Distributed Set-membership Filtering Frameworks For Multi-agent Systems With Absolute and Relative Measurements

Yu Ding, Yirui Cong, *Member, IEEE,* Xiangke Wang, *Senior Member, IEEE,*

arXiv:2305.15797v1 [cs.MA] 25 May 2023

***Abstract*—In this paper, we focus on the distributed set-membership filtering (SMFing) problem for a multi-agent system with absolute (taken from agents themselves) and relative (taken from neighbors) measurements. In the literature, the relative measurements are difficult to deal with, and the SMFs highly rely on specific set descriptions. As a result, establishing the general distributed SMFing framework having relative measurements is still an open problem. To solve this problem, first, we provide the set description based on uncertain variables determined by the relative measurements between two agents as the foundation. Surprisingly, the accurate description requires only a single calculation step rather than multiple iterations, which can effectively reduce computational complexity. Based on the derived set description, called the uncertain range, we propose two distributed SMFing frameworks: one calculates the joint uncertain range of the agent itself and its neighbors, while the other only computes the marginal uncertain range of each local system. Furthermore, we compare the performance of our proposed two distributed SMFing frameworks and the benchmark – centralized SMFing framework. A rigorous set analysis reveals that the distributed SMF can be essentially considered as the process of computing the marginal uncertain range to outer bound the projection of the uncertain range obtained by the centralized SMF in the corresponding subspace. Simulation results corroborate the effectiveness of our proposed distributed frameworks and verify our theoretical analysis.**

***Index Terms*—Distributed set-membership filter, absolute and relative measurement, performance analysis.**

I. Introduction

A. Motivation and Related Work

With the development of wireless networks and multi-agent systems, rising attention has been attracted to distributed filtering problems, i.e., the agents utilize the locally available measurements and exchange estimation-related information with their neighbors through communications to recursively obtain the state estimation in a decentralized manner. To solve the distributed filtering problems, researchers proposed different filters according to the type of noises. The distributed Kalman filter deals well with white Gaussian noises [1], [2], and the distributed H_∞ filter performs well facing energy-bounded noises [3].

It is worth noticing that for unknown but bounded noises, which are common in practical scenarios, the set-membership filter (SMF) serves as a well-appreciated robust scheme ensuring the error states to be included in certain sets [4]–[6]. However, compared to the distributed Kalman and H_∞ filters, our understanding of distributed SMFs is limited. In the literature, the distributed SMFs can be divided into two types.

For the first type of distributed SMFs, all the agents aim to reach a consensus on the estimated state [7]–[14]. Considering the problem of the variable delays in communications, with the maximum value of the delay known, the authors in [7] proposed a guaranteed distributed observer, such that with partial information and communication with neighboring observers, the generated guaranteed zonotopic sets contain the complete state of the system in real time. In [8], a recursive resource-efficient filtering algorithm was proposed to realize distributed estimation in the simultaneous presence of the Round-Robin transmission protocol, the multi-rate mechanism, and bounded noises, such that there exists a certain ellipsoid that includes all possible error states at each time instant. In analogy with the traditional diffusion step in the stochastic Kalman filter, [9] proposed a diffusion strategy combined with zonotope formula to realize distributed estimation. Based on the multi-hop subspace decomposition theory [15], a distributed zonotopic estimator was designed in [10] for the system with two agents, which was generalized to any number of agents in [11] and [12]. More specifically, in [11], by transforming the dynamics of the system to a cascaded form, each agent is only required to compute a family of sets in lower-dimensional subspace instead of the complete state-space, which effectively reduced computational requirements. Under a sufficient condition of the detectability of each source component, an upper bound of the prediction error is derived via Young's inequality and minimized by designing a suboptimal estimator gain [12]. For nonlinear distributed event-based SMFs with sensor saturation, [13] derived a sufficient condition for the existence of the SMFs, and two optimization problems were solved for improving the filtering performance and reducing the triggering frequency, repectively. In [14], a distributed event-triggered SMF was designed for a class of general nonlinear systems, where both an accurate estimate of the Lagrange remainder and the event-based media-access condition were proposed to improve the filter performance.

The second type of distributed SMFs deals with the estimation problem of interconnected subsystems, and the estimation goal of each agent is to construct the set containing the states of the local subsystem. To the best of our knowledge, few articles studied this problem [16]–[21]. A distributed

Y. Ding, Y. Cong, and X. Wang are with the College of Intelligence Science and Technology, National University of Defense Technology, China.

zonotopic SMF was proposed for robust observation and the fault detection and isolation of linear time-varying cyber-physical systems in [16], where the bit-rate requirements were considered. A novel convex optimization approach was developed to derive sufficient conditions for the existence of local networked SMFs in [17]. Reference [18] considered the distributed SMFing problem for an interconnected multi-rate system, i.e., coupled subsystems can be sampled or actuated at different rates, and the SMF was developed by minimizing the volume of the zonotopes. Reference [19] designed a distributed zonotopic SMF where the communication burden and the estimation performance are well-balanced. Reference [20] defined the parameterized distributed state bounding zonotope for each interconnected system, and proposed an optimization problem to minimize the effect of uncertainties based on the P-radius minimization criterion. Similarly, [21] minimized the intersection of zonotopes using an optimization-based method with a series of linear matrix inequalities.

It should be pointed out that the existing work on distributed SMFs does not incorporate the relative measurements [22] (reflecting the difference of agents from their neighbors). As a result, the existing methods can hardly be applied to many important cooperative estimation problems [23], e.g., the cooperative localization problem [24]. In other words, the existing distributed SMFing framework cannot provide an effective solution method to the estimation problem with relative measurements, especially for the well-known cooperative localization problem. This is largely due to the fact that the existing methods mainly concentrated on the descriptions and/or manipulations of the sets (e.g., ellipsoids and zonotopes), but overlooked the essence of the SMFing framework. Thus, it is necessary to provide new SMFing frameworks with general set-based descriptions to fully handle the relative measurements.

B. Our Contributions

In this article, we establish two distributed SMFing frameworks for nonlinear systems, such that each agent in the system can estimate its own state based on the absolute measurement from itself, relative measurements with neighbor agents, as well as the state estimation of neighborhoods received through communications. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We accurately describe the uncertain range determined by the relative measurements between two agents, which is the foundation of establishing the distributed SMFing frameworks. Surprisingly, the accurate description of the uncertain range requires only a single calculation step rather than multiple iterations. This fact means the non-stochastic SMFs, with relative measurements, can be designed without relying on extra information exchanges among agents or complex optimization processes; this is in contrast to their stochastic counterparts (e.g., using the belief propagation or the covariance intersection techniques).
- Two distributed SMFing frameworks are proposed, which can deal with both linear and nonlinear systems. The first is the neighborhood-joint range distributed SMFing framework, where each agent calculates the joint uncertain range w.r.t. itself and its neighbors. The second is the marginal range distributed SMFing framework which only computes the marginal uncertain range w.r.t. the local system. These two frameworks can serve as the first step toward SMFing with relative measurements.
- Finally, we conducted a performance analysis of the optimal centralized SMFing framework and our two proposed distributed frameworks. The result reveals that the essence of a distributed SMFing framework lies in computing the marginal uncertain range to derive an outer-bounding approximation on the projection of the uncertain range derived by the centralized SMF in the corresponding subspace.

C. Paper Organization

This paper is organized as follows. Section II gives the system model and the problem description. The distributed SMFing frameworks are established in Section III: In Section III-A, the process of deriving uncertain range through relative measurements is provided; the neighborhood-joint range distributed SMFing framework is designed in Section III-B; the marginal range distributed SMFing framework is proposed in Section III-C. We make a comparison of the performance in Section IV among the centralized SMFing framework and our two proposed distributed SMFing frameworks with a rigorous mathematical proof. Simulation examples are provided in Section V to corroborate our theoretical results. Finally, Section VI summarizes the main conclusions of the paper.

D. Notations

For a sample space Ω, a mapping $\mathbf{x}$ from the sample space Ω to a set of interest χ is called an uncertain variable [25]. For an uncertain variable $\mathbf{x}$, a realization is defined as $\mathbf{x}(\omega) = x$. The range of an uncertain variable is described by: $[\![\mathbf{x}]\!] = \{\mathbf{x}(\omega) : \omega \in \Omega\}$. The conditional range of $\mathbf{x}$ given $\mathbf{y} = y$ is denoted by $[\![\mathbf{x}|y]\!]$. A directed graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A})$ is used to represent system topology. $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of vertices, $\mathcal{E} = \{(v_i, v_j) : i, j \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is the set of edges which models information flow, and $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}]$ is the weighted adjacent matrix. The neighborhood set of agent i is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} : (v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ [26]. In this paper, we define $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i = \{i\} \cup \mathcal{N}_i$ to denote the union set of the agent i and its in-neighbors and $\mathcal{M}_i = \{l \in \mathcal{V} : (v_l, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ to denote the out-neighborhood of agent i. $\mathbb{N}_0$ is the set of natural numbers. $\mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the n-dimensional Euclidean space. The operator $\mathrm{col}(\cdot, \cdot)$ stacks subsequent matrices into a column vector, e.g. for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times n}$, $\mathrm{col}(A,\ B) = [A^T \quad B^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(m_1+m_2)\times n}$. Given two sets S_1 and S_2 in an Euclidean space, the operation $\oplus$ stands for the Minkowski sum of S_1 and S_2, i.e., $S_1 \oplus S_2 = \{s_1 + s_2 : s_1 \in S_1,\ s_2 \in S_2\}$. The operation $\times$ stands for the Cartesian product, $S_1 \times S_2 = \{(s_1, s_2) : s_1 \in S_1,\ s_2 \in S_2\}$. The product $\prod_{i=a}^{b} S_i$ represents $S_a \times S_{a+1} \times \cdots \times S_b$.

II. System Model and Problem Description

Consider a system composed by N agents, where each agent is identified by a positive integer $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. The dynamic of agent i is represented by a discrete-time equation

$$x_{i,k+1} = f_i(x_{i,k}) + w_{i,k}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{1}$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As a realization of $\mathbf{x}_{i,k}$, $x_{i,k} \in [\![\mathbf{x}_{i,k}]\!] \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ denotes the state at time instant k for agent i; $w_{i,k} \in [\![\mathbf{w}_{i,k}]\!] \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the process noise; $f_i : D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ stands for the state transition function.

In this work, we consider two types of measurements, i.e., absolute measurements and relative measurements, which are widely considered in the literature [27].

Absolute measurement: An absolute measurement refers to agent i takes an observation on its state directly, with an measurement equation as the following form:

$$y_{i,k} = h_i(x_{i,k}) + v_{i,k}, \tag{2}$$

where $y_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the measurement at time instant k for agent i; $h_i : D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \to \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the measurement function; $v_{i,k} \in [\![\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!]$ is the measurement noise, with $d([\![\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!]) \leq \overline{v}_i$, and $d(\cdot)$ returns the diameter of a set.

Relative measurement: Relative measurements are related to agent i and its neighbors,

$$z_{i,j,k} = g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) + r_{i,j,k}, \ j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \tag{3}$$

where $z_{i,j,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ is the measurement at time instant k between agent i and its in-neighborhood agent j; $g_{i,j} : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_j} \to \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ is the measurement function; $r_{i,j,k} \in [\![\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]$ is the measurement noise, with $d([\![\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]) \leq \overline{r}_{i,j}$.

In this article, the uncertain variables of noise at each time instant and the initial state of each agent are assumed to be unrelated, i.e.,

Assumption 1 (Unrelated Noises and Initial State)**.** *$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbf{w}_{i,0:k}, \mathbf{v}_{i,0:k}, \mathbf{r}_{i,j,0:k}, \mathbf{x}_{i,0}$, $\forall i, j = 1, \ldots, N$. are unrelated.*

Moreover, we consider the communication topology is consistent with the time-invariant measurement topology, i.e., $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ implies agent i takes a relative measurement from agent j and receives information from agent j simultaneously.

For the centralized SMFing framework, readers can refer to [28], and obtain the general centralized SMFing framework by replacing the linear dynamics and measurement model with general nonlinear equations. The uncertain range of agent i solved by centralized set-membership filter is denoted by $S^c_{i,k} = [\![\mathbf{x}_{i,k}|Y_{0:k}]\!] = \{x_{i,k} : (x_{1,k}, \ldots, x_{N,k}) \in [\![\mathbf{x}_k|Y_{0:k}]\!]\}$. By using Theorem 2 in [29], the centralized SMFing framework is optimal, and thus provided here as a benchmark for the distributed frameworks.

The aim of this paper is to derive an uncertain range $S_{i,k}$ for each agent i at each instant k by using all the measurements $y_{i,k}$, $y_{j,k}$ and $z_{i,j,k}$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ up to k, such that $x_{i,k} \in S_{i,k}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

III. Distributed Set-Membership Filtering Frameworks

In this section, we first introduce the process of deriving the uncertain range through relative measurements (see Section III-A). Then, two distributed SMFing frameworks are proposed, i.e., the neighborhood-joint distributed SMF (see Section III-B) and marginal-range distributed SMF (see Section III-C).

A. Uncertain Range Determined by Relative Measurements

In this subsection, we derive the uncertain range corresponding to each relative measurement, which plays a pivotal role in establishing the distributed SMFs in Section III-B and Section III-C. More specifically, for a given $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, with $z_{i,j,k} = g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) + r_{i,j,k}$, we focus on how to obtain an uncertain range $S_{i,k}$ such that $x_{i,k} \in S_{i,k}$.

Since both $x_{i,k}$ and $x_{j,k}$ are the realizations of uncertain variables, (3) implies these two uncertain variables forms a joint range, which means the uncertain range $S_{i,k}$ is correlated with the uncertain range of $\mathbf{x}_{j,k}$. For any given uncertain range $S_{j,k} \ni x_{j,k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,k} = \{x_{i,k} : g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) = z_{i,j,k} - r_{i,j,k}, \\ x_{j,k} \in S_{j,k}, \ r_{i,j,k} \in [\![\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

For any given $x_{j,k} \in S_{j,k}$ and $r_{i,j,k} \in [\![\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]$, let $g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(z_{i,j,k} - r_{i,j,k}, x_{j,k})$ denote the preimage of $g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) = z_{i,j,k} - r_{i,j,k}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(z_{i,j,k} - r_{i,j,k}, x_{j,k}) = \\ \{x_{i,k} : g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) + r_{i,j,k} = z_{i,j,k}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

then $S_{i,k}$ can be derived by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,k} &= \bigcup_{x_{j,k} \in S_{j,k}} \bigcup_{r_{i,j,k} \in [\![\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]} g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(z_{i,j,k} - r_{i,j,k}, x_{j,k}) \\ &= g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], S_{j,k}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Equation (6) implies the size of $S_{i,k}$ relies on the uncertain range $S_{j,k}$. Furthermore, given $z_{i,j,k}$ and $[\![\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]$, $S_{i,k}$ is monotonically nondecreasing with $S_{j,k}$, i.e., for any $S^1_{j,k}, S^2_{j,k} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$, if $S^1_{j,k} \subseteq S^2_{j,k}$, $S^1_{i,k} \subseteq S^2_{i,k}$ holds.

Remark 1. *Notice that $g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{p_i} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$. Similarly, we use $g^{-1}_{i,j,2}(\cdot,\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{n_j} \times \mathbb{R}^{p_i} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ to denote the preimage of $g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) + r_{i,j,k} = z_{i,j,k}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n_j}$.*

With absolute and relative measurements, the uncertain range of $\mathbf{x}_{i,k}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{j,k}$ can be derived as follows.

Proposition 1. *For a given $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, consider the following measurement equations:*

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i,k} &= h_i(x_{i,k}) + v_{i,k}, \\ y_{j,k} &= h_j(x_{j,k}) + v_{j,k}, \\ z_{i,j,k} &= g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) + r_{i,j,k}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$




Fig. 1. Sketch map of Proposition 1.

Let $S_{i,j,k} = \{(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) : (x_{i,k}, x_{j,k})$ satisfying (7)$\}$*, and the following equations hold:*

$$\underset{\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\times\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S_{i,j,k} = h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!]) \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k}]\!])), \quad (8)$$

$$\underset{\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\times\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S_{i,j,k} = h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k}]\!]) \cap g_{i,j,2}^{-1}(h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!]), \{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]). \quad (9)$$

Proof: For simplicity, we define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 &= h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!]),\\
\widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0 &= h_i^{-1}(\{y_{j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k}]\!]),\\
\widetilde{S}_{j,k}^1 &= \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,2}^{-1}(\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0, \{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]),\\
\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1 &= \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^1).
\end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Considering the formal symmetry of $x_{i,k}$ and $x_{j,k}$, we only need to prove (8). With (10), we rewrite (8) as

$$\underset{\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\times\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S_{i,j,k} = \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0). \quad (11)$$

With (11), we divide the proof into three steps.

Step 1:

$$\underset{\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\times\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S_{i,j,k} \subseteq \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1. \quad (12)$$

Step 2:

$$\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1 \subseteq \underset{\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\times\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S_{i,j,k}. \quad (13)$$

Step 3:

$$\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1 = \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0). \quad (14)$$

For Step 1, $\forall x_{i,k}^0 \in \underset{\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\times\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S_{i,j,k}$, $\exists x_{j,k}^0$ such that $(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) \in S_{i,j,k}$. By the definition of $S_{i,j,k}$ and $\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1$, it is easy to prove that $x_{i,k}^0 \in \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1$, hence (12) holds.

For Step 2, $\forall x_{i,k}^1 \in \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1$, there exists $x_{j,k}^1 \in \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^1$, such that $g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}^1, x_{j,k}^1) + r_{i,j,k} = z_{i,j,k}$. From the definition of $\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1$ and $\widetilde{S}_{j,k}^1$, we have $(x_{i,k}^1, x_{j,k}^1) \in S_{i,j,k}$. Hence, $x_{i,k}^1 \in \underset{\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\times\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S_{i,j,k}$, which implies (13) holds.

For Step 3, noticing that $\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1 = \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^1)$ and $\widetilde{S}_{j,k}^1 \subseteq \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0$, we have

$$\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1 \subseteq \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0). \quad (15)$$

$\forall x_{i,k}^2 \in \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0)$, $\exists x_{j,k}^2 \in \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0$ such that $g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}^2, x_{j,k}^2) + r_{i,j,k} = z_{i,j,k}$. Hence, $x_{j,k}^2 \in g_{i,j,2}^{-1}(\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0, \{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!])$, which implies $x_{j,k}^2 \in \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^1$. By the definition of $\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1$, we have $x_{i,k}^2 \in \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^1$, (14) holds. ■

Remark 2. *According to the monotonical property of* $g_{i,j,1}^{-1}$*, one may consider constructing a monotonically decreasing set sequence* $\{\widetilde{S}_{j,k}^t\},\ t = 1, 2, \cdots$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^t &= \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^{t-1} \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^t),\\
\widetilde{S}_{j,k}^t &= \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^{t-1} \cap g_{i,j,2}^{-1}(\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^{t-1}, \{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]),
\end{aligned}$$

[as in (10)*] is helpful to derive* $S_{i,k}$ *with higher accuracy. However, the proof of* (14) *indicates that only the first iteration is effective in reducing uncertainty, i.e.,* $\widetilde{S}_{i,k}^0 \cap g_{i,j,1}^{-1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \widetilde{S}_{j,k}^0) = \widetilde{S}_{i,k}^t,\ \forall t \geq 1$.

Moreover, (8) *and* (9) *imply that the process of deriving the uncertain range from relative measurements does not cause overestimation in the set-membership filter. For random variables, the process of deriving a covariance from absolute and relative measurements is often called "sensor information fusion", which is essentially the same process with* (8) *and* (9)*, with a probability measure defined on each set. The covariance fusion is to find a minimized ellipsoid outer bound of the intersection of two ellipses [30], which implies the overestimation is inevitable in stochastic methods.*

B. Neighborhood-Joint Range Distributed SMFing Framework

In this subsection, we consider a distributed framework that each agent calculates the joint uncertain range w.r.t. itself and its in-neighbors. Without loss of generality, we assume agents $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_s$ are the in-neighborhood agents of i. Let $x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}} = [x_{i,k}^T, x_{j_1,k}^T, \ldots, x_{j_s,k}^T]^T$, $W_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}} = [w_{i,k}^T, w_{j_1,k}^T, \ldots, w_{j_s,k}^T]^T$ with $W_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}} \in [\![\mathbf{W}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}}]\!]$. $F_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} : \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j} \to \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$, and $F_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}}) = [f_i(x_{i,k})^T,\ f_{j_1}(x_{j_1,k})^T, \cdots,\ f_{j_s}(x_{j_s,k})^T]^T$.

The relative measurements of an agent are related to its in-neighbors, we define $z_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}}$ as all the relative measurements taken by agent i, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
z_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}} &= [z_{i,j_1,k}^T, \ldots, z_{i,j_s,k}^T]^T\\
&= \mathrm{col}[(g_{i,j}(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k}) + r_{i,j,k})]_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\\
&= g_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}}) + r_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}}.
\end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{col}(h_j(x_{j,k}))_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \\ z_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{col}(v_{j,k})_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \\ r_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}} \end{bmatrix}\\
&= H_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}}) + V_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{i,k}},
\end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $H_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\cdot) : \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j} \to \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{m_j}$ is the joint measurement function; $V_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} = [v_{i,k}^T,\ v_{j_1,k}^T, \cdots,\ v_{j_s,k}^T,\ r_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^T]^T$ denotes the joint absolute measurement noise; the augmented form of relative measurements $z_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$ and its noise $r_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$ is given in (16).

Our proposed neighborhood-joint range distributed SMFing framework is to generate a uncertain range $S_{i,k}^p \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ at each step k given the measurements $Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,0:k}$, such that $x_{i,k} \in S_{i,k}^p,\ \forall k \in N_0$.

Denote $\overline{S}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p$ and $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p$ as the joint prior and posterior uncertain range of $x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$, respectively. The framework of neighborhood-joint distributed SMFing framework is provided in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Neighborhood-Joint Range Distributed SMFing Framework

1: **Initialization**. For agent i, set the initial uncertain range $S_{i,0}^p$.
2: **loop**
3: **Prediction**. Given $S_{i,k-1}^p$, the prior range of each agent, i.e., $\overline{S}_{i,k}^p$ is given by

$$\overline{S}_{i,k}^p = f_i(S_{i,k-1}^p) \oplus [\![\mathbf{w}_{i,k-1}]\!], \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, N. \tag{18}$$

4: Receive $\overline{S}_{j,k}^p$ from neighbourhood agents and calculate neighborhood-joint prior uncertain range $\overline{S}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p = \overline{S}_{i,k}^p \times \prod_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\overline{S}_{j,k}^p$.
5: **Measurement**. Take integrated measurements $Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$.
6: **Joint Update**. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, given the observation $Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$, the joint posterior set $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p$ is formulated by

$$S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p = H_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}^{-1}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}\} \oplus [\![-V_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}]\!]) \cap \overline{S}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p. \tag{19}$$

where $H_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse map of $H_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\cdot)$.
7: Receive $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^{p,i}$ from $l \in \mathcal{M}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_i$. If $\mathcal{M}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_i = \emptyset$, $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^{p,i} = \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, where $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^{p,i}$ is the projection of $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^p$ to subspace $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, i.e., $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^{p,i} = \underset{\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l}\mathbb{R}^{n_u}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^p = \{x_{i,k} | x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k} \in S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^p\}$.
8: **Update Intersection**. The posterior uncertain range of agent i at step k is calculated by

$$S_{i,k}^p = [\bigcap_{l\in\mathcal{M}_i\cap\mathcal{N}_i} S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}^{p,i}] \cap [\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p]. \tag{20}$$

9: $k = k + 1$;
10: **end loop**

The line-by-line explanation is given as follows:

- Line 1 initializes the uncertain range of the state of the i^{th} agent.
- Line 4 denotes the communication process that an agent receives the information required in the joint prior uncertain range.




Fig. 2. The topology of neighborhood-joint range distributed SMF example.

- Line 7-8 denotes the process of intersection from joint uncertain ranges, similar idea is also presented in [20], [31]. To make it easy to understand, we present a diagrammatic drawing to demonstrate this process (see Fig. 3). Consider a 3-agent system with topology $1 \to 2 \to 3 \to 1$. The update process of centralized SMFing framework is shown in Fig. 3(a). The joint posterior uncertain range obtained by line 6 are $(x_{1,k}, x_{3,k}) \in S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1,k}^p$ (Fig. 3(b)), $(x_{2,k}, x_{1,k}) \in S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_2,k}^p$ (Fig. 3(d)), $(x_{3,k}, x_{2,k}) \in S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_3,k}^p$ (Fig. 3(c)). Lines 7-8 present the uncertain range of $x_{2,k}$, $S_{2,k}^p = \underset{(x_1,x_2)\to x_2}{\text{Proj}} S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_2,k}^p \cap \underset{(x_3,x_2)\to x_2}{\text{Proj}} S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_3,k}^p$.

C. Marginal Range Distributed SMFing Framework

Considering $H_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\cdot)^{-1}$ in Algorithm 1 is with high computational complexity for lager number of neighbors, we propose another distributed SMFing framework to directly generate $S_{i,k}^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ that contains $x_{i,k}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, i.e., the marginal range distributed SMFing framework (see Algorithm 2).

Remark 3. *Algorithm 1 mainly manipulates the uncertain range $S_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}^p \subseteq \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ with $\sum_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} n_j$ dimensions while Algorithm 2 calculates the uncertain range in the $\mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ subspace, i.e., sets with n_j dimensions. Thus Algorithm 2 has lower computational complexity in general.*

IV. Performance Analysis

In this section, we make a performance comparison among the centralized SMFing framework and our proposed distributed SMFing frameworks, given in Theorem 1. To start with, we provide three important lemmas as follows.

Lemma 1. *Consider two sets W_1 and W_2, for any set $S \subset W_1 \times W_2$, and let $\underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_1}{\text{Proj}} S$ denote the projection of S from $W_1 \times W_2$ to W_1. Then*

$$S \subseteq \underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_1}{\text{Proj}} S \times \underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_2}{\text{Proj}} S, \tag{23}$$

$$S_1 \subseteq S_2 \to \underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_1}{\text{Proj}} S_1 \subseteq \underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_1}{\text{Proj}} S_2, \tag{24}$$




Fig. 3. Illustration of neighborhood-joint range distributed SMF, each uncertain range derived by neighborhood-joint range distributed SMF is illustrated by purple lines. (a) The actual uncertain range of state $x_k = [x_{1,k}^T, x_{2,k}^T, x_{3,k}^T]^T$. The prior uncertain range $[\![\mathbf{x}_k|Y_{0:k-1}]\!]$ is expressed by the blue paralleltope. The red cuboid is the primary image of observation $H_c^{-1}(\{Y_k\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_k]\!]) = \{x_k | \exists V_k \in [\![\mathbf{V}_k]\!],\ H_c(x_k) + V_k = Y_k\}$. The posterior uncertain range $[\![\mathbf{x}_k|Y_{0:k}]\!]$ is described by the green polytope. (b) The uncertain range $S^p_{\mathcal{N}_3,k} \ni (x_{3,k}, x_{1,k})$. (c) The uncertain range $S^p_{\mathcal{N}_2,k} \ni (x_{2,k}, x_{3,k})$. (d) The uncertain range $S^p_{\mathcal{N}_1,k} \ni (x_{1,k}, x_{2,k})$.

$$\underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_1}{\text{Proj}} S_1 \cap S_2 \subseteq \underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_1}{\text{Proj}} S_1 \cap \underset{W_1\times W_2\to W_1}{\text{Proj}} S_2. \tag{25}$$

Proof: This proof directly follows from the definition of subset and projection. ■

Lemma 2. *The following two formula set up:*

$$\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}\} \oplus [\![-V_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}]\!]) = h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!])[\bigcap_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k}]\!]))]; \tag{26}$$

$$\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\text{Proj}} H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}\} \oplus [\![-V_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}]\!]) = h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k}]\!]) \cap [g^{-1}_{i,j,2}(h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!]), \{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!])],\ \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_i. \tag{27}$$

Proof: This conclusion comes directly from Proposition 1. ■

Lemma 3. *The following formula sets up:*

$$\underset{\prod_{i=1}^N\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\to\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\text{Proj}} [H_c^{-1}(\{Y_k\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_k]\!])] \subseteq H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}]\!]). \tag{28}$$

Proof: For (28), $\forall x^0_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \in \underset{\prod_{i=1}^N\mathbb{R}^{n_i}\to\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\text{Proj}} [H_c^{-1}(\{Y_k\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_k]\!])]$, there exists $x^0_{c,k} = (x^0_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}, x^0_{\mathcal{V}/\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}) \in H_c^{-1}(\{Y_k\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_k]\!])$. Hence

$$x^0_{c,k} \in H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}]\!]) \times \prod_{j\in\mathcal{V}/\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}. \tag{29}$$

Project both sides of (29) from $\prod_{j=1}^N \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ to $\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$, we have $x^0_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \in H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}]\!])$, (28) holds. ■

Theorem 1. *With the same initial condition* $[\![\mathbf{x}_{i,0}]\!] = \{x_{i,0} : (x_{1,0}, x_{2,0}, \cdots, x_{N,0}) \in [\![\mathbf{x}_0]\!]\}$, *for each* $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *and observation* $y_{i,k},\ z_{i,k},\ i = 1, \ldots, N$, *the posterior uncertain range*

Algorithm 2 Marginal Range Distributed SMFing Framework

1: **Initialization**. For agent i, set the initial prior range $S^d_{i,0}$.
2: **loop**
3: **Prediction**. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,given the posterior range $S^d_{i,k-1}$ in the previous step, the prior range $\overline{S}^d_{i,k}$ is predicted by

$$\overline{S}^d_{i,k} = f_i(S^d_{i,k-1}) \oplus [\![\mathbf{w}_{i,k-1}]\!]. \tag{21}$$

4: **Measurement**. Take measurements $y_{i,k}$ and $z_{i,j,k}$.
5: Receive $\overline{S}^d_{j,k}$, h_j, $y_{j,k}$ and $[\![\mathbf{v}_{j,k}]\!]$ from in-neighborhood agents $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.
6: **Update**. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, given absolute measurement $y_{i,k}$, relative measurements $z_{i,j,k}$ and the prior range $\overline{S}^d_{i,k}$, the posterior range $S^d_{i,k}$ is updated by

$$\begin{aligned} S^d_{i,k} = \overline{S}^d_{i,k} \cap [h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k}]\!])] \cap \\ [\bigcap_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\{z_{i,j,k}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!], \overline{S}^d_{j,k} \cap h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k}\} \oplus \\ [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k}]\!]))]. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

7: $k = k + 1$;
8: **end loop**

of centralized SMF, neighborhood-joint range distributed SMF and marginal range distributed SMF satisfy

$$S^c_{i,k} \subseteq S^p_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}. \tag{30}$$

Proof: This proof is divided into two steps, i.e., $S^c_{i,k} \subseteq S^p_{i,k}$ and $S^p_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}$.

Step 1: $S^c_{i,k} \subseteq S^p_{i,k}$.

Consider an auxiliary joint uncertain range $S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} = \{x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} : x_k \in [\![\mathbf{x}_k|Y_{0:k}]\!]\}$. We firstly prove $S^c_{i,k} \subset \underset{\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} R^{n_u}\to R^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}$, $\forall l \in \mathcal{M}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_i$. Secondly, we utilize mathematical induction to prove $S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \subseteq S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Finally, it is shown $S^c_{i,k} \subseteq S^p_{i,k}$, $k \in N_0$.

Step 1.1: $S^c_{i,k} \subset \underset{\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} R^{n_u}\to R^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}$.

For any $x^0_{i,k} \in S^c_{i,k}$, $\exists x^0_k$ such that

$$x^0_k = (x^0_{1,k}, \cdots, x^0_{i,k}, \cdots, x^0_{N,k}) \in [\![\mathbf{x}_k|Y_{0:k}]\!] \tag{31}$$

Project (31) from $\prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ to $\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, $l \in M_i$,

$$x^0_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k} \in S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}, \ \forall l \in \mathcal{M}_i \tag{32}$$

Project both sides of (32) from $\prod_{u\in\mathcal{N}_l} \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$,

$$x^0_{i,k} \in S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}, \ \forall l \in \mathcal{M}_i. \tag{33}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} S^c_{i,k} &\subseteq \bigcap_{l\in\mathcal{M}_i} \underset{\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} \mathbb{R}^{n_u}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k} \\ &\subseteq \bigcap_{l\in\mathcal{M}_i\cap\mathcal{N}_i} \underset{\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} \mathbb{R}^{n_u}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Step 1.2: $S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \subseteq S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$.

Next we prove $S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \subseteq S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$ with mathematical induction.

Base case: When $k = 0$, with the same initialization $S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,0} = S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,0}$, $S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,0} \subseteq S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,0}$ holds.

Inductive Step: Assume $S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \subseteq S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$ holds for any $k = k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Consider the prediction step, from the definition of $S^c_{i,k}$ and (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{S}^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1} &\subseteq \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} [\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\text{Proj}} \overline{S}^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1}] \\ &= \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \underset{\prod_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\text{Proj}} [F_c([\![\mathbf{x}_k|Y_{0:k_0}]\!]) \oplus [\![\mathbf{w}_k]\!]] \\ &\subseteq \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} [f_i(S^c_{i,k_0}) \oplus [\![\mathbf{w}_{i,k_0}]\!]] \\ &\subseteq \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} [f_i(S^p_{i,k_0}) \oplus [\![\mathbf{w}_{i,k_0}]\!]] = \overline{S}^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

According to (28) in Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1} &= \underset{\prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{R}^{n_i}\to\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\text{Proj}} [\![\mathbf{x}_{k_0+1}|Y_{0:k_0+1}]\!] \\ &\subseteq \overline{S}^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1} \cap \underset{\prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{R}^{n_i}\to\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}}{\text{Proj}} [H_c^{-1}(\{Y_{k_0+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{k_0+1}]\!])] \\ &\subseteq \overline{S}^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1} \cap [H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1}]\!])] \\ &= S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_0+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$S^c_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \subseteq S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}, \forall i = 1, \cdots, N, \ \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \tag{37}$$

Step 1.3: $S^c_{i,k} \subseteq S^p_{i,k}$.

For each $l \in \mathcal{M}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_i$, project both sides of (37) from $\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and combine it with (34),

$$\begin{aligned} S^c_{i,k} &\subseteq \underset{\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} \mathbb{R}^{n_u}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k} \cap [\bigcap_{l\in\mathcal{M}_i\cap\mathcal{N}_i} \underset{\prod_{u\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l} \mathbb{R}^{n_u}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_i}}{\text{Proj}} S^p_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,k}] \\ &= S^p_{i,k}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The first part of Theorem 1, i.e. $S^c_{i,k} \subseteq S^p_{i,k}$ has been proven.

Step 2: $S^p_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}$.

Consider an auxiliary filtering framework, i.e., Algorithm 1 without the update intersection step. The uncertain range of agent i and neighborhood-joint uncertain range given by the auxiliary framework are denoted by $S^{p^a}_{i,k}$ and $S^{p^a}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$, respectively.

It is obvious that $S^p_{i,k} \subseteq S^{p^a}_{i,k}$ from line 8 in Algorithm 1; thus we only need to prove $S^{p^a}_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}$, which can be completed by mathematical induction.

Base case: When $k=0$, $S^{p^a}_{i,0} = S^d_{i,0}$, $S^{p^a}_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}$ holds.

Inductive step: Assume $S^{p^a}_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}$ holds for any $k = k_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Thus $\overline{S}^{p^a}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1} \subseteq \overline{S}^d_{i,k_1+1} \times \prod_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \overline{S}^d_{j,k_1+1}$.

$$S^{p^a}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1} = \overline{S}^{p^a}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1} \cap [H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1}]\!])] \tag{39}$$

$$\subseteq [\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \overline{S}^d_{j,k_1+1}] \cap [H^{-1}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}(\{Y_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1}]\!])].$$

Project both sides of (39) from $\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{n_j}$, respectively,

$$\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_{i(j)}}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S^{p^a}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1} \subseteq [\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_{i(j)}}}{\mathrm{Proj}} \prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \overline{S}^d_{j,k_1+1}] \tag{40}$$

$$\cap [\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_{i(j)}}}{\mathrm{Proj}} H^{-1}_{\mathcal{N}_i,k_1+1}(\{Y_{\mathcal{N}_i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{N}_i,k_1+1}]\!])].$$

From Lemma 2,

$$S^{p^a}_{i,k_1+1} \subseteq \overline{S}^d_{i,k_1+1} \cap [h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k_1+1}]\!])] \cap \tag{41}$$
$$\bigcap_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} [g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\{z_{i,j,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k_1+1}]\!], h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k_1+1}\}$$
$$\oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k_1+1}]\!]))];$$
$$\underset{\prod_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i}\mathbb{R}^{n_j}\to\mathbb{R}^{n_{i(j)}}}{\mathrm{Proj}} S^{p^a}_{i,k_1+1} \subseteq \overline{S}^d_{j,k_1+1} \cap h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k_1+1}\} \oplus$$
$$[\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k_1+1}]\!]) \cap [g^{-1}_{i,j,2}(h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k_1+1}]\!]),$$
$$\{z_{i,j,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k_1+1}]\!])],\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i$$

hence for any $x^1_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1} \in S^{p^a}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k_1+1}$, we have

$$x^1_{i,k_1+1} \in \overline{S}^d_{i,k+1} \cap h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k_1+1}]\!]); \tag{42}$$
$$x^1_{i,k_1+1} \in \bigcap_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} [g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\{z_{i,j,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k_1+1}]\!], h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k_1+1}\}$$
$$\oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k_1+1}]\!])),$$

and

$$x^1_{j,k_1+1} \in \overline{S}^d_{j,k+1} \cap [h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k_1+1}]\!])]; \tag{43}$$
$$x^1_{j,k_1+1} \in g^{-1}_{i,j,2}(h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k+1}]\!]), \{z_{i,j,k+1}\} \oplus$$
$$[\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k+1}]\!]),\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i.$$

Notice that (43) implies

$$x^1_{i,k_1+1} \in g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\{z_{i,j,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k_1+1}]\!], \overline{S}^d_{j,k_1+1} \cap \tag{44}$$
$$h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k_1+1}]\!])),\ \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_i.$$

Combine (44) and (42), one can prove

$$x^1_{i,k_1+1} \in \overline{S}^d_{i,k_1+1} \cap [h_i^{-1}(\{y_{i,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{i,k_1+1}]\!])] \cap \tag{45}$$
$$\bigcap_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} [g^{-1}_{i,j,1}(\{z_{i,j,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k_1+1}]\!], \overline{S}^d_{j,k_1+1} \cap$$
$$h_j^{-1}(\{y_{j,k_1+1}\} \oplus [\![-\mathbf{v}_{j,k_1+1}]\!]))] = S^d_{i,k_1+1}.$$

Therefore, for $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $S^p_{i,k} \subseteq S^{p^a}_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}$. Theorem 1 has been proved. ■

In analogy with the joint probability distribution, the neighbourhood-joint uncertain variable $\mathbf{x}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$ can be considered as a marginal uncertain variable of the centralized variable $\mathbf{x}_k$. Similarly, consider i as the central node of $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i$, then $S^{p^a}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$ is the centralized SMFing uncertain range corresponding to $x_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,k}$, while $\mathbf{x}_{i,k}$ is a marginal uncertain variable with marginal uncertain range $S^d_{i,k}$. In Theorem 1 and its proof we can observe that, the marginal uncertain range always outer bounds the uncertain range derived by the 'centralized' method, e.g., $S^c_{i,k} \subseteq S^p_{i,k}$ and $S^{p^a}_{i,k} \subseteq S^d_{i,k}$. This is due to the fact that the range projection manipulation from a joint uncertain range to marginal range reduces the state order and computation burden, but leads to loss of the correlation between uncertain variables, which can not be restored by the Cartesian product, thus lost part of accuracy. Therefore the distributed SMFing framework can be considered as a process of marginal range computation in the corresponding subspace, which outer approximates the projection of the optimal uncertain range derived by the centralized SMF.

Remark 4. *It is worth mentioning that for nonadditive noise and time-varying model in* (1)-(3)*, our conclusion still holds. By replacing* $F(S) \oplus [\![\mathbf{w}_k]\!]$ *and* $H^{-1}(\{y_k\} \oplus [\![\mathbf{v}_k]\!])$ *with* $F_k(S, [\![\mathbf{w}_k]\!])$ *and* $H^{-1}_{k,v_k}(\{y_k\}, [\![\mathbf{v}_k]\!])$*, Theorem 1 can be proved with the same process.*

V. Simulation Results

In this section, we consider five UAVs in a 2-D plane with the topology shown in Fig. 4, each utilizes absolute and relative measurements to localize its position. To distinguish with the absolute measurement noise $v_{i,k}$, in this section we use tilde $\widetilde{v}_{i,k}$ to denote the velocity of UAV i at time instant k.




Fig. 4. System measurement and communication topology.

A. Linear Example

In this subsection, we consider the linear model that each UAV is described by a discrete-time double integrator. The system state $x_{i,k} = [p^T_{i,k}, \widetilde{v}^T_{i,k}]^T$, where $p^T_{i,k}, \widetilde{v}_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}^2$

denote the position and velocity of UAV i at time instant k, respectively. The system equation can be written as:

$$x_{i,k+1} = (A_i \otimes I_2)x_{i,k} + (B_i \otimes \begin{bmatrix}1\\1\end{bmatrix})[(u_{i,k} + w_{i,k}) \otimes I_2], \tag{46}$$

where $A_{i,k} = \begin{bmatrix}1 & T\\0 & 1\end{bmatrix}$, $B_i = \begin{bmatrix}\frac{T^2}{2}\\T\end{bmatrix}$, $T = \pi/8$, and u_i is the control input with noise $w_{i,k} \in [-0.5, 0.5] \times [-0.5, 0.5]$. In this simulation, we consider a classical consensus protocol, $u_i = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}[(p_{i,k} - p_{j,k}) + \gamma(\widetilde{v}_{i,k} - \widetilde{v}_{j,k})]$, $\gamma = 0.5$.

The measurement equations are as follows:

$$y_{i,k} = C_i x_{i,k} + v_{i,k}, \tag{47}$$

$$z_{i,j,k} = D_i(x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}) + r_{i,j,k}, \tag{48}$$

where $C_i = D_i = I_4$, $v_{i,k}, r_{i,j,k} \in [-0.5, 0.5] \otimes [1; 1; 1; 1]^T$.

The uncertain range of each UAV is described by a constrained zonotope [32] $\mathcal{Z}_{i,k} = \{z : z = G_{i,k}\xi + c_{i,k},\ A_{i,k}\xi = b_{i,k}, \|\xi\|_\infty \le 1\}$. The initial state and uncertain range of each UAV $x_{i,0}$, $\mathcal{Z}_{i,0}$ are randomly generated.





Fig. 5. The real trajectories of five UAVs.

The consensus trajectories of the five UAVs are shown in Fig. 5. Due to the page limit, we only present the position estimation results of UAV 5 with centralized, neighborhood-joint range distributed and marginal range distributed constrained zonotopic algorithms. In Fig. 6(a)-Fig. 6(c), the trajectory of UAV 5 is the red line, with the dots representing the real positions at different time steps. The position estimation sets in 2-D plane are rectangles. At each step, we can see that the constrained zonotope presented by centralized algorithm and distributed SMF algorithm contain the real positions of UAV 5, which corroborates the effectiveness of our proposed methods.


In Fig. 6(d), we consider the centralized SMFing framework as a benchmark, and make a comparison with two proposed distributed SMFing frameworks. To measure the conservativeness directly, we consider using the diameter of sets, i.e.,

$$d(S) = \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in S} \|s_1 - s_2\|_\infty. \tag{49}$$


For an interval hull in 2-D plane, $d(S)$ is the maximum edge length, which is the twice of the infinite norm of G matrix.




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)

Fig. 6. Position estimation of UAV 5 presented by centralized and distributed SMF algorithms. (a) The position estimation of UAV 5 presented by the centralized constrained zonotopic algorithm. (b) The position estimation of UAV 5 presented by the proposed neighborhood-joint range distributed SMF constrained zonotopic algorithm. (c) The position estimation of UAV 5 presented by the proposed marginal range distributed SMF constrained zonotopic algorithm. (d)The infinite norm of generator matrix $\|G\|_\infty$ corresponding to the diameter of uncertain range.

The curve corresponding to the neighborhood-joint range framework and marginal range framework is always above the centralized method, which verifies our results in Theorem 1.

B. Nonlinear Example

In this subsection, we utilize a nonlinear example to verify the effectiveness of our proposed distributed SMFing frameworks. Consider the following discrete-time unicycle model [33]:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{i,x,k+1} &= p_{i,x,k} + \frac{\widetilde{v}_{i,k}}{\widetilde{\omega}_{i,k}}[\sin(\widetilde{\omega}_{i,k}T + \theta_{i,k}) - \sin(\theta_{i,k})] \\ &\quad + w_{i,x,k}; \\ p_{i,y,k+1} &= p_{i,y,k} + \frac{\widetilde{v}_{i,k}}{\widetilde{\omega}_{i,k}}[\cos(\theta_{i,k}) - \cos(\widetilde{\omega}_{i,k}T + \theta_{i,k})] \\ &\quad + w_{i,y,k}; \\ \theta_{i,k+1} &= \theta_{i,k} + \widetilde{\omega}_{i,k}T + w_{i,\theta,k}, \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$


where $p_{i,k} = [p_{i,x,k}^T, p_{i,y,k}^T]^T$ denotes the position of UAV i at step k; $\widetilde{v}_{i,k} = 4$ m/s is the velocity of each UAV; where $\widetilde{\omega}_{i,k}$ is the angle velocity, $\widetilde{\omega}_{1,k} = \widetilde{\omega}_{3,k} = \widetilde{\omega}_{5,k} = \frac{\pi}{3}$ and $\widetilde{\omega}_{2,k} = \widetilde{\omega}_{4,k} = -\frac{\pi}{3}$; $w_{i,k}$ is the process noise, with $\|w_{i,x,k}\|_\infty, \|w_{i,y,k}\|_\infty \leq 0.25$, and $\|w_{i,\theta,k}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\pi}{24}$. The measurement equations are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i,p,k} &= [1\ 0\ 0] \begin{bmatrix} p_{i,k} \\ \widetilde{v}_{i,k} \\ \theta_{i,k} \end{bmatrix} + v_{i,p,k}, \\ y_{i,\theta,k} &= [0\ 0\ 1] \begin{bmatrix} p_{i,k} \\ \widetilde{v}_{i,k} \\ \theta_{i,k} \end{bmatrix} + v_{i,\theta,k}, \\ z_{i,j,k} &= \|p_{i,k} - p_{j,k}\|_2 + r_{i,j,k},\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$


where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the 2-norm of a vector, which represents the range-based measurements (e.g., UWB measurements). $v_{i,k}$ is the absolute measurement noise, with $\|v_{i,p,k}\|_\infty \leq 0.5$, $\|v_{i,\theta,k}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\pi}{24}$; $r_{i,j,k}$ is the relative measurement noise, with $r_{i,j,k} \in [-1, 1]$.

Our proposed neighborhood-joint range distributed SMFing framework is realized with a Monte Carlo technique, which is provided in Algorithm 3. The marginal range distributed SMFing framework is realized in a similar process.


In Fig. 7(a) and Fig. 7(b), the rectangles stand for the uncertain range of UAV 4 presented by the neighborhood-joint range distributed SMFing and marginal range distributed SMFing framework, respectively. The real position of UAV 4 is contained at each step, which corroborates the effectiveness of our proposed distributed frameworks in dealing with nonlinear systems. In Fig. 7(c), we make a brief comparison of two distributed estimation results. Similarly to $\|G\|_\infty$ in Section V-A, we consider the maximum length of the interval $d_k = \max_{x,y}\{b_{i,x,k} - a_{i,x,k}, b_{i,y,k} - a_{i,y,k}\}$ as a measure of the conservativeness. The curve corresponding to the marginal range framework is closely above the neighborhood-joint range framework, which verifies our theoretical results in Theorem 1 under nonlinear cases.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 7. Position estimation of UAV 4 presented by distributed SMFing frameworks and Monte Carlo technique. (a) The position estimation of UAV 4 presented by the neighborhood-joint range distributed SMFing framework and Monte Carlo technique. (b) The position estimation of UAV 4 presented by the marginal range distributed SMFing framework and Monte Carlo technique. (c)The diameter of the uncertain range comparison between two proposed distributed SMFing frameworks.

Algorithm 3 Monte Carlo Realization of Neighborhood-Joint Range Distributed SMF of Nonlinear Systems

Initialization. For each agent i, set the initial prior range $S^p_{i,0} = [a_{i,x,0}, b_{i,x,0}] \times [a_{i,y,0}, b_{i,y,0}] \times [a_{i,\theta,0}, b_{i,\theta,0}]$. $M = 10000$;{**Comments**: M is the number of random samples for $S^p_{i,k}$ $(k \in \mathbb{N}_+)$.}

loop

  while $k \in \mathbb{N}$

   $i = 1$;

   while $i \leq N$

   $m = 1$;

    while $m \leq M$ **do**

     for $j \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}_i$

$[\widetilde{p}^T_{j,x,k-1}, \widetilde{p}^T_{j,y,k-1}, \widetilde{\theta}^T_{j,k-1}]^T \leftarrow U([a_{j,x,k-1}, b_{j,x,k-1}] \times [a_{j,y,k-1}, b_{j,y,k-1}] \times [a_{j,\theta,k-1}, b_{j,\theta,k-1}])$ and $\widetilde{w}_{j,k-1} \leftarrow [\![\mathbf{w}_{j,k-1}]\!]$; {**Comments**: $x \leftarrow U(a,b)$ means x is a realization of a random variable uniformly distributed in $[a,b]$. }

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{p}_{j,x,k} &= \widetilde{p}_{j,x,k-1} + \frac{\widetilde{v}_j}{\widetilde{\omega}_j}[\sin(\widetilde{\omega}_j T + \widetilde{\theta}_{j,k-1}) - \sin(\widetilde{\theta}_{j,k-1})] \\ &\quad + \widetilde{w}_{j,x,k-1}, \\ \widetilde{p}_{j,y,k} &= \widetilde{p}_{j,y,k-1} + \frac{\widetilde{v}_j}{\widetilde{\omega}_j}[\cos(\widetilde{\theta}_{j,k-1}) - \cos(\widetilde{\omega}_j T + \widetilde{\theta}_{j,k-1})] \\ &\quad + \widetilde{w}_{j,y,k-1}, \\ \widetilde{\theta}_{i,k} &= \widetilde{\theta}_{i,k-1} + \widetilde{\omega}_i T + w_{i,\theta,k-1};\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

     if $y_{j,p,k} - \widetilde{p}_{j,p,k} \in [\![\mathbf{v}_{j,x,k}]\!] \times [\![\mathbf{v}_{j,y,k}]\!]$ && $y_{i,\theta,k} - \widetilde{\theta}_{i,k} \in [\![\mathbf{v}_{i,\theta,k}]\!]$ && $z_{i,j,k} - \|\widetilde{p}_{i,k} - \widetilde{p}_{j,k}\|_2 \in [\![\mathbf{r}_{i,j,k}]\!]$ then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{p}^{(m)}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,x,k} \\ \widetilde{p}^{(m)}_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,y,k} \\ \widetilde{\theta}^{(m)}_{i,k} \end{pmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{col}[\widetilde{p}_{j,x,k}]_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \\ \mathrm{col}[\widetilde{p}_{j,y,k}]_{j\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i} \\ \widetilde{\theta}_{i,k} \end{pmatrix},$$

     end if

    end for

   $m = m + 1$;

   end while

Let $[a_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u,x,k}, b_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u,x,k}]$ denote the uncertain range of agent i on the x-axis derived by the neighborhood $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u$, we have $a_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u,x,k} = \min_m\{\widetilde{p}^{(m)}_{i,x,k}\}_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u}$, $b_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u,x,k} = \min_m\{\widetilde{p}^{(m)}_{i,x,k}\}_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u}$, and $a_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u,y,k}, b_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_u,y,k}$ in the same way.

  $i = i + 1$;

  end while

The posterior uncertain range of each agent i is given by

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i,x,k} &= \max\{a_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,x,k}, a_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,x,k}, l \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}_i\}, \\ b_{i,x,k} &= \min\{b_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,x,k}, b_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,x,k}, l \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}_i\}; \\ a_{i,y,k} &= \max\{a_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,y,k}, a_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,y,k}, l \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}_i\}, \\ b_{i,y,k} &= \min\{b_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i,y,k}, b_{i\in\overline{\mathcal{N}}_l,y,k}, l \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}_i\}; \\ a_{i,\theta,k} &= \min_m\{\widetilde{\theta}^{(m)}_{i,k}\}, \\ b_{i,\theta,k} &= \max_m\{\widetilde{\theta}^{(m)}_{i,k}\}; \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

$k = k + 1$;

end loop

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we have studied the distributed set-membership filtering problem of a multi-agent system with absolute and relative measurements. Firstly, the uncertain range determined by the relative measurements between two agents was described, which was shown to require only a single calculation step rather than multiple iterations. The accuracy of the uncertain range implies the extra information exchanges among agents or complex optimization processes to minimize overestimation, which is essential in stochastic methods, can be omitted in the design of non-stochastic SMFs. Based on this, two distributed SMFing frameworks, i.e., the neighborhood-joint range distributed framework and the marginal range distributed framework have been proposed. More specifically, the neighborhood-joint range distributed framework calculates the joint uncertain range of each agent and its neighbors, while the marginal range distributed framework only computes the marginal uncertain range of each local system. These two frameworks work for both linear and nonlinear systems and can serve as the first step toward SMFing with relative measurements. Furthermore, we have made a performance comparison among our proposed two distributed SMFing frameworks and the centralized SMFing framework. Through a rigorous set analysis, it has been revealed that the distributed SMF can be considered as a process of marginal uncertain range computation in the corresponding subspace, aiming to outer bound the projection of the uncertain range derived by the centralized SMF. Finally, simulation results have shown that our proposed frameworks are effective to both linear and nonlinear systems.

References

[1] D. Viegas, P. Batista, P. Oliveira, and C. Silvestre, "Discrete-time distributed kalman filter design for formations of autonomous vehicles," *Control Eng. Practice*, vol. 75, pp. 55–68, 2018.

[2] S. Battilotti, F. Cacace, and M. d'Angelo, "A stability with optimality analysis of consensus-based distributed filters for discrete-time linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 129, p. 109589, 2021.

[3] X. Ge, Q.-L. Han, and Z. Wang, "A threshold-parameter-dependent approach to designing distributed event-triggered h_∞ consensus filters over sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 1148–1159, 2019.

[4] Witsenhausen and H., "Sets of possible states of linear systems given perturbed observations," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 556–558, 1968.

[5] W. Tang, Z. Wang, Y. Wang, T. Raïssi, and Y. Shen, "Interval estimation methods for discrete-time linear time-invariant systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 4717–4724, 2019.

[6] C. Combastel, "Zonotopes and kalman observers: Gain optimality under distinct uncertainty paradigms and robust convergence," *Automatica*, vol. 55, pp. 265–273, 2015.

[7] R. A. García, F. R. Rubio, L. Orihuela, P. Millán, and M. G. Ortega, "Observadores distribuidos garantistas para sistemas en red," *Revista Iberoamericana de Automática e Informática Ind. RIAI*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 256–267, 2017.

[8] S. Liu, Z. Wang, G. Wei, and M. Li, "Distributed set-membership filtering for multirate systems under the round-robin scheduling over sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1910–1920, 2020.

[9] A. Alanwar, J. J. Rath, H. Said, K. H. Johansson, and M. Althoff, "Distributed set-based observers using diffusion strategy," *arXiv:2003.10347*, Aug. 2020.

[10] L. Orihuela, C. Ierardi, and I. Jurado, "A distributed set-membership estimator for linear systems considering multi-hop subspace decomposition," vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 4157–4162, 2020, 21st IFAC World Congr.

[11] C. Ierardi, L. Orihuela, and I. Jurado, "A distributed set-membership estimator for linear systems with reduced computational requirements," *Automatica*, vol. 132, p. 109802, 2021.

[12] Y. Xu, Y. Deng, Z. Huang, M. Lin, and P. Shi, "Distributed state estimation over sensor networks with substate decomposition approach," *IEEE Trans. on Netw. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 527–537, 2023.

[13] L. Ma, Z. Wang, H.-K. Lam, and N. Kyriakoulis, "Distributed event-based set-membership filtering for a class of nonlinear systems with sensor saturations over sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 47, no. 11, pp. 3772–3783, 2017.

[14] D. Ding, Z. Wang, and Q.-L. Han, "A set-membership approach to event-triggered filtering for general nonlinear systems over sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 1792–1799, 2020.

[15] Álvaro Rodríguez del Nozal, P. Millán, L. Orihuela, A. Seuret, and L. Zaccarian, "Distributed estimation based on multi-hop subspace decomposition," *Automatica*, vol. 99, pp. 213–220, 2019.

[16] C. Combastel and A. Zolghadri, "Fdi in cyber physical systems: A distributed zonotopic and gaussian kalman filter with bit-level reduction," *IFAC Papers Online*, pp. 776–783, 2018.

[17] N. Xia, F. Yang, and Q.-L. Han, "Distributed networked set-membership filtering with ellipsoidal state estimations," *Inform. Sci.*, vol. 432, pp. 52–62, 2018.

[18] L. Orihuela, S. Roshany-Yamchi, R. A. García, and P. Millán, "Distributed set-membership observers for interconnected multi-rate systems," *Automatica*, vol. 85, pp. 221–226, 2017.

[19] L. Orihuela, P. Millán, S. Roshany-Yamchi, and R. A. García, "Negotiated distributed estimation with guaranteed performance for bandwidth-limited situations," *Automatica*, vol. 87, pp. 94–102, 2018.

[20] Y. Wang, T. Alamo, V. Puig, and G. Cembrano, "A distributed set-membership approach based on zonotopes for interconnected systems," in *Proc. of the 57th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 668–673.

[21] ——, "Distributed zonotopic set-membership state estimation based on optimization methods with partial projection," *IFAC papers online*, pp. 4039–4044, 2017.

[22] W. S. Rossi, P. Frasca, and F. Fagnani, "Distributed estimation from relative and absolute measurements," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, pp. 6385–6391, 2017.

[23] S. Battilotti, F. Cacace, M. D'Angelo, and A. Germani, "Cooperative filtering with absolute and relative measurements," in *2018 IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 7182–7187.

[24] Y. Wang, Y. Cai, and Y. Shen, "Cooperative localization in wireless networks," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 427–450, 2009.

[25] G. N. Nair, "A nonstochastic information theory for communication and state estimation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 1497–1510, 2013.

[26] W. Ren, "On consensus algorithms for double-integrator dynamics," in *2007 IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, 2008, pp. 2295–2300.

[27] W. Li, Y. Jia, and J. Du, "Distributed kalman filter for cooperative localization with integrated measurements," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 3302–3310, 2020.

[28] Y. Ding, Y. Cong, and X. Wang, "Set-membership filtering-based cooperative state estimation for multi-agent systems," in *2023 Chinese Control Conference (CCC accepted)*, July 2023. [Online]. Available: arXiv:2305.10366


[29] Y. Cong, X. Wang, and X. Zhou, "Rethinking the mathematical framework and optimality of set-membership filtering," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2544–2551, 2022.

[30] B. Noack, J. Sijs, M. Reinhardt, and U. D. Hanebeck, "Decentralized data fusion with inverse covariance intersection," *Automatica*, vol. 79, pp. 35–41, 2017.


[31] R. A. García, L. Orihuela, P. Millán, F. R. Rubio, and M. G. Ortega, "Guaranteed estimation and distributed control of vehicle formations," *Int. J. of Control*, vol. 93, no. 11, pp. 2729–2742, 2020.

[32] J. K. Scott, D. M. Raimondo, G. R. Marseglia, and R. D. Braatz, "Constrained zonotopes: A new tool for set-based estimation and fault detection," *Automatica*, vol. 69, pp. 126–136, 2016.

[33] A. Alvarez-Aguirre, M. Velasco-Villa, and B. del Muro-Cuellar, "Nonlinear smith-predictor based control strategy for a unicycle mobile robot subject to transport delay," in *2008 5th Int. Conf. on Elec. Eng., Computing Sci. and Automat. Control*, 2008, pp. 102–107.



Yu Ding received the bachelor's degree in automation from the Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China, in 2017, the M.S. degree in control science and engineering from National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China, in 2019. He is currently pursuing his Ph.D. degree in control science and engineering from the National University of Defense Technology. His current research interests include formation control, multi-agent system and distributed filtering theory.



Yirui Cong (S'14–M'18) is an associate professor with National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China. He received the B.E. degree (outstanding graduates) in automation from Northeastern University, Shenyang, China, in 2011, the M.Sc. degree (graduated in advance) in control science and engineering from National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China, in 2013, and the Ph.D. degree from Australian National University, Canberra, Australia, in 2018. He joined the faculty of the College of Intelligence Science and Technology at National University of Defense Technology in 2018. His research interests include control theory, communication theory, and filtering theory.



Xiangke Wang (SM'18) received the B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in Control Science and Engineering from National University of Defense Technology, China, in 2004, 2006 and 2012, respectively. From 2012, he served as a Lecture, Associate professor and Professor with the College of Intelligence Science and Technology, National University of Defense Technology, China. He was a visiting student at the Research School of Engineering, Australian National University from 2009 to 2011. His current research interests focus on the control of multi-agent systems and its applications on unmanned aerial vehicles. He has authored or coauthored 3 books and more than 100 publications in peer reviewed journals and international conferences, including IEEE Transactions,IJRNC, CDC, IFAC, ICRA. etc.