

LQG Control Over SWIPT-enabled Wireless Communication Network

Huiwen Yang, Lingying Huang, Yuzhe Li, Subhrakanti Dey, and Ling Shi

Abstract—In this paper, we consider using simultaneous wireless information and power transfer (SWIPT) to recharge the sensor in the LQG control, which provides a new approach to prolonging the network lifetime. We analyze the stability of the proposed system model and show that there exist two critical values for the power splitting ratio α . Then, we propose an optimization problem to derive the optimal value of α . This problem is non-convex but its numerical solution can be derived by our proposed algorithm efficiently. Moreover, we provide the feasible condition of the proposed optimization problem. Finally, simulation results are presented to verify and illustrate the main theoretical results.

Index Terms—Networked control systems, SWIPT, packet drop, stability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Sensing and actuation are essential factors for the control of complex dynamical networks. As one of the most fundamental optimal controller in control theory, the linear-quadratic-Gaussian (LQG) controller, which is a combination of a Kalman filter with a linear-quadratic regulator (LQR), has been studied for decades [1]–[5]. With the extensive use of wireless devices (e.g., sensors, actuators, and remote controllers), sensing signals and control signals are transmitted over wireless communication networks, where packets may be lost or delayed. The effect of packet loss on Kalman filtering was studied in the seminal paper [6]. Later, the impact of the network reliability on control and estimation was comprehensively and systematically analyzed by [3].

In real applications, sensors are usually battery-powered and their battery capabilities are limited. As a result, sensor scheduling and power management are important for reducing power consumption and prolonging the lifetime of a network. Many existing works have considered the sensor scheduling and power control problems for remote state estimation with Kalman filter [7]–[17]. The sensor scheduling with limited communication energy was investigated by [7]–[9]. A deterministic event-based scheduling mechanism to achieve the trade-off between communication rate and estimation quality was proposed in [10], and it was extended to a stochastic event-triggering mechanism in [11]. The power control problems under more practical communication models were studied by [12]–[16]. To further increase the life span of networks, many researchers considered employing energy-harvesting sensors [18]–[20]. As a result of the development of radio frequency (RF) energy harvesting circuit design, wireless sensors equipped with an RF energy receiver have the ability to harvest energy from the RF signals transmitted by some wired-supplied devices, which may have unlimited

energy supply but have limited transmission power. Different from the energy harvested from the external environments (e.g., solar energy, wind energy, body heat, etc.), the energy harvested from RF signal is more predictable and controllable, since the transmission power of the energy supplier can be controlled and adjusted. In the era of the fifth generation (5G) of wireless communication, there is an increasing demand for a technology that can transfer both information and power simultaneously to the end-devices [21]. As a result, the concept of simultaneous wireless information and power transfer (SWIPT) was introduced in [22]. In recent years, SWIPT has aroused great interest in wireless communication networks [23]–[28], and has also been considered in networked control systems [29]. In [29], a novel power control problem for remote state estimation was formulated, where the signal transmitted by the remote estimator served as the energy source of the sensor, and the transmission power allocations of the remote estimator and the sensor are jointly optimized. In this paper, we consider applying SWIPT to the LQG control. The control signals are transmitted by a transmitter, which has maximum transmission power. One part of the transmitted power will be used to decode the expected control input, and the other part of the transmitted power will be harvested by the sensor for the subsequent transmission of its measurements.

The contributions of this paper are multi-fold. First, this is the first work that considers using SWIPT to recharge the sensor in the LQG control, which provides a new approach to prolonging the network lifetime. Second, we show that there exist two critical values for the power splitting ratio α , and the cost of the infinite horizon LQG control is bounded if and only if α is between these two critical values. Third, we propose an optimization problem to derive the optimal value of α . This problem is non-convex but its numerical solution can be derived by our proposed algorithm efficiently.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the system model and the communication model. Section III introduces necessary preliminaries and provides the main theoretical results. Section IV presents the simulation results to verify the main theorems in Section III. Section V concludes this paper and presents some future work.

Notations: \mathbb{R} is the set of real numbers, \mathbb{R}^n is the n -dimensional Euclidean space, and $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the set of real matrices with size $n \times m$. For a matrix X , $X > 0$ ($X \geq 0$) denotes X is a positive definite (positive semidefinite) matrix, $\lambda_i^u(X)$ denotes the unstable eigenvalues of X , and $\text{Tr}(X)$ denotes the trace of X . $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ is the expectation of a random variable. $\mathbb{P}(\cdot|\cdot)$ refers to conditional probability.

For the TCP-like system, the optimal estimator is the following:

$$\hat{x}_{k+1} = \hat{x}_{k+1}^- + \gamma_{k+1} K_{k+1} (y_{k+1} - C \hat{x}_{k+1}^-), \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1}^- &\triangleq \mathbb{E}[(x_{k+1} - \hat{x}_{k+1}^-)(x_{k+1} - \hat{x}_{k+1}^-)^T | \mathcal{L}_k] \\ &= AP_k A^T + Q. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Consider the following cost function:

$$\begin{aligned} J_N(\bar{x}_0, P_0) &= \mathbb{E}[x_N^T W_N x_N \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (x_k^T W_k x_k + u_k^{aT} U_k u_k^a) | \bar{x}_0, P_0], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

then, to obtain the optimal control input sequence, the following optimization problem should be solved

$$\min_{u_k, k=0,1,\dots,N-1} J_N(\bar{x}_0, P_0). \quad (15)$$

Define the optimal value function $V_k(x_k)$ as follows:

$$V_N(x_N) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[x_N^T W_N x_N | \mathcal{L}_N], \quad (16)$$

$$V_k(x_k) \triangleq \min_{u_k} \mathbb{E}[x_k^T W_k x_k + \eta_k u_k^T U_k u_k + V_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) | \mathcal{L}_k], \quad (17)$$

where $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$. Using dynamic programming, it can be shown that $J_N^* \triangleq \min_{u_k, k=0,1,\dots,N-1} J_N(\bar{x}_0, P_0) = V_0(x_0)$. For the TCP-like system, the following lemma holds:

Lemma 3.1: [3, Lemma 5.1] The value function $V_k(x_k)$ in (17) has the following form:

$$V_k(x_k) = \mathbb{E}[x_k^T S_k x_k | \mathcal{L}_k] + c_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, N, \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_k &= A^T S_{k+1} A + W_k \\ &\quad - \eta A^T S_{k+1} B (B^T S_{k+1} B + U_k)^{-1} B^T S_{k+1} A, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_k &= \text{Tr}((A^T S_{k+1} A + W_k - S_k) P_k) + \text{Tr}(S_{k+1} Q) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[c_{k+1} | \mathcal{L}_k], \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

with initial values $S_N = W_N$ and $c_N = 0$, and the optimal control input is given by

$$u_k = -(B^T S_{k+1} B + U_k)^{-1} B^T S_{k+1} A \hat{x}_k = L_k \hat{x}_k. \quad (21)$$

Since $J_N^*(\bar{x}_0, P_0) = V_0(x_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_N^*(\bar{x}_0, P_0) &= \bar{x}_0^T S_0 \bar{x}_0 + \text{Tr}(S_0 P_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{Tr}(S_{k+1} Q) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{Tr}((A^T S_{k+1} A + W_k - S_k) \mathbb{E}_\gamma[P_k]), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\gamma[\cdot]$ explicitly indicates that the expectation is calculated with respect to the arrival sequence $\{\gamma_k\}$.

The infinite horizon LQG can be obtained by taking the limit for $N \rightarrow +\infty$ of the previous equations in Section III.

Define the Modified Riccati Algebraic Equation (MARE) as

$$S = \Pi(S, A, B, W, U, \eta), \quad (23)$$

where $\Pi(S, A, B, W, U, \eta) \triangleq A^T S A + W - \eta A^T S B (B^T S B + U)^{-1} B^T S A$. Then, we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.2: [3, Lemma 5.4] Consider the modified Riccati equation defined in (23). Let A be unstable, (A, B) be controllable, and $(A, W^{1/2})$ be observable. Then, the MARE has a unique strictly positive definite solution S_∞ if and only if $\eta > \eta_c$, where η_c is the critical arrival probability defined as

$$\eta_c \triangleq \inf_{\eta} \{0 < \eta < 1 | S = \Pi(S, A, B, W, U, \eta), S \geq 0\}. \quad (24)$$

Lemma 3.3: [3, Theorem 5.5] Assume that $(A, Q^{1/2})$ is controllable, (A, C) is observable, and A is unstable. Then there exists a critical observation arrival probability γ_c , such that the expectation of estimator error covariance is bounded if and only if the observation arrival probability is greater than the critical arrival probability, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_\gamma[P_k] \leq M, \forall k \iff \gamma > \gamma_c, \quad (25)$$

where M is a positive definite matrix possibly dependent on P_0 . Moreover, it is possible to compute a lower and an upper bound for the critical observation arrival probability γ_c , i.e., $p_{\min} \leq \gamma_c \leq \gamma_{\max} \leq p_{\max}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\min} &\triangleq 1 - \frac{1}{\max_i |\lambda_i^u(A)|^2}, \quad p_{\max} \triangleq 1 - \frac{1}{\prod_i |\lambda_i^u(A)|^2}, \\ \gamma_{\max} &\triangleq \inf_{\gamma} \{0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 | P = \Pi(P, A^T, C^T, Q, R, \gamma), P \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

B. Properties of optimal control

As introduced in the last subsection, there exists a critical value for the probability of successful control signal reception, i.e., η_c defined in (24), and a critical value for the probability of successful reception of the sensor's local estimate, i.e., γ_c defined in (25). In this subsection, we will show there exist two critical values, i.e., the left critical value $\underline{\alpha}$ and the right critical value $\bar{\alpha}$, for the power splitting ratio α . The existence of the two critical values for α results from that α realizes the trade-off between control and estimation. The infinite-horizon average cost of the LQG control will be unbounded if α is smaller than $\underline{\alpha}$ or larger than $\bar{\alpha}$. Moreover, the convergence property of the cost under the optimal control law is analyzed.

Define the following functions:

$$\tilde{h}(X) \triangleq AXA^T + Q, \quad (26)$$

$$\hat{h}(X) \triangleq A^T X A + W, \quad (27)$$

$$\tilde{g}(\alpha, X) \triangleq X^{-1} - \gamma(r) A X C^T (C X C^T + R)^{-1} C X A^T, \quad (28)$$

$$\hat{g}(\alpha, X) \triangleq X^{-1} - \eta(\alpha) A^T X B (B^T X B + U)^{-1} B^T X A. \quad (29)$$

For the sake of simplicity, we use $\tilde{g}_\alpha(X)$ and $\hat{g}_\alpha(X)$ to denote $\tilde{g}(\alpha, X)$ and $\hat{g}(\alpha, X)$, respectively. Also, define

$$S(\alpha) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} (\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_\alpha)^k(S_N), \quad (30)$$

$$\bar{P}(\alpha) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} (\tilde{g}_\alpha \circ \tilde{h})^k(P_0), \quad (31)$$

where $S_N = W$. Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4: If $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$, then $S(\alpha_1) \leq S(\alpha_2)$ and $\bar{P}(\alpha_1) \geq \bar{P}(\alpha_2)$.

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

Theorem 3.5: The cost J_N^* can be bounded as follows:

$$J_N^{\min} \leq J_N^* \leq J_N^{\max},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_N^{\min} = & \bar{x}_0^T S_0 \bar{x}_0 + \text{Tr}(S_0 P_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{Tr}(S_{k+1} Q) \\ & + (1 - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p)))) \\ & \times \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{Tr}((A^T S_{k+1} A + W_k - S_k) \underline{P}_k), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_N^{\max} = & \bar{x}_0^T S_0 \bar{x}_0 + \text{Tr}(S_0 P_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{Tr}(S_{k+1} Q) \\ & + \text{Tr}((A^T S_k A + W_k - S_k) \\ & \times (\bar{P}_k - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p)))) \\ & \times \bar{P}_k C^T (C \bar{P}_k C^T + R)^{-1} C \bar{P}_k), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{P}_k = & (1 - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p)))) A \underline{P}_{k-1} A^T + Q, \\ \bar{P}_k = & A \bar{P}_k A^T + Q \\ & - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p))) A \bar{P}_k C^T (C \bar{P}_k C^T + R)^{-1} \\ & \times C \bar{P}_k A^T. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

Theorem 3.6: Consider a system with $W_k = W, \forall k$ and $U_k = U, \forall k$. There exist two critical values $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ such that the infinite-horizon average cost $J_\infty^* \triangleq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} J_N^*(\bar{x}_0, P_0)$ can be bounded if and only if $\underline{\alpha} < \alpha < \bar{\alpha}$. Moreover, $J_\infty^{\min} \leq J_\infty^* \leq J_\infty^{\max}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} J_\infty^{\min} \triangleq & \text{Tr}(SQ) + (1 - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p)))) \\ & \times \text{Tr}((A^T SA + W - S) \underline{P}), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_\infty^{\max} \triangleq & \text{Tr}(SQ) + \text{Tr}((A^T SA + W - S) \\ & \times (\bar{P} - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p)))) \\ & \times \bar{P} C^T (C \bar{P} C^T + R)^{-1} C \bar{P}), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and

$$S = A^T SA + W - \eta(h_a \alpha p) A^T SB (B^T SB + U)^{-1} B^T SA, \quad (38)$$

$$\underline{P} = (1 - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p)))) A \underline{P} A^T + Q. \quad (39)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P} = & A \bar{P} A^T + Q \\ & - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p))) A \bar{P} C^T (C \bar{P} C^T + R)^{-1} C \bar{P} A^T. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Moreover, the critical values $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ are the solutions of the following equations:

$$\eta(h_a \alpha p) = \eta_c, \quad (41)$$

$$\gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \bar{\alpha})p))) = \gamma_c, \quad (42)$$

where η_c and γ_c are the critical probabilities mentioned in Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, respectively.

Proof: See Appendix C. ■

Remark 3.7: If α is smaller than the left critical value $\underline{\alpha}$, the power for transmitting the control signals will be relatively low. As a result, the cost is unbounded due to inadequate control. Similarly, if α is larger than the right critical value $\bar{\alpha}$, the power for transmitting the measurements will be relatively low. Consequently, the cost will be unbounded due to inaccurate estimates. Note that the exact value of $\bar{\alpha}$ cannot be obtained as γ_c cannot be calculated exactly as well, but the upper bound and the lower bound of $\bar{\alpha}$ can be found according to the bounds of γ_c in Lemma 3.3.

C. Optimization Problem

When the power splitting ratio α satisfies $\underline{\alpha} < \alpha < \bar{\alpha}$, the LQG cost J_∞^* can be bounded. However, different values of α result in different costs. In this subsection, an optimization problem is proposed as an aid to the selection of α . The intention is to minimize the cost J_∞^* as much as possible. However, J_∞^* cannot be minimized directly since it depends on the specific realization of the sequence $\{\gamma_k\}$ and cannot be computed analytically. From the perspective of robustness, therefore, it is reasonable to minimize the upper bound of J_∞^* , i.e., J_∞^{\max} .

Based on the above statement, we have the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\alpha, \bar{P}, S} J_\infty^{\max}, \quad (43)$$

$$\text{s.t. } S = A^T SA + W \quad (44)$$

$$- \eta(h_a \alpha p) A^T SB (B^T SB + U)^{-1} B^T SA,$$

$$\bar{P} = A \bar{P} A^T + Q$$

$$- \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p))) A \bar{P} C^T (C \bar{P} C^T + R)^{-1}$$

$$\times C \bar{P} A^T,$$

$$(45)$$

$$0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \quad (46)$$

where p is a positive constant, and $\eta(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\gamma(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are monotonically nondecreasing continuous concave functions.

Proposition 3.8: Problem (43) is equivalent to the following problem:

$$\min_{\alpha, \bar{P}, S} \text{Tr}((A^T SA + W - S) \tilde{P}) + \text{Tr}(SQ), \quad (47)$$

$$\text{s.t. } S = \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_\alpha(S), \quad (48)$$

$$\tilde{P} = \tilde{g}_\alpha \circ \tilde{h}(\tilde{P}), \quad (49)$$

$$0 \leq \alpha \leq 1. \quad (50)$$

Proof: See Appendix D. ■

Remark 3.9: In this paper, we only consider the situation where problem (43) is feasible, i.e., $\underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha}$. Otherwise, the infinite-horizon average cost J_∞^{\max} will be unbounded and there is no need to study this problem.

At the first sight, problem (43) is non-convex and it is difficult to convert it to a convex optimization problem. However, its numerical solution can be easily obtained. First, we can discretize α with interval size δ . With α fixed, S and \tilde{P} can be uniquely determined by respectively solving the equations (48) and (49) via the iterative method, i.e., executing the following iterations until S and \tilde{P} converge to their steady-state values:

$$S_{k+1} = \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_\alpha(S_k), \quad (51)$$

$$\tilde{P}_{k+1} = \tilde{g}_\alpha \circ \tilde{h}(\tilde{P}_k), \quad (52)$$

where S_0 and \tilde{P}_0 should be initialized. Note that S and \tilde{P} converge to their steady-state values exponentially fast [2]. Therefore, S and \tilde{P} can be calculated by the iterative method efficiently. Then, we can substitute α , S and \tilde{P} in the objective function (43) and obtain the corresponding objective value. By iterating through all the discretized α , i.e., $\alpha \in \{\underline{\alpha} + k\delta, k = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{\bar{\alpha} - \underline{\alpha}}{\delta} \rfloor\}$, the value of α which can minimize the value of objective function can be found. The searching algorithm for obtaining the numerical solution of the problem (43) is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Obtain numerical solution of problem (43)

Require: $\delta, \underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, P_0, S_0, A, B, C, Q, R, W, U$

Ensure: α, J

initialize $\hat{\alpha} = \underline{\alpha}$, $\alpha = \underline{\alpha}$, $J = 0$

while $\hat{\alpha} \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ **do**

$\tilde{P} = P_0$, $S = S_0$

repeat

$\tilde{P} = \tilde{g}_\alpha \circ \tilde{h}(\tilde{P})$

until converge

repeat

$S = \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_\alpha(S)$

until converge

compute J_∞^{\max} according to (37)

if $\hat{\alpha} = \underline{\alpha}$ **then**

$J = J_\infty^{\max}$

else if $J_\infty^{\max} < J$ **then**

$J = J_\infty^{\max}$, $\alpha = \hat{\alpha}$

end if

$\hat{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha} + \delta$

end while

return

Remark 3.10: The accuracy of the obtained numerical solution depends on the selected parameter δ . The optimality gap is bounded by δ , i.e., $|\alpha - \alpha^*| < \delta$, where α is the output of Algorithm 1 and α^* is the optimal solution of problem (43). A smaller δ brings a higher accuracy, but also leads to more computational overhead.

IV. SIMULATION

In this section, we choose $A = 1.2$ and $B = C = Q = R = W = U = 1$. Moreover, we set channel fading $h_s = h_a = 0\text{dB}$

and $h_e = -3\text{dB}$. The transmission power of the transmitter is $p = 0.3\text{mW}$. In this simulation, we adopt the linear energy harvesting model [29], i.e.,

$$r = \xi(h_s(1 - \alpha)p + \sigma_e^2), \quad (53)$$

where σ_e^2 denotes the noise power introduced by the receiver antenna and ξ denotes the energy conversion efficiency, which is a constant and characterizes the energy loss of converting the harvested energy to electrical energy. For convenience, ξ is assumed to be 1. In practice, σ_e^2 is much smaller than $h_s(1 - \alpha)p$ so that it can be neglected. Thus, for simplicity, we assume $\sigma_e^2 = 0$, i.e.,

$$r = h_s(1 - \alpha)p. \quad (54)$$

The measurements y_k and the control signals u_k are transmitted via the binary phase shifting keying (BPSK) transmission scheme with B bits per packet (symbol). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta_k = 1 | h_a, \alpha, p) &= \eta(h_a \alpha p) \\ &= \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\sqrt{\frac{2h_a \alpha p T_s}{BN_0}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} dx \right)^B, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\gamma_k = 1 | h_e, r) &= \gamma(h_e r) \\ &= \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\sqrt{\frac{2h_e r T_s}{BN_0}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} dx \right)^B, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $N_0/2$ is the two-sided noise power spectral density and T_s is the symbol transmission time. We choose $B = 2$, $T_s = 2 \times 10^{-7}\text{s}$, and $N_0 = 2 \times 10^{-8}\text{W/Hz}$ in the simulations.

First, we set the time horizon $T = 500$ and conduct a Monte Carlo experiment with 1000 runs. Fig.2 shows the empirical




Fig. 2. Empirical cost J_{emp} for different values of the power splitting ratio α

cost for different values of the power splitting ratio α . It can be seen that there exist two critical values for the ratio α , i.e., $\underline{\alpha} = 0.012$ and $\bar{\alpha} = 0.994$. If α is less than the left critical value, the power for transmitting the control signal will be

relatively low. When α is less than the left critical value or larger than the right critical value, the cost is unbounded due to inadequate control and inaccurate estimate, respectively.




Fig. 3. Simulation results with $A = 1.2$, $B = Q = R = W = U = 1$, $h_s = h_a = 0\text{dB}$ and $h_e = -3\text{dB}$.




Fig. 4. Simulation results with $A = 1.3$, $B = Q = R = W = U = 1$, $h_s = h_a = 0\text{dB}$ and $h_e = -3\text{dB}$.




Fig. 5. Simulation results with $A = 1.2$, $B = Q = R = W = 1$, $U = 10$, $h_s = h_a = 0\text{dB}$ and $h_e = -3\text{dB}$.

Then, we present some simulation results to illustrate the main results in Section III. Fig.3-6 show the plot of the probability of successful packet reception (left) and the upper bound J_∞^{\max} and the lower bound J_∞^{\min} of J_∞^* defined in Theorem 3.6 (right) under different simulation parameter settings. Clearly,




Fig. 6. Simulation results with $A = 1.2$, $B = Q = R = W = U = 1$, $h_s = 0\text{dB}$, $h_a = -3\text{dB}$ and $h_e = -3\text{dB}$.

two critical values for α can also be observed. Fig.3-6 also show the value of α searched by Algorithm 1 ($\delta = 0.02$). By comparing Fig.3 and Fig.4, one can see that the stability of the system has an effect on the two critical values of α : a more unstable system leads to a lower $\bar{\alpha}$ and a higher $\underline{\alpha}$. By comparing Fig.3 and Fig.5, it can be seen that the value of α minimizing J_∞^{\max} will increase when the cost of control is increased. Since inadequate control will cause more cost than inaccurate estimation, the transmitter will tend to use more energy to transmit the control signal to avoid a higher total cost. On the contrary, when the cost of estimation is increased, the transmitter will tend to transfer more energy to the sensor. By comparing Fig.3 and Fig.6, the influence of the channel states can be observed. When the state of the channel from the transmitter to the actuator, i.e., h_a , gets worse, the transmitter will use more energy to transmit the control signal to guarantee the control performance. Therefore, the value of α minimizing J_∞^{\max} will increase. Similarly, when h_s and h_e get worse, the transmitter will transfer more energy to the sensor to ensure the estimation performance, and the value of α minimizing J_∞^{\max} will decrease.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we consider using a novel technology, the so-called SWIPT, to recharge the sensor in the LQG control, which provides a new approach to prolonging the network lifetime. We show that there exist two critical values for the power splitting ratio α , and the cost of the infinite horizon LQG control is bounded if and only if α is between these two critical values. Then, we propose an optimization problem to derive the optimal value of α . This problem is non-convex but its numerical solution can be derived by our proposed algorithm efficiently. Moreover, we provide the feasible condition of the proposed optimization problem. Simulation results are presented to verify and illustrate the main theoretical results. One direction of future work is to consider beamforming when devices are equipped with multiple antennas, which can further improve the spectral efficiency of the system. Another direction is to consider the scenario when there are multiple sensors and multiple actuators.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF LEMMA ??

We will prove this lemma by induction. The proof consists of two steps:

- S1. If $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq 1$, then $\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1}(X) \leq \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2}(X)$;
 S2. If $(\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1})^k(X) \leq (\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2})^k(X)$, then $(\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1})^{k+1}(X) \leq (\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2})^{k+1}(X), \forall 0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq 1$.

The first step can be easily completed. We will mainly focus on the second step.

Proposition A.1: If $X \geq Y \geq 0$, then $\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_\alpha(X) \geq \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_\alpha(Y)$.

If $(\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1})^k(X) \leq (\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2})^k(X)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1})^{k+1}(X) &= \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1}((\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1})^k(X)) \\ &\leq \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_1}((\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2})^k(X)) \\ &\leq \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2}((\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2})^k(X)) \\ &= (\hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_{\alpha_2})^{k+1}(X), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where the first inequality is from proposition A.1, and the second inequality is from S1.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5

First, we have the following lemma:

Lemma B.1: The expected error covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}_\gamma[P_k]$ satisfies the following bounds:

$$\tilde{P}_k \leq \mathbb{E}_\gamma[P_k] \leq \hat{P}_k, \quad (58)$$

where

$$\tilde{P}_k = (1 - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p)))) \underline{P}_k, \quad (59)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}_k &= \bar{P}_k \\ &\quad - \gamma(h_e \psi(h_s((1 - \alpha)p))) \bar{P}_k C^T (C \bar{P}_k C^T + R)^{-1} C \bar{P}_k. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Proof: This lemma can be proved based on the observation that the matrices P_{k+1}^- and P_k^- are concave and monotonic functions of P_k^- . The proof can be easily derived based on Lemma 5.2 in [3] and is thus omitted. ■

Then, Theorem 3.5 holds.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF THEOREM 3.6

Following Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ must respectively satisfy equation (41) and equation (42). Since $\eta(\cdot)$ and $\gamma(\cdot)$ are monotonically increasing continuous functions, equation (41) and equation (42) have one unique solution, respectively. Then we have $\eta > \eta_c$ if and only if $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}$. Similarly, we have $\gamma > \gamma_c$ if and only if $\alpha < \bar{\alpha}$. Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \underline{P}_k = \underline{P}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_k = \bar{P}$, the lower bound $J_\infty^{\min} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} J_N^{\min}$ and the upper bound $J_\infty^{\max} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} J_N^{\max}$ can be derived as (36) and (37) based on Theorem 3.5, respectively. One can see that when $\gamma > \gamma_c > p_{\min}$, the solution of equation (39) exist. According to Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, MARE (38) and MARE (40) have a unique positive definite solution if and only if $\eta > \eta_c$ and $\gamma > \gamma_c$, respectively. Based on all of the above, we have Theorem 3.6.

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.8

It is easy to see that

$$S = \hat{h} \circ \hat{g}_\alpha(S), \quad (61)$$

$$\bar{P} = \tilde{h} \circ \tilde{g}_\alpha(\bar{P}). \quad (62)$$

Let $\tilde{P} = \tilde{g}_\alpha(\bar{P})$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P} &= \tilde{g}_\alpha(\tilde{h} \circ \tilde{g}_\alpha(\bar{P})) \\ &= \tilde{g}_\alpha \circ \tilde{h} \circ \tilde{g}_\alpha(\bar{P}) \\ &= \tilde{g}_\alpha \circ \tilde{h}(\tilde{P}). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Then it can be seen that problem (43) is equivalent to problem (47).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Nilsson, B. Bernhardsson, and B. Wittenmark, "Stochastic analysis and control of real-time systems with random time delays," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 57–64, 1998.
- [2] B. D. Anderson and J. B. Moore, *Optimal filtering*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [3] L. Schenato, B. Sinopoli, M. Franceschetti, K. Poolla, and S. S. Sastry, "Foundations of control and estimation over lossy networks," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 163–187, 2007.
- [4] V. Gupta, B. Hassibi, and R. M. Murray, "Optimal lqg control across packet-dropping links," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 439–446, 2007.
- [5] J. Xu, G. Gu, Y. Tang, and F. Qian, "Channel modeling and lqg control in the presence of random delays and packet drops," *Automatica*, vol. 135, p. 109967, 2022.
- [6] B. Sinopoli, L. Schenato, M. Franceschetti, K. Poolla, M. I. Jordan, and S. S. Sastry, "Kalman filtering with intermittent observations," *IEEE transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1453–1464, 2004.
- [7] L. Shi, P. Cheng, and J. Chen, "Sensor data scheduling for optimal state estimation with communication energy constraint," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1693–1698, 2011.
- [8] D. Han, P. Cheng, J. Chen, and L. Shi, "An online sensor power schedule for remote state estimation with communication energy constraint," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 7, pp. 1942–1947, 2013.
- [9] Z. Ren, P. Cheng, J. Chen, L. Shi, and Y. Sun, "Optimal periodic sensor schedule for steady-state estimation under average transmission energy constraint," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 3265–3271, 2013.
- [10] J. Wu, Q.-S. Jia, K. H. Johansson, and L. Shi, "Event-based sensor data scheduling: Trade-off between communication rate and estimation quality," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 1041–1046, 2012.
- [11] D. Han, Y. Mo, J. Wu, S. Weerakkody, B. Sinopoli, and L. Shi, "Stochastic event-triggered sensor schedule for remote state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 2661–2675, 2015.
- [12] Y. Li, D. E. Quevedo, V. Lau, and L. Shi, "Optimal periodic transmission power schedules for remote estimation of arma processes," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 24, pp. 6164–6174, 2013.
- [13] Y. Li, D. E. Quevedo, V. Lau, and L. Shi, "Multi-sensor transmission power scheduling for remote state estimation under sinr model," in *53rd IEEE conference on decision and control*, pp. 1055–1060, IEEE, 2014.
- [14] J. Wu, Y. Li, D. E. Quevedo, V. Lau, and L. Shi, "Data-driven power control for state estimation: A bayesian inference approach," *Automatica*, vol. 54, pp. 332–339, 2015.
- [15] K. Ding, Y. Li, S. Dey, and L. Shi, "Multi-sensor transmission management for remote state estimation under coordination," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 3829–3834, 2017.
- [16] K. Ding, X. Ren, H. Qi, G. Shi, X. Wang, and L. Shi, "Dynamic pricing for power control in remote state estimation," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 11038–11043, 2020.
- [17] L. Huang, J. Wu, Y. Mo, and L. Shi, "Joint sensor and actuator placement for infinite-horizon lqg control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 398–405, 2021.

- [18] A. Nayyar, T. Başar, D. Teneketzis, and V. V. Veeravalli, "Optimal strategies for communication and remote estimation with an energy harvesting sensor," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 2246–2260, 2013.
- [19] M. Nourian, A. S. Leong, and S. Dey, "Optimal energy allocation for kalman filtering over packet dropping links with imperfect acknowledgments and energy harvesting constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 2128–2143, 2014.
- [20] Y. Li, D. E. Quevedo, V. Lau, S. Dey, and L. Shi, "Transmission power scheduling for energy harvesting sensor in remote state estimation," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 122–127, 2014.
- [21] T. D. Ponnimbaduge Perera, D. N. K. Jayakody, S. K. Sharma, S. Chatzinotas, and J. Li, "Simultaneous wireless information and power transfer (swipt): Recent advances and future challenges," *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 264–302, 2018.
- [22] L. R. Varshney, "Transporting information and energy simultaneously," in *2008 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 1612–1616, 2008.
- [23] H. Lee, K.-J. Lee, H. Kim, and I. Lee, "Joint transceiver optimization for miso swipt systems with time switching," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 3298–3312, 2018.
- [24] J. Tang, A. Shojaeifard, D. K. C. So, K.-K. Wong, and N. Zhao, "Energy efficiency optimization for comp-swipt heterogeneous networks," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 66, no. 12, pp. 6368–6383, 2018.
- [25] K. W. Choi, S. I. Hwang, A. A. Aziz, H. H. Jang, J. S. Kim, D. S. Kang, and D. I. Kim, "Simultaneous wireless information and power transfer (swipt) for internet of things: Novel receiver design and experimental validation," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 2996–3012, 2020.
- [26] H. Yang, Y. Ye, X. Chu, and M. Dong, "Resource and power allocation in swipt-enabled device-to-device communications based on a nonlinear energy harvesting model," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 10813–10825, 2020.
- [27] W. Wang, J. Tang, N. Zhao, X. Liu, X. Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, and Y. Qian, "Joint precoding optimization for secure swipt in uav-aided noma networks," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 5028–5040, 2020.
- [28] H. Yang, X. Xia, J. Li, P. Zhu, and X. You, "Joint transceiver design for network-assisted full-duplex systems with swipt," *IEEE Systems Journal*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1206–1216, 2022.
- [29] H. Yang, M. Huang, Y. Li, S. Dey, and L. Shi, "Joint power allocation for remote state estimation with swipt," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 2022.