}\} := \hat{x}_{k-1}^{l+1}$  and  $\mathbf{E}\{x_{k-1}^l\} := \hat{x}_{k-1}^l$ . The state vector  $x_{k-1}^l$  is independent of the noise  $\tilde{w}_{k-1}^l$ . Therefore the associated covariance obeys the following recursion:

$$\mathbf{var}\{x_{k-1}^{l+1}\} = \mathbf{var}\{x_{k-1}^l + \tau F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l)\} + \tau G Q G^\top. \quad (5)$$

Further, the EKF technology implies that the moment equations (4) and (5) are solved approximately on each subinterval  $[t_{k-1}^l, t_{k-1}^{l+1}]$  of the Euler-Maruyama discretization (3) [14]. This is done by means of the first-order Taylor expansion of the drift function  $F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l)$  around the state mean vector  $\hat{x}_{k-1}^l$  computed at the time  $t_{k-1}^l$ , i.e.

$$F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l) = F(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1}^l) + \partial_x F(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1}^l)(x_{k-1}^l - \hat{x}_{k-1}^l) + HOT \quad (6)$$

where  $\partial_x F(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1}^l) := \partial F(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1}^l) / \partial x_{k-1}^l$  is the corresponding partial derivative (Jacobian) of the function  $F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l)$  with respect to  $x_{k-1}^l$  and evaluated at  $(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1}^l)$ , *HOT* stands for higher-order terms of this Taylor expansion. Now neglecting *HOT* in (6) and substituting it into Eqs (4) and (5) yields the classical EKF in the form of the following  $m$ -step state estimation algorithm.

---

**Initialization.** Set the initial state mean and covariance as follows:  $\hat{x}_{0|0} := \bar{x}_0$ ,  $P_{0|0} := \Pi_0$ .

**Loop body.** For  $k := 1, 2, \dots, K$ , where  $K$  is the number of sampling instants in the simulation interval of SDE model (1), do:

Time update: Given the filtering solution  $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}$  and  $P_{k-1|k-1}$  at time  $t_{k-1}$ , compute the predicted state mean  $\hat{x}_{k|k-1}$  and covariance matrix  $P_{k|k-1}$  at the next sampling instant  $t_k$ . For that, set the local initial values  $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^0 := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}$  and  $P_{k-1|k-1}^0 := P_{k-1|k-1}$  and fulfil the following  $m$ -step time-update recursive procedure with  $\tau := (t_k - t_{k-1})/m$ :

For  $l = 0, 1, \dots, m - 1$  do;

- $t_{k-1}^l := t_{k-1} + l\tau$ ;
- Evaluate the Jacobian matrix  $\partial_x F(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l)$ ;
- $M_{k-1}^l := I_n + \tau \partial_x F(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l)$ , where  $I_n$  is the identity matrix of size  $n$ ;
- $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l + \tau F(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l)$ ;
- $P_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := M_{k-1}^l P_{k-1|k-1}^l (M_{k-1}^l)^\top + \tau G Q G^\top$ .

Measurement update: Having computed the predicted state expectation  $\hat{x}_{k|k-1} := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^m$  and the predicted covariance matrix  $P_{k|k-1} := P_{k-1|k-1}^m$ , one finds then the filtering solution  $\hat{x}_{k|k}$  and  $P_{k|k}$  based on measurement  $z_k$  received at the time  $t_k$ , as follows:

- Evaluate the Jacobian  $\partial_x h(\hat{x}_{k|k-1})$  at the state mean  $\hat{x}_{k|k-1}$ ;
- $R_{e,k} := R_k + \partial_x h(\hat{x}_{k|k-1}) P_{k|k-1} \partial_x h^\top(\hat{x}_{k|k-1})$ ;
- $K_k := P_{k|k-1} \partial_x h^\top(\hat{x}_{k|k-1}) R_{e,k}^{-1}$ ;
- $\hat{x}_{k|k} := \hat{x}_{k|k-1} + K_k (z_k - h(\hat{x}_{k|k-1}))$ ;
- $P_{k|k} := P_{k|k-1} - K_k \partial_x h(\hat{x}_{k|k-1}) P_{k|k-1}$ .

---

The presented CD-EKF calculates the *linear least-square estimate*  $\hat{x}_{k|k}$  of the system's state  $x(t_k)$  based on measurements  $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ .

## 2.2 Continuous-Discrete Cubature Kalman Filter

The CD-CKF method is invented by Arasaratnam et al. [3] and presented in the cited paper in great detail. Again, this filter is fixed-stepsize and, hence, SDE (1) should be discretized on an equidistant mesh at first. However, Arasaratnam et al. [3] recommend the higher-order IT-1.5 discretization for constructing their CD-CKF algorithm. IT-1.5 converges with order 1.5 [19, Sec. 10.4]. That is why it is expected to provide a more accurate approximation in comparison to the Euler-Maruyama discretization (3) on the same mesh. It results in the following discrete-time stochastic state-space model:

$$x_{k-1}^{l+1} = F_d(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l) + \tilde{G}w_1 + \mathbb{L}F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l)w_2 \quad (7)$$

with  $\tilde{G} := GQ^{1/2}$ , where  $Q^{1/2}$  denotes the square root of  $Q$ , and

$$F_d(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l) := x_{k-1}^l + \tau F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l) + \frac{\tau^2}{2} \mathbb{L}_0 F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l).$$

Here, the vector  $x_{k-1}^l$  stands for the IT-1.5 approximation to the state  $x(t_{k-1}^l)$  of SDE (1) at the time  $t_{k-1}^l := t_{k-1} + l\tau$ ,  $l = 0, 1, \dots, m$ , and  $F(\cdot)$  is the drift function in the given SDE model. Again,  $\tau := \delta/m$  implies the step size of our subdivision of the sampling interval  $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$  underlying the  $m$ -step equidistant discretization formula (7). The above differential operators  $\mathbb{L}_0$  and  $\mathbb{L}_j$  are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_0 &:= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^n F_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,p,r=1}^n \tilde{G}_{pj} \tilde{G}_{rj} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_p \partial x_r}, \\ \mathbb{L}_j &:= \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{G}_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{G}_{ij}$  stands for the  $(i, j)$ -entry in the above-defined matrix  $\tilde{G}$ . We stress that the term  $\mathbb{L}F(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l)$  in discretization (7) refers to the square matrix with each  $(i, j)$ -entry determined by the operator  $\mathbb{L}_j F_i(t_{k-1}^l, x_{k-1}^l)$ . Also, the pair of correlated  $n$ -dimensional random Gaussian variables  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  is generated from the pair of uncorrelated  $n$ -dimensional random Gaussian variables  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$  as follows:  $w_1 := \sqrt{\tau}\nu_1$  and  $w_2 := \tau^{3/2}(\nu_1 + \nu_2/\sqrt{3})/2$ .

Having obtained the discretized process stochastic model (7), the CD-CKF technique relies on the third-degree spherical-radial cubature rule approximations of the following Gaussian integrals:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_d(x_k) \mathcal{N}(x_k; \hat{x}_{k|k}, P_{k|k}) dx_k, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_d(x_k) F_d^T(x_k) \mathcal{N}(x_k; \hat{x}_{k|k}, P_{k|k}) dx_k$$

for calculation of the mean and covariance of the propagated Gaussian density. For that, one defines the corresponding cubature nodes

$$\xi_i := \begin{cases} \sqrt{n}e_i, & i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ -\sqrt{n}e_{i-n}, & i = n+1, n+2, \dots, 2n, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where  $e_i$  stands for the  $i$ -th coordinate vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $n$  refers to the size of SDE (1). Then, the square-root variant of the CD-CKF presented in [3, Appendix B] is implemented as follows.

---

**Initialization.** Determine the lower triangular Cholesky factor (square root)  $\Pi_0^{1/2}$  of the initial state covariance matrix, i.e.  $\Pi_0 = \Pi_0^{1/2} \Pi_0^{\top/2}$ , and the process covariance square root  $Q^{1/2}$ , i.e.  $Q = Q^{1/2} Q^{\top/2}$ . Set the initial values as follows:  $\hat{x}_{0|0} := \bar{x}_0$ ,  $P_{0|0}^{1/2} := \Pi_0^{1/2}$ .

**Loop body.** For  $k := 1, 2, \dots, K$ , where  $K$  is the number of sampling instants in the simulation interval of SDE model (1), do:

Time update: Given the filtering solution  $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}$  and  $P_{k-1|k-1}^{1/2}$  at time  $t_{k-1}$ , compute the predicted state mean  $\hat{x}_{k|k-1}$  and covariance square root  $P_{k|k-1}^{1/2}$  at the next sampling instant  $t_k$ . For that, set the local initial values  $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^0 := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}$  and  $S_{k-1|k-1}^0 := P_{k-1|k-1}^{1/2}$  and fulfil the  $m$ -step recursive procedure with  $\tau := (t_k - t_{k-1})/m$ :

For  $l = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$  do;

- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{X}_{k-1|k-1}^l := [\mathcal{X}_{1,k-1|k-1}^l \ \dots \ \mathcal{X}_{2n,k-1|k-1}^l]$  of the cubature nodes  $\mathcal{X}_{i,k-1|k-1}^l := S_{k-1|k-1}^l \xi_i + \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$ , where the vectors  $\xi_i$  are defined in (8);
- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := [\mathcal{Y}_{1,k-1|k-1}^{l+1} \ \dots \ \mathcal{Y}_{2n,k-1|k-1}^{l+1}]$  of the propagated nodes  $\mathcal{Y}_{i,k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := F_d(t_{k-1}^l, \mathcal{X}_{i,k-1|k-1}^l)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$ , where the mapping  $F_d(\cdot)$  is defined in (7);
- $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := \mathcal{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} \mathbb{1}/(2n)$ , where  $\mathbb{1}$  stands for the  $2n$ -dimensional unitary column-vector;
- $\mathbb{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := (\mathcal{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} - \mathbb{1}^\top \otimes \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1})/\sqrt{2n}$ , where  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker tensor product (see, for instance, [27] for the definition and properties of the mentioned product; this product is also coded as the built-in function `kron` in MATLAB);
- Compute the matrix  $\mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l := \tau \mathbb{L} F_d(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l)/2$ ;
- $S_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := [\mathbb{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} | \sqrt{\tau}(\tilde{G} + \mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l) | \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{3}} \mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l] \Theta_l$ , where  $\Theta_l$  is any orthogonal rotation that lower triangularizes the right-hand matrix and produces the square root  $S_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1}$ .

Measurement update: Having computed the predicted state expectation  $\hat{x}_{k|k-1} := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^m$  and the predicted covariance square root  $P_{k|k-1}^{1/2} := S_{k-1|k-1}^m$ , one finds then the filtering solution  $\hat{x}_{k|k}$  and  $P_{k|k}^{1/2}$  based on measurement  $z_k$  received at the time  $t_k$ , as follows:

- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{X}_{k|k-1} := [\mathcal{X}_{1,k|k-1} \ \dots \ \mathcal{X}_{2n,k|k-1}]$  of the cubature nodes  $\mathcal{X}_{i,k|k-1} := P_{k|k-1}^{1/2} \xi_i + \hat{x}_{k|k-1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$ ;

- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1} := [\mathcal{Z}_{1,k|k-1} \ \dots \ \mathcal{Z}_{2n,k|k-1}]$  of the propagated nodes  $\mathcal{Z}_{i,k|k-1} := h(\mathcal{X}_{i,k|k-1})$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$ , where the function  $h(\cdot)$  is from the measurement equation (2);
- $\hat{z}_{k|k-1} := \mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1} \mathbb{1} / (2n)$ ;
- $\mathbb{X}_{k|k-1} := (\mathcal{X}_{k|k-1} - \mathbb{1}^\top \otimes \hat{x}_{k|k-1}) / \sqrt{2n}$ ;
- $\mathbb{Z}_{k|k-1} := (\mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1} - \mathbb{1}^\top \otimes \hat{z}_{k|k-1}) / \sqrt{2n}$ ;
- Apply the Cholesky decomposition  $R_k = R_k^{1/2} R_k^{T/2}$  for finding the measurement noise covariance lower triangular factor  $R_k^{1/2}$ ;
- Compute the cross-covariance matrix  $\bar{P}_{xz,k}$ , the square root  $R_{e,k}^{1/2}$  of the innovations covariance and the square root  $P_{k|k}^{1/2}$  of the filtering covariance as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_{k|k-1} & R_k^{1/2} \\ \mathbb{X}_{k|k-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Theta_k = \begin{bmatrix} R_{e,k}^{1/2} & 0 \\ \bar{P}_{xz,k} & P_{k|k}^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

where  $\Theta_k$  is any orthogonal rotation that lower triangularizes the left-hand matrix of this formula, i.e.  $R_{e,k}^{1/2}$  and  $P_{k|k}^{1/2}$  are lower triangular matrices. The square root  $P_{k|k}^{1/2}$  of the filtering covariance matrix at the sampling time  $t_k$  appears as the result of this triangularization;

- $\mathbb{W}_k := \bar{P}_{xz,k} R_{e,k}^{-1/2}$ ;
- $\hat{x}_{k|k} := \hat{x}_{k|k-1} + \mathbb{W}_k (z_k - \hat{z}_{k|k-1})$ .

---

We remark that the Cholesky decomposition of the noise covariance  $R_k$  in the measurement-update step of the CD-CKF may be optional and absent in the situation when this measurement covariance matrix is time-invariant or possesses such a trivial structure that its square root is known in advance. In all such cases, the square root  $R_k^{1/2}$  is set in the beginning of the filtering procedure, i.e. in the **Initialization**. Our examples presented in Sec. 3 satisfy this condition.

## 2.3 Continuous-Discrete Unscented Kalman Filter

The *Unscented Kalman Filtering* (UKF) originates from the paper of Julier et al. [17], which constructs the method for discrete-time nonlinear stochastic systems. Later on, various issues related to the UKF have been explored by many authors, including [18, 41, 42, 15, 16, 30, 31] and so on. At the heart of the unscented filtering is the *Unscented Transform* (UT) introduced by Julier et al. [17, 18, 15, 16]. The UT implies that the set

of  $2n + 1$  deterministically selected sigma points  $\mathcal{X}_i$  (smaller sigma sets are also possible) is taken by the rule

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = \hat{x}, \quad \mathcal{X}_i = \hat{x} + \sqrt{3}P^{1/2}e_i, \quad \mathcal{X}_{i+n} = \hat{x} - \sqrt{3}P^{1/2}e_i, \quad (10)$$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , where, as customary,  $e_i$  stands for the  $i$ -th coordinate vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $P^{1/2}$  means the lower triangular Cholesky factor (square root) of the covariance matrix of a given  $n$ -dimensional random variable  $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{x}, P)$ , i.e.  $P = P^{1/2}P^{\top/2}$ . In this paper, we utilize the classical parametrization of the mentioned UT and use the following UT coefficients:

$$w_0^{(m)} = \frac{\lambda}{n + \lambda}, \quad w_0^{(c)} = \frac{\lambda}{n + \lambda} + 1 - \alpha^2 + \beta, \quad w_i^{(m)} = w_i^{(c)} = \frac{\lambda}{2n + 2\lambda}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2n,$$

with the fixed parameters  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0$  and  $\lambda = 3 - n$  (see the cited papers). However, other parameterizations have also been considered in literature and an exhaustive study of this issue is published in [31].

The sigma vectors (10) and weights (2.3) allow the mean and covariance of given Gaussian distribution to be calculated as follows:

$$\hat{x} = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} w_i^{(m)} \mathcal{X}_i, \quad P = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} w_i^{(c)} (\mathcal{X}_i - \hat{x})(\mathcal{X}_i - \hat{x})^{\top}. \quad (11)$$

The main property of the above-defined UT is that if one changes the Gaussian distribution with the mean  $\hat{x}$  and covariance  $P$  by a sufficiently smooth nonlinear mapping  $F(\cdot)$  then the mean and covariance of the transformed random variable  $F(x)$  will be calculated approximately by the same formulas (11) but with the sigma vectors  $\mathcal{X}_i$  replaced by the transformed ones  $F(\mathcal{X}_i)$  and with the mean  $\hat{x}$  replaced by the mean evaluated for the transformed distribution by the first formula in (11) [18, 41, 42, 15, 16].

For treating continuous-time nonlinear stochastic systems, the continuous-discrete variant of the UKF is developed in [23]. Again, it is grounded the in the stochastic IT-1.5 discretization of SDE (1) and uses the the additive (zero-mean) noise case UKF algorithm [42, Table 7.3] for estimating the discretized process model (7). Eventually, one arrives at the following CD-UKF method, which is tested on nonstiff and stiff models in Sec. 3, numerically.

---

**Initialization.** Set the initial state expectation and covariance and also the UT coefficients (2.3) as follows:  $\hat{x}_{0|0} := \bar{x}_0$ ,  $P_{0|0} := \Pi_0$ ,  $W_m := [w_0^{(m)} \dots w_{2n}^{(m)}]^{\top}$ ,  $\mathcal{W} := (I_{2n+1} - \mathbb{1}^{\top} \otimes W_m) \times \text{diag} \left\{ w_0^{(c)} \dots w_{2n}^{(c)} \right\} (I_{2n+1} - \mathbb{1}^{\top} \otimes W_m)^{\top}$  (here,  $\mathbb{1}$  stands for the  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional unitary column-vector,  $I_{2n+1}$  is the identity matrix of size  $2n + 1$ ,  $\text{diag} \left\{ w_0^{(c)} \dots w_{2n}^{(c)} \right\}$  denotes the diagonal matrix with the given entries on its main diagonal and  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker tensor product coded by the function `kron` in MATLAB).  
**Loop body.** For  $k := 1, 2, \dots, K$ , where  $K$  is the number of sampling instants in the simulation interval of SDE model (1), do:



Time update: Given the filtering solution  $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}$  and  $P_{k-1|k-1}$  at time  $t_{k-1}$ , compute the predicted state mean  $\hat{x}_{k|k-1}$  and covariance matrix  $P_{k|k-1}$  at the next sampling instant  $t_k$ . For that, set the local initial values  $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^0 := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}$  and  $P_{k-1|k-1}^0 := P_{k-1|k-1}$  and fulfil the  $m$ -step recursive procedure with  $\tau := (t_k - t_{k-1})/m$ :  
For  $l = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$  do;

- Apply the Cholesky decomposition  $P_{k-1|k-1}^l = S_{k-1|k-1}^l \times (S_{k-1|k-1}^l)^\top$  for finding the lower triangular factor  $S_{k-1|k-1}^l$ ;
- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{X}_{k-1|k-1}^l := [\mathcal{X}_{0,k-1|k-1}^l \dots \mathcal{X}_{2n,k-1|k-1}^l]$  of the sigma points  $\mathcal{X}_{i,k-1|k-1}^l$  computed by formulas (10) with  $P^{1/2} := S_{k-1|k-1}^l$  and  $\hat{x} := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l$ ;
- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := [\mathcal{Y}_{0,k-1|k-1}^{l+1} \dots \mathcal{Y}_{2n,k-1|k-1}^{l+1}]$  of the propagated points  $\mathcal{Y}_{i,k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := F_d(t_{k-1}^l, \mathcal{X}_{i,k-1|k-1}^l)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2n$ , where the mapping  $F_d(\cdot)$  is defined in (7);
- $\hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := \mathcal{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} W_m$ ;
- Compute the matrix  $\mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l := \tau \mathbb{L} F_d(t_{k-1}^l, \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^l)/2$ ;
- $P_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} := \mathcal{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1} \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}_{k-1|k-1}^{l+1})^\top + \tau(\tilde{G} + \mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l)(\tilde{G} + \mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l)^\top + \tau \mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l (\mathbb{F}_{k-1|k-1}^l)^\top / 3$ .

Measurement update: Having computed the predicted state expectation  $\hat{x}_{k|k-1} := \hat{x}_{k-1|k-1}^m$  and the predicted covariance matrix  $P_{k|k-1} := P_{k-1|k-1}^m$ , one finds then the filtering solution  $\hat{x}_{k|k}$  and  $P_{k|k}$  based on measurement  $z_k$  received at the time  $t_k$ , as follows:

- Apply the Cholesky decomposition  $P_{k|k-1} = P_{k|k-1}^{1/2} P_{k|k-1}^{\top/2}$  for finding the lower triangular factor  $P_{k|k-1}^{1/2}$ ;
- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{X}_{k|k-1} := [\mathcal{X}_{0,k|k-1} \dots \mathcal{X}_{2n,k|k-1}]$  of the sigma points  $\mathcal{X}_{i,k|k-1}$  computed by formulas (10) with  $P^{1/2} := P_{k|k-1}^{1/2}$  and  $\hat{x} := \hat{x}_{k|k-1}$ ;
- Create the matrix  $\mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1} := [\mathcal{Z}_{0,k|k-1} \dots \mathcal{Z}_{2n,k|k-1}]$  of the propagated points  $\mathcal{Z}_{i,k|k-1} := h(\mathcal{X}_{i,k|k-1})$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2n$ , where the function  $h(\cdot)$  is from the measurement equation (2);
- $\hat{z}_{k|k-1} := \mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1} W_m$ ,  $P_{zz,k|k-1} := \mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1} \mathcal{W} \mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1}^\top + R_k$ ;
- $P_{xz,k|k-1} = \mathcal{X}_{k|k-1} \mathcal{W} \mathcal{Z}_{k|k-1}^\top$ ,  $\mathbb{W}_k := P_{xz,k|k-1} P_{zz,k|k-1}^{-1}$ ;
- $\hat{x}_{k|k} := \hat{x}_{k|k-1} + \mathbb{W}_k(z_k - \hat{z}_{k|k-1})$ ;
- $P_{k|k} = P_{k|k-1} + \mathbb{W}_k P_{zz,k|k-1} \mathbb{W}_k^\top$ .

Note that the above CD-UKF is equivalent to the CD-UKF published in [23]. However, we have used Särkkä's matrix notation [35] for presenting the state estimator under consideration in the concise and straight forward for the MATLAB implementation form in this paper.

In conclusion, we recall that the quality of any continuous-discrete nonlinear Gaussian state estimator depends mainly on errors of two sorts, namely, on the error in capturing the model's dynamic behavior (i.e. the *discretization error*) and on the error in approximating the moments of Gaussian distribution (i.e. the *moment approximation error*) [23]. These errors influence the practical performance of this or that nonlinear Kalman-like filtering technique. The above observation is supported by exhaustive numerical tests presented in the cited paper and in the studies fulfilled in [18, 16, 2, 3, 33, 34] and in many others. In the present research, the Euler-Maruyama discretization scheme used in our CD-EKF in Sec. 2.1 is of the strong convergence order 0.5. Whereas the discretizations underlying the CD-CKF and CD-UKF are the same and based on the Itô-Taylor approximation of the strong convergence order 1.5 in Sec. 2.2 and 2.3. The latter will be obviously more accurate than the first one if all the filters are run on the same equidistant mesh [19]. Next, the mean and covariance approximations use the *linearization* of the moment equations (4) and (5) in the CD-EKF. Therefore it provides the first-order accuracy for calculation of the filtering solution. In contrast, the CD-CKF and CD-UKF are grounded in the *third-degree spherical-radial cubature rule* and in the *unscented transform*, respectively. Then, these estimation methods enjoy the third-order approximations of state means and the first-order accuracies of covariances computed in the time- and measurement-update steps of the mentioned filters. For instance, it is proven theoretically in [36] (or in the other cited literature). Based on the above analysis, one would expect better accuracies achieved with the CD-CKF and CD-UKF in comparison to those of the CD-EKF. That would be in line with the conclusion made in [17, 18, 41, 42, 15, 16, 2, 3, 33, 34] and in many other papers. Below, we intend for testing this guess on stochastic systems which can also expose a stiff behavior.

### 3 Numerical Examples

Here, the CD-EKF, CD-CKF and CD-UKF methods presented in Sec. 2 are examined on two nonlinear stochastic systems, which can be both nonstiff and stiff depending on values of their stiffness parameters. Our intention is to study the filters' accuracies in relation to the stiffness of estimated SDE models. To assess these accuracies, we fulfil the following research. First, to simulate true states of each stochastic system used in our numerical experiments, we solve the corresponding SDE by the Euler-Maruyama with the tiny step size equal to  $10^{-5}$  in the entire simulation interval  $[t_0, t_{end}]$  of the problem. Second, having fixed a sampling time  $\delta$ , we generate true measurements at all  $K := [(t_{end} - t_0)/\delta]$  sampling instants, where  $[\cdot]$  stands for the integer part of the number, by means of the computed stochastic reference solution and the system's measurement equation. Third, we solve the reverse problem, i.e. the given continuous-discrete stochastic system and




Figure 1: Accuracies of the CD-EKF, CD-CKF and CD-UKF methods in the Example 3.1 scenarios

the simulated measurement history are treated together for yielding filtering solutions by the CD-EKF, CD-CKF and CD-UKF methods. Then, the square errors are evaluated at the fixed sampling points. Fourth, we perform 100 Monte Carlo runs for determining the *mean square error* at each sampling instant. The accepted sampling intervals are  $\delta = 0.2, 0.3, \dots, 0.6$  in both test examples. Thus, for all these  $\delta$ 's, we compute the *Accumulated Root Mean Square Error* (ARMSE)

$$\text{ARMSE} := \left[ \frac{1}{100K} \sum_{l=1}^{100} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^n (x_{i_{ref},l}(t_k) - \hat{x}_{i_{k|k,l}})^2 \right]^{1/2} \quad (12)$$

where the subscript *ref* stands for the stochastic reference solution,  $i$  indexes the estimated state vector entries in the stochastic system under consideration (i.e.  $n$  is the size of the given SDE model (1)),  $l$  marks the Monte Carlo run,  $k$  refers to the sampling time  $t_k$  and  $K$  means the total number of sampling instants  $t_k$  fixed for each  $\delta$ . In addition, all our filters are implemented with  $2 \times 10^5$  equidistant subdivisions of each sampling interval  $[t_k, t_{k-1}]$ , i.e.  $m = 2 \times 10^5$  in the CD-EKF, CD-CKF and CD-UKF algorithms presented in Sec. 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, respectively. Thus, the committed discretization errors are expected to be negligible in the experiments, below.

### 3.1 Van der Pol Oscillator

Our first test SDE model is the Van der Pol oscillator, which is considered to be a classical benchmark by many authors (see, for instance, [7, 29, 26, 21]). However, the cited literature deals with its nonstiff variants. To cover the stiff version as well, we rescale it as explained in [12, p. 5]. This is done for estimating the Van der Pol oscillator on the same period, i.e.

irrespective of its stiffness. More precisely, we consider the following process equation:

$$d \begin{bmatrix} x1(t) \\ x2(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x2(t) \\ \lambda((1 - x1^2(t))x2(t) - x1(t)) \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} dw(t).$$

Here,  $\lambda$  is the stiffness parameter and the process noise  $w(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$  where  $I_2$  stands for the identity matrix of size 2. The entire simulation interval is taken to be  $[0, 2]$  in our experiment. The initial values of all the filters are fixed as follows:  $\bar{x}_0 := [\bar{x}1(0), \bar{x}2(0)]^\top = [2, 0]^\top$  and  $\Pi_0 = \text{diag}\{10^{-1}, 10^{-1}\}$ . The formulated SDE model is observed partially, i.e. we exploit the measurement equation

$$z_k = x1(t_k) + v_k$$

with the measurement noise  $v_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.04)$ .

We stress that the *Ordinary Differential Equation* (ODE) underlying the Van der Pol oscillator is the known test example VDPOL for examining stiff ODE solvers [12, p. 144] and, hence, suits well to our purpose. Its stiffness depends on the value of the parameter  $\lambda$ . Below, we test the CD-EKF, CD-CKF and CD-UKF algorithms presented in Sec. 2 on the nonstiff Van der Pol oscillator with  $\lambda = 10$  and on the stiff one with  $\lambda = 10^4$ . Our outcome is shown in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1(a) says that all the filters work well in the nonstiff Van der Pol scenario and produce more or less similar ARMSE's. However, the CD-CKF outperforms slightly the CD-UKF and more seriously the CD-EKF. This advantage is clearly seen for the longer sampling intervals  $\delta$ . Thus, everything is in line with the theoretical analysis presented in the concluding part of Sec. 2. However, the situation changes dramatically when one estimates the stiff Van der Pol oscillator with the same methods. We stress that all the utilized data (including random sequences) and the filtering codes stay unchanged except for the value of the stiffness parameter  $\lambda$  and the corresponding reference solutions. Then, Fig. 1(b) (scaled logarithmically) allows for the following conclusions. First, the accuracies of all our filters drop essentially. They become unacceptable in many cases. This is explained by the fact that the drift function  $F(\cdot)$  in Example 3.1 possesses large eigenvalues in the simulation interval  $[0, 2]$ . In turn, such eigenvalues may enlarge the uncertainty of the state estimation and, hence, increase its ARMSE, significantly. Second, the worst method for estimating the stiff Van der Pol oscillator is the CD-UKF because it halts the performance even at the minimum  $\delta = 0.2$ . This code reports that the calculated covariance matrix loses its positive definiteness and the MATLAB command `chol` fails to complete the demanded Cholesky factorization (that is why all ARMSE's of the CD-UKF are absent in Fig. 1(b)). The latter is not surprising because the similar CD-CKF code reports its huge ARMSE's for the same  $\delta$ 's. Obviously, no positive definiteness can be preserved in such circumstances, and only the square-root fashion of this method allows for completing the state estimation runs. At the same time, the CD-EKF exposes its much better performance with smaller ARMSE's. Thus, our results suggest that the CD-CKF and CD-UKF methods lose the CD-EKF in estimating stiff SDE models. Nevertheless, the accuracies of all the filters are found to be unsatisfactory within the stiff oscillator




Figure 2: Accuracies of the CD-EKF, CD-CKF and CD-UKF methods in the Example 3.2 scenarios

scenario. So we further confirm our observation in the reverse situation, i.e. when the CD-EKF, CD-CKF and CD-UKF are more accurate in the stiff scenario in comparison to nonstiff one.

### 3.2 Artificial SDE

Another SDE model is the continuous-discrete stochastic system already used in [22, 21]. Again, the cited papers deal with its nonstiff variant. Here, we consider the stiff version of this problem as well. We remark that the ODE underlying our SDE test is challenging and published in [24] in the first time. Its difficulty is also confirmed in [25], where the stiff MATLAB code `ode15s` is ineffective for this ODE and is not able to find its accurate numerical solutions. The cited model is presented in the form of the following SDE:

$$d \begin{bmatrix} x1(t) \\ x2(t) \\ x3(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda(x2^2(t) - x1(t)) + 2x1(t)/x2(t) \\ x1(t) - x2^2(t) + 1 \\ -50(x2(t) - 2)x3(t) \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} dw(t)$$

where the process noise is taken to be  $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_3)$  with  $I_3$  standing for the identity matrix of dimension 3. Again, this SDE is estimated in the simulation interval  $[0, 2]$ . The initial data of all the filters are fixed as follows:  $\bar{x}_0 := [\bar{x}1(0), \bar{x}2(0), \bar{x}3(0)]^\top = [1, 1, \exp(-25)]^\top$  and  $\Pi_0 = \text{diag}\{10^{-4}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-4}\}$ . The formulated SDE model is observed partially, i.e. we exploit the measurement equation

$$z_k = x2(t_k) + v_k$$

with the measurement noise  $v_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.04)$ .

Fig. 2 exposes the outcome of our numerical simulation of Example 3.2 in nonstiff and stiff scenarios. Our nonstiff scenario corresponds to  $\lambda = 10$ , whereas the stiff one is obtained by increasing its stiffness to  $\lambda = 10^4$ , as in Example 3.1. Fig. 2(a) is scaled logarithmically.

Despite its reverse matter in the accuracies of the state estimation, Example 3.2 undoubtedly confirms our observation on the better performance of the traditional EKF in comparison to the contemporary CKF and UKF methods for estimating stiff continuous-discrete stochastic systems. This is clearly seen in Fig. 2(b). In contrast, the accuracies of all the filters under examination are in line with the commonly accepted opinion on their performances within our nonstiff scenario presented in Fig. 2(a). Here, the ARMSE's of the CD-EKF are about 2% larger in average than those of the CD-CKF and CD-UKF. Thus, stiff continuous-discrete stochastic systems constitute a special class of state estimation problems for which the contemporary CKF and UKF are ineffective. A theoretical exploration of this unsatisfactory performance of the modern filtering techniques on stiff continuous-time stochastic models will be an interesting topic of future research.

## 4 Concluding Remarks

This paper has revealed quite an interesting and counterintuitive phenomenon of better performance of the traditional EKF in comparison to the contemporary CKF and UKF methods when applied to stochastic systems modeled by SDEs whose drift functions expose stiff behaviors. In other words, we have shown numerically that the lower-order filter outperform the higher-order methods in the accuracy of estimation of stiff continuous-discrete stochastic systems. So a theoretical justification of this phenomenon will be an interesting issue of future research in filtering theory. In addition, our numerical examples suggest that stiff stochastic systems constitute a family of SDE models which are much more difficult for accurate state estimation than traditional nonstiff ones and demand special filtering methods to be invented yet for their effective numerical treatment.

## Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support from Portuguese National Funds through the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (FCT) within project UID/Multi/04621/2013 and the *Investigador FCT 2013* programme.

## References

- [1] L. Aggoun and R. J. Elliot. *Measure Theory and Filtering*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2005.

- [2] I. Arasaratnam and S. Haykin. Cubature Kalman filters. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 54(6):1254–1269, Jun. 2009.
- [3] I. Arasaratnam, S. Haykin, and T. R. Hurd. Cubature Kalman filtering for continuous-discrete systems: Theory and simulations. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 58(10):4977–4993, Oct. 2010.
- [4] K. J. Aström. *Introduction to Stochastic Control Theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [5] Y. Bar-Shalom, X.-R. Li, and T. Kirubarajan. *Estimation with Applications to Tracking and Navigation*. Wiley, New York, 2001.
- [6] J. L. Crassidis and J. L. Junkins. *Optimal Estimation of Dynamic Systems*. CRC Press LLC, New York, 2004.
- [7] P. Frogerais, J.-J. Bellanger, and L. Senhadji. Various ways to compute the continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 57(4):1000–1004, Apr. 2012.
- [8] G. C. Goodwin and K. S. Sin. *Adaptive Filtering Prediction and Control*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1984.
- [9] M. S. Grewal and A. P. Andrews. *Kalman Filtering: Theory and Practice*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2001.
- [10] M. S. Grewal, L. R. Weill, and A. P. Andrews. *Global Positioning Systems, Inertial Navigation and Integration*. Wiley, New York, 2001.
- [11] F. Gustafsson and A. J. Isaksson. Best choice of coordinate system for tracking coordinated turns. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Decision and Control, Kobe, Japan, 1996*.
- [12] E. Hairer and G. Wanner. *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations II: Stiff and Differential-Algebraic Problems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [13] E. L. Haseltine and J. B. Rawlings. Critical evaluation of extended Kalman filtering and moving-horizon estimation. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 44:2451–2460, 2005.
- [14] A. H. Jazwinski. *Stochastic Processes and Filtering Theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [15] S. J. Julier and J. K. Uhlmann. Reduced sigma point filters for the propagation of means and covariances through nonlinear transformations. In *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, pages 887–892, May 2002.
- [16] S. J. Julier and J. K. Uhlmann. Unscented filtering and nonlinear estimation. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 92(3):401–422, Mar. 2004.

- [17] S. J. Julier, J. K. Uhlmann, and H. F. Durrant-Whyte. A new approach for filtering nonlinear systems. In *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, pages 1628–1632, Jun. 1995.
- [18] S. J. Julier, J. K. Uhlmann, and H. F. Durrant-Whyte. A new method for the nonlinear transformation of means and covariances in filters and estimators. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 45(3):477–482, Mar. 2000.
- [19] P. E. Kloeden and E. Platen. *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [20] G. Yu. Kulikov and M. V. Kulikova. Accurate numerical implementation of the continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 59(1):273–279, Jan. 2014.
- [21] G. Yu. Kulikov and M. V. Kulikova. The accurate continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter for continuous-time stochastic systems. *Russian J. Numer. Anal. Math. Modelling*, 30(4):239–249, 2015.
- [22] G. Yu. Kulikov and M. V. Kulikova. High-order accurate continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter for chemical engineering. *European Journal of Control*, 21:14–26, 2015.
- [23] G. Yu. Kulikov and M. V. Kulikova. The accurate continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter for radar tracking. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 64(4):948–958, Feb. 2016.
- [24] G. Yu. Kulikov and R. Weiner. Global error estimation and control in linearly-implicit parallel two-step peer W-methods. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 236(6):1226–1239, 2011.
- [25] G. Yu. Kulikov and R. Weiner. A singly diagonally implicit two-step peer triple with global error control for stiff ordinary differential equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 37(3):A1593–A1613, 2015.
- [26] M. V. Kulikova and G. Yu. Kulikov. Adaptive ODE solvers in extended Kalman filtering algorithms. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 262:205–216, 2014.
- [27] P. Lancaster. *Theory of matrices*. Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [28] F. L. Lewis. *Optimal Estimation: with an Introduction to Stochastic Control Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1986.
- [29] T. Mazzoni. Computational aspects of continuous-discrete extended Kalman filtering. *Comput. Statist.*, 23(4):519–539, 2008.
- [30] H. M. Menegaz, J. Y. Ishihara, and G. A. Borges. New minimum sigma set for unscented filtering. *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, 25(17):3286–3298, 2015.



- [31] H. M. Menegaz, J. Y. Ishihara, G. A. Borges, and A. N. Vargas. A systematization of the unscented Kalman filter theory. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 60(10):2583–2598, Oct. 2015.
- [32] B. Øksendal. *Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications*. Springer, New York, 2003.
- [33] A. Romanenko and J. A. A. M. Castro. The unscented filter as an alternative to the EKF for nonlinear state estimation: a simulation case study. *Comput. Chem. Eng.*, 28(3):347–355, 2004.
- [34] A. Romanenko, L. O. Santos, and P. A. F. N. A. Afonso. Unscented Kalman filtering of a simulated pH system. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 43:7531–7538, 2004.
- [35] S. Särkkä. On unscented Kalman filter for state estimation of continuous-time nonlinear systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 52(9):1631–1641, Sep. 2007.
- [36] S. Särkkä. *Bayesian Filtering and Smoothing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2013.
- [37] S. Särkkä and A. Solin. On continuous-discrete cubature Kalman filtering. In *Proceedings of the 16th IFAC Symposium on System Identification 16, part 1*, pages 1221–1226, 2012.
- [38] D. Simon. *Optimal State Estimation: Kalman, H Infinity and Nonlinear Approaches*. Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006.
- [39] H. Singer. Conditional Gauss-Hermite filtering with application to volatility estimation. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 60(9):2476–2481, Sep. 2015.
- [40] M. Soroush. State and parameter estimation and their applications in process control. *Comput. Chem. Eng.*, 23:229–245, 1998.
- [41] R. Van der Merwe and E. A. Wan. The square-root unscented Kalman filter for state and parameter-estimation. In *2001 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing Proceedings*, volume 6, pages 3461–3464, May 2001.
- [42] E. A. Wan and R. Van der Merwe. The unscented Kalman filter. In S. Haykin ed. *Kalman Filtering and Neural Networks*, pages 221–280, New York, 2001. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [43] D. I. Wilson, M. Agarwal, and D. W. T. Rippin. Experiences implementing the extended Kalman filter on an industrial batch reactor. *Comput. Chem. Eng.*, 22:1653–1672, 1998.