

Distributed Filtering for Uncertain Systems Under Switching Sensor Networks and Quantized Communications¹

Xingkang He^{a,b}, Wenchao Xue^{a,*}, Xiaocheng Zhang^a, Haitao Fang^a

^a LSC, NCMIS, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

^b Division of Decision and Control Systems, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden

Abstract

This paper considers the distributed filtering problem for a class of stochastic uncertain systems under quantized data flowing over switching sensor networks. Employing the biased noisy observations of the local sensor and interval-quantized messages from neighboring sensors successively, an extended state based distributed Kalman filter (DKF) is proposed for simultaneously estimating both system state and uncertain dynamics. To alleviate the effect of observation biases, an event-triggered update based DKF is presented with a tighter mean square error bound than that of the time-driven one by designing a proper threshold. Both the two DKFs are shown to provide the upper bounds of mean square errors online for each sensor. Under mild conditions on systems and networks, the mean square error boundedness and asymptotic unbiasedness for the proposed two DKFs are proved. Finally, the numerical simulations demonstrate the effectiveness of the developed filters.

Key words: Sensor network; Uncertain system; Distributed Kalman filtering; Biased observation; Quantized communications

1 Introduction

In recent years, sensor networks are broadly studied and applied to environment sensing, target tracking, smart grid, etc. As is well known, state estimation problems over sensor networks are usually modeled as distributed filtering studies. Thus more and more researchers and engineers around the world are paying their attention to the methods and theories of distributed filtering.

In the existing literature on distributed filtering over sensor networks, many effective approaches and analysis tools have been provided. For linear time-invariant systems, distributed filters with constant parameter gains were investigated in [1, 2], which yet confined the scope of the system dynamics to be considered. As is known, the optimal centralized Kalman filter for linear stochastic systems can provide the estimation error covariances online. However, in distributed Kalman filters (DKFs) [3–9], the covariances can not be obtained by each sensor due to the unknown

correlation between state estimates of sensors, which essentially hinders the optimality of distributed filters. Then the distributed Kalman filters based on consensus or diffusion strategies were studied in [4, 5], where the state estimates were fused by scalar weights. As a result, the neighboring information can not be well utilized. Owing to the important role of filtering consistency¹ in real-time precision evaluation, the consistent algorithms in [6–8, 10] enabled their applications to design covariance weight based fusion schemes, though the system models were limited to be linear and the communications were required to be perfect. In this paper, we will propose consistent filters for general system models, communication schemes and network topologies.

Stability is one of fundamental properties for filtering algorithms. In the existing results on stability analysis, local observability conditions of linear systems were assumed in [5, 11], which confined the application scope of distributed filters. On the other hand, the sensor observation bias, which prevalently exists owing to factors like calibration error, sensor drift, and registration error, can directly influence the consistency as well as the stability of filters. This is attributed to the difficulty in dealing with biased observations of the local sensor and fusing the biased estimates from neighboring

* The material in this paper was not presented at any conference.

* Corresponding author.

Email addresses: xingkang@kth.se (Xingkang He), wenchaoxue@amss.ac.cn (Wenchao Xue), zhangxiaocheng16@mails.uca.ac.cn (Xiaocheng Zhang), htfang@iss.ac.cn (Haitao Fang).

¹ The filtering consistency means that an upper bound of estimation error covariance can be calculated online.

sensors. The state estimation problems in the presence of observation bias were investigated in [12, 13] by assuming the independence between the system state and the random bias, which yet is hard to be satisfied for feedback control systems with colored random bias processes. More importantly, owing to the existence of outer disturbances or unmodeled dynamics, many practical systems contain uncertain dynamics, which may be nonlinear. To deal with the unknown dynamics, some robust estimation methods, such as H_∞ filters and set valued filters, were studied by researchers [14, 15]. An extended state based Kalman filter was proposed in [16] for a class of nonlinear uncertain systems. However, the relation between the original system and the formulated system still needs further investigation. Compared with the centralized filter [16], more general system models and noise conditions will be studied in this work under a distributed framework.

Communication scheme between sensors is one of the essential features for decentralized algorithms. In the past years, a considerable number of results have analyzed topology conditions in terms of network connectivity and graph types [3–9, 11]. Most of these results assumed that the network is fixed over time. However, due to the network vulnerability (e.g., link failure [10]), the topologies of sensor networks may be changing with time. Another significant aspect is on the message transmission between neighboring sensors. A majority of the existing literature on distributed filters required the accurate transmission. Nevertheless, due to limitations of energy and channels in practical networks, such as wireless sensor network, it is difficult to ensure perfect sensor communications. Thus, the filter design under quantized sensor communications seems to be an important issue of practice.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized in the following.

- (1) By utilizing the techniques of interval quantization and state extension, we propose a quantized communication based distributed Kalman filter for a class of stochastic systems suffering uncertain dynamics and observation biases. The filter enables the upper bounds of mean square estimation errors to be available online.
- (2) Under some mild conditions including uniformly collective observability of the system and jointly strong connectivity of the switching networks, we prove that the mean square estimation errors are uniformly upper bounded. Furthermore, it is shown that the estimation biases tend to zero under certain decaying conditions of uncertain dynamics and observation biases.
- (3) An event-triggered observation update based DKF is presented with a tighter mean square error bound than that of the time-driven one. Also, the mean square boundedness of the estimation error for the event-triggered filter is proved. More importantly, we reveal that the estimation biases of the event-triggered filter can tend to zero even if the observation biases of some sensors are not decaying over time.

Compared with the existing literature [1–9], the studied systems are more general by considering uncertain dynamics and observation biases. Furthermore, although there are some results on quantized distributed consensus [17, 18], the distributed filtering problems with quantized sensor communications have not been well investigated in the existing literature, especially for the scenario that the system is unstable and collectively observable. Moreover, the conditions of noise in [8], the initial estimation error in [3, 19], and the non-singularity of time-varying system matrices in [3, 8] are all relaxed in this paper.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is on the model description and preliminaries. Section 3 studies the system reconstruction and filtering structure. Section 4 analyzes the distributed filter with time-driven update scheme. Section 5 studies the distributed filter with event-triggered update scheme. Section 6 shows the numerical simulations. The conclusion of this paper is given in Section 7. Some proofs are given in Appendix.

Notations. The superscript “ T ” represents the transpose. I_n stands for the identity matrix with n rows and n columns. $E\{x\}$ denotes the mathematical expectation of the stochastic variable x , and $\text{blockdiag}\{\cdot\}$ means that the block elements are arranged in diagonals. $\text{diag}\{\cdot\}$ represents the diagonalization of scalar elements. $\text{tr}(P)$ is the trace of the matrix P . \mathbb{N}^+ denotes the set of positive natural numbers. \mathbb{R}^n stands for the set of n -dimensional real vectors. $[a : b]$ stands for the set of integers $a, a+1, \dots, b-1$. We denote $[a : b] = [a : b] \cup b$. And, $\text{sat}(f, b)$ means $\max\{\min\{f, b\}, -b\}$. We assume that $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ are the minimal eigenvalue and maximal eigenvalue of a real-valued square matrix A , respectively. $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} A_k A_k^T < \infty$ means $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{\max}(A_k A_k^T) < \infty$. Let $\|\cdot\|_2$ be the standard Euclidean norm.

2 Model Description and Preliminaries

2.1 Network topology and definitions

We model the communication topologies of sensor networks by switching weighted digraphs $\{\mathcal{G}_s = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_s, \mathcal{A}_s)\}$, where \mathcal{V} , \mathcal{E}_s and \mathcal{A}_s stand for the node set, the edge set and the weighted adjacency matrix, respectively. We assume that \mathcal{A}_s is row stochastic with nonnegative off-diagonal elements and positive diagonal elements, i.e., $a_{i,i}^{\mathcal{G}_s} > 0$, $a_{i,j}^{\mathcal{G}_s} \geq 0$, $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{i,j}^{\mathcal{G}_s} = 1$. As node i can receive information from its neighboring sensors, the neighbor set of node i is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_i^{\mathcal{G}_s} \triangleq \{j \in \mathcal{V} | a_{i,j}^{\mathcal{G}_s} > 0\}$, which includes node i . We denote $a_{i,j}^{\mathcal{G}_s} = a_{i,j}(k)$ and $\mathcal{N}_i^{\mathcal{G}_s} = \mathcal{N}_i(k)$, if the graph is \mathcal{G}_s at time k . \mathcal{G}_s is called strongly connected if for any pair nodes (i_1, i_l) , there exists a direct path from i_1 to i_l consisting of edges $(i_1, i_2), (i_2, i_3), \dots, (i_{l-1}, i_l)$. We say that $\{\mathcal{G}_s\}_{s=1}^K$ is jointly strongly connected if the union graph $\bigcup_{s=1}^K \mathcal{G}_s$ is strongly connected, where $K \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

The following definitions are needed in this paper.

Definition 2.1 ([20]) Suppose that x_k is a random vector and \hat{x}_k is the estimate of x_k . Then the pair (\hat{x}_k, Π_k) is said to be **consistent** if $E\{(\hat{x}_k - x_k)(\hat{x}_k - x_k)^T\} \leq \Pi_k$. An algorithm is of **consistency** if it provides consistent pairs (\hat{x}_k, Π_k) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 2.2 Let $e_{k,i}$ be the state estimation error of sensor i at time k , then the sequence of estimation error covariances $E\{e_{k,i}e_{k,i}^T\}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, is said to be **stable** if $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} E\{e_{k,i}e_{k,i}^T\} < \infty$. And, the sequence of estimates is said to be **asymptotically unbiased** if $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E\{e_{k,i}\} = 0$.

Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be the basic probability space. \mathcal{F}_k stands for a filtration of σ -algebra \mathcal{F} , i.e., for $\mathcal{F}_k \subset \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_i \subset \mathcal{F}_j$ if $i < j$. Here, the σ -algebra is a collection of subsets of Ω and satisfies certain algebraic structure. A discrete-time sequence $\{\xi_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}$ is said to be adapted if ξ_k is measurable to \mathcal{F}_k . In principle, ξ_k is a function of past events within \mathcal{F}_k . We refer the readers to the formal definitions of ‘filtration’, ‘ σ -algebra’ and ‘measurable’ in [21].

Definition 2.3 A discrete-time adapted sequence $\{\xi_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}$ is called a **martingale difference sequence (MDS)**, if $E\{\|\xi_k\|_2\} < \infty$ and $E\{\xi_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\} = 0$, almost surely.

Definition 2.4 A time sequence $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is called an **L-step supporting sequence (L-SS)** of a matrix sequence $\{M_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, if there exists a scalar $\beta > 0$, such that the sequence $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is well defined in the following manner

$$\begin{cases} T_0 = \inf \left\{ k \geq 0 \mid \lambda_{\min}(M_{k+s}M_{k+s}^T) \geq \beta, \forall s \in [0 : L) \right\} \\ T_{l+1} = \inf \left\{ k \geq T_l + L \mid \right. \\ \left. \lambda_{\min}(M_{k+s}M_{k+s}^T) \geq \beta, \forall s \in [0 : L) \right\} \\ \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \{T_{l+1} - T_l\} < \infty. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Remark 2.1 The definition of L-SS is introduced to study the nonsingularity of the time-varying transition matrices $\{\bar{A}_{k,i}\}$ given in the sequel. In many existing results [3, 8], $\bar{A}_{k,i}$ is assumed to be nonsingular for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which is removed in this paper.

2.2 Model description and assumptions

Consider the following model for a class of stochastic systems with uncertain dynamics and biased observations

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = \bar{A}_k x_k + \bar{G}_k f(x_k, k) + \bar{\omega}_k, \\ y_{k,i} = \bar{H}_{k,i} x_k + b_{k,i} + v_{k,i}, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the unknown system state, $\bar{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the known state transition matrix and $\bar{\omega}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the unknown zero-mean white process noise. $f(x_k, k) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the uncertain dynamics (e.g., some unknown disturbance). $\bar{G}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is the known matrix subject to $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\bar{G}_k \bar{G}_k^T\} < \infty$. Here, $y_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the observation vector obtained via sensor i , $\bar{H}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$ is the known observation matrix, subject to $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\bar{H}_{k,i}^T \bar{H}_{k,i}\} < \infty$, $b_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the unknown state-correlated stochastic observation bias of sensor i , and $v_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the stochastic zero-mean observation noise. N is the number of sensors over the system, thus $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Note that \bar{A}_k, \bar{G}_k are known to all the local sensors, while $\bar{H}_{k,i}$ and $y_{k,i}$ are only known to the local sensor i . Suppose that $\sigma\{x\}$ stands for the minimal sigma algebra generated by the random vector x . Let $\mathcal{F}_k \triangleq \sigma\{x_0, b_{0,i}, \bar{\omega}_j, v_{j,i}, i \in \mathcal{V}, 0 \leq j \leq k\}$ and $f_k \triangleq f(x_k, k)$ for simplicity. In the following, we will provide several assumptions on the system structure and communication scheme.

Assumption 2.1 The following conditions hold:

- 1) The sequence $\{\bar{\omega}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is independent of x_0 and $\{v_{k,i}\}_{k=0}^\infty, i \in \mathcal{V}$, with $E\{\bar{\omega}_k \bar{\omega}_k^T\} \leq Q_k$, where $\inf_k Q_k > 0$ and $\sup Q_k < \infty, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- 2) The sequences $\{b_{k,i}\}_{k=0}^\infty, i \in \mathcal{V}$, are measurable to $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}, k \geq 1$, and $E\{b_{k,i} b_{k,i}^T\} \leq B_{k,i}$.
- 3) The sequence $\{v_{k,i}, \mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is MDS and $E\{v_{k,i} v_{k,i}^T\} \leq R_{k,i}$ as well as $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} R_{k,i} > 0$ holds $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$.
- 4) It holds that $E\{(X_0 - \hat{X}_{0,i})(X_0 - \hat{X}_{0,i})^T\} \leq P_{0,i}$, where $\hat{X}_{0,i}$ is the estimate of $X_0 \triangleq [x_0^T, f_0^T]^T, i \in \mathcal{V}$.

Compared with [8] where the observation noises of sensors are independent, the MDS assumption on $v_{k,i}$ is milder. The condition 4) of Assumption 2.1 is more general than that in [3, 19] which the initial estimation error is required to be sufficiently small.

Assumption 2.2 There is an $L \in \mathbb{N}^+$, such that the sequence $\{\bar{A}_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has an L-SS and $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T\} < \infty$.

Assumption 2.2 poses no requirement on the stability of the original system (2). Besides, within the scope of distributed filtering for time-varying systems, Assumption 2.2 is milder than that in [3, 8], where the non-singularity of the system state transition matrix is needed for each time.

Assumption 2.3 The following conditions hold.

- 1) f_k is measurable to $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_k$, where $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_k = \sigma\{x_0, b_{0,i}, \bar{\omega}_{j-1}, v_{j,i}, i \in \mathcal{V}, 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ for $k \geq 1$, and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_0 = \sigma\{x_0, b_{0,i}, v_{0,i}, i \in \mathcal{V}\}$.
- 2) $E\{u_k u_k^T\} \leq \hat{Q}_k$, where $u_k \triangleq f_{k+1} - f_k$, subject to $\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{Q}_k) > 0$ and $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{\max}(\hat{Q}_k) < \infty$.

The first condition of Assumption 2.3 permits f_k to be implicitly related with $\{x_j, y_{j,i}\}_{j=0}^k, i \in \mathcal{V}$. Under this setting, the model built in (2) also considers the distributed output feedback control systems, such as the system of coupled tanks [22]. The condition in 2) of Assumption 2.3 relies on the boundedness of the dynamic increment, which is milder than the boundedness of uncertain dynamics required by [23].

Definition 2.5 *The system (2) is said to be **uniformly collectively observable** if there exist two positive integers \bar{N} , \bar{M} , and a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $k \geq \bar{M}$, there is $\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{j=k}^{k+\bar{N}} \bar{\Phi}_{j,k}^T \bar{H}_{j,i}^T (R_{j,i} + B_{j,i})^{-1} \bar{H}_{j,i} \bar{\Phi}_{j,k} \right] \geq \alpha I_n$, where $\bar{\Phi}_{k,k} = I_n, \bar{\Phi}_{k+1,k} = \bar{A}_k, \bar{\Phi}_{j,k} = \bar{\Phi}_{j,j-1} \times \cdots \times \bar{\Phi}_{k+1,k}$, if $j > k$.*

Assumption 2.4 *The system (2) is uniformly collectively observable.*

Assumption 2.4 is a mild collective observability condition for time-varying stochastic systems. If the system is time-invariant, then Assumption 2.4 degenerates to (A, \bar{H}) being observable [6, 24], where $\bar{H} = [\bar{H}_1^T, \dots, \bar{H}_N^T]^T$. Besides, if the local observability conditions are satisfied [5, 11], then Assumption 2.4 holds, but not vice versa.

The topologies of the networks are assumed to be switching digraphs $\{\mathcal{G}_{\sigma_k}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. σ_k is the switching signal defined by $\sigma_k : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \Omega$, where Ω is the set of the underlying network topology numbers. For convenience, the weighted adjacency matrix of the digraph \mathcal{G}_{σ_k} is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_k} = [a_{i,j}(k)] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. To analyze the switching topologies, we consider the infinite interval sequence consisting of non-overlapping and contiguous time intervals $[k_l, k_{l+1}), l = 0, 1, \dots$, with $k_0 = 0$. It is assumed that there exists an integer k_0 , such that $k_{l+1} - k_l \leq k^0$. On the switching topologies, the following assumption is needed.

Assumption 2.5 *The union graph $\bigcup_{k=k_l}^{k_{l+1}} \mathcal{G}_{\sigma_k}$ is strongly connected, and the elements of \mathcal{G}_{σ_k} , i.e., $a_{i,j}(k)$, belong to a set consisting of finite nonnegative real numbers.*

Since the joint connectivity of the switching digraphs admits that the network is unconnected at each moment, Assumption 2.5 is milder for the networks confronting link failures. If the network remains connected at each moment or fixed [6, 7], then Assumption 2.5 holds as well.

2.3 Quantized communications

In sensor networks, such as wireless sensor networks, the signal transmission between two sensors may confront the problems of channel limitation and energy restriction. Thus, without losing too much accuracy, some quantization operators can be considered to reduce the package size in the encoding process with respect to the transmitted messages. In

this paper, we study the case that the messages to be transmitted are quantized element by element through a given quantizer before transmission. Let $z_{k,i}$ be a scalar element remaining to be sent out by sensor i , then we consider the following interval quantizer with quantizing step $\Delta_i > 0$ and quantizing function $g(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_i$

$$g(z_{k,i}) = m\Delta_i, \text{ if } (m - \frac{1}{2})\Delta_i \leq z_{k,i} < (m + \frac{1}{2})\Delta_i \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_i = \{m\Delta_i | m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the quantization alphabet with countably infinite elements. Then we write $g(z_{k,i}) = z_{k,i} + \vartheta(z_{k,i})$, where $\vartheta(z_{k,i})$ is the quantization error, which is deterministic conditioned on the input $z_{k,i}$. In addition, we have $\vartheta(z_{k,i}) \in [-\frac{\Delta_i}{2}, \frac{\Delta_i}{2})$. A technique to deal with the correlation between $\vartheta(z_{k,i})$ and $z_{k,i}$ is to consider a dither operator by adding a random sequence $\{\xi_{k,i}\}$, which can randomize the quantization error and make it independent of the input data. Write

$$\vartheta(k, i) = g(z_{k,i} + \xi_{k,i}) - (z_{k,i} + \xi_{k,i}), \quad (4)$$

then the quantization error sequence $\{\vartheta(k, i)\}$ is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), uniformly distributed on $[-\frac{\Delta_i}{2}, \frac{\Delta_i}{2})$ and independent of $z_{k,i}$, if the following assumption holds.

Assumption 2.6 *The sequence $\{\xi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies Schuchman conditions [17] and it is independent of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_k$ defined in Assumption 2.3.*

A sufficient condition such that $\{\xi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies Schuchman conditions is that $\{\xi_{k,i}\}_{k \geq 0}$ is an i.i.d. sequence uniformly distributed on $[-\frac{\Delta_i}{2}, \frac{\Delta_i}{2})$ and independent of input sequence $\{z_{k,i}\}$.

3 System Reconstruction and Filtering Structure

3.1 System reconstruction

By constructing a new state vector, consisting of the original state x_k and the uncertain dynamics f_k , a modified system model is given as follows.

$$\begin{cases} X_{k+1} = A_k X_k + D u_k + \omega_k \\ y_{k,i} = H_{k,i} X_k + b_{k,i} + v_{k,i} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where

$$X_k \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} x_k \\ f_k \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}, \quad A_k \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_k & \bar{G}_k \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+p)},$$

$$\omega_k \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\omega}_k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}, \quad D \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_p \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times p},$$

$$u_k \triangleq f_{k+1} - f_k \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad H_{k,i} \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{H}_{k,i} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times (n+p)}.$$

Considering the system (2) and the reformulated system (5), Propositions 3.1 and 3.2, which are proved in Appendices A-B, show the equivalence between the properties of the two systems.

Proposition 3.1 *On the relation between \bar{A}_k in (2) and A_k in (5), the following conclusions hold.*

- 1) $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{A_k A_k^T\} < \infty$ if and only if $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T\} < \infty$.
- 2) $\{A_k | A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+p)}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has an L-SS if and only if $\{\bar{A}_k | \bar{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has an L-SS.

Proposition 3.2 *The reformulated system (5) is uniformly collectively observable if and only if there exist $M, \bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\alpha > 0$, such that for any $k \geq M$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,1} &> \alpha I_n \\ \bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{2,2} - (\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,2})^T (\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,1} - \alpha I_n)^{-1} \bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,2} &> \alpha I_p \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,1}$, $\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,2}$, and $\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{2,2}$ are given in (B.1).

According to the proof of Proposition 3.2 and Definition 2.5, we can obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *Let Assumption 2.4 holds, then there exist $M, \bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\alpha > 0$, such that for any $k \geq M$, $\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,1} > \alpha I_n$, where $\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,1}$ is given in (B.1).*

Remark 3.1 *By Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.1, the observability gap between the reformulated system (5) and the system (2) is the second equation in (6), which will reduce to $\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} I_n - \bar{A} & -\bar{G} \\ \bar{H} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = n + p$ if the system is time-invariant and observable, where $\bar{H} = [\bar{H}_1^T, \dots, \bar{H}_N^T]^T$, $\bar{H}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$, $\bar{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\bar{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$.*

Example

To show the feasibility of (6), we consider a connected network with three sensors. Suppose that $b_{k,i} = \text{sat}(\sin(x_k^2(1) + x_k^2(2)), 1)$. For the system (2), we let $\bar{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\bar{G} = [1, 1]^T$, $\bar{H}_1 = [1, 0]$, $\bar{H}_2 = [0, 1]$, $\bar{H}_3 = [1, 1]$, $R_i = 1$, $B_i = 1$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. On one hand, according to (6) and the notations in the proof of Proposition 3.2, by choosing $\alpha = 2$ and $\bar{N} = 10$, we have $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,1} - \alpha I_n) > 5.77$, and $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{2,2} - (\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,2})^T (\bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,1} - \alpha I_n)^{-1} \bar{\Theta}_{k, \bar{N}}^{1,2} - \alpha I_p) > 1.2 \times 10^6$. On the other hand, by Remark 3.1, we have $\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} I_n - \bar{A} & -\bar{G} \\ \bar{H} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 3$. Then due to $\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{H} \\ \bar{H} \bar{A} \end{pmatrix} = 2$, the condition (6) holds.

In the sequel, we require the following assumption.

Assumption 3.1 *There exist $M, \bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\alpha > 0$, such that for any $k \geq M$, the second inequality in (6) holds.*

It is straightforward to prove that if Assumptions 2.4 and 3.1 are both satisfied, there is a common $\alpha > 0$, such that the two inequalities in (6) holds simultaneously. By Proposition 3.1, Assumptions 2.4 and 3.1 can lead to the uniformly collective observability of the reformulated system (5).

3.2 Filtering structure

In this paper, we consider two observation update schemes, namely, time-driven update and event-triggered update, whose difference lies in whether the biased noisy observation $y_{k,i}$ is utilized at the update stage or not. We propose the following distributed filter structure of the system (5) for sensor i , $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$\begin{cases} \bar{X}_{k,i} = A_{k-1} \hat{X}_{k-1,i} \\ \text{if } y_{k,i} \text{ is utilized:} \\ \quad \bar{X}_{k,i} = \bar{X}_{k,i} + K_{k,i}(y_{k,i} - H_{k,i} \bar{X}_{k,i}) \\ \text{if } y_{k,i} \text{ is discarded:} \\ \quad \bar{X}_{k,i} = \bar{X}_{k,i} \\ \hat{X}_{k,i} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} W_{k,i,j} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{k,j} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{k,j} = \bar{X}_{k,i}$, if $i = j$, otherwise $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{k,j} = \mathbf{G}_1(\tilde{X}_{k,j})$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, and $\mathbf{G}_1(\tilde{X}_{k,j}) =: [g(\tilde{X}_{k,j}(1)), \dots, g(\tilde{X}_{k,j}(n))]^T$ is the quantized message sent out by sensor j with element-wise quantization by (3). Also, $\bar{X}_{k,i}$, $\hat{X}_{k,i}$, and $\tilde{X}_{k,i}$ are the extended state's prediction, update, and estimate by sensor i at the k th moment, respectively. $K_{k,i}$ and $W_{k,i,j}$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)$, are the filtering gain matrix and the local fusion matrices, respectively. They remain to be designed.

Remark 3.2 *We utilize the dither quantization of state estimates in (7) to relax the conservativeness in handling correlation between the quantization error and state estimates. For example, if random variables x and y are correlated, a common technique is to use $E\{(x+y)^2\} \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\alpha})E\{x^2\} + (1 + \alpha)E\{y^2\}$ for $\alpha > 0$. However, this operator is usually conservative. Thus, we use the dithered quantization to remove the correlation.*

In the sequel, we will study the consistency, stability and asymptotic unbiasedness of the proposed distributed filters under Assumptions 2.1-3.1. Table 1 is to provide the connection between the main results and assumptions.

Table 1
Connection between results and assumptions

Assumptions	Results
Assumptions 2.1, 2.3, 2.6	Lemma 4.1/5.2 (Consistency)
Assumptions 2.1-2.3	Lemma 4.3
Assumptions 2.1-2.6, 3.1	Theorem 4.1/5.1 (Stability)
Assumptions 2.1-2.6, 3.1	Theorem 4.2/5.2 (Unbiasedness)

4 Distributed filter: time-driven update

In this section, for the filtering structure (7) with $y_{k,i}$ employed at each time, we will study the design methods of $K_{k,i}$ and $W_{k,i,j}$. Then we will find the conditions to guarantee the stability of the estimation error covariances for the proposed filter with the designed $K_{k,i}$ and $W_{k,i,j}$.

4.1 Filter design

The next lemma, proved in Appendix C, provides a design method of fusion matrices $\{W_{k,i,j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}$, which can lead to the consistent estimate of each sensor.

Lemma 4.1 Consider the filtering structure (7) with a non-stochastic filtering gain $K_{k,i}$. Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.3 and 2.6, for any $i \in \mathcal{V}$, positive scalars $\theta_{k,i}$ and $\mu_{k,i}$, the pairs $(\bar{X}_{k,i}, \bar{P}_{k,i}), (\tilde{X}_{k,i}, \tilde{P}_{k,i}), (\hat{X}_{k,i}, \hat{P}_{k,i})$ and $(\check{X}_{k,i}, P_{k,i})$ are all consistent, provided by $W_{k,i,j} = a_{i,j}(k)P_{k,i}\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}$, where

$$\tilde{P}_{k,j} = \begin{cases} \tilde{P}_{k,j}, & \text{if } i = j, j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k) \\ \tilde{P}_{k,j} + \frac{\bar{n}\Delta_j(2\Delta_j+1)}{2}I_{\bar{n}}, & \text{if } i \neq j, j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k), \end{cases}$$

and $\bar{P}_{k,i}, \tilde{P}_{k,i}, \check{P}_{k,i}$ and $P_{k,i}$ are recursively calculated through

$$\begin{cases} \bar{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \theta_{k,i})A_{k-1}P_{k-1,i}A_{k-1}^T + \frac{1+\theta_{k,i}}{\theta_{k,i}}\bar{Q}_{k-1} + \tilde{Q}_{k-1}, \\ \tilde{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \mu_{k,i})(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})\tilde{P}_{k,i}(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})^T \\ \quad + K_{k,i}\left(R_{k,i} + \frac{1+\mu_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}}B_{k,i}\right)K_{k,i}^T, \\ \check{P}_{k,i} = \mathbf{G}_2(\tilde{P}_{k,i}), \\ P_{k,i} = \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{i,j}(k)\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}\right)^{-1}, \end{cases}$$

with $\bar{n} = n + p$, $\tilde{Q}_{k-1} = \text{blockdiag}\{Q_{k-1}, 0^{p \times p}\}$, $\bar{Q}_{k-1} = D\tilde{Q}_{k-1}D^T$. Here, $\mathbf{G}_2(\tilde{P}_{k,i})$ is the element-wise quantization operator by (3) without dither.

Remark 4.1 In some distributed filtering algorithms [6, 7], besides state estimates, parameter matrices are also transmitted between neighboring sensors. In this work, the quantized messages $\{\tilde{X}_{k,j}, \tilde{P}_{k,j}\}$, will be received by sensor i from its neighbor sensor j , $j \neq i$. To keep the consistency in Definition 2.1, the quantization error of the parameter matrix is compensated by $\tilde{P}_{k,j} = \check{P}_{k,j} + \frac{\bar{n}\Delta_j(2\Delta_j+1)}{2}I_{\bar{n}}$.

The next lemma, proved in Appendix D, considers the design of the filtering gain matrix $K_{k,i}$.

Lemma 4.2 Solving the optimization problem $K_{k,i}^* = \arg \min_{K_{k,i}} \text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{k,i})$ yields

$$K_{k,i}^* = \bar{P}_{k,i}H_{k,i}^T \left(H_{k,i}\bar{P}_{k,i}H_{k,i}^T + \frac{R_{k,i}}{1 + \mu_{k,i}} + \frac{B_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}} \right)^{-1}.$$

Summing up the results of Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, the extended state based distributed Kalman filter (ESDKF) with quantized communications is provided in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Extended State Based Distributed Kalman Filter (ESDKF):

Prediction: Each sensor carries out a prediction operation $\bar{X}_{k,i} = A_{k-1}\hat{X}_{k-1,i}$, $\bar{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \theta_{k,i})A_{k-1}P_{k-1,i}A_{k-1}^T + \frac{1+\theta_{k,i}}{\theta_{k,i}}\bar{Q}_{k-1} + \tilde{Q}_{k-1}$, $\forall \theta_{k,i} > 0$, where \bar{Q}_{k-1} and \tilde{Q}_{k-1} are given in Lemma 4.1.

Update: Each sensor uses its own observations to update the estimation

$$\hat{X}_{k,i} = \bar{X}_{k,i} + K_{k,i}(y_{k,i} - H_{k,i}\bar{X}_{k,i})$$

$$K_{k,i} = \bar{P}_{k,i}H_{k,i}^T \left(H_{k,i}\bar{P}_{k,i}H_{k,i}^T + \frac{R_{k,i}}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + \frac{B_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}} \right)^{-1}$$

$$\tilde{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \mu_{k,i})(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})\bar{P}_{k,i}.$$

Quantization: Each sensor uses element-wise dither quantization to $\hat{X}_{k,i}$ and interval quantization to $\tilde{P}_{k,i}$, i.e., $\check{X}_{k,i} = \mathbf{G}_1(\hat{X}_{k,i})$, $\check{P}_{k,i} = \mathbf{G}_2(\tilde{P}_{k,i})$, where $\mathbf{G}_1(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{G}_2(\cdot)$ are the element-wise quantization operators with and without dither, respectively.

Local Fusion: Each sensor receives $(\check{X}_{k,i}, \check{P}_{k,i}, \Delta_j)$ from its neighbors, denoting $\bar{n} = n + p$, for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)$,

$$(\tilde{X}_{k,j}, \tilde{P}_{k,j}) = \begin{cases} (\hat{X}_{k,j}, \tilde{P}_{k,j}), & \text{if } i = j, \\ (\check{X}_{k,i}, \check{P}_{k,j} + \frac{\bar{n}\Delta_j(2\Delta_j+1)}{2}I_{\bar{n}}), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{X}_{k,i} = P_{k,i} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{i,j}(k)\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}\tilde{X}_{k,j},$$

$$P_{k,i} = \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{i,j}(k)\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} \right)^{-1}.$$

4.2 Stability

The next lemma, proved in Appendix E, is useful for further analysis.

Lemma 4.3 Under Assumptions 2.1-2.3, if there are positive constants $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \mu_1, \mu_2\}$ such that $\theta_{k,i} \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ and $\mu_{k,i} \in (\mu_1, \mu_2)$, the following two conclusions hold.

- 1) It holds that $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} = \frac{\bar{P}_{k,i}^{-1}}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + H_{k,i}^T \Delta R_{k,i}^{-1} H_{k,i}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$, where $\Delta R_{k,i} = R_{k,i} + \frac{1+\mu_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}}B_{k,i}$.
- 2) There exists a positive scalar η such that $\bar{P}_{T_l+s+1,i}^{-1} \geq \eta A_{T_l+s}^{-T} P_{T_l+s,i}^{-1} A_{T_l+s}^{-1}$, $s \in [0 : L)$, where $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an L -SS of $\{A_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Theorem 4.1 Consider the system (5) with Algorithm 1. Under Assumptions 2.1-2.6 and 3.1, if the parameter L given in (1) satisfies $L > \max\{k^0, N\} + \bar{N}$ and there are positive constants $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \mu_1, \mu_2\}$ such

that $\theta_{k,i} \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ and $\mu_{k,i} \in (\mu_1, \mu_2)$, then the sequence of estimation error covariances is stable, i.e., $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ E\{(\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k)(\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k)^T\} \right\} < +\infty, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}$.

PROOF. Due to the consistency in Lemma 4.1, we turn to prove $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} P_{k,i} < \infty$. Under Assumption 2.2, $\{A_k | A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+p)}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has an L-SS, which is supposed to be $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$ subject to $L \leq T_{l+1} - T_l \leq T < \infty, \forall l \geq 0$, where $L > \max\{k^0, N\} + \bar{N}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $T_0 \geq \bar{M}$, where \bar{M} is given in Assumption 2.4. Otherwise, a subsequence of $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$ can always be obtained to satisfy the requirement. We divide the sequence set $\{T_l, l \geq 0\}$ into two non-overlapping time set: $\{T_l + L, l \geq 0\}$ and $\bigcup_{l \geq 0} [T_l + L + 1 : T_{l+1} + L - 1]$.

1) First, we consider the case of $k = T_l + L, l \geq 1$. For convenience, let $\bar{k} \triangleq T_l + L$. It can be easily shown that $\left(\tilde{P}_{k,i} + \frac{\bar{n}\Delta_i(2\Delta_i+1)}{2} I_{\bar{n}} \right)^{-1} \geq \varrho \tilde{P}_{\bar{k},i}^{-1}$, where $\varrho \in (0, 1]$ and $\bar{n} = n + p$. According to Lemma 4.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\bar{k},i}^{-1} &\geq \varrho \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(\bar{k})} a_{i,j}(\bar{k}) \tilde{P}_{\bar{k},j}^{-1} \\ &\geq \frac{\varrho\eta}{(1+\mu_2)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(\bar{k})} a_{i,j}(\bar{k}) A_{\bar{k}-1}^{-T} P_{\bar{k}-1,j}^{-1} A_{\bar{k}-1}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(\bar{k})} a_{i,j}(\bar{k}) H_{\bar{k},j}^T \Delta R_{\bar{k},j}^{-1} H_{\bar{k},j}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By recursively applying (8) for L times, denoting $\delta = \frac{\varrho\eta}{(1+\mu_2)}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\bar{k},i}^{-1} &\geq \frac{a_{min} \delta^{L-1} \mu_1}{\mu_1 + 1} \sum_{s=k^0}^{L-1} \left[\Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-T} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \left. \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} H_{\bar{k}-s,j}^T (R_{\bar{k}-s,j} + B_{\bar{k}-s,j})^{-1} H_{\bar{k}-s,j} \right] \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $a_{min} = \min_{i,j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{i,j}^{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s} > 0, s \in [\max\{k^0, N\} : L]$, and $a_{i,j}^{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}$ is the (i, j) th element of $\prod_{l=\bar{k}-s}^{\bar{k}} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma_l}$. Note that a_{min} can be obtained under Assumption 2.5, since the elements of \mathcal{A}_{σ_k} belong to a finite set and the jointly strongly connected network can lead to $a_{i,j}^{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s} > 0, s \geq \max\{k^0, N\}$. Under Assumptions 2.2 and 2.4, there exists a constant positive definite matrix \check{P} , such that $P_{k,i} \leq \check{P}, k = T_l + L$.

2) Second, we consider the time set $\bigcup_{l \geq 0} [T_l + L + 1 : T_{l+1} + L - 1]$. Considering (9), we have $P_{T_l+L,i} \leq \check{P}, k \geq L$. Since the length of the interval $k \in [T_l + L + 1 : T_{l+1} + L - 1]$ is bounded by $T < \infty$, we can just consider the prediction

stage to study the boundedness of $P_{k,i}$, for $k \in [T_l + L + 1 : T_{l+1} + L - 1]$.

Under Assumption 2.2 and Proposition 3.1, there is a scalar $\beta_1 > 0$ such that $A_k A_k^T \leq \beta_1 I_n$. Due to $\sup_k (\bar{Q}_k + \tilde{Q}_k) < \infty$, it is safe to conclude that there exists a constant matrix P^{mid} , such that

$$P_{k,i} \leq P^{mid}, k \in [T_l + L + 1 : T_{l+1} + L - 1] \quad (10)$$

3) Finally, for the time interval $[0 : T_0 + L]$, there exists a constant matrix \hat{P} , such that

$$P_{k,i} \leq \hat{P}, k \in [0 : T_0 + L]. \quad (11)$$

According to (10) and (11), we have $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} P_{k,i} < \infty$.

An upper bound of error covariance can be derived by the proof of Theorem 4.1, from which the influence of quantization interval size Δ_i can be seen through the scalar ϱ . With the increase of Δ_i , the upper bound will become larger.

4.3 Design of parameters

In this subsection, the design methods for the parameters $\theta_{k,i}$ and $\mu_{k,i}$ are considered by solving two optimization problems.

a) Design of $\theta_{k,i}$

At the prediction stage, the design of the parameter $\theta_{k,i}$ is aimed to minimize the trace of $\bar{P}_{k,i}$, which is an upper bound of mean square error by Lemma 4.1. Mathematically, the optimization problem on $\theta_{k,i}$ is given as

$$\theta_{k,i}^* = \arg \min_{\theta_{k,i}} \text{tr}(\bar{P}_{k,i}), \quad (12)$$

where $\bar{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \theta_{k,i}) A_{k-1} P_{k-1,i} A_{k-1}^T + \frac{1+\theta_{k,i}}{\theta_{k,i}} \bar{Q}_{k-1} + \tilde{Q}_{k-1}$.

Since (12) is convex, which can be numerically solved by many existing convex optimization methods. The next proposition 4.1, proved in Appendix F, provides the closed-form solution of (12).

Proposition 4.1 Solving (12) yields the closed-form solution

$$\theta_{k,i}^* = \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr}(\bar{Q}_{k-1})}{\text{tr}(A_{k-1} P_{k-1,i} A_{k-1}^T)}}, i \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Furthermore, it holds that $\theta_{k,i}^* > 0$.

b) Design of $\mu_{k,i}$

Considering the consistency, we cast the design of $\mu_{k,i}$ into the following optimization problem:

$$\mu_{k,i}^* = \arg \min_{\mu_{k,i}} \text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{k,i}), \text{ s.t. } \mu_{k,i} > 0. \quad (13)$$

Remark 4.2 *Although the optimization in (13) is not convex, it can be solved by some existing methods, such as the quasi-Newton methods or the nonlinear least square [25].*

4.4 Asymptotically unbiased

We write $f_k = O(g_k)$ (or $f_k = o(g_k)$) if and only if $f_k \leq Mg_k$ for all $k \geq 0$ (or $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_k}{g_k} = 0$). The following two lemmas, proved in [26] and Appendix G respectively, are to find conditions ensuring the asymptotic unbiasedness of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 4.4 *Suppose that Π_0 and Π_1 satisfy $0 \leq \Pi_0 \leq \Pi_1$ and $\Pi_1 > 0$, then $\Pi_0 \Pi_1^{-1} \Pi_0 \leq \Pi_0$.*

Lemma 4.5 *Let $\{d_k\} \in \mathbb{R}$ be generated by $d_{k+1} = \rho d_k + m_k$ with $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $d_0 < \infty$, then*

- (1) if $m_k = o(1)$, then $d_k = o(1)$, i.e., $d_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$;
- (2) if $m_k = o(\delta^k)$ and $\rho < \delta < 1$, then $d_k = o(\delta^k)$;
- (3) if $m_k = o(\frac{1}{k^M})$ with $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then $d_k = o(\frac{1}{k^{M-1}})$.

Theorem 4.2 *Consider the system (5) satisfying the same conditions as Theorem 4.1 and $\lambda_{\min}\{A_k A_k^T\} \geq \beta_0 > 0$. Denoting $\mathcal{M}_k := \max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \|E\{b_{k,j}\}\|_2^2 + \|E\{u_k\}\|_2^2$,*

- if $\mathcal{M}_k = o(1)$, then $\|E\{e_{k,i}\}\|_2 = o(1)$;
- if $\mathcal{M}_k = o(k^{-M})$ with $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then $\|E\{e_{k,i}\}\|_2 = o(k^{\frac{1-M}{2}})$;
- if $\mathcal{M}_k = o(\delta^k)$ and $\tilde{\varrho} < \delta < 1$, then $\|E\{e_{k,i}\}\|_2 = o(\delta^{\frac{k}{2}})$, where $\tilde{\varrho} \in (0, 1)$ is defined in (16).

PROOF. Since $\tilde{P}_{k,i}$ is positive definite, we define the following function $V_{k,i}(E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\}) = E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\}^T \tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\}$. From the fact (iii) of Lemma 1 in [6] and the non-singularity of A_k , we have $V_{k+1,i}(E\{\bar{e}_{k+1,i}\}) \leq \varrho E\{\bar{e}_{k+1,i}\}^T A_k^{-T} P_{k,i}^{-1} A_k^{-1} E\{\bar{e}_{k+1,i}\}$, where $0 < \varrho < 1$. Since w_k is zero-mean, $E\{\bar{e}_{k+1,i}\} = A_k E\{e_{k,i}\} - DE\{u_k\}$. Then, there exists a scalar $\alpha_0 > 0$, such that $\tilde{\varrho}_1 = \varrho(1 + \alpha_0) \in (0, 1)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & V_{k+1,i}(E\{\bar{e}_{k+1,i}\}) \\ & \leq \tilde{\varrho}_1 E\{e_{k,i}\}^T P_{k,i}^{-1} E\{e_{k,i}\} + O(\|E\{u_k\}\|_2^2). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

As the quantization error is uniformly distributed in $[-\frac{\Delta_i}{2}, \frac{\Delta_i}{2}]$, the quantization error is zero-mean. By (14) and Lemma 2 in [6], there exists a scalar $\tilde{\varrho}_2 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1,i}(E\{\bar{e}_{k+1,i}\}) & \leq \tilde{\varrho}_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{i,j}(k) E\{\tilde{e}_{k,j}\}^T \tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} E\{\tilde{e}_{k,j}\} \\ & \quad + O(\|E\{u_k\}\|_2^2). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Notice that $\tilde{P}_{k,j} = (1 + \mu_{k,j})(I - K_{k,j} H_{k,j}) \tilde{P}_{k,j}$ and $E\{e_{k,j}\} = (I - K_{k,j} H_{k,j}) E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\} + K_{k,j} E\{b_{k,j}\}$, then we have $\frac{\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}}{1 + \mu_{k,j}} = \tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} (I - K_{k,j} H_{k,j})$ and $\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} \leq \tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}$. There exists a sufficiently small scalar $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $\tilde{\varrho}_2(1 + \alpha_1) < 1$. Denote

$$\tilde{\varrho} = \tilde{\varrho}_2(1 + \alpha_1), \quad (16)$$

For this α_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{\tilde{e}_{k,j}\}^T \tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} E\{\tilde{e}_{k,j}\} \\ & \leq (1 + \alpha_1) E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\}^T (I - K_{k,j} H_{k,j})^T \\ & \quad \times \tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} (I - K_{k,j} H_{k,j}) E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\} + O(\|E\{b_{k,j}\}\|_2^2) \\ & \leq (1 + \alpha_1) E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\}^T \frac{\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}}{1 + \mu_{k,j}} \tilde{P}_{k,j} \frac{\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}}{1 + \mu_{k,j}} E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\} \\ & \quad + O(\|E\{b_{k,j}\}\|_2^2) \\ & \leq (1 + \alpha_1) E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\}^T \tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\} + O(\|E\{b_{k,j}\}\|_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by Lemma 4.4 and 1) of Lemma 4.3. By (15) and (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & V_{k+1,i}(E\{\bar{e}_{k+1,i}\}) \\ & \leq \tilde{\varrho} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{i,j}(k) V_{k,j}(E\{\bar{e}_{k,j}\}) \\ & \quad + O(\max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \|b_{k,j}\|_2^2) + O(\|u_k\|_2^2) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Due to $\mathcal{A}_k = [a_{i,j}(k)]$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, summing up (17) for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & V_{k+1}(E\{\bar{e}_{k+1}\}) \\ & \leq \tilde{\varrho} \mathcal{A}_k V_k(E\{\bar{e}_k\}) + \mathbf{1}_N \otimes (O(\max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \|b_{k,j}\|_2^2) + O(\|u_k\|_2^2)), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $V_k(E\{\bar{e}_k\}) = [V_{k,1}^T(E\{\bar{e}_{k,1}\}), \dots, V_{k,N}^T(E\{\bar{e}_{k,N}\})]^T$. Taking 2-norm operator on both sides of (18) and considering $\|\mathcal{A}_k\|_2 = 1$ yields $\|V_{k+1}(E\{\bar{e}_{k+1}\})\|_2 \leq \tilde{\varrho} \|V_k(E\{\bar{e}_k\})\|_2 + O(\max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \|b_{k,j}\|_2^2 + \|u_k\|_2^2)$. Due to $\mathcal{M}_k = \max_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \|b_{k,j}\|_2^2 + \|u_k\|_2^2 = o(1)$ and (1) of Lemma 4.5, the estimate sequence of each sensor by Algorithm 1 is asymptotically unbiased. Furthermore, if \mathcal{M}_k satisfies certain convergence rates (i.e., $\mathcal{M}_k = o(k^{-M})$ or $\mathcal{M}_k = o(\delta^k)$), by (2) and (3) of Lemma 4.5, the estimation bias is convergent to zero with certain rates (i.e., $o(k^{\frac{1-M}{2}})$ or $o(\delta^{\frac{k}{2}})$), respectively.

Remark 4.3 Theorem 4.2 shows the polynomial and exponential convergence rates of estimation bias by Algorithm 1 in presence of decaying observation biases and uncertain dynamics. In practical applications, if the observation biases of sensors do not converge to zero or the uncertainty does not converge to a constant vector, one can analyze an upper bound (i.e., b_1) of estimation bias with the similar procedure as the proof of Theorem 4.2. Additionally, due to $E\{\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k\}E\{\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k\}^T + Cov\{\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k\} = E\{(\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k)(\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k)^T\} \leq P_{k,i}$, it holds that $b_2 := \|E\{(\hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k)\}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\|P_{k,i}\|_2}$. Then one can utilize the value $\min\{b_1, b_2\}$ to evaluate the estimation bias in real time.

5 Distributed filter: event-triggered update

In this section, we will study an even-triggered update based DKF and analyze the conditions to ensure the mean square boundedness and asymptotic unbiasedness.

5.1 Event-triggered update scheme

Due to the influence of random noise and observation bias over the system (2), some corrupted observations may lead to the performance degradation of filters. Thus, we aim to provide a scheme to decide when the observation is utilized or discarded. We introduce the information metric $S_{k,i}$, defined as $S_{k,i} \triangleq H_{k,i}^T \left(R_{k,i} + \frac{(1+\mu_{k,i})}{\mu_{k,i}} B_{k,i} \right)^{-1} H_{k,i}$. In the following, we define the update event and the event-triggered scheme.

Definition 5.1 We say that an update event \mathbb{E} of sensor i is triggered at time k , if sensor i utilizes the observation $y_{k,i}$ to update the estimate as Algorithm 1.

The event \mathbb{E} is triggered at time k (i.e., $y_{k,i}$ is utilized) if

$$\lambda_{max} \left(S_{k,i} - \frac{\mu_{k,i}}{1 + \mu_{k,i}} \bar{P}_{k,i}^{-1} \right) > \tau, \quad (19)$$

where $\tau \geq 0$ is the preset triggering threshold of the observation update. Otherwise, $y_{k,i}$ will be discarded.

Remark 5.1 The triggering scheme in (19) shows that if the current information is more sufficient in at least one channel than the prediction information, then it is worth using the available observation in the update stage. The triggering threshold τ is used as a measure of information increment.

The following lemma, proved in Appendix H, provides an equivalent form of the triggering scheme.

Lemma 5.1 The event-triggered scheme (19) is satisfied if and only if

$$\lambda_{max}(\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} - \bar{P}_{k,i}^{-1}) > \tau, \quad (20)$$

where $\tilde{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \mu_{k,i})(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})\bar{P}_{k,i}$ and $\tau \geq 0$.

Since Algorithm 1 is consistent, $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1}$ and $\bar{P}_{k,i}^{-1}$ stand for the lower bounds of information matrices at the update stage and the prediction stage, respectively. Then $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} - \bar{P}_{k,i}^{-1}$ reflects the variation of statistical information resulted from a new observation. In light of Lemma 5.1, the event \mathbb{E} is triggered if sufficiently new information is accumulated at the update stage.

5.2 ESKDF with event-triggered update

Based on the event-triggered scheme (19) and Algorithm 1, we can obtain the extended state based DKF with event-triggered update scheme in Algorithm 2. According to Al-

Algorithm 2 ESKDF based on event-triggered update:

Prediction: the same as the one of Algorithm 1

Event-triggered update:

If (19) is satisfied, then

$$K_{k,i} = \bar{P}_{k,i} H_{k,i}^T \left(H_{k,i} \bar{P}_{k,i} H_{k,i}^T + \frac{R_{k,i}}{1 + \mu_{k,i}} + \frac{B_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}} \right)^{-1}$$

$$\tilde{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \mu_{k,i})(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})\bar{P}_{k,i}.$$

$$\tilde{X}_{k,i} = \bar{X}_{k,i} + K_{k,i}(y_{k,i} - H_{k,i}\bar{X}_{k,i})$$

Otherwise,

$$\tilde{X}_{k,i} = \bar{X}_{k,i}, \tilde{P}_{k,i} = \bar{P}_{k,i}.$$

Quantization: the same as the one of Algorithm 1

Local Fusion: the same as the one of Algorithm 1

gorithms 1 and 2, we can easily obtain Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.2 Consider the system (5) with Algorithm 2. Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.3 and 2.6, the pairs $(\bar{X}_{k,i}, \bar{P}_{k,i})$, $(\tilde{X}_{k,i}, \tilde{P}_{k,i})$, $(\check{X}_{k,i}, \check{P}_{k,i})$ and $(\hat{X}_{k,i}, P_{k,i})$ are all consistent.

The next lemma, proved in Appendix H, is on Algorithm 2.

Lemma 5.3 Under the event-triggered update scheme, for Algorithm 2, it holds that $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} \geq \frac{\bar{P}_{k,i}^{-1}}{1 + \mu_{k,i}} + H_{k,i}^T \Delta R_{k,i}^{-1} H_{k,i} - \tau I_{n+p}$, where $\Delta R_{k,i} = R_{k,i} + \frac{1 + \mu_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}} B_{k,i}$.

The next proposition, proved in Appendix H, studies the relation between Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, which shows that the event-triggered observation update scheme can lead to a tighter bound of error covariance than the typical time-driven observation update.

Proposition 5.1 Let $P_{k,i}^{As}$, $s = 1, 2$, be the $P_{k,i}$ matrix of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, respectively. If the two algorithms share the same initial setting and $\tau = 0$, then $P_{k,i}^{A2} \leq P_{k,i}^{A1}$.

Remark 5.2 Compared with Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 is able to obtain better estimation performance since it discards corrupted observations that may deteriorate the estimation performance. Meanwhile, in the scenarios as [27, 28]

where the estimator and sensor are distributed at different geographical locations with energy-constrained communication channels, it is suggested to judge which observations contain novel information and to decide when the observations are transmitted from the sensor to the remote estimator. These tasks can be achieved by the proposed event-triggered update scheme.

5.3 Stability and asymptotic unbiasedness

Theorem 5.1 Consider the system (5) and Algorithm 2 under Assumptions 2.1-2.6 and 3.1. If the parameter L given in (1) satisfies $L > \max\{k^0, N\} + \bar{N}$ and $\theta_{k,i} \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, $\mu_{k,i} \in (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ for positive constants $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \mu_1, \mu_2\}$, then there exists a scalar $\vartheta > 0$, such that for $0 \leq \tau < \vartheta$,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{E\{e_{k,i} e_{k,i}^T\}\} < +\infty, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Furthermore, if $\inf_k \lambda_{\min}(A_k A_k^T) > 0$, then

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{k \geq L} \lambda_{\max}(E\{e_{k,i} e_{k,i}^T\}) \leq \frac{1}{a_0 - \tau a_1},$$

where $e_{k,i} = \hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k$, a_0 and a_1 are given in (22).

PROOF. According to Lemma 5.2, we turn to prove $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} P_{k,i} < \infty$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1, with the same notations, we consider the time set $\bigcup_{l \geq 0} [T_l + L + 1 : T_{l+1} + L - 1]$. The rest part can be similarly proved by taking the method as the proof of Theorem 4.1. We have $P_{\bar{k},i}^{-1} \geq \delta^L \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-L}^{-T} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{i,j}^{\bar{k},\bar{k}-L} P_{\bar{k}-L,j}^{-1} \right] \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-L}^{-1} + \check{P}_{\bar{k},i}^{-1}$, where $\delta = \frac{\varrho\eta}{(1+\mu_2)}$ and

$$\check{P}_{\bar{k},i}^{-1} = \varrho \sum_{s=0}^{L-1} \delta^s \left[\Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-T} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{i,j}^{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s} \cdot \left(H_{\bar{k}-s,j}^T \Delta R_{\bar{k}-s,j}^{-1} H_{\bar{k}-s,j} - \tau I_{n+p} \right) \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-1} \right]. \quad (21)$$

We have $P_{\bar{k},i}^{-1} \geq \check{P}_{\bar{k},i}^{-1}$. To prove the conclusion, we turn to prove there is a constant matrix $S > 0$, such that $\check{P}_{\bar{k},i}^{-1} \geq S$. Under the conditions of this theorem, it follows from the proof of Theorem 4.1 that there is a scalar $\pi > 0$, such that $\sum_{s=0}^{L-1} \delta^s \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-T} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{i,j}^{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s} H_{\bar{k},j}^T \Delta R_{\bar{k},j}^{-1} H_{\bar{k},j} \right] \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-1} \geq \pi I_{n+p}$. Denote $\Xi_{\bar{k}} = \sum_{s=0}^{L-1} \delta^s \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-T} \Phi_{\bar{k},\bar{k}-s}^{-1}$. To guarantee $\inf_{\bar{k}} \check{P}_{\bar{k},i}^{-1} > 0$, it is sufficient to prove that there exists a constant matrix S , such that $\pi I_{n+p} - \tau \Xi_{\bar{k}} \geq S > 0$. Under Assumption 2.2, there exists a constant scalar $\bar{\mu} > 0$, such that $\sup_{\bar{k}} \Xi_{\bar{k}} \leq \bar{\mu} I_{n+p}$. Let $S = (\pi - \tau \bar{\mu}) I_{n+p}$, then a sufficient condition is $0 \leq \tau < \frac{\pi}{\bar{\mu}}$. Choosing $\vartheta = \frac{\pi}{\bar{\mu}} > 0$, then the boundedness is obtained. Furthermore, if

$\inf_k \lambda_{\min}\{A_k A_k^T\} > 0$, then the above analysis holds for any $k \geq L$ with no prediction step in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Thus, for any $k \geq 0$, it holds that $P_{k,i}^{-1} \geq \check{P}_{k,i}^{-1} \geq \varrho(\pi - \tau \bar{\mu}) I_{n+p}$. Let

$$a_0 = \varrho\pi, a_1 = \varrho\bar{\mu}, \quad (22)$$

then we have $\max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{k \geq L} \lambda_{\max}(P_{k,i}) \leq \frac{1}{a_0 - \tau a_1}$. In light of the consistency in Lemma 4.1, the conclusion holds.

Remark 5.3 If better performance of Algorithm 2 is pursued, one could let τ be zero or sufficiently small, which can ensure a smaller bound of mean square error by Proposition 5.1. If one aims to reduce the update frequency with stable estimation error, a relatively large τ can be set by satisfying the requirement in Theorem 5.1. Note that if a too large τ is given such that the triggering condition (19) is hardly satisfied, then most of observation information will be discarded. As a result, the collective observability condition in Assumption 2.4 may not hold, which means that the boundedness of estimation error covariances is not guaranteed.

To analyze the asymptotic unbiasedness of Algorithm 2, for convenience, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{k,i} &= H_{k,i}^T \left(R_{k,i} + \frac{1 + \mu_2}{\mu_2} B_{k,i} \right)^{-1} H_{k,i} \\ \bar{a} &= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\lambda_{\max}(A_k A_k^T)\}, b_w = \sup\{\lambda_{\max}(\bar{Q}_k)\} \\ r_0 &= (1 + \theta_2)(a_0 - \tau a_1)\bar{a} + \frac{1 + \theta_1}{\theta_1} b_w + b_q \\ r_1 &= \frac{\mu_1}{(\mu_1 + 1)r_0} + \tau, b_q = \sup\{\lambda_{\max}(\tilde{Q}_k)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where a_0 and a_1 are given in (22), $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \mu_1, \mu_2\}$ are given in Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.2 Consider the system (5) with Algorithm 2 under the same conditions as Theorem 5.1. If there is an integer $\bar{M} > L$ such that the set $\mathcal{S} = \{i \in \mathcal{V} \mid \sup_{k \geq \bar{M}} \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{I}_{k+1,i}) \leq r_1\}$ is non-empty, and

- if $\bar{M}_k = o(1)$, then $\|E\{e_{k,i}\}\|_2 = o(1)$;
- if $\bar{M}_k = o(k^{-M})$ with $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then $\|E\{e_{k,i}\}\|_2 = o(k^{\frac{1-M}{2}})$;
- if $\bar{M}_k = o(\delta^k)$ and $\tilde{\varrho} < \delta < 1$, then $\|E\{e_{k,i}\}\|_2 = o(\delta^{\frac{k}{2}})$, where $\tilde{\varrho} \in (0, 1)$ is defined in (16),

where $\bar{M}_k := \max_{j \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{S}} \|E\{b_{k,j}\}\|_2^2 + \|E\{u_k\}\|_2^2$.

Remark 5.4 Theorem 5.2 shows that the estimation biases of Algorithm 2 tend to zero even if the observation biases of some sensors do not decay. The proof of Theorem 5.2 is similar to that of Theorem 4.2, by noting that $\check{P}_{k,i} = \bar{P}_{k,i}$, for $i \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{S}$.

In the following, we show the feasibility of the condition that there is a positive integer $\bar{M} > L$ such that the set $\mathcal{S} = \{i \in \mathcal{V} | \sup_{k \geq \bar{M}} \lambda_{max}(\mathcal{I}_{k+1,i}) \leq r_1\}$ is non-empty.

Feasibility for a non-empty \mathcal{S}

To find the condition under which the set \mathcal{S} is non-empty, we prove that the condition $\sup_{k \geq \bar{M}} \lambda_{max}(\mathcal{I}_{k+1,i}) \leq r_1$ can be satisfied for some sensors. Note that under the conditions of Theorem 5.2, then the conclusions of Theorem 5.1 holds as well. Thus, recalling the notations in (23), we have $a_0 - \tau a_1 > 0$, which leads to $r_0 > 0$ and then $r_1 > \tau > 0$. Meanwhile, whatever how τ is small, r_1 has a uniformly lower bound by noting $0 < r_0 \leq (1 + \theta_2)a_0\bar{a} + \frac{1+\theta_1}{\theta_1}b_w + b_q$. If there is $M \geq L$, such that $\sup_{k \geq \bar{M}} \lambda_{max}(\mathcal{I}_{k+1,i}) \leq r_1$, then \mathcal{S} is non-empty. Simple examples ensuring this condition include that for $k \geq \bar{M} \geq L$, $\|H_{k,i}\|_2$ being very small, $\lambda_{max}(R_{k,i} + \frac{1+\mu_2}{\mu_2}B_{k,i})$ being very large, and so on.

The event-triggered scheme and the time-driven scheme have some similar properties in estimation consistency, boundedness of error covariances, and asymptotic unbiasedness of estimates. The differences between the two schemes are explicitly shown in Table 2.

6 Numerical Simulations

In this section, numerical simulations are carried out to demonstrate the aforementioned theoretical results and show the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms.

6.1 Performance Evaluation

In this and next subsections, let us consider an object whose motion is described by the kinematic model [29] with uncertain dynamics:

$$x_{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & T & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & T \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_k + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ T & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix} f(x_k, k) + \omega_k, \quad (24)$$

where $T = 0.1$ is the sampling step, x_k is the unknown state vector consisting of four-dimensional components along the coordinate axes and $f(x_k, k)$ is the uncertain dynamics. The covariance of process noise ω_k is $Q_k = \text{diag}([4, 4, 1, 1])$. The kinematic state of the object is observed by means of four sensors modeled as

$$y_{k,i} = \bar{H}_{k,i}x_k + b_{k,i} + v_{k,i}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

The observation noise $[v_{k,1}, \dots, v_{k,N}]^T$ is i.i.d. Gaussian with covariance $R_k = 4 \times I_4$. Additionally, the sensor network's communication topology is assumed to be directed and switching, whose adjacency matrix is selected

from $\mathcal{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathcal{A}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.3 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\mathcal{A}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0.25 & 0.25 & 0.25 & 0.25 \end{pmatrix}$. And the topology switching signal $\sigma_k = \text{mod}(\lfloor \frac{k}{5} \rfloor, 3) + 1$, where $\text{mod}(a, b)$ stands for the modulo operation of a by b . In the following, we conduct the numerical simulations through Monte Carlo experiment, in which 500 runs for the considered algorithms are implemented, respectively. The Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) averaged over all the sensors is defined as $RMSE_k = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 MSE_{k,i}}$, where $MSE_{k,i} = \frac{1}{500} \sum_{j=1}^{500} (x_{k,i}^j - \hat{x}_{k,i}^j)^T (x_{k,i}^j - \hat{x}_{k,i}^j)$, and $\hat{x}_{k,i}^j$ is the state (position or velocity) estimate of the j th run of sensor i at the k th time instant. Besides, we denote $P_k = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 P_{k,i}$. The mean estimation error (ME) averaged over all sensors is defined by $ME_k = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{1}{500} \sum_{j=1}^{500} \frac{1}{4} \sum_{l=1}^4 (x_{k,i}^j(l) - \hat{x}_{k,i}^j(l))$. It is assumed that the initial state is a zero-mean random vector with covariance matrix $P_0 = \text{diag}([10, 10, 1, 1])$.

The uncertain dynamics and the state-correlated bias are assumed to be $f(x_k, k) = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x_k(3))+k \\ \sin(x_k(4))+k \end{pmatrix}$ and $b_{k,i} = \text{sat}(2 \sin(x_k^2(1) + x_k^2(2)) + b_{0,i}, 2)$, respectively, where the initial bias $b_{0,i}$ is generated uniformly within $[-2, 2]$. We assume $B_{k,i} = 4$. The observation matrices are supposed to be switching with time, following $\bar{H}_{k,i} = \bar{H}_{\text{mod}(i+\lfloor \frac{k}{10} \rfloor, 4)+1}$, and $\bar{H}_1 = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)$, $\bar{H}_2 = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)$, $\bar{H}_3 = \bar{H}_4 = (0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)$. And the parameters of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are set $X_{i,0} = 0_{6 \times 1}$, $P_{i,0} = \begin{pmatrix} P_0 & 0_{4 \times 2} \\ 0_{2 \times 4} & I_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\hat{Q}_k = 10^{-3} \times I_2$, $\mu_{k,i} = 0.3$, $\tau_i = 0.001$, $\forall i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. First, we carry out numerical simulations for Algorithm 1 (i.e., ESDKF) and Algorithm 2 with results given in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. Fig. 1 shows Algorithm 2 generally have better performance than Algorithm 1. Meanwhile, Fig. 2 shows the triggering time instants of observation update for each sensor. Because of the periodic switching of observation matrices, the triggering time instants of all sensors are also periodic. Thus, compared with Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 can reduce the frequency of observation update with competitive estimation performance. Fig. 2 also gives the behavior of the RMSE and $\sqrt{\text{tr}(P_k)}$ of Algorithm 2, from which one can see the estimation error covariances of the proposed ESDKF keep stable in the given period and the consistency of each sensor remains.

6.2 Asymptotically unbiasedness of Algorithms 1 and 2

Next, we give a numerical simulation to verify Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 5.2. In this subsection, the uncertain dynamics is assumed to be $f(x_k, k) = \frac{1}{2k} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x_k(3)) \\ \sin(x_k(4)) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and the state-correlated bias $b_{k,i}$ has two situations:

Table 2

Differences of time-driven and event-triggered update schemes

update scheme	observation	threshold	stability condition	asymptotic unbiasedness
time-driven	always	no	system+topology	decaying observation biases of all sensors
event-triggered	selective	yes	system+topology+threshold	non-decaying observation biases of some sensors





Fig. 1. RMSE difference between Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2

Fig. 2. Triggering times, RMSE and $\sqrt{\text{tr}(P)}$ of Algorithm 2

- Situation 1:

$$b_{k,i} = \frac{1}{k} \text{sat}(s_{k,i}, 2), B_{k,i} = \frac{4}{k^2} \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4$$

where $s_{k,i} = 2 \sin(x_k^2(1) + x_k^2(2)) + b_{0,i}$, and $b_{0,i}$ is generated uniformly within $[-2, 2]$.

- Situation 2:

$$b_{k,i} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k} \text{sat}(s_{k,i}, 2), B_{k,i} = \frac{4}{k^2}, & i = 1, 2, \\ \text{sat}(\tilde{s}_{k,i}, 40), B_{k,i} = 1600, & i = 3, 4, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{s}_{k,i} = 40 \sin(x_k^2(1) + x_k^2(2)) + b_{0,i}$, $b_{0,1}$ and $b_{0,2}$ are generated uniformly within $[-2, 2]$, $b_{0,3}$ and $b_{0,4}$ are generated uniformly within $[-40, 40]$.

In Situation 2, the biases of sensor 3 and sensor 4 are big and do not tend to zero. The observation ma-

trices are supposed to be $\bar{H}_{k,1} = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)$, $\bar{H}_{k,2} = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)$, $\bar{H}_{k,3} = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)$, $\bar{H}_{k,4} = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)$. And the parameters of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are set $X_{i,0} = -\begin{pmatrix} 10 & 10 & \sqrt{10} & \sqrt{10} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$, $P_{i,0} = \begin{pmatrix} 11P_0 & 0_{4 \times 2} \\ 0_{2 \times 4} & I_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\hat{Q}_k = 10^{-3} \times I_2$, $\mu_{k,i} = 0.3$, $\tau_i = 0.001$, $\forall i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Fig. 3 gives the mean estimation error of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 under Situation 1 and Situation 2. From this figure, one can see, under Situation 1, both Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are asymptotically unbiased; however, under Situation 2, only Algorithm 2 is asymptotically unbiased. Thus Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 5.2 are verified.




Fig. 3. Mean estimation error of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2

6.3 Comparisons with other algorithms

To verify that the proposed algorithm can handle singular system matrices, as stated in Theorems 4.1 and 5.1, in this subsection, let us leave out the physical meaning of system (24) and assume that the system matrix satisfies

$$\bar{A}_k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & T & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & T \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ if } \text{mod}(k, 10) < 8. \text{ Otherwise, } \bar{A}_k =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & T & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & T \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \text{ Besides, we consider a network with 20 nodes,}$$

where 3 kinds of nodes in this network: sensor A, sensor B and non-sensing node. A non-sensing node has no observation but it is capable to run algorithms and communicate with other nodes. The observation matrices of sensor A and sensor B are supposed to be $\bar{H}_A = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)$, $\bar{H}_B = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)$. The distribution of these 3 kinds of nodes is given in Fig. 4, which is undirected and switching between two graphs. Note that a non-sensing node i can implement algorithms by assuming $\bar{H}_{k,i} = 0$ and $y_{k,i} = 0$. In the figure, the dotted red lines and blue lines will exist successively for every five time instants. The elements of the adjacency matrix are

set to be $a_{i,j}^{\mathcal{G}_s} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_i^{\mathcal{G}_s}|}$. The setting of uncertain dynamics and bias is the same as Subsection 6.1.




Fig. 4. Communication topology of the sensor network

For above system, we carry out numerical simulations to compare Algorithm 2 with other three algorithms, namely, distributed state estimation with consensus on the posteriors (DSEA-CP) [6], centralized Kalman filter (CKF) and centralized extended state based Kalman filter (CESKF) [16]. For DSEA-CP, the initial estimate is assume to be $\hat{x}_{0,i} = 0_{4 \times 1}$, $P_{0,i} = P_0, \forall i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. As for CKF, in a data center, the CKF is utilized with the form of standard Kalman filter by employing the collected observations from all sensors. Here, the initial estimate of CKF are $\hat{x}_0 = 0_{4 \times 1}$, $P_0^{\text{CKF}} = P_0$. Similar to CKF, CESKF is utilized with the form of ESKF [16] by employing the collected observations from all sensors. As for the parameter of CESKF are set to be $\hat{X}_0 = 0_{6 \times 1}$, $P_0^{\text{CESKF}} = \begin{pmatrix} P_0 & 0_{4 \times 2} \\ 0_{2 \times 4} & I_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\hat{Q}_k = I_2$.

The performance comparison result of the above algorithms is shown in Fig. 5. From this figure, one can see that the RMSE of x_3 and x_4 for DSEA-CP and CKF become unstable, but the estimation errors of CESKF and Algorithm 2 still keep stable. The stability of CESKF and Algorithm 2 lies in its capability in handling with uncertain nonlinear dynamics. Since CESKF is a centralized filter without being affected by the quantized channels and the switching of communication topologies, its estimation error is smaller than ESDKF. For the DSEA-CP, due to the existence of unbounded uncertain dynamics and the switching topologies, both the position estimation error and the velocity estimation error are divergent. As for CKF, since observations (position information) of all sensors are available, the position estimation error is stable. However, the velocity estimation error is divergent since the existence of unbounded uncertain dynamics.

Based on the above results, we can see the proposed Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are effective distributed filtering algorithms for the considered scenarios.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied a distributed filtering problem for a class of general uncertain stochastic systems. By treating the nonlinear uncertain dynamics as an extended state, we




Fig. 5. Estimation performance of different algorithms

proposed a novel consistent distributed Kalman filter based on quantized sensor communications. To alleviate the effect of biased observations, the event-triggered observation update based distributed Kalman filter was presented with a tighter bound of error covariance than that of the time-driven one by designing a proper threshold. Based on mild conditions, the boundedness of the estimation error covariances and the asymptotic unbiasedness of state estimate for both the proposed two distributed filters were proved.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their very constructive comments, which greatly improved the quality of this work.

A Proof of Proposition 3.1

Recall $A_k = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_k & \bar{G}_k \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix}$, and $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\bar{G}_k \bar{G}_k^T\} < \infty$, then

we have

$$A_k A_k^T = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T + \bar{G}_k \bar{G}_k^T & \bar{G}_k \\ \bar{G}_k^T & I_p \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

First, we consider the proof of 1). We start with the sufficiency of 1). According to (A.1), we have $A_k A_k^T \leq 2 \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T + \bar{G}_k \bar{G}_k^T & 0 \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix}$. Thus, $\sup_k \{\bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T\} < \infty$ and $\sup_k \{\bar{G}_k \bar{G}_k^T\} < \infty$ lead to $\sup_k \{A_k A_k^T\} < \infty$. We then consider the necessity of 1). If $\sup_k \{A_k A_k^T\} < \infty$, it follows from (A.1) that $\sup_k \{\bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T + \bar{G}_k \bar{G}_k^T\} < \infty$. Due to $\bar{G}_k \bar{G}_k^T \geq 0$, then $\sup_k \{\bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T\} < \infty$. Next, we consider the proof of 2). According to (A.1), it holds that $A_k A_k^T = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & \bar{G}_k \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T & 0 \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ \bar{G}_k^T & I_p \end{pmatrix}$. Thus, $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T) = \min\{\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}_k \bar{A}_k^T), 1\}$. We study the sufficiency of 2). If $\{\bar{A}_k | \bar{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has an L-SS $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$

which satisfies $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}_{T_l+s}\bar{A}_{T_l+s}^T) > \beta, s \in [0 : L]$. Then for the same time sequence $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$, it holds that $\lambda_{\min}(A_{T_l+s}A_{T_l+s}^T) > \beta^* = \min\{\beta, 1\}, s \in [0 : L]$. Thus, the time sequence $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is also an L-SS of $\{A_k | A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+p)}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We then consider the necessity of 2). If $\{A_k | A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+p)}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has an L-SS $\{\bar{T}_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then $\lambda_{\min}(A_{\bar{T}_l+s}A_{\bar{T}_l+s}^T) > \bar{\beta}, s \in [0 : L]$. Recall $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}_k\bar{A}_k^T) = \min\{\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}_k\bar{A}_k^T), 1\}$, then we have $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{A}_{\bar{T}_l+s}\bar{A}_{\bar{T}_l+s}^T) > \bar{\beta}, s \in [0 : L]$. As a result, the time sequence $\{\bar{T}_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is also an L-SS of $\{\bar{A}_k | \bar{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

B Proof of Proposition 3.2

Denote $\Phi_{j,k} = \Phi_{j,j-1} \cdots \Phi_{k+1,k} (j > k)$, $\Phi_{k,k} = I_{n+p}$, and $\Phi_{k+1,k} = A_k$, then it holds that $\Phi_{j,k} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_{j-1} & \bar{G}_{j-1} \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix} \times \cdots \times \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_k & \bar{G}_k \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Phi}_{j,k} & \tilde{\Phi}_{j,k+1} \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix}$, where $\tilde{\Phi}_{j,k+1} = \sum_{i=k+1}^j \bar{\Phi}_{j,i}\bar{G}_{i-1}$. Thus, we obtain $\Phi_{j,k}^T H_{j,i}^T (R_{j,i} + B_{j,i})^{-1} H_{j,i} \Phi_{j,k} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,1} & \Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,2} \\ (\Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,2})^T & \Theta_{i,j,k}^{2,2} \end{pmatrix}$, where $\Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,1} = \bar{\Phi}_{j,k}^T \bar{H}_{j,i}^T (R_{j,i} + B_{j,i})^{-1} \bar{H}_{j,i} \bar{\Phi}_{j,k}$, $\Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,2} = \bar{\Phi}_{j,k}^T \bar{H}_{j,i}^T (R_{j,i} + B_{j,i})^{-1} \bar{H}_{j,i} \tilde{\Phi}_{j,k+1}$ and $\Theta_{i,j,k}^{2,2} = (\bar{H}_{j,i} \tilde{\Phi}_{j,k+1})^T (R_{j,i} + B_{j,i})^{-1} (\bar{H}_{j,i} \tilde{\Phi}_{j,k+1})$.

For $\bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we denote

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=k}^{k+\bar{N}} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,1} & \Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,2} \\ (\Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,2})^T & \Theta_{i,j,k}^{2,2} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} & \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2} \\ (\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2})^T & \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{2,2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=k}^{k+\bar{N}} \Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,1} \\ \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=k}^{k+\bar{N}} \Theta_{i,j,k}^{1,2} \\ \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{2,2} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=k}^{k+\bar{N}} \Theta_{i,j,k}^{2,2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

1) Necessity. If the reformulated system (5) is uniformly collectively observable, then there exist $M, \bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\alpha > 0$

such that $\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} & \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2} \\ (\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2})^T & \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{2,2} - \alpha I_p \end{pmatrix} - \alpha I_{n+p} > 0, \forall k \geq M$.

Thus, $\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} > 0$, then in light of Schur Complement [30], for $k \geq \bar{M}$, $(\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{2,2} - \alpha I_p) - (\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2})^T (\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} - \alpha I_n)^{-1} \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2} > 0$.

2) Sufficiency. If there exist $\bar{N}, M \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\alpha > 0$, such that $\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} - \alpha I_n > 0$, for $k \geq \bar{M}$. For $k \geq \bar{M}$, by $(\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{2,2} - \alpha I_p) - (\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2})^T (\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} - \alpha I_n)^{-1} \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2} > 0$ and

Schur Complement [30], for $k \geq \bar{M}$, $\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,1} & \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2} \\ (\bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{1,2})^T & \bar{\Theta}_{k,\bar{N}}^{2,2} \end{pmatrix} >$

αI_{n+p} holds. Thus, the reformulated system (5) is uniformly collectively observable.

C Proof of Lemma 4.1

Here we utilize an inductive method for the proof. At the initial moment, under Assumption 2.1, $E\{(\hat{X}_{0,i} - X_0)(\hat{X}_{0,i} - X_0)^T\} \leq P_{0,i}$. Suppose $E\{(\hat{X}_{k-1,i} - X_{k-1})(\hat{X}_{k-1,i} - X_{k-1})^T\} \leq P_{k-1,i}$. Recall $\bar{e}_{k,i} = \hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k = A_{k-1}e_{k-1,i} - Du_{k-1} - \omega_{k-1}$. Since the estimation error $e_{k-1,i}$ is measurable to $\sigma\{\mathcal{F}_{k-2}, v_{k-1,i}, i \in \mathcal{V}\}$, and ω_{k-1} is independent from \mathcal{F}_{k-2} and $v_{k-1,i}, i \in \mathcal{V}$, we have $E\{e_{k-1,i}\omega_{k-1}^T\} = 0$. Similarly, it holds that $E\{u_{k-1,i}\omega_{k-1}^T\} = 0$. Then, due to $E\{(\sqrt{\theta_{k,i}}x + \frac{y}{\sqrt{\theta_{k,i}}})(\sqrt{\theta_{k,i}}x + \frac{y}{\sqrt{\theta_{k,i}}})^T\} \geq 0$, we have the inequality $E\{xy^T + yx^T\} \leq E\{\theta_{k,i}xx^T + \frac{1}{\theta_{k,i}}yy^T\}, \forall \theta_{k,i} > 0$. Then, we have $E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\bar{e}_{k,i}^T\} \leq (1 + \theta_{k,i})A_{k-1}P_{k-1,i}A_{k-1}^T + (1 + \frac{1}{\theta_{k,i}})\bar{Q}_{k-1} + \bar{Q}_{k-1}$. According to the definition of $\bar{P}_{k,i}$, $E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\bar{e}_{k,i}^T\} \leq \bar{P}_{k,i}$ hold. At the update stage, there is $\bar{e}_{k,i} = \hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k = (I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})\bar{e}_{k,i} + K_{k,i}b_{k,i} + K_{k,i}v_{k,i}$. Under Assumption 2.1 and the fact that $\bar{e}_{k,i}$ is measurable to \mathcal{F}_{k-1} , it follows that $E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}v_{k,i}^T\} = E\{E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}v_{k,i}^T | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}\} = E\{A_{k-1}e_{k-1,i}E\{v_{k,i}^T | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}\} + E\{E\{w_{k-1}v_{k,i}^T | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\}\} = E\{w_{k-1}v_{k,i}^T\} = 0$. Similarly, it holds that $E\{b_{k,i}v_{k,i}^T\} = 0$ by noting that $b_{k,i}$ is measurable to \mathcal{F}_{k-1} . Then, $\forall \mu_{k,i} > 0$, we have $E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\bar{e}_{k,i}^T\} \leq (1 + \mu_{k,i})(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\bar{e}_{k,i}^T\}(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})^T + K_{k,i}E\{v_{k,i}v_{k,i}^T\}K_{k,i}^T + \frac{1+\mu_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}}K_{k,i}E\{b_{k,i}b_{k,i}^T\}K_{k,i}^T \leq \tilde{P}_{k,i}$.

Recall the existence of quantization operation with respect to $\hat{X}_{k,i} + \xi_{k,i}$, where $\xi_{k,i}$ stands for the dithering noise vector. We denote the estimation error $\check{e}_{k,i} := \hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k = \bar{e}_{k,i} + \xi_{k,i} + \vartheta_{k,i}$, where $\vartheta_{k,i}$ is the quantization error vector of $\hat{X}_{k,i} + \xi_{k,i}$. By Assumption 2.6, $\xi_{k,i} + \vartheta_{k,i}$ is independent of $\bar{e}_{k,i}$. Then $E\{\check{e}_{k,i}\check{e}_{k,i}^T\} \leq E\{\bar{e}_{k,i}\bar{e}_{k,i}^T\} + E\{(\xi_{k,i} + \vartheta_{k,i})(\xi_{k,i} + \vartheta_{k,i})^T\} \leq \bar{P}_{k,i} + \Delta_i^2 \bar{n} I_{\bar{n}} = \check{P}_{k,i} + P_{k,i}^* + \Delta_i^2 \bar{n} I_{\bar{n}}$, where $P_{k,i}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n} \times \bar{n}}$ is the symmetric quantization error matrix of $\check{P}_{k,i}$. It holds that $P_{k,i}^* \leq \lambda_{\max}(P_{k,i}^*)I_{\bar{n}} \leq \|P_{k,i}^*\|_F I_{\bar{n}} := \sqrt{\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\bar{n}} \sum_{l=1}^{\bar{n}} (P_{k,i}^*(s,l))^2\right)} I_{\bar{n}} \leq \frac{\Delta_i \bar{n}}{2} I_{\bar{n}}$, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm, and $P_{k,i}^*(s,l)$ is the (s,l) th element of $P_{k,i}^*$. Thus, we have $E\{\check{e}_{k,i}\check{e}_{k,i}^T\} \leq \check{P}_{k,i} + \frac{\bar{n}\Delta_i(2\Delta_i+1)}{2} I_{\bar{n}}$. Notice that $e_{k,i} = \hat{X}_{k,i} - X_k =$

$P_{k,i}(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k), j \neq i} a_{i,j}(k) \tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1} \tilde{e}_{k,j} + a_{i,i}(k) \tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} \tilde{e}_{k,i})$, where $\tilde{P}_{k,j} = \tilde{P}_{k,j} + \frac{\tilde{n}\Delta_i(2\Delta_i+1)}{2} I_{\tilde{n}}$, if $i \neq j$, and $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$. According to the consistent estimate of Covariance Intersection [31], there is $E\{e_{k,i}e_{k,i}^T\} \leq P_{k,i}$. Therefore, the proof is finished.

D Proof of Lemma 4.2

By Lemma 4.1, it holds that $\tilde{P}_{k,i} = (1 + \mu_{k,i})\Delta\tilde{P}_{k,i}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\tilde{P}_{k,i} &\triangleq (I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})\tilde{P}_{k,i}(I - K_{k,i}H_{k,i})^T + K_{k,i}\tilde{R}_{k,i}K_{k,i}^T \\ &= (K_{k,i} - K_{k,i}^*)(H_{k,i}\tilde{P}_{k,i}H_{k,i}^T + \tilde{R}_{k,i})(K_{k,i} - K_{k,i}^*)^T \\ &\quad + (I - K_{k,i}^*H_{k,i})\tilde{P}_{k,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where $\tilde{R}_{k,i} = \frac{R_{k,i}}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + \frac{B_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}}$, $K_{k,i}^* = \tilde{P}_{k,i}H_{k,i}^T(H_{k,i}\tilde{P}_{k,i}H_{k,i}^T + \tilde{R}_{k,i})^{-1}$. Thus, it is seen from (D.1) that $\tilde{P}_{k,i}$ is minimized in the sense of positive definiteness (i.e., $\text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{k,i})$ is minimized) when $K_{k,i} = K_{k,i}^*$.

E Proof of Lemma 4.3

For the proof of 1), exploiting the matrix inverse formula on $\tilde{P}_{k,i}$ directly yields the conclusion. Next, we consider the proof of 2). First, we prove there exists a constant positive definite matrix \bar{P} , such that $P_{k,i} \geq \bar{P}$. Consider $\bar{P}_{k,i} \geq \frac{1+\theta_{k,i}}{\theta_{k,i}}\bar{Q}_{k-1} + \bar{Q}_{k-1} \geq \frac{1+\theta_2}{\theta_2}\bar{Q}_{k-1} + \bar{Q}_{k-1} \geq Q^* > 0$, where Q^* can be obtained by noting $\inf_k Q_k \geq Q > 0$ and Assumption 2.3. According to 1) of Lemma 4.3, then we have $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} \leq \frac{Q^*}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + H_{k,i}^T\Delta R_{k,i}^{-1}H_{k,i} \leq Q_*$, where $Q_* > 0$ is obtained by employing the condition 3) of Assumption 2.1. Recall $P_{k,i} = \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(k)} a_{i,j}(k)\tilde{P}_{k,j}^{-1}\right)^{-1}$,

then $P_{k,i}^{-1} \leq Q_*$, which means $P_{k,i} \geq Q_*^{-1} > 0$. Consider the time sequence $\{T_l, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$, which is the L-SS of $\{A_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Under Assumption 2.2, there exists a scalar β , such that $A_{T_l+s}P_{T_l+s,i}A_{T_l+s}^T \geq \beta Q_*^{-1} > 0$. Due to $\sup_k Q_k \leq \bar{Q} < \infty$, there is a scalar $\varpi > 0$, such that $Q_{T_l+s} \leq \varpi A_{T_l+s}P_{T_l+s,i}A_{T_l+s}^T$. Then $\tilde{P}_{T_l+s+1,i} = A_{T_l+s}P_{T_l+s,i}A_{T_l+s}^T + Q_{T_l+s} \leq (1 + \varpi)A_{T_l+s}P_{T_l+s,i}A_{T_l+s}^T$. Let $\eta = \frac{1}{1+\varpi}$, then the conclusion 2) of this lemma holds.

F Proof of Proposition 4.1

Consider $\text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{k,i})$, then we have $\text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{k,i}) = (1 + \theta_{k,i})\text{tr}(A_{k-1}P_{k-1,i}A_{k-1}^T) + \frac{1+\theta_{k,i}}{\theta_{k,i}}\text{tr}(\bar{Q}_{k-1}) + \text{tr}(\tilde{Q}_{k-1})$. Hence $\theta_{k,i}^* = \arg \min_{\theta_{k,i}} \text{tr}(\tilde{P}_{k,i}) = \arg \min_{\theta_{k,i}} f_k(\theta_{k,i})$, where $f_k(\theta_{k,i}) = \theta_{k,i}\text{tr}(A_{k-1}P_{k-1,i}A_{k-1}^T) + \frac{\text{tr}(\bar{Q}_{k-1})}{\theta_{k,i}}$, which is minimized if $\theta_{k,i}^* \text{tr}(A_{k-1}P_{k-1,i}A_{k-1}^T) = \frac{\text{tr}(\bar{Q}_{k-1})}{\theta_{k,i}^*}$. As

a result, $\theta_{k,i}^* = \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr}(\bar{Q}_{k-1})}{\text{tr}(A_{k-1}P_{k-1,i}A_{k-1}^T)}}$. Since $P_{k-1,i} > 0$, $\bar{Q}_{k-1} > 0$ and $A_{k-1} \neq 0$, we have $\theta_{k,i}^* > 0$.

G Proof of Lemma 4.5

By Theorem 1 of [5], (1) can be proved. For (2), we have $\frac{x_k}{\delta^k} = \left(\frac{\rho}{\delta}\right)^k x_0 + \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\frac{\rho}{\delta}\right)^{k-i} \frac{m_i}{\delta^i}$. Due to $\rho < \delta < 1$, $\left(\frac{\rho}{\delta}\right)^k x_0 \rightarrow 0$. Denote $\bar{\rho} = \frac{\rho}{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{m}_i = \frac{m_i}{\delta^i} = o(1)$, then construct a sequence $\{\bar{x}_k\}$ satisfying $\bar{x}_{k+1} = \bar{\rho}\bar{x}_k + \bar{m}_k$ with $\bar{x}_0 = 0$. By (1), we have $\bar{x}_k = o(1)$. In light of $\bar{x}_k = \sum_{i=0}^k (\bar{\rho})^{k-i} \bar{m}_i$, $\sum_{i=0}^k \left(\frac{\rho}{\delta}\right)^{k-i} \frac{m_i}{\delta^i} = \sum_{i=0}^k (\bar{\rho})^{k-i} \bar{m}_i \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $x_k = o(\delta^k)$. For (3), consider $x_k k^{M-1} = \rho^k k^{M-1} x_0 + k^{M-1} \sum_{i=0}^k \rho^{k-i} m_i$. Notice $\rho^k k^{M-1} = o(1)$, then consider the convergence of the second term, namely, $k^{M-1} \sum_{i=0}^k \rho^{k-i} m_i$. Due to $m_k = o(\frac{1}{k^M})$, we have $k^{M-1} \sum_{i=0}^k \rho^{k-i} m_i = \sum_{i=0}^k o(\rho^{k-i} \frac{k^{M-1}}{i^M}) = \sum_{i=0}^k o(\frac{\rho^{k-i} k^{M-1}}{i^M}) = \sum_{i=0}^k o(\frac{1}{i^M (\frac{k-i}{k})^M}) = \sum_{i=0}^k o(\frac{1}{i^M}) = o(1)$, where the second equality is obtained by $\rho^{k-i} = o(\frac{1}{(k-i)^M})$ and the third equality is obtained by $i(k-i) \leq \frac{k}{2}$. Thus, $x_k k^{M-1} = o(1)$, which means $x_k = o(\frac{1}{k^{M-1}})$.

H Proofs of Lemmas 5.1, 5.3 and Proposition 5.1

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Employing the matrix inverse formula on $\tilde{P}_{k,i}$ yields $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} = \frac{\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1}}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + H_{k,i}^T \Delta R_{k,i}^{-1} H_{k,i}$, where $\Delta R_{k,i} = R_{k,i} + \frac{1+\mu_{k,i}}{\mu_{k,i}} B_{k,i}$. Substituting $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1}$ into (20), the conclusion of this lemma holds.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. If (20) is satisfied, we have $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} = \frac{\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1}}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + H_{k,i}^T \Delta R_{k,i}^{-1} H_{k,i}$. Thus, conclusion of Lemma 5.3 holds in this case. If the update event in (20) is not triggered, then $\tilde{P}_{k,i} = \tilde{P}_{k,i}$. Besides, according to the scheme, it follows that $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} \geq \frac{\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1}}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + H_{k,i}^T \Delta R_{k,i}^{-1} H_{k,i} - \tau I_n$.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. In light of Lemma 5.3, for $\tau = 0$, $\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1} \geq \frac{\tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1}}{1+\mu_{k,i}} + H_{k,i}^T \Delta R_{k,i}^{-1} H_{k,i} = \tilde{P}_{k,i}^{-1}$, which means $\tilde{P}_{k,i} \leq \tilde{P}_{k,i}$, where $\tilde{P}_{k,i}$ corresponds to the observation update of Algorithm 1. By using the mathematical induction method, the proof of this proposition can be finished.

References

- [1] U. A. Khan and A. Jadbabaie, "Collaborative scalar-gain estimators for potentially unstable social dynamics with limited communication," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 1909–1914, 2014.

- [2] U. A. Khan, S. Kar, A. Jadbabaie, and J. M. F. Moura, "On connectivity, observability, and stability in distributed estimation," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6639–6644, 2010.
- [3] G. Battistelli and L. Chisci, "Stability of consensus extended Kalman filter for distributed state estimation," *Automatica*, vol. 68, pp. 169–178, 2016.
- [4] R. Olfati-Saber, "Distributed Kalman filtering for sensor networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 5492 – 5498, 2007.
- [5] F. S. Cattivelli and A. H. Sayed, "Diffusion strategies for distributed Kalman filtering and smoothing," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 2069–2084, 2010.
- [6] G. Battistelli and L. Chisci, "Kullback-Leibler average, consensus on probability densities, and distributed state estimation with guaranteed stability," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 707–718, 2014.
- [7] X. He, W. Xue, and H. Fang, "Consistent distributed state estimation with global observability over sensor network," *Automatica*, vol. 92, pp. 162 – 172, 2018.
- [8] S. Wang and W. Ren, "On the convergence conditions of distributed dynamic state estimation using sensor networks: A unified framework," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1300–1316, 2018.
- [9] P. Liu, Y. Tian, and Y. Zhang, "Distributed Kalman filtering with finite-time max-consensus protocol," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 10795–10802, 2018.
- [10] Q. Liu, Z. Wang, X. He, and D. Zhou, "On Kalman-consensus filtering with random link failures over sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 2701–2708, 2017.
- [11] W. Yang, G. Chen, X. Wang, and L. Shi, "Stochastic sensor activation for distributed state estimation over a sensor network," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 2070–2076, 2014.
- [12] A. K. Caglayan and R. E. Lancraft, "A separated bias identification and state estimation algorithm for nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 561–570, 1983.
- [13] J. Y. Keller and M. Darouach, "Optimal two-stage Kalman filter in the presence of random bias," *Automatica*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 1745–1748, 1997.
- [14] G. Yang and W. Che, "Non-fragile H_∞ filter design for linear continuous-time systems," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 2849–2856, 2008.
- [15] D. Ding, Z. Wang, H. Dong, and H. Shu, "Distributed H_∞ state estimation with stochastic parameters and nonlinearities through sensor networks: the finite-horizon case," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1575–1585, 2012.
- [16] W. Bai, W. Xue, Y. Huang, and H. Fang, "On extended state based Kalman filter design for a class of nonlinear time-varying uncertain systems," *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 61, no. 4, p. 042201, 2018.
- [17] S. Kar and J. M. Moura, "Distributed consensus algorithms in sensor networks: Quantized data and random link failures," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1383–1400, 2010.
- [18] M. Zhu and S. Martínez, "On the convergence time of asynchronous distributed quantized averaging algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 386–390, 2011.
- [19] K. Reif, S. Gunther, E. Yaz, and R. Unbehauen, "Stochastic stability of the discrete-time extended Kalman filter," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 714–728, 1999.
- [20] S. J. Julier and J. K. Uhlmann, "A non-divergent estimation algorithm in the presence of unknown correlations," in *American Control Conference*, pp. 2369–2373, 1997.
- [21] Y. S. Chow and H. Teicher, *Probability theory: independence, interchangeability, martingales*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [22] L. Orihuela, P. Millán, C. Vivas, and F. R. Rubio, "Suboptimal distributed control and estimation: application to a four coupled tanks system," *International Journal of Systems Science*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1755–1771, 2016.
- [23] Z. Cai, M. S. D. Queiroz, and D. M. Dawson, "Robust adaptive asymptotic tracking of nonlinear systems with additive disturbance," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 524–529, 2006.
- [24] X. He, C. Hu, W. Xue, and H. Fang, "On event-based distributed Kalman filter with information matrix triggers," in *IFAC World Congress*, pp. 14873–14878, 2017.
- [25] M. Bartholomew-Biggs, *Nonlinear optimization with engineering applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [26] X. He, C. Hu, Y. Hong, L. Shi, and H. Fang, "Distributed Kalman filters with state equality constraints: time-based and event-triggered communications," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2019.
- [27] D. Han, K. You, L. Xie, J. Wu, and L. Shi, "Optimal parameter estimation under controlled communication over sensor networks," *IEEE Transaction on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 24, pp. 6473–6485, 2015.
- [28] S. Weerakkody, Y. Mo, B. Sinopoli, D. Han, and L. Shi, "Multi-sensor scheduling for state estimation with event-based, stochastic triggers," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 2695–2701, 2016.
- [29] D. Simon, "Kalman filtering with state constraints: a survey of linear and nonlinear algorithms," *IET Control Theory & Applications*, vol. 4, no. 8, pp. 1303–1318, 2010.
- [30] G. A. F. Seber, *A Matrix Handbook for Statisticians*. Wiley-Interscience, 2007.
- [31] W. Niehsen, "Information fusion based on fast covariance intersection filtering," in *International Conference on Information Fusion*, pp. 901–904, 2002.