

Delay-Dependent Distributed Kalman Fusion Estimation with Dimensionality Reduction in Cyber-Physical Systems

Bo Chen, *Member, IEEE*, Daniel W. C. Ho, *Fellow, IEEE*
Guoqiang Hu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Li Yu, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper studies the distributed dimensionality reduction fusion estimation problem with communication delays for a class of cyber-physical systems (CPSs). The raw measurements are preprocessed in each sink node to obtain the local optimal estimate (LOE) of a CPS, and the compressed LOE under dimensionality reduction encounters with communication delays during the transmission. Under this case, a mathematical model with compensation strategy is proposed to characterize the dimensionality reduction and communication delays. This model also has the property to reduce the information loss caused by the dimensionality reduction and delays. Based on this model, a recursive distributed Kalman fusion estimator (DKFE) is derived by optimal weighted fusion criterion in the linear minimum variance sense. A stability condition for the DKFE, which can be easily verified by the existing software, is derived. In addition, this condition can guarantee that estimation error covariance matrix of the DKFE converges to the unique steady-state matrix for any initial values, and thus the steady-state DKFE (SDKFE) is given. Notice that the computational complexity of the SDKFE is much lower than that of the DKFE. Moreover, a probability selection criterion for determining the dimensionality reduction strategy is also presented to guarantee the stability of the DKFE. Two illustrative examples are given to show the advantage and effectiveness of the proposed methods.

Index Terms—Distributed Fusion Estimation, Kalman Filtering, Bandwidth Constraints, Communication Delays, Stability Analysis, Cyber-Physical Systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Information fusion has attracted considerable research interest during the past decades, and has found applications in a variety of areas, including internet of things [1], sensor networks [2], [3] and cyber-physical systems (CPSs) [4]. Particularly, multi-sensor fusion estimation utilizes useful information contained in multiple sets of data for the purpose of estimating a quantity or parameter in a process [5]. It is widely used in practical applications because it can potentially improve estimation accuracy and enhance reliability and robustness against faults [5], [6], [7]. Many fusion estimation approaches have been presented in the literature (see [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], and the references therein). At the same time, advances in embedded computing, communication, and related hardware technologies have recently brought the paradigm of CPSs to a new research frontier [14]. Moreover, CPSs have found applications in a broad range of

areas such as intelligent transportation systems [15], multi-robot systems [16], and smart grid systems [17]. As one of important issues in CPSs, real-time state estimation based on sensor measurements has recently attracted considerable research interests because state estimate can provide a CPS with the real-time monitoring and control capability [18], [19]. For example, estimating the real voltage from sensor information must be completed before taking certain actions to regulate the voltage into some desired range in a power grid [17]. It is noted that the accuracy of state estimation has an important impact on computing control commands for safe and efficient operation of a CPS [18], [19], [20], [21]. Therefore, it is of theoretical significance and practical relevance to investigate the problem of information fusion estimation for the CPSs [22], [23].




Fig. 1. Information fusion estimation for a class of spatially distributed physical systems over communication networks: i) $x(t)$ is the state of the physical process, where $x(t)$ is composed of $c_1(t)$, $c_2(t)$, $c_3(t)$, ..., $c_n(t)$; ii) sensor node only measures the target information; iii) sink node is a gateway, which is responsible for receiving measurements, computing the local optimal estimate (LOE) and sending the LOE to an information fusion center via communication networks.

There mainly exist two kinds of fusion architectures: centralized fusion structure and distributed fusion structure. However, the distributed fusion structure is generally more robust and fault-tolerant as compared with the centralized fusion structure [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. This motivates us to consider the distributed fusion estimation problem in this paper for a class of CPS architecture (see Fig.1), where system state is spatially distributed in the physical space. When the local estimates are transmitted to the fusion center (FC) via communication channels, bandwidth constrains and communication delays are unavoidable in communication networks [24]. Moreover, the above two factors can degrade the fusion estimation performance because of the information loss caused by bandwidth and delay constrains [25], [26], [27]. Thus, how to design distributed fusion methods in the presence of bandwidth and delay constraints is essential for

B. Chen and L. Yu are with Department of Automation, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, China, and also with Institute of Cyberspace Security, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, China (email: bchen@aliyun.com; lyu@zjut.edu.cn).

D. W. C. Ho is with the Department of Mathematics, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, 999077. (email: madaniel@cityu.edu.hk).

G. Hu is with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 639798 Singapore (email: gqhu@ntu.edu.sg).

real-time state estimate of CPSs.

A. Related Work

When considering the problem of bandwidth constraints in multi-sensor systems, as pointed out in [28], there are mainly two approaches to reduce the communication traffic: the quantization method (see [29], [30], [31], and references therein) and the dimensionality reduction method (see [32], [33], [34], and the references therein). Particularly, by analyzing the statistical property of measurement information and resorting to the principal component analysis method, the dimensionality reduction strategy has been designed in [35] to compress the measurement signals, while the dimensionality reduction strategy with the quantization error was developed in [36] to deal with stable multi-sensor fusion systems. Notice that the dimensionality reduction method in [35] requires to know the global measurement matrix that may be difficult to be satisfied in distributed systems, and solving non-convex nonlinear optimization problem under this strategy may also add the computational cost and design difficulty. Under the distributed fusion structure, when the physical state $x(t)$ as shown in Fig.1 is multi-dimensional (or even high-dimensional) in a CPS, it is unrealistic to completely send the local estimate of the state $x(t)$ to the FC via a bandwidth-constrained communication channel. In this sense, bandwidth constraint in the CPSs is the primary consideration when designing a distributed state fusion estimator. Notice that, to reduce the communication traffic, the idea of the dimensionality reduction method is that a multi-dimensional signal is directly converted into a low-dimensional signal, while the idea of the quantization method is that the number of coding bits for each component of a multidimensional signal is reduced before being transmitted. Meanwhile, the quantization usually results in nonlinear dynamics, and it is difficult to find a data compression operator analytically, particularly, for the multidimensional signals. Therefore, the dimensionality reduction method can provide an attractive alternative to solve the distributed fusion estimation problem with bandwidth constraints in the CPSs.

Though the dimensionality reduction fusion estimation algorithms have been proposed in [32], [33], [34], [35], [36] to reduce the communication traffic, the communication delays, which occurs during the transmission, were not taken into account. With the communication delays, the dimensionality reduction fusion estimation must solve two challenging issues: one is how to compensate the information loss caused by the communication delays and bandwidth constraints under a unified mathematical model; The other one is how to fuse the asynchronous local compressed estimates because of communication delays. Notice that the centralized and distributed fusion estimation algorithms have been proposed in [25], [37], [38], [39], [40], [41], [42] based on different communication delay models, however, the main results in [25], [37], [38], [39], [40], [41], [42] cannot be extended to the case of the dimensionality reduction estimation with communication delays. The reason is that the data compression and information compensation in dimensionality reduction may change the property of the original measurements (e.g., the statistical correlation in [32], [34] has been changed under the Kalman fusion structure). Under this case, we have studied the information fusion estimation problem in [22], [26] for the CPSs with bandwidth constraints and

communication delays. It should be pointed out that the steady-state fusion estimator with simple calculation cannot be obtained based on the proposed communication model in [22], while the covariance intersection (CI) fusion strategy in [26] was suboptimal because fusion estimator was determined by minimizing an upper bound of estimation error covariance.

B. Contributions

Motivated by the aforementioned analysis, we study the distributed stochastic dimensionality reduction fusion estimation problem with communication delays for the CPSs. Notice that the information loss is inevitable because of the dimensionality reduction and communication delays, and such a fusion estimation with incomplete information will degrade the estimation performance. Since the delays are caused by communication channels, the key issue is how to design an efficient dimensionality reduction strategy to guarantee the stability of the distributed fusion estimator. Although our previous works in [22], [26], [32] have studied the related stochastic dimensionality fusion estimation problems, there are still fundamental problems that cannot be solved up to now. In detail,

- When only considering stochastic dimensionality reduction strategy, the stable probability selection criterion in [32] was derived from the inequality relaxation of the matrix trace. However, the inequality relaxation will lead to certain conservatism, thus how to find a new derivation idea to reduce the conservatism is very important for the application of the proposed dimensionality reduction strategy. Notice that the stability conditions in [22] were directly derived from the similar derivation in [32], and thus the corresponding conservatism also cannot be avoided in [22]. Moreover, the stability conditions in [26] also have certain conservatism due to the inequality relaxation of 1-norm and ∞ -norm.
- When considering stochastic dimensionality reduction strategy under communication delays, the distributed CI fusion estimator in [26] was suboptimal because the corresponding optimization objective was an upper bound of the estimation error covariance matrix. Particularly, the CI fusion results in [26] required to solve non-convex nonlinear optimization problems online at each time, which may lead to a large number of calculation. Though the distributed fusion estimator in [22] was optimal based on the optimal weighted fusion criterion, the model of communication delays cannot be applicable to the case of time-varying delays. More importantly, the computational complexity of the fusion estimator in [22] was also high. Obviously, the common disadvantage of the results in [22] and [26] is the high computation cost, and the optimal weighed fusion criterion can provide the optimal and analytic solutions. Therefore, based on the optimal weighted fusion criterion, how to design steady-state dimensionality reduction fusion estimators with simple calculation is of great significance in the presence of communication delays.

We shall solve the above two problems, and the main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- By constructing a new common orthogonal space, the cross-covariance matrix is calculated by the recursive form, and then an optimal distributed Kalman fusion

estimator (DKFE) is derived in the linear minimum variance sense when there are bandwidth and communication delay constraints in CPSs. Notice that each weighting fusion matrix is calculated by the analytic form.

- A delay-dependent and probability-dependent stability condition is derived such that the fusion estimation error covariance matrix of the DKFE converges to a unique steady-state matrix for any initial values. Under this condition, the steady-state DKFE, which has much lower computational complexity as compared with the DKFE, is given. Moreover, when each communication delay is known, the probability selection criterion for determining dimensionality reduction strategy is presented to guarantee the stability of the DKFE.
- Compared with the fusion estimation method in [22], the model of communication delays in this paper does not require that each sink node knows the communication delay in advance, and the steady-state DKFE with simple calculation is derived (see Remark 1). Since the covariance intersection fusion criterion in [26] is suboptimal, the estimation performance of the designed DKFE must be better than that of the fusion estimator in [26] when each communication delay is constant. Moreover, the computation cost of the steady-state DKFE must be lower than that of the CI fusion estimator in [26] and the conservatism of delay-dependent stability conditions is less than that of the conditions in [26] (see Remark 2 and Remark 7).
- When there is no communication delay for the scenario described in Fig. 1, it is shown that the stability condition in this paper has less conservatism than the result in [32]. This is because a new derivation idea without any inequality relaxation is proposed to design the stochastic dimensionality reduction strategy. Moreover, when considering communication delays, the corresponding stability analysis is also based on this new derivation idea. Notice that it is difficult to obtain the stability condition by using the derivation idea in [32] when the communication delay is modeled in this paper (see Remarks 7-8).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the problem formulation. The finite-horizon DKFE is designed in Section III. In Section IV, the stability condition and the steady-state DKFE are derived, and the probability selection criteria are given to determine satisfactory compression operators. Two illustrative examples are presented in Section V to show the advantage and effectiveness of the proposed approaches, and then the conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

Notations: The notations used throughout the paper are fairly standard. The superscript 'T' represents the transpose, and $E\{\cdot\}$ is the mathematical expectation. I_m represents the identity matrix of size $m \times m$, while $\text{diag}\{\cdot\}$ stands for a block diagonal matrix. $\text{Prob}\{A\}$ means the occurrence probability of the event A , while $\text{Tr}(B)$ denotes the trace of the matrix B . $\|A\|_2$ represent the 2-norm of the matrix A . $x \perp y$ denotes that x and y are orthogonal vectors, and $\text{col}\{a_1, \dots, a_L\}$ represents the column vector that is composed of the elements a_1, \dots, a_L . The symbol $\text{lcm}(a, b)$ is the least common multiple of a and b , while $\text{rank}(A)$ denotes the rank of the matrix A . The function $f_{\circ}^h(t)$ is defined

by $f_{\circ}^h(t) \triangleq \underbrace{f(f(\dots(f(t))\dots))}_{h \text{ times}}$, and $X > (<)0$ denotes a positive-definite (negative-definite) matrix.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Dimensionality Reduction and Communication Delays

Consider the physical process in Fig.1 described by the following discrete state-space model:

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + w(t), \quad (1)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n > 1$) is the state of the process, $w(t)$ is the system noise, and A is a constant matrix with appropriate dimension. As pointed out in [19], the model (1) is widely adopted for describing state dynamics of CPSs including power systems, smart grid infrastructures, and building automation systems, etc. When the measurements from each sensor are sent to sink nodes, the i th sink node's measurement $y_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{q_i}$ is modeled by:

$$y_i(t) = C_i x(t) + v_i(t) (i = 1, 2, \dots, L), \quad (2)$$

where C_i is the measurement matrix with appropriate dimension, and $v_i(t)$ is the measurement noise. Moreover, $w(t)$ and $v_i(t)$ are uncorrelated zero-mean Gaussian white noises satisfying

$$E\{[w^T(t) \ v_i^T(t)]^T [w^T(t_1) \ v_j^T(t_1)]\} = \delta_{t,t_1} \text{diag}\{Q_w, \delta_{i,j} Q_{v_i}\}, \quad (3)$$

where δ_{t,t_1} is defined by:

$$\delta_{t,t_1} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t = t_1 \\ 0 & \text{if } t \neq t_1 \end{cases}. \quad (4)$$

Then, based on the measurements $\{y_i(1), \dots, y_i(t)\}$, the local optimal estimate (LOE) $\hat{x}_i(t)$ is given by the Kalman filter:

$$\hat{x}_i(t) = G_{K_i}(t) A \hat{x}_i(t-1) + K_i(t) y_i(t), \quad (5)$$

where

$$G_{K_i}(t) \triangleq I_n - K_i(t) C_i. \quad (6)$$

Define $\tilde{x}_i(t) \triangleq x(t) - \hat{x}_i(t)$. Then, the optimal gain matrix $K_i(t)$ and the local estimation error covariance matrix $P_{ii}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i(t) \tilde{x}_i^T(t)\}$ are calculated by

$$\begin{cases} K_i(t) = P_{ii}^*(t) C_i^T [C_i P_{ii}^*(t) C_i^T + Q_{v_i}]^{-1} \\ P_{ii}(t) = G_{K_i}(t) P_{ii}^*(t) \\ P_{ii}^*(t) = A P_{ii}(t-1) A^T + Q_w \end{cases}, \quad (7)$$

where $P_{ii}^*(t)$ denotes the error covariance matrix of one-step prediction. Moreover, it follows from (1), (5) and (7) that the local estimation error cross-covariance matrix $P_{ij}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i(t) \tilde{x}_j^T(t)\} (i \neq j)$ is calculated by:

$$P_{ij}(t) = G_{K_i}(t) [Q_w + A P_{ij}(t-1) A^T] G_{K_j}^T(t). \quad (8)$$

Under the distributed fusion structure, each LOE $\hat{x}_i(t)$ must be sent to the FC to design an optimal fusion estimator. However, it is unrealistic to send the complete information included in $\hat{x}_i(t) (\in \mathbb{R}^n)$ to the FC over communication networks because almost all communication network can only carry a finite amount of information per unit time. This problem is especially prominent in the fusion estimation for the large-scale CPSs integrated by wireless sensor networks. To reduce communication traffic, only $r_i (1 \leq r_i < n)$ components of the i th LOE $\hat{x}_i(t)$ are allowed to be transmitted




Fig. 2. Distributed dimensionality reduction fusion estimation with communication delays in CPSs

to the FC at each time, and other components are discarded. Compared with the original LOE $\hat{x}_i(t)$, the dimension of the transmitted signal is reduced. In this sense, the above method can be viewed as one of the dimensionality reduction strategies. According to this dimensionality reduction strategy, the allowed sending components (ASC) of $\hat{x}_i(t)$ has Δ_i possible cases, where $\Delta_i = \frac{\prod_{\ell_i=0}^{r_i-1} (n - \ell_i^n)}{\prod_{\ell_i=1}^{r_i} \ell_i^r}$. Then, at a

particular time, only one vector signal, which is taken from one group of the above Δ_i cases, is selected and transmitted to the FC, and this selected signal is denoted by $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t) \in R^{r_i}$. When $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ is sent to the FC by the sink node, the FC will receive the data packet containing $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ at time $t + d_i$ because of communication delay. Let $\bar{x}_{s_i}(t)$ denote the local estimation information received by the FC at time t . Then, $\bar{x}_{s_i}(t)$ in the FC is given by:

$$\bar{x}_{s_i}(t) = \hat{x}_{s_i}(t - d_i). \quad (9)$$

It should be pointed out that the communication delays for different sink nodes are not the same (i.e., $d_i \neq d_j$), which means that the addressed delays are not constant from the perspective of the whole fusion systems. Moreover, the constant communication delay for each sink node is mainly determined by signal transmission power, and is difficult to be avoid due to resource constraints. Particularly, when the fusion center received the signals from multiple sink nodes, there must exist the problem of resource scheduling. Though time-varying delays may occur for different sink nodes, they must lead to the information disorder that directly add the design difficulties of dimensionality reduction fusion estimators. In this case, to avoid the information disorder in multi-sensor fusion, resource scheduling can be controlled by designing the physical mechanism for guaranteeing constant delays (see an example in Remark 1). Therefore, it is of significance in studying the dimensionality reduction fusion estimation problem with constant delays in this paper. Up to now, the problem of dimensionality reduction and communication delays has been presented, and the process diagram is shown in Fig. 2.

It is noted that the signal $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ only takes one element from the following finite set:

$$S_i(t) = \{\hat{x}_{s_i}^{h_i}(t) | h_i = 1, 2, \dots, \Delta_i\}, \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{x}_{s_i}^{h_i}(t) \in R^{r_i}$ represents one group of ASCs. To characterize the determining process of $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$, we introduce

the following indicator functions:

$$\sigma_{h_i}^i(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \hat{x}_{s_i}(t) = \hat{x}_{s_i}^{h_i}(t) \\ 0 & \text{if } \hat{x}_{s_i}(t) \neq \hat{x}_{s_i}^{h_i}(t) \end{cases}, \quad (11)$$

where $\sigma_{h_i}^i(t)$ ($h_i = 1, 2, \dots, \Delta_i$) are required to satisfy

$$\sigma_{h_i}^i(t) \sigma_{h_i^0}^i(t) = 0 (h_i \neq h_i^0), \sum_{h_i=1}^{\Delta_i} \sigma_{h_i}^i(t) = 1 \quad (12)$$

such that $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ only takes one ASC from the set (10) at time t , i.e.,

$$\hat{x}_{s_i}(t) = \sum_{h_i=1}^{\Delta_i} \sigma_{h_i}^i(t) \hat{x}_{s_i}^{h_i}(t). \quad (13)$$

Then, it is derived from (9) and (13) that

$$\bar{x}_{s_i}(t) = \sum_{h_i=1}^{\Delta_i} \sigma_{h_i}^i(t - d_i) \hat{x}_{s_i}^{h_i}(t - d_i). \quad (14)$$

At time t , if the fusion estimate of $x(t)$ is directly designed based on $\bar{x}_{s_i}(t)$, the fusion estimation performance must be poor because of the communication delays and the un-transmitted component of $\hat{x}_i(t)$. In this case, the compensating state estimate (CSE) of $x(t)$, denoted by $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$, can be modeled as follows:

$$\hat{x}_i^c(t) = A^{d_i} H_i(t - d_i) \hat{x}_i(t - d_i) + A^{d_i} [I_n - H_i(t - d_i)] A \hat{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1), \quad (15)$$

where $H_i(t - d_i)$ is determined by

$$H_i(t) = \sum_{h_i=1}^{\Delta_i} \sigma_{h_i}^i(t) H_{h_i}^i = \text{diag}\{\gamma_1^i(t), \dots, \gamma_n^i(t)\}. \quad (16)$$

Here, $H_{h_i}^i$ represents a diagonal matrix that contains r_i diagonal elements "1" and $n - r_i$ diagonal elements "0". Then it follows from (11) and (12) that

$$\gamma_\ell^i(t) \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{\ell=1}^n \gamma_\ell^i(t) = r_i (i = 1, \dots, L), \quad (17)$$

where $\gamma_\ell^i(t) = 1$ means that the ℓ th component of $\hat{x}_i(t)$ is selected and sent to the FC, while $\gamma_\ell^i(t) = 0$ means that the ℓ th component of $\hat{x}_i(t)$ is discarded. Particularly, at time t , the compensation strategy in the CSE model (15) is reflected by the following aspects:

- The un-transmitted components of $\hat{x}_i(t)$ are compensated by the one-step prediction based on $\hat{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1)$.
- The delayed information $\bar{x}_{s_i}(t)$ is compensated by the d_i -step prediction based on $\hat{x}_i^c(t - d_i)$, where $\hat{x}_i^c(t - d_i) = H_i(t - d_i) \hat{x}_i(t - d_i) + [I - H_i(t - d_i)] A \hat{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1)$.

Remark 1. In [22], at the i th sink node, the d_i -step prediction based on the local estimate $\hat{x}_i(t)$ was given by ($\hat{x}_i^{d_i}(t) = A^{d_i} \hat{x}_i(t)$). Due to the bandwidth constraints, only r_i components of $\hat{x}_i^{d_i}(t)$ were allowed to be sent. Then, the CSE of $x(t)$, denoted as $\hat{x}_{d_i}^c(t)$, was given by (i.e., the model (18) in [22]):

$$\hat{x}_{d_i}^c(t) = H_i^c(t - d_i) A^{d_i} \hat{x}_i(t - d_i) + [I - H_i^c(t - d_i)] A \hat{x}^f(t - 1), \quad (18)$$

where the definition of $H_i^c(t - d_i)$ is the same as that of $H_i(t - d_i)$, and $\hat{x}^f(t - 1)$ denotes the fusion estimate designed by [22]. For the CSE model (18), the d_i -step prediction $\hat{x}_i^{d_i}(t)$ must be completed at the sink node, which implies that each sink node must know the communication delay from the sink node to the FC *in advance*. Under this case, when the communication delay is unknown for the sink node or time-varying, the model (18) will be *invalid*. Different from the modeling method in [22], the CSE model (15) does not require that each sink node knows the communication

delay in advance, and thus the model (15) can be more easily implemented in a practical system. Particularly, when considering the time-varying communication delay $d_i(t)$, the local estimation information received by the FC, denoted as $\hat{x}_i^{d_i}(t)$, is given by:

$$\bar{x}_i^{d_i}(t) = \hat{x}_i^{s_i}(t - d_i(t)), \quad (19)$$

where $\hat{x}_i^{s_i}(t)$ denotes the selected ASC at the sink node. Meanwhile, it is reasonable to consider that the time-varying delay $d_i(t)$ is bounded in practical applications, and satisfies $d_i(t) \leq d_i^u$. Then, by resorting to the buffers at the FC, each time-varying delay can be prolonged to its upper bound d_i^u at each time, i.e., the model (19) is reduced to:

$$\bar{x}_i^{d_i}(t) = \hat{x}_i^{s_i}(t - d_i^u) \quad (20)$$

Since the structure of (20) is the same as that of (9), the case of time-varying delays can still be modeled by (15). Notice that the CSE model (18) in [22] will not be applicable to this case, because the time-varying communication delays are only known to the FC, and each sink node impossibly know the time-varying delays a priori. On the other hand, the stability condition in [22] could only guarantee the MSE of the fusion estimator converged to a steady-state value. It should be pointed out that the computational complexity of the fusion estimator in [22] is a slightly high, yet the corresponding steady-state fusion estimator cannot be derived from the stability condition in [22]. In contrast, the steady-state DKFE with simple calculation can be designed based on the stability condition in Theorem 3.

Remark 2. For the case of time-varying delays, the estimation error cross-covariance matrices cannot be obtained under the dimensionality reduction strategy in this paper. Fortunately, the CI fusion criterion does not need the cross-covariance matrices. Therefore, the distributed CI fusion estimation algorithm was developed in [26] to deal with the time-varying delays. Notice that the CI fusion criterion is not optimal because the optimization objective is an upper bound of estimation error covariance matrix, and each weighting matrix is obtained by solving non-convex nonlinear optimization problems *at each time*. Different from the fusion criterion in [26], the *optimal* weighted fusion criterion with analytic solutions is used to design the DKFE in this paper. Thus, when considering the constant communication delays, the estimation performance of the DKFE is better than that of the fusion estimator in [26]. On the other hand, as pointed out in Remark 1, the designed fusion estimation algorithms in this paper can be also applicable to the case of time-varying communication delays. However, it is difficult to show whose estimation performance is better, the DKFE in this paper or the fusion estimator in [26], when dealing with time-varying delays. This is because the performance loss in this paper is introduced from the delay model (i.e., prolonging the time-varying delay to its upper bound at each time), while the performance loss in [26] is introduced from the CI fusion criterion (i.e., minimizing an upper bound of the fusion estimation error covariance). However, from the perspective of computational complexity, the steady-state DKFE in this paper is better than the CI fusion estimator in [26] whenever considering the constant delays or time-varying delays.

B. Problem of Interest

It is concluded from (13) that the selected ASC $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t) (\in \mathbb{R}^{r_i})$ at the sink node is determined by the binary vari-

ables $\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t) (\bar{h}_i = 1, 2, \dots, \Delta_i)$. On the other hand, it is known from (15) that the design of optimal $\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t) (\bar{h}_i = 1, 2, \dots, \Delta_i)$ must be completed at the FC, because the communication delay (from the sink node to the FC) and each CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ are only obtained by the FC, but these information are unknown to each sink node. Therefore, an optimal $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ may be difficult to be designed at the sink node. Based on the above consideration, let each binary variable $\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t)$ be generated in a random way at the sink node, and let random variables $\{\sigma_1^i(t), \sigma_2^i(t), \dots, \sigma_{\Delta_i}^i(t)\}$ obey the categorical distribution satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t)\sigma_{\bar{h}_j}^j(t)\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_{\bar{h}_i, \bar{h}_j} \mathbb{E}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t)\} & \text{if } i = j, t = t_1 \\ \mathbb{E}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t)\}\mathbb{E}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_j}^j(t_1)\} & \text{if } i = j, t \neq t_1 \\ \mathbb{E}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t)\}\mathbb{E}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_j}^j(t_1)\} & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases} \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

Under this case, a group of ASC $\hat{x}_{s_i}^{\bar{h}_i}(t) (\bar{h}_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \Delta_i\})$ in the set (10) is randomly selected as the $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ at time t . Moreover, the occurrence probabilities of the cases $\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t) = 1$ and $\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t) = 0$ are given by $\text{Prob}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t) = 1\} = \pi_{\bar{h}_i}^i$ and $\text{Prob}\{\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t) = 0\} = 1 - \pi_{\bar{h}_i}^i$, where the selection probability $\pi_{\bar{h}_i}^i \geq 0$ satisfies:

$$\sum_{\bar{h}_i=1}^{\Delta_i} \pi_{\bar{h}_i}^i = 1 \quad (i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}). \quad (22)$$

Then, it is concluded from (16) and (21) that the binary variables $\gamma_\ell^i(t) (\ell = 1, \dots, n)$ in (17) are independent Bernoulli distributed white noise sequences with $\text{Prob}\{\gamma_\ell^i(t) = 1\} \triangleq \gamma_\ell^i$ and $\text{Prob}\{\gamma_\ell^i(t) = 0\} \triangleq 1 - \gamma_\ell^i$, which yields

$$H_i \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{H_i(t - d_i)\} = \text{diag}\{\gamma_1^i, \gamma_2^i, \dots, \gamma_n^i\}. \quad (23)$$

From (16) and (23), there must exist a constant matrix $U_\ell^i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \Delta_i}$ such that

$$\gamma_\ell^i = U_\ell^i \varsigma_i \quad (\ell = 1, \dots, n; i = 1, \dots, L), \quad (24)$$

where $\varsigma_i \triangleq \text{col}\{\pi_1^i, \pi_2^i, \dots, \pi_{\Delta_i}^i\}$. This means that when each selection probability $\pi_{\bar{h}_i}^i$ is given by (21–22), γ_ℓ^i in (23) will be determined by (24). Notice that the selection probabilities $\varsigma_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ are to be designed in this paper for guaranteeing the stability of the DKFE.

Let $\tilde{x}_i^c(t) \triangleq x(t) - \hat{x}_i^c(t)$ denote the estimation error of each CSE. Then, it follows from (1) and (15) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_i^c(t) &= A^{d_i} H_i(t - d_i) \tilde{x}_i(t - d_i) \\ &+ A^{d_i} [I_n - H_i(t - d_i)] A \tilde{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1) \\ &+ A^{d_i} [I_n - H_i(t - d_i)] w(t - d_i - 1) + F_w(d_i, t), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $F_w(d_i, t)$ is determined by the following function:

$$F_w(g, t) \triangleq \sum_{\theta=1}^g A^{\theta-1} w(t - \theta). \quad (26)$$

When $\mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}_i^c(-d_{n_i})\} = \mathbb{E}\{x(-d_{n_i})\} (d_{n_i} = 0, 1, \dots, d_i)$, it is concluded from (3), (25) and the fact $\mathbb{E}\{x(t)\} = \mathbb{E}\{\hat{x}_i(t)\}$ that each CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ is unbiased, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\hat{x}_i^c(t)\} = \mathbb{E}\{x(t)\} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, L). \quad (27)$$

According to the CSEs $\hat{x}_i^c(t) (i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ in the FC, the DKFE for the addressed CPSs is given by:

$$\hat{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^L \Omega_i(t) \hat{x}_i^c(t), \quad (28)$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^L \Omega_i(t) = I_n$, and combining (27) yields that the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$ is unbiased if $\mathbb{E}\{\hat{x}_i^c(d_{n_i})\} = \mathbb{E}\{x(d_{n_i})\} (d_{n_i} = 0, 1, \dots, d_i)$.

Consequently, the problems to be solved in this paper are described as follows:

1) When the selection probabilities $\pi_{\hat{h}_i}^i(\hat{h}_i = 1, \dots, \Delta_i; i = 1, \dots, L)$ satisfying (22) are given in advance, the aim is to design optimal weighting matrices $\Omega_1(t), \dots, \Omega_L(t)$ such that the MSE of the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$ is minimal at each time step, i.e.,

$$\{\Omega_1(t), \dots, \Omega_L(t)\} = \arg \min_{\sum_{i=1}^L \Omega_i(t) = I} \mathbb{E}\{[x(t) - \hat{x}(t)]^T [x(t) - \hat{x}(t)]\}. \quad (29)$$

2) Find stability conditions, which are dependent on the communication delay d_i in (9) and the selection probability $\pi_{\hat{h}_i}^i$ in (22), such that the estimation error covariance matrix of the DKFE converges to a unique positive matrix, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\{[x(t) - \hat{x}(t)][x(t) - \hat{x}(t)]^T\} = P, \quad (30)$$

and P is independent of the initial values.

Remark 3. When the i th sink node knows the selection probability ς_i in advance, the binary variables $\sigma_{\hat{h}_i}^i(t)(\hat{h}_i = 1, \dots, \Delta_i)$ obeying the categorical distribution will be randomly generated at each time step, and then the selected ASC $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ can be determined by (13) at the sink node. Under this case, one of the important issues in this paper is how to design the satisfactory probability selection criteria, which will be solved in Section IV. On the other hand, when the result (30) holds, the limit of each weighting matrix $\Omega_i(t)$ must exist, and will be independent of the initial values. This is because the estimation error covariance matrix of the DKFE is dependent on each time-varying matrix $\Omega_i(t)$. In such a case, the steady-state DKFE with simple calculation will be given in this paper.

III. FINITE-HORIZON DKFE FOR THE CPSS

In this section, the recursive DKFE will be derived by using the optimal fusion criterion weighted by matrices in the linear minimum variance sense. Define $\tilde{x}(t) \triangleq x(t) - \hat{x}(t)$ and $I_a = \text{col}\{I_n, \dots, I_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^{nL \times n}$. Then, from the results in [9], [10], the optimal weighting matrices $\Omega_1(t), \dots, \Omega_L(t)$ in (29) and the corresponding fusion estimation error covariance matrix $P(t) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}(t)\tilde{x}^T(t)\}$ can be calculated by:

$$[\Omega_1(t), \Omega_2(t), \dots, \Omega_L(t)] = (I_a^T \Xi^{-1}(t) I_a)^{-1} I_a^T \Xi^{-1}(t) \quad (31)$$

$$P(t) = (I_a^T \Xi^{-1}(t) I_a)^{-1}, \quad (32)$$

where the weighting matrices $\Omega_i(t)(i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ determined by (31) satisfy the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^L \Omega_i(t) = I_n$, and

$$\Xi(t) = (\Xi_{ij}(t))_{nL \times nL}, \Xi_{ij}(t) = \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t)(\tilde{x}_j^c(t))^T\}. \quad (33)$$

It is concluded from (31) and (33) that if the computation procedure of $\Xi(t)$ is given, then the optimal weighting matrices $\Omega_i(t)(i = 1, \dots, L)$ in (31) can be thus obtained.

In what follows, six lemmas will be given before deriving the recursive form of $\Xi_{ij}(t)$. For notational convenience, the following indicator function is introduced:

$$C_o(t_1, t_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_1 > t_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } t_1 \leq t_2 \end{cases}. \quad (34)$$

Meanwhile, if $\tau_1 > \tau_2$, it will be specified that $\prod_{\tau=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} F(\tau) = I_m$ and $\sum_{\tau=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} G(\tau) = 0$, where $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $G(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ represent different matrix functions with respect to the variable τ .

Lemma 1 [32] For stochastic matrices U, B, G , where

$$U \triangleq \text{diag}\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}, B \triangleq \text{diag}\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$$

$$G \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} g_{11} & \cdots & g_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_{n1} & \cdots & g_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If each random variable g_{ij} in G is independent of any random variables of u_k and $b_k(k = 1, 2, \dots, n)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\{UGB\} = \mathbb{E}\{U \odot B\} \otimes \mathbb{E}\{G\},$$

where “ \otimes ” is defined as $[G^1 \otimes G^2]_{ij} = G_{ij}^1 G_{ij}^2$, and the product “ \odot ” for the matrices U and B is defined by

$$U \odot B = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 b_1 & \cdots & u_1 b_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_n b_1 & \cdots & u_n b_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Lemma 2 Define

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_{K_i}(t) \triangleq G_{K_i}(t)A, \Phi_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}_i(t_1)w^T(t_2)\} \\ \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t_1, t_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}_i(t_1)\tilde{x}_j^T(t_2)\} \\ \Phi_{x_i}^F(t_1, g, t_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}_i(t_1)F_w^T(g, t_2)\} \\ \Phi_F^w(g, t_1, t_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{F_w(g, t_1)w^T(t_2)\} \end{cases}, \quad (35)$$

where $G_{K_i}(t)$ and $F_w(g, t_2)$ are determined by (6) and (26), respectively. Then, $\Phi_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2)$, $\Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t_1, t_2)$, $\Phi_{x_i}^F(t_1, t_2)$ and $\Phi_F^w(t_1, g, t_2)$ are given by:

$$\Phi_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2) = C_o(t_1, t_2) \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{t_1-t_2-2} \Phi_{K_i}(t_1 - \varphi_i) \right) \times G_{K_i}(t_2 + 1)Q_w \quad (36)$$

$$\Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t_1, t_2) = \begin{cases} \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{t_1-t_2-1} \Phi_{K_i}(t_1 - \varphi_i) \right) P_{ij}(t_2) & \text{if } t_1 \geq t_2 \\ [\Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t_2, t_1)]^T & \text{if } t_1 < t_2 \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

$$\Phi_{x_i}^F(t_1, g, t_2) = \sum_{\theta=1}^g \Phi_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2 - \theta)[A^{\theta-1}]^T \quad (38)$$

$$\Phi_F^w(g, t_1, t_2) = C_o(t_1, t_2)C_o(t_2, t_1 - g - 1)A^{t_2-1}Q_w, \quad (39)$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ and $C_o(t_1, t_2)$ are determined by (4) and (34), respectively. $P_{ij}(t_2)$ in (37) is calculated by (7) or (8).

Proof: See A.1 in Appendix. ■

Lemma 3 Define

$$\begin{cases} f_i(t) \triangleq t - d_i - 1, f_{i0}^0(t) \triangleq t \\ \chi_i(t_1, t_2) \triangleq \min\{\chi_i(t_1, t_2) | f_{i0}^{X_i(t_1, t_2)}(t_2) - t_1 \leq 0\} \\ \Theta_{x_i^c}^w(t_1, t_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t_1)w^T(t_2)\} \\ \Theta_{x_i^c}^F(t_1, g, t_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t_1)F_w^T(g, t_2)\} \end{cases}. \quad (40)$$

Then, $\Theta_{x_i^c}^w(t_1, t_2)$, $\Theta_{x_i^c}^{x_j}(t_1, t_2)$, $\Theta_{x_i^c}^F(t_1, g, t_2)$ are given by:

$$\Theta_{x_i^c}^w(t_1, t_2) = C_o(t_1 - d_i, t_2) \times \left\{ \sum_{\tilde{h}=0}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)-1} \{\delta_{f_{i0}^{h+1}(t_1), t_2} H_{\text{Ad}_i}^{\tilde{h}} \bar{H}_{\text{Ad}_i} Q_w + H_{\text{d}_i} \Phi_{x_i}^w(f_{i0}^h(t_1) - d_i, t_2)\} + \Phi_F^w(d_i, t_1, t_2) + \sum_{\tilde{h}=1}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)-1} H_{\text{Ad}_i} \Phi_F^w(d_i, f_{i0}^h(t_1), t_2) \right\} \quad (41)$$

$$\Theta_{x_i^c}^F(t_1, g, t_2) = \sum_{\theta=1}^g \Theta_{x_i^c}^w(t_1, t_2 - \theta)(A^{\theta-1})^T, \quad (42)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} H_{\text{d}_i} = A^{d_i} H_i, \bar{H}_{\text{Ad}_i} = A^{d_i} - H_{\text{d}_i} \\ H_{\text{Ad}_i} = A^{d_i} [I_n - H_i] A \end{cases}, \quad (43)$$

where H_i is determined by (23), while $\Phi_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2)$ and $\Phi_F^w(d_i, t_1, t_2)$ are calculated by (36) and (39).

Proof: See A.2 in Appendix. ■

The statistical correlation between $\tilde{x}_i(t)$ and $w(t)$ is presented in Lemma 2, while Lemma 3 gives the statistical correlation between $\tilde{x}_i^c(t)$ and $w(t)$. Additionally, to obtain the $\Xi_{ij}(t)$, it is still required to know the statistical correlations between $\tilde{x}_i(t_1)$ and $\tilde{x}_i^c(t_2)$, and between $\tilde{x}_i^c(t_1)$ and $\tilde{x}_i^c(t_2)$, which will be derived in Lemmas 4–6.

Lemma 4 Define

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_{ij}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i(t)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t)]^T\} \\ \Gamma_{ij}(t_1, t_2) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i(t_1)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t_2)]^T\} (t_1 > t_2) \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

Then, $\Gamma_{ij}(t)$ is calculated by the following recursive form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ij}(t) = & \left(\prod_{\varphi_j=0}^{d_j} \Phi_{K_i}(t - \varphi_j) \right) \Gamma_{ij}(t - d_j - 1) H_{Ad_j}^T \\ & + \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t, t - d_j) H_{d_j}^T + \Phi_{x_i}^F(t, d_j, t) \\ & + \Phi_{x_i}^w(t, t - d_j - 1) \bar{H}_{Ad_j}^T \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $H_{d_j}, \bar{H}_{Ad_j}, H_{Ad_j}$ are given by (43), while $\Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t, t - d_j), \Phi_{x_i}^F(t, d_j, t), \Phi_{x_i}^w(t, t - d_j - 1)$ are computed by (36), (37) and (38). In this case, $\Gamma_{ij}(t_1, t_2)$ is calculated by:

$$\Gamma_{ij}(t_1, t_2) = \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{t_1-t_2-1} \Phi_{K_i}(t_1 - \varphi_i) \right) \Gamma_{ij}(t_2). \quad (46)$$

Proof: See A.3 in Appendix. ■

Lemma 5 Define

$$\Psi_{ij}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i(t - d_i)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t - d_j - 1)]^T\}. \quad (47)$$

For $i = j$, $\Psi_{ii}(t)$ is calculated by

$$\Psi_{ii}(t) = \Phi_{K_i}(t - d_i) \Gamma_{ij}(t - d_i - 1). \quad (48)$$

For $i \neq j$, let $\eta_{ij} \triangleq \min\{\eta_{ij} | \eta_{ij}(d_j + 1) - d_i \geq 0\}$. Then, $\Psi_{ij}(t)$ is calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{ij}(t) = & \sum_{\kappa=1}^{\eta_{ij}-1} \{ [\Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t - d_i, f_{j_0}^\kappa(t) - d_j) H_{d_j}^T \\ & + \Phi_{x_i}^w(t - d_i, f_{j_0}^{\kappa+1}(t)) \bar{H}_{Ad_j}^T \\ & + \Phi_{x_i}^F(t - d_i, d_j, f_{j_0}^\kappa(t))] (H_{Ad_j}^{\kappa-1})^T \} \\ & + \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{\eta_{ij}(d_j+1)-1-d_i} \Phi_{K_i}(t - d_i - \varphi_i) \right) \\ & \times \Gamma_{ij}(f_{j_0}^{\eta_{ij}}(t)) (H_{Ad_j}^{\eta_{ij}-1})^T \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where $H_{d_j}, \bar{H}_{Ad_j}, H_{Ad_j}$ are given by (43); $\Gamma_{ij}(t)$ is computed by (45), while $\Phi_{x_i}^w(t - d_i, f_{j_0}^{\kappa+1}(t)), \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t - d_i, f_{j_0}^\kappa(t) - d_j)$ and $\Phi_{x_i}^F(t - d_i, d_j, f_{j_0}^\kappa(t))$ are calculated by (36), (37), (38).

Proof: See A.4 in Appendix. ■

Remark 4. It should be pointed out that $\Psi_{ij}(t)$ in Lemma 5 is not a special case of $\Gamma_{ij}(t_1, t_2)$ in Lemma 4 because there may exist the case $d_i > d_j + 1$. Notice that when $d_i \leq d_j + 1$, one has $\eta_{ij} = 1$. Then, according to the definitions of $\sum_{\tau=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} G(\tau) = 0$ and $\prod_{\tau=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} F(\tau) = I$ for $\tau_1 > \tau_2$, $\Psi_{ij}(t)$ is calculated by $\Psi_{ij}(t) = \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{d_j-d_i} \Phi_{K_i}(t - d_i - \varphi_i) \right) \Gamma_{ij}(t - d_j - 1)$.

Lemma 6 Define

$$\begin{cases} \tau_{ij} = \tau_{ji} \triangleq \text{lcm}(d_i + 1, d_j + 1), \tau_{d_i} \triangleq \tau_{ij}/(d_i + 1) \\ \Upsilon_{ij}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t - d_j - 1)]^T\} \\ \Upsilon_{ij}^x(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_f^w(t)[\tilde{x}_f^w(t)]^T\} \\ \Upsilon_{ij}^c(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_f^w(t)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t - \tau_{ij})]^T\} \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

where $\tilde{x}_f^w(t)$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{x}_f(t) \triangleq \text{col}\{\tilde{x}_i(f_{i_0}^1(t) - d_i), \dots, \tilde{x}_i(f_{i_0}^{\tau_{d_i}-1}(t) - d_i)\} \\ w_{f_i}(t) \triangleq \text{col}\{w(f_{i_0}^2(t)), \dots, w(f_{i_0}^{\tau_{d_i}}(t))\} \\ F_{f_i}(t) \triangleq \text{col}\{F_w(d_i, f_{i_0}^1(t)), \dots, F_w(d_i, f_{i_0}^{\tau_{d_i}-1}(t))\} \\ \tilde{x}_f^w(t) \triangleq \text{col}\{\tilde{x}_{f_i}(t), w_{f_i}(t), F_{f_i}(t)\} \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

Then, $\Upsilon_{ij}^x(t)$ can be calculated by (36–38) (see Lemma 2), while $\Upsilon_{ij}^c(t)$ can be calculated by (41–42) (see Lemma 3) and (46). In this case, $\Upsilon_{ij}(t)$ is calculated by:

$$\begin{cases} \Upsilon_{ij}(t) = H_{Ad_i}^{\tau_{d_i}-1} \Xi_{ij}(t - \tau_{ij}) [H_{Ad_j}^{\tau_{d_j}-1}]^T + \hat{\Upsilon}_{ij}(t) \\ \hat{\Upsilon}_{ij}(t) = (1 - \delta_{1, \tau_{d_i}})(1 - \delta_{1, \tau_{d_j}}) \Sigma_i \Upsilon_{ij}^x(t) \Sigma_j^T \\ \quad + (1 - \delta_{1, \tau_{d_i}}) \Sigma_i \Upsilon_{ij}^c(t) [H_{Ad_j}^{\tau_{d_j}-1}]^T \\ \quad + (1 - \delta_{1, \tau_{d_j}}) H_{Ad_i}^{\tau_{d_i}-1} [\Upsilon_{ji}^c(t)]^T \Sigma_j^T \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

where $\delta_{1, \tau_{d_i}}$ is defined in (4), and

$$\begin{cases} \Sigma_{1i} \triangleq [H_{d_i}, H_{Ad_i} H_{d_i}, \dots, H_{Ad_i}^{\tau_{d_i}-2} H_{d_i}] \\ \Sigma_{2i} \triangleq [\bar{H}_{Ad_i}, H_{Ad_i} \bar{H}_{Ad_i}, \dots, H_{Ad_i}^{\tau_{d_i}-2} \bar{H}_{Ad_i}] \\ \Sigma_{3i} \triangleq [I_n, H_{Ad_i}, \dots, H_{Ad_i}^{\tau_{d_i}-2}] \\ \Sigma_i \triangleq [\Sigma_{1i} \ \Sigma_{2i} \ \Sigma_{3i}] \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

Proof: See A.5 in Appendix. ■

Remark 5. Notice that the structure of $\Upsilon_{ij}^x(t)$ consists of $\Phi_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2), \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t_1, t_2), \Phi_{x_i}^F(t_1, g, t_2)$ and $\Phi_{x_i}^F(t_1, g, t_2)$, and thus $\Upsilon_{ij}^x(t)$ can be calculated by Lemma 2. Meanwhile, $\Upsilon_{ij}^c(t)$ can be calculated by Lemma 3 and (46), because its structure consists of $\Gamma_{ij}(t_1, t_2) (t_1 > t_2), \Theta_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2)$ and $\Theta_{x_i}^F(t_1, g, t_2)$. On the other hand, in most cases, the delay d_i is not equal to d_j . Thus, to design the recursive form of $\Xi_{ij}(t)$, one of the key issues is how to obtain the relationship between $E\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t - d_j - 1)]^T\}$ and $\Xi_{ij}(t)$, which has been solved by Lemma 6.

According to the results in Lemmas 1–6, the recursive form of $\Xi_{ij}(t)$ in (33) will be given by Theorem 1.

Theorem 1 Define

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda_i \triangleq E\{H_i(t) \odot H_i(t)\} \\ V_i \triangleq E\{H_i(t) \odot [I_n - H_i(t)]\} \\ W_i \triangleq E\{[I_n - H_i(t)] \odot [I_n - H_i(t)]\} \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

Then, the local estimation error covariance matrix $\Xi_{ii}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t)[\tilde{x}_i^c(t)]^T\}$ for each CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{ii}(t) = & A^{d_i} [W_i \otimes (A \Xi_{ii}(t - d_i - 1) A^T)] (A^{d_i})^T \\ & + A^{d_i} [\Lambda_i \otimes P_{ii}(t - d_i) + W_i \otimes Q_w] (A^{d_i})^T \\ & + A^{d_i} [V_i \otimes (\Phi_{K_i}(t - d_i) \Gamma_{ii}(t - d_i - 1) A^T \\ & + G_{K_i}(t - d_i) Q_w)] (A^{d_i})^T \\ & + A^{d_i} [V_i^T \otimes (A \Gamma_{ii}^T(t - d_i - 1) \Phi_{K_i}^T(t - d_i) \\ & + Q_w G_{K_i}^T(t - d_i))] (A^{d_i})^T \\ & + \sum_{\theta=1}^{d_i} A^{\theta-1} Q_w [A^{\theta-1}]^T \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $P_{ii}(t - d_i)$ and $\Gamma_{ii}(t - d_i - 1)$ are calculated by (7) and (45) (see Lemma 4). On the other hand, the estimation error cross-covariance matrix $\Xi_{ij}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t)]^T\}$ is given by:

$$\begin{cases} \Xi_{ij}(t) = H_{Ad_i}^{\tau_{d_i}} \Xi_{ij}(t - \tau_{ij}) (H_{Ad_j}^{\tau_{d_j}})^T + \hat{\Xi}_{ij}(t) \\ \hat{\Xi}_{ij}(t) = H_{Ad_i} \hat{\Upsilon}_{ij}(t) H_{Ad_j}^T + \sum_{\theta=1}^{\min\{d_i, d_j\}} A^\theta Q_w (A^\theta)^T \\ \quad + H_{d_i} \{ \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t - d_i, t - d_j) H_{d_j}^T \\ \quad + \Psi_{ij}(t) H_{Ad_j}^T + \Phi_{x_i}^F(t - d_i, d_j, t) \\ \quad + \Phi_{x_i}^w(t - d_i, t - d_j - 1) \bar{H}_{Ad_j}^T \} \\ \quad + H_{Ad_i} \{ \Theta_{x_i}^w(t - d_i - 1, t - d_j - 1) H_{Ad_j}^T \\ \quad + \Psi_{ji}^T(t) H_{d_j}^T + \Theta_{x_i}^F(t - d_i - 1, d_j, t) \} \\ \quad + \bar{H}_{Ad_i} \{ \delta_{d_i, d_j} Q_w \bar{H}_{Ad_j}^T + C_o(d_j, d_i) Q_w (A^{d_i})^T \\ \quad + (\Phi_{x_j}^w(t - d_j, t - d_i - 1)) H_{d_i}^T \\ \quad + (\Theta_{x_j}^w(t - d_j - 1, t - d_i - 1)) H_{d_i}^T \\ \quad + (\Phi_{x_j}^F(t - d_j, d_i, t)) H_{d_i}^T \\ \quad + (\Theta_{x_j}^F(t - d_j - 1, d_i, t)) H_{d_i}^T \\ \quad + C_o(d_i, d_j) A^{d_j} Q_w \bar{H}_{Ad_j}^T \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

where δ_{d_i, d_j} is determined by (4), and $C_o(d_i, d_j)$ is determined by (34); $H_{d_i}, \bar{H}_{Ad_i}, H_{Ad_i}$ are defined by (43), while τ_{ij}, τ_{d_i} and τ_{d_j} are defined in (50). $\hat{Y}_{ij}(t)$ is calculated by (52) (see Lemma 6), and $\Psi_{ij}(t)$ is calculated by (49) (see Lemma 5); $\Theta_{x_i^c}(t_1, t_2), \Theta_{x_i^c}^F(t_1, t_2)$ are calculated by (41–42) (see Lemma 3), while $\Phi_{x_i^c}^w(t_1, t_2), \Phi_{x_i^c}^w(t_1, t_2), \Phi_{x_i^c}^F(t_1, t_2)$ are calculated by (36–38) (see Lemma 2). Moreover, the relationship between the CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ and the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$ is

$$\text{Tr}\{P(t)\} \leq \text{Tr}\{\Xi_{ii}(t)\} (i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}). \quad (57)$$

Proof: See A.6 in Appendix. ■

From Theorem 1, $\Xi(t)$ can be calculated by (55–56), then the optimal weighting matrices $\Omega_1(t), \dots, \Omega_L(t)$ are obtained by (31). Moreover, the computation procedures for the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$ can be summarized by Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 For the given selection probabilities $\pi_{h_i}^i (h_i = 1, \dots, \Delta_i; i = 1, \dots, L)$ satisfying (22)

- 1: At each sink node:
 - 2: **for** $i := 1$ **to** L **do**
 - 3: Calculate $G_{K_i}(t)$ and $K_i(t)$ by (6) and (7);
 - 4: Calculate the LOE $\hat{x}_i(t)$ by (5);
 - 5: Generate the binary variables $\sigma_{h_i}^i(t) (h_i = 1, \dots, \Delta_i)$ satisfying the categorical distribution, then determine the selected ASC $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ by (13);
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: At the FC:
 - 8: **for** $i := 1$ **to** L **do**
 - 9: Calculate $G_{K_i}(t)$ by (6);
 - 10: Calculate the CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ by (15);
 - 11: **for** $j := i$ **to** L **do**
 - 12: Calculate $P_{ij}(t)$ by (6–8);
 - 13: Calculate $\Gamma_{ij}(t), \Psi_{ij}(t), \Upsilon_{ij}(t)$ by (45), (49), (52);
 - 14: Calculate $\Xi_{ij}(t)$ by (55–56);
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: Calculate $\Omega_1(t), \Omega_2(t), \dots, \Omega_L(t)$ by (31);
 - 18: Calculate the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$ by (28).
-

Remark 6. According to (55–56), each covariance matrix $\Xi_{ij}(t)$ is independent of the measurement $y_i(t)$ and the LOE $\hat{x}_i(t)$. Thus, $\Xi_{ij}(t)$ can be calculated at the FC when the initial values are given. In this case, only if each selected ASC $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$ is sent to the FC, Algorithm 1 will be implemented in practical applications. On the other hand, when the communication delays and the number of local estimates increase slightly, the computational complexity of Algorithm 1 will be high. In this case, the steady-state DKFE with time-invariant weighting matrices can reduce the amount of computation. Therefore, to obtain the steady-state DKFE, we should find the stability conditions satisfying the following two points: i) The covariance matrix of the recursive DKFE converges to a positive-definite matrix; ii) The limit of the covariance matrix $P(t)$ is independent of the initial values. Following this idea, the steady-state DKFE will be derived in the next section.

IV. STABILITY ANALYSIS FOR THE DKFE

A. Stability Condition of Each Local CSE

The estimation performance of each CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ will be discussed in this subsection. First, it is considered that the

i th subsystem satisfies

$$(A, \sqrt{Q_w}) \text{ is stabilizable and } (A, C_i) \text{ is detectable.} \quad (58)$$

When the condition (58) holds, it is well known that the estimation error covariance matrix $P_{ii}(t)$ in (7) will converge from any initial conditions $P_{ii}(0) > 0$ to the unique positive semi-definite solution P_{ii} . This means that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P_{ii}(t) = P_{ii}, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{K_i}(t) = \Phi_{K_i}, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} K_i(t) = K_i \quad (59)$$

where the limits P_{ii}, Φ_{K_i} and K_i are independent of the initial values. Moreover, Φ_{K_i} is a stable matrix. Thus, there must exist an integer $N_{P_i} > 0$ such that, for $t > N_{P_i}$, the estimation error system (96) reduces to:

$$\tilde{x}_i(t) = \Phi_{K_i} \tilde{x}_i(t-1) + G_{K_i} w(t-1) - K_i v_i(t). \quad (60)$$

Then, it follows from (60) that

$$\tilde{x}_i(t+1) = \Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1} \tilde{x}_i(t-d_i) + \zeta_i^o(t), \quad (61)$$

where

$$\zeta_i^o(t) = \sum_{\alpha_i=1}^{d_i+1} \Phi_{K_i}^{\alpha_i-1} G_{K_i} w(t-\alpha_i+1) - \sum_{\alpha_i=0}^{d_i} \Phi_{K_i}^{\alpha_i-1} G_{K_i} K_i v_i(t-\alpha_i+1). \quad (62)$$

Meanwhile, it is derived from (25) and (60) that

$$\tilde{x}_i^c(t+1) = A_{i1}(t) \tilde{x}_i^c(t-d_i) + A_{i2}(t) \tilde{x}_i(t-d_i) + \zeta_i^c(t) \quad (63)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} A_{i1}(t) = A^{d_i} [I_n - H_i(t-d_i+1)] A \\ A_{i2}(t) = A^{d_i} H_i(t-d_i+1) \Phi_{K_i} \\ \zeta_i^c(t) = A^{d_i} H_i(t-d_i+1) G_{K_i} w(t-d_i) \\ \quad + A^{d_i} H_i(t-d_i+1) w(t-d_i) + F_w(d_i, t+1) \\ \quad - A^{d_i} H_i(t-d_i+1) v_i(t-d_i+1) \end{cases}. \quad (64)$$

Define $\tilde{\xi}_i(t) \triangleq \text{col}\{\tilde{x}_i^c(t), \tilde{x}_i(t)\}$, $\zeta_i(t) \triangleq \text{col}\{\zeta_i^c(t), \zeta_i^o(t)\}$. Then, combining (61) and (63) yields that

$$\tilde{\xi}_i(t+1) = A_i(t) \tilde{\xi}_i(t-d_i) + \zeta_i(t), \quad (65)$$

where

$$A_i(t) = \begin{bmatrix} A_{i1}(t) & A_{i2}(t) \\ 0 & \Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (66)$$

It is concluded from the definition of $\tilde{\xi}_i(t)$ that if the covariance matrix $\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) \triangleq E\{\tilde{\xi}_i(t) \tilde{\xi}_i^T(t)\}$ converges to the unique matrix $\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}$, there must exist the unique limit of the estimation error covariance matrix $\Xi_{ii}(t)$ for the i th CSE.

Lemma 7 Define

$$f(B) \triangleq E\{A_i^T(t) B A_i(t)\}, \quad (67)$$

where $B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}$. Then, $f(B)$ is calculated by:

$$f(B) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{B}_{11} & \tilde{B}_{12} \\ \tilde{B}_{21} & \tilde{B}_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (68)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{B}_{11} = A^T \{W_i \otimes [(A^{d_i})^T B_{11} A^{d_i}]\} A \\ \tilde{B}_{12} = A^T \{V_i^T \otimes [(A^{d_i})^T B_{11} A^{d_i}]\} \Phi_{K_i} \\ \quad + A^T [I_n - H_i] (A^{d_i})^T B_{12} \Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1} \\ \tilde{B}_{21} = \Phi_{K_i}^T \{V_i \otimes [(A^{d_i})^T B_{11} A^{d_i}]\} A \\ \quad + [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1}]^T B_{21} A^{d_i} [I_n - H_i] A \\ \tilde{B}_{22} = \Phi_{K_i}^T \{\Lambda_i \otimes [(A^{d_i})^T B_{11} A^{d_i}]\} \Phi_{K_i} \\ \quad + [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1}]^T B_{21} A^{d_i} H_i \Phi_{K_i} + [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1}]^T B_{22} \Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1} \\ \quad + \Phi_{K_i}^T H_i (A^{d_i})^T B_{12} \Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1} \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

where the probability selection matrix H_i is given by (23), and W_i, Λ_i, V_i are given by (54). Moreover, for any matrices B_1, B_2 , there will be:

$$f(B_1 + B_2) = f(B_1) + f(B_2). \quad (70)$$

Proof: (68) can be obtained from (16), (21), Lemma 1 and the definition of $f(B)$, while (70) is derived from (68). This completes the proof. ■

Based on Lemma 7, the delay-dependent stability condition of the CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ will be given in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2 For the communication delay d_i and selection probabilities $\pi_{h_i}^i(\bar{h}_i = 1, \dots, \Delta_i)$ in (68), if there exist $D_i > 0, X_i, Y_i, Z_i$ and $S_i > 0$ such that

$$M_i = \begin{bmatrix} X_i & Y_i \\ Y_i^T & Z_i \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (71)$$

$$M_i = \begin{bmatrix} M_i(1, 1) & -Y_i - d_i Z_i A_i \\ -Y_i^T - d_i A_i^T Z_i & f(D_i) + d_i f(Z_i) - S_i \end{bmatrix} < 0, \quad (72)$$

where $M_i(1, 1) = -D_i + X_i + Y_i^T + Y_i + d_i Z_i + S_i$ and $A_i = E\{A_i(t)\}$, while $f(D_i)$ and $f(Z_i)$ are calculated by (68) in Lemma 7, then the covariance matrix $\Xi_{ii}(t)$ (55) converges to the unique matrix, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Xi_{ii}(t) = \Xi_{ii}, \quad (73)$$

and the limit Ξ_{ii} is independent of the initial values.

Proof: See A.7 in Appendix. ■

Remark 7. When $d_i \neq 0$, it is calculated from (54) and (55) that $\text{Tr}\{A^{d_i}[V_i \otimes (\Phi_{K_i}(t - d_i)\Gamma_{ii}(t - d_i - 1)A^T + G_{K_i}(t - d_i)Q_w)](A^{d_i})^T\} \neq 0$ and $\text{Tr}\{A^{d_i}[V_i^T \otimes (A\Gamma_{ii}^T(t - d_i - 1)\Phi_{K_i}^T(t - d_i) + Q_w G_{K_i}^T(t - d_i))](A^{d_i})^T\} \neq 0$, which are different from the results (101) and (102) in [32]. This implies that the stability condition for each CSE is difficult to be obtained by the derivation method based on the property of the operator $\text{Tr}\{\bullet\}$ in [32]. In contrast, by adopting a novel derivation idea in this paper, the stability conditions (71) and (72) are linear matrix inequalities (LMIs), and thus they can be verified by resorting to Matlab LMI Toolbox [44]. On the other hand, according to the similar derivation of stability conditions in [26], if the following conditions are satisfied

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_{\infty, i} \triangleq \|A^{d_i}\|_1 \|(I_n - H_i)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_1 \\ \quad \times \|A^{d_i}\|_{\infty} \|(I_n - H_i)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_{\infty} < 1 \\ \zeta_{2, i} \triangleq \|\Phi_{K_i}^{d_i+1}\|_2 \|A^{d_i}(I_n - H_i)A\|_2 < 1 \end{cases} \quad (74)$$

where $\Phi_{K_i} \triangleq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{K_i}(t)$, while $\|\bullet\|_1$ and $\|\bullet\|_{\infty}$ represent the 1-norm and ∞ -norm of matrices, respectively. Then, the covariance matrix $\Xi_{ii}(t)$ (55) will converge. However, the stability conditions in Theorem 2 are derived from the perspective of approaching the spectral radius when using Lyapunov stability theory, while the condition (74) is directly given by using the relaxation technique of matrix norms. Notice that, for any matrix "o", there must be $\rho(o) \leq \|o\|_i (i \in \{1, 2, \infty\})$, where $\rho(\bullet)$ denotes the spectral radius. In this sense, the stability conditions in Theorem 2 has less conservatism than (74) derived by [26]. Moreover, according to the definitions of 1-norm and ∞ -norm, the condition (74) will become more conservatism because of the product of $\|\bullet\|_1$ and $\|\bullet\|_{\infty}$. The above-mentioned result has been illustrated by Examples 1-2.

Remark 8. When $d_i = 0$, the Lyapunov function candidate can be chosen as $V_{\xi_i}(t) = E\{\xi_i^T(t)D_i\xi_i(t)\}$. Then it is

concluded from the similar derivation of Theorem 2 that if there exists $D_i > 0$ such that

$$\hat{f}(D_i) - D_i < 0, \quad (75)$$

where $\hat{f}(D_i)$ is calculated by $f(D_i)$ (i.e., (68) in Lemma 7) for $d_i = 0$, then the corresponding covariance matrix $\Xi_{ii}(t)$ will converge to the unique steady-state value. Meanwhile, it is concluded from the result in [32] that if

$$\lambda_{\max}(A^T(I_n - H_i)A) < 1, \quad (76)$$

where H_i is determined by (23), then the $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr}\{\Xi_{ii}(t)\}$ will exist for $d_i = 0$. It should be pointed out that, under the condition (76), one cannot prove the following results: a) the limit of the covariance matrix $\Xi_{ii}(t)$ exists, and b) the limit of $\Xi_{ii}(t)$ is independent of the initial conditions. Since the results (a) and (b) are necessary before deriving the steady-state DKFE, the steady-state fusion estimator cannot be given under the condition (76). Moreover, when only considering the convergence of the sequence $\{\text{Tr}\{\Xi_{ii}(t)\}\}$, the condition (75) has less conservatism than the condition (76). This is because the relaxation technique of matrix trace inequality is introduced to derive (76), but the condition (75) is derived by the stability theory without any relaxation. This result has been demonstrated by Example 1.

B. Steady-State DKFE Design

According to (32) and (33), the stability of the DKFE is also dependent on each estimation error cross-covariance matrix $\Xi_{ij}(t)$ (see (56)). Thus, the convergence of the sequence $\{\Xi_{ij}(t)\}$ will first be discussed in this subsection, and then combining Theorem 2 leads to the delay-dependent stability condition of the DKFE and the steady-state DKFE (SDKFE). The main result will be presented in Theorem 3.

Theorem 3 Consider the CPSs (1–2) under the condition (58), if the selection probabilities $\pi_{h_i}^i(\bar{h}_i = 1, 2, \dots, \Delta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ and the communication delays $d_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ satisfy (71), (72), and

$$\rho(A^{d_i}(I_n - H_i)A) < 1 (i = 1, 2, \dots, L), \quad (77)$$

where H_i is given by (23), then the fusion estimation error covariance matrix $P(t)$ (32) will converge to the unique matrix P , i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(t) = P \quad (78)$$

with P independent of the initial values. Moreover, the steady-state weighing matrices $\Omega_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ are calculated by

$$[\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_L] = P^{-1}I_a^T \Xi^{-1}, \quad (79)$$

where $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Xi(t) = \Xi$, and the limit Ξ is independent of the initial values. In this case, the SDKFE $\hat{x}_s(t)$ at the FC side is given by:

$$\hat{x}_s(t) = \sum_{i=1}^L \Omega_i \hat{x}_i^c(t), \quad (80)$$

where $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ is calculated by (15).

Proof: See A.8 in Appendix. ■

According to Theorem 3, the computation procedures for the SDKFE $\hat{x}_s(t)$ can be summarized by Algorithm 2.

Remark 9. It has been proved in Theorem 3 that when the conditions (71), (72) and (77) hold, the estimation error

Algorithm 2 For the given selection probabilities $\pi_{\bar{h}_i}^i (\bar{h}_i = 1, \dots, \Delta_i; i = 1, \dots, L)$ satisfying (22)

- 1: Determine the weighting matrices $\Omega_i (i = 1, \dots, L)$ by (79);
- 2: At each sink node:
- 3: **for** $i := 1$ **to** L **do**
- 4: Calculate the LOE $\hat{x}_i(t)$ by (5);
- 5: Generate the binary variables $\sigma_{\bar{h}_i}^i(t) (\bar{h}_i = 1, \dots, \Delta_i)$ satisfying the categorical distribution, then determine the selected ASC $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ by (13);
- 6: **end for**
- 7: At the FC:
- 8: **for** $i := 1$ **to** L **do**
- 9: Calculate the CSE $\hat{x}_i^c(t)$ by (15);
- 10: **end for**
- 11: Calculate the SDKFE $\hat{x}_s(t)$ by (80).

covariance matrix $P(t)$ can converge to the unique steady-state values for any initial conditions. Thus, the steady-state weighting matrices (79) can be obtained off-line by implementing the Step 7–Step 16 of Algorithm 1. It is noted that the computational complexity of the SDKFE obtained by Algorithm 2 is much lower than that of the DKFE obtained by Algorithm 1.

Notice that the stability condition in Theorems 2–3 are dependent on the communication delays and the selection probabilities of dimensionality reduction. Since each communication delay is determined by the property of communication channel, it is difficult to adjust the parameter d_i to satisfy the stability condition. In this case, from the result (57) in Theorem 1 and Theorems 2–3, how to determine the selection probabilities (22) such that the MSE of the DKFE is bounded or convergent will be presented in Theorem 4.

Theorem 4 For the CPSs (1–2), when each communication delay d_i is known in prior, two probability criteria to determine the dimensionality reduction strategy are presented as follows:

(C.1): To guarantee that the MSE of the DKFE is bounded, one needs to determine one group of the selection probability $\varsigma_i \triangleq \text{col}\{\pi_1^i, \dots, \pi_{\Delta_i}^i\}$ in (24) by (71–72).

(C.2): To guarantee the existence of the SDKFE, one needs to determine the L selection probabilities $\varsigma_i (i = 1, \dots, L)$ in (24) by (71–72) and (77).

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, two illustrative examples are presented to show the advantage and effectiveness of the proposed dimensionality reduction fusion estimation methods.

Example 1: Consider a CPS (1) with the following system parameters [19]:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1.25 & 0 \\ 1 & 1.1 \end{bmatrix}, Q_w = \begin{bmatrix} 20 & 0 \\ 0 & 20 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (81)$$

where the parameters of the first measurement equation in (2) are taken as:

$$C_1 = [0 \quad 1], Q_{v_1} = 2.5. \quad (82)$$

Then, it is calculated from (81) and (82) that $\text{rank}\{\sqrt{Q_w} A \sqrt{Q_w}\} = 2$ and $\text{rank}\{\text{col}\{C_1, C_1 A\}\} = 2$,

which means that (58) holds. In this case, one has by (6), (7) and (59) that

$$G_{K_i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4760 & -0.8573 \\ 0.0314 & 0.0376 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (83)$$

According to the dimensionality reduction strategy, it is considered in this example that only one component of $\hat{x}_1(t)$ is allowed to be transmitted to the FC at each time step. In this case, it is calculated from (54) that

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda_1 = \text{diag}\{\gamma_{11}, 1 - \gamma_{11}\}, W_1 = \text{diag}\{1 - \gamma_{11}, \gamma_{11}\} \\ V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \gamma_{11} \\ 1 - \gamma_{11} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, H_1 = \text{diag}\{\gamma_{11}, 1 - \gamma_{11}\} \end{cases} \quad (84)$$

where $0 \leq \gamma_{11} \leq 1$.

To demonstrate the advantage of the designed stability condition, it is assumed that there is no communication delay for this example, and the selection probability γ_{11} is taken as $\gamma_{11} = 0.5$. Then, by using LMI Toolbox in Matlab to solve the inequality matrix (75), one has

$$D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.3284 & 0.1730 & -0.0731 & -0.0395 \\ 0.1730 & 0.3727 & 0.0009 & -0.0782 \\ -0.0731 & 0.0009 & 1.0315 & -0.5204 \\ -0.0395 & -0.0782 & -0.5204 & 1.9647 \end{bmatrix},$$

while it is calculated from (81) and (84) that

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_{\max}(A^T(I_2 - H_1)A) = 1.5887 > 1 \\ \xi_{\infty,1} = \|(I_2 - H_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_1 \|(I_2 - H_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_{\infty} = 2.3625 > 1 \end{cases}$$

Therefore, it is concluded from Theorem 2 that the limit of $\text{Tr}\{\Xi_{11}(t)\}$ exists, however, the condition (74) derived by [26] and the condition (76) derived by [32] do not hold for this example. Moreover, when choosing γ_{11} from 0 to 1, the effectiveness of the conditions (75) and (76) is shown in Table I, Fig.3 and Fig.4. It can be seen from Fig.3 and Fig.4 that the sequence of $\text{Tr}\{\Xi_{11}(t)\}$ is convergent when $\gamma_{11} \in \{0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$. This result can be directly obtained by the judgement condition (75), however, the judgement condition (74) derived by [26] and the judgment condition (76) derived by [32] are invalid for the above cases. Therefore, the judgement condition (75) in this paper has much less conservatism than the result in [32], and thus is applicable to more fusion systems under the dimensionality reduction.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF THE RESULT IN THEOREM 2 AND THE RESULTS IN [26] AND [32]

γ_{11}	(75)	(76) derived by [32]	(74) derived by [26]
0	False	False	False
0.1	False	False	False
0.2	False	False	False
0.3	False	False	False
0.4	True	False	False
0.5	True	False	False
0.6	True	False	False
0.7	True	False	False
0.8	True	False	False
0.9	False	False	False
1.0	False	False	False

Example 2: Consider a CPS described by power grid with a 4-bus model for the distribution test feeders [45]. To monitor the work status of the grid, two sink nodes collect




Fig. 3. The estimation performances of the CSE (i.e., $\text{Tr}\{\Xi_{11}(t)\}$) with different selection probabilities γ_{11} .




Fig. 4. The estimation performances of the CSE (i.e., $\text{Tr}\{\Xi_{11}(t)\}$) with different selection probabilities γ_{11} .

their sensor measurements, and the local estimates computed by the sink nodes are transmitted to the FC (e.g., monitoring center or control center). According to the continuous-time smart grid system in [17], and setting the sampling time $T_0 = 10^{-4}$ s, the discretized system matrix in (1) is given by:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0156 & 0.0139 & 0.0457 & 0.0971 \\ -0.0353 & 0.9997 & -0.0008 & -0.0017 \\ -0.0526 & -0.0448 & 0.9625 & -0.0797 \\ -0.008 & -0.0505 & -0.0903 & 0.9011 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (85)$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(A) = 1.0441 > 1$ means that this 4-bus smart grid system is unstable, and the covariance of the process noise is taken as:

$$Q_w = \begin{bmatrix} 0.04 & 0.1 & 0.06 & 0.08 \\ 0.1 & 0.25 & 0.15 & 0.2 \\ 0.06 & 0.15 & 0.09 & 0.12 \\ 0.08 & 0.2 & 0.12 & 0.16 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (86)$$

Then, the measurement matrices in (2) are given by

$$C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (87)$$

which means that the measurement information on the fourth component of “ $x(t)$ ” cannot be obtained by the first sink node, while the measurement information on the second component of “ $x(t)$ ” cannot be obtained by the second sink node. The covariances of $v_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$)

in (2) are taken as $Q_{v_1} = \text{diag}\{0.9, 0.6, 0.9, 0.4\}$ and $Q_{v_2} = \text{diag}\{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.2\}$, respectively. Then it is calculated from (85–87) that $\text{rank}(\text{col}\{C_i, C_i A, C_i A^2, C_i A^3\}) = 4$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $\text{rank}([\sqrt{Q_w}, A\sqrt{Q_w}, A^2\sqrt{Q_w}, A^3\sqrt{Q_w}]) = 4$, which means that the condition (58) holds. Thus, the limits in (59) exist, and one has

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_{K_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7915 & -0.0778 & -0.1333 & 0.0886 \\ -0.3288 & 0.6887 & -0.4510 & 0.0035 \\ -0.1573 & -0.2237 & 0.6459 & -0.0659 \\ -0.2790 & -0.2490 & -0.4294 & 0.9001 \end{bmatrix} \\ \Phi_{K_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7324 & 0.025 & -0.0683 & -0.0919 \\ -0.6848 & 1.0244 & -0.2209 & -0.4579 \\ -0.4547 & -0.0287 & 0.5831 & -0.1738 \\ -0.5093 & -0.0291 & -0.3937 & 0.6284 \end{bmatrix} \end{cases} \cdot (88)$$




Fig. 5. The trajectories of the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$ and the state “ $x(t)$ ”.




Fig. 6. Comparison of estimation performance for the CSEs, DKFE and ODKFE.

For this example, according to the dimensionality reduction strategy, it is considered that only two components of $\hat{x}_i(t)$ are allowed to be transmitted to the FC for satisfying the finite bandwidth, and thus $r_1 = r_2 = 2$ and $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = 6$. In this case, the diagonal matrices $H_{h_i}^i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2; h_i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$) in (16) are given by

$$\begin{cases} H_1^i = \text{diag}\{1, 1, 0, 0\}, H_2^i = \text{diag}\{1, 0, 1, 0\} \\ H_3^i = \text{diag}\{1, 0, 0, 1\}, H_4^i = \text{diag}\{0, 1, 1, 0\} \\ H_5^i = \text{diag}\{0, 1, 0, 1\}, H_6^i = \text{diag}\{0, 0, 1, 1\} \end{cases} \cdot (89)$$

Then it follows from (16) and (89) that

$$H_i(t) = \text{diag}\{\sigma_1^i(t) + \sigma_2^i(t) + \sigma_3^i(t), \sigma_1^i(t) + \sigma_4^i(t) + \sigma_5^i(t), \sigma_2^i(t) + \sigma_4^i(t) + \sigma_6^i(t), \sigma_3^i(t) + \sigma_5^i(t) + \sigma_6^i(t)\}, \quad (90)$$

where $\sigma_{h_i}^i(t)$ ($h_i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$) are determined by (11–12), and each stochastic process $\{\sigma_{h_i}^i(t)\}$ obeys the categorical distribution. To determine the signal $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ (see (13)), the selection probabilities in (22) are taken as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \pi_1^1 = 0.3, \pi_2^1 = 0.2, \pi_3^1 = 0.1, \pi_4^1 = 0.1 \\ \pi_5^1 = 0.1, \pi_6^1 = 0.2, \pi_1^2 = 0.2, \pi_2^2 = 0.1 \\ \pi_3^2 = 0.2, \pi_4^2 = 0.1, \pi_5^2 = 0.3, \pi_6^2 = 0.1 \end{cases} \quad (91)$$

Thus, the selection probability matrices H_1 and H_2 (see (23)) are given by:

$$\begin{cases} H_1 = \text{diag}\{0.6, 0.5, 0.5, 0.4\} \\ H_2 = \text{diag}\{0.5, 0.6, 0.3, 0.6\} \end{cases} \quad (92)$$

When each selected ASC $\hat{x}_{s_i}(t)$ is transmitted to the FC, the communication delays are taken as $d_1 = 1$ and $d_2 = 2$. In this case, it is calculated from (85) and (92) that

$$\begin{cases} \rho(A(I_4 - H_1)A) = 0.5759 < 1 \\ \rho(A^2(I_4 - H_2)A) = 0.6631 < 1 \end{cases} \quad (93)$$

which means that the condition (77) holds in Theorem 3. Meanwhile, by using LMI Toolbox in Matlab, the variables D_i, X_i, Y_i, Z_i and S_i ($i = 1, 2$) are obtained by solving the matrix inequalities (71) and (72), i.e., the conditions (71–72) hold for the two local CSEs with different selection probabilities and communication delays. Under this case, it is concluded from Theorem 3 that the fusion estimation covariance matrix $P(t)$ for this example converges to a unique matrix, and the SDKFE exists. Then, implementing Algorithm 1 obtains the steady-state weighting matrices as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \Omega_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6254 & 0.0921 & 0.3294 & 0.044 \\ 0.0585 & 0.7874 & 0.2587 & 0.2107 \\ 0.1654 & 0.0271 & 0.6857 & 0.2670 \\ 0.0065 & 0.0765 & 0.2257 & 0.6729 \end{bmatrix} \\ \Omega_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3746 & -0.0921 & -0.3294 & -0.044 \\ -0.0585 & 0.2126 & -0.2587 & -0.2107 \\ -0.1654 & -0.0271 & 0.3143 & -0.2670 \\ -0.0065 & -0.0765 & -0.2257 & 0.3271 \end{bmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (94)$$

Thus, the SDKFE $\hat{x}_s(t)$ for this example is obtained by substituting (94) into (80). Notice that one also has by (85) and (92) that

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_{\infty,1} = \|A\|_1 \|(I_n - H_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_1 \\ \quad \times \|A\|_{\infty} \|(I_n - H_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_{\infty} = 0.8657 < 1 \\ \zeta_{\infty,2} = \|A^2\|_1 \|(I_n - H_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_1 \\ \quad \times \|A^2\|_{\infty} \|(I_n - H_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} A\|_{\infty} = 1.3554 > 1 \end{cases} \quad (95)$$

It is obvious that the judgement condition (74) derived by [26] is invalid for the second sink node in this example, which implies that the stability condition in this paper has less conservatism than the one in [26].

By using Algorithm 1, the trajectories of the DKFE “ $\hat{x}(t)$ ” and the state “ $x(t)$ ” are plotted in Fig.5, which shows that the designed DKFE is able to estimate the original state “ $x(t)$ ” well. Meanwhile, let $P_o(t)$ denote the original DKFE (ODKFE) under the dimensionality reduction when there are no communication delays between the sink nodes and the FC. Then, the estimation performances (assessed by the trace of the estimation error covariance matrix) of the local CSEs, DKFE and ODKFE are shown in Fig.6. It is seen from this figure that the estimation performance of the DKFE is better than that of each CSE at each time-step, which is in line with

the result (57). However, the estimation performance of the DKFE is worse than that of the ODKFE, which implies that the communication delays can affect the fusion estimation performance. Moreover, it is known from this figure that the MSEs of the DKFE and CSEs all converge to the steady-state values, which accords with the results (73) and (78).

To demonstrate the effectiveness of the SDKFE for this example, the matrix 2-norms of $P(t)$ and $\Omega_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are shown in Fig.7 under different initial values. It is seen from this figure that $\|P(t)\|_2$ and $\|\Omega_i(t)\|_2$ ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) can converge to the unique steady-state values under different initial values, which is in line with the result in Theorem 3. On the other hand, let $\text{Er}_i(t) \triangleq \hat{x}(i, t) - \hat{x}_s(i, t)$, where $\hat{x}(i, t)$ represents the i th component of the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$, and the meaning of $\hat{x}_s(i, t)$ is the same as that of $\hat{x}(i, t)$. Then, implementing Algorithms 1–2, the trajectories of $\text{Er}_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) are depicted in Fig.8, where the measurement sequences $\{y_i(t) (i = 1, 2)\}$ are the same when computing the DKFE $\hat{x}(t)$ and the SDKFE $\hat{x}_s(t)$. It is shown from this figure that the errors between the DKFE and SDKFE will converge to zero as t increases, which is in line with the property of the SDKFE. It should be pointed out that the SDKFE is much easier to implement as compared with the DKFE in practical applications.




Fig. 7. The trajectories of $\|P^i(t)\|_2$, $\|\Omega_1^i(t)\|_2$ and $\|\Omega_2^i(t)\|_2$ ($i = 1, 2$), where $P^i(t)$, $\Omega_1^i(t)$ and $\Omega_2^i(t)$ represents the covariance matrix $P(t)$ and the weighting matrices $\Omega_1(t)$, $\Omega_2(t)$ under different initial values for $i \neq j$.




Fig. 8. The trajectories of $\text{Er}_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

CPSs are being widely integrated in various critical infrastructures and running on wired or wireless communication

networks, however, bandwidth constraints and communication delays are usually unavoidable. State estimation plays an essential role in the monitoring and supervision of CPSs, and its importance has made the robustness and estimation performance a major concern. Therefore, to guarantee the satisfactory estimation performance in CPSs, the distributed dimensionality reduction fusion estimation problem with communication delays has been studied in this paper. Based on the stochastic dimensionality reduction strategy, a mathematical model was proposed to establish the relationship between the dimensionality reduction and communication delays, and then the recursive DKFE was obtained by resorting to the optimal weighted fusion criterion. A delay-dependent and probability-dependent condition, which can be easily judged by using Matlab LMI Toolbox, was derived for the DKFE such that the fusion estimation error covariance matrix $P(t)$ converges to a unique steady-state matrix. This result is very important to derive the SDKFE, and the computational complexity of the SDKFE is much lower than that of the DKFE. Meanwhile, when the communication delay d_i is known in advance, the selection probability criterion to determine the dimensionality reduction strategy has also been presented. Moreover, it has been shown that the stability condition in this paper has less conservatism than the existing ones. Finally, two examples were given to demonstrate the advantage and effectiveness of the proposed methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] P.Y. Chen, S.M. Cheng, K.C. Chen, Information fusion to defend intertional attack in internet of things, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 1, no. 4, 2014, pp. 337-348.
- [2] H.M. La, W. Sheng, Distributed sensor fusion for scalar field mapping using mobile sensor networks, *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 43, no. 2, 2013, pp. 766-778.
- [3] Y. Li, D.K. Jha, A. Ray, T.A. Wettergren, Information fusion of passive sensors for detection of moving targets in dynamic environments, *IEEE transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2016, pp. 93-104.
- [4] A. Miloslavov, M. Veeraraghavan, Sensor data fusion algorithms for vehicular cyber-physical systems, *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 23, no. 9, 2012, pp. 1762-1774.
- [5] X.R. Li, Y. Zhu, J. Wang, C. Han, Optimal linear estimation fusion-part I: unified fusion rules, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no.9, 2003, pp. 2192-2208.
- [6] J.A. Roecker, C.D. McGillen, Comparison of two-sensor tracking methods based on state vector fusion and measurement fusion, *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1988, pp. 447-449.
- [7] Y. Bar-Shalom, X.R. Li, T. Kirubarajan, *Estimation with applications to tracking and navigation*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2001.
- [8] N.A. Carlson, Federated square root filter for decentralized parallel processes, *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 26, no. 3, 1990, pp. 517-525.
- [9] S. Sun, Z. Deng, Multi-sensor optimal information fusion Kalman filter, *Automatica*, vol. 40, 2004, pp. 1017-1023.
- [10] Z. Deng, Y. Gao, L. Mao, Y. Li, G. Hao, New approach to information fusion steady-state Kalman filtering, *Automatica*, vol. 41, 2005, pp. 1695-1707.
- [11] Y. Wang, X.R. Li, Distributed estimation fusion with unavaliabe cross-correlation, *IEEE Transactoins on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 48, no.1, 2012, pp. 259-278.
- [12] E. Song, J. Xu, Y. Zhu, Optimal distributed Kalman filtering fusion with singular covariances of filtering errors and measurement noises, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, 2014, pp. 1271-1282.
- [13] B. Chen, G. Hu, D.W.C. Ho, W. Zhang, L. Yu, Distributed robust fusion estimation with application to state monitoring systems, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 47, no. 11, 2017, pp. 2994-3005.
- [14] K.H. Johansson, G.J. Pappas, P. Tabuada, C.J. Tomlin, Special issue on control of cyber-physical systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 12, 2014, pp. 3120-3121.
- [15] A. Gokhale, M. P.Mcdonald, A cyber physical systems perspective on the real-time and reliable dissemination of information in intelligent transportation systems, *Network Protocls and Algorithms*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2010, pp. 116-136.
- [16] J. Fink, A. Ribeiro, V. Kumar, Robust control for mobility and wireless communication in cyber-physical systems with application to robot teams, *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 100, no. 1, 2012, pp. 164-178.
- [17] H. Li, L. Lai, V. Poor, Multicast routing for decentralized control of cyber physical systems with an application in smart grid, *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communication*, vol. 30, 2012, pp. 1097-1107.
- [18] Y.F. Huang, S. Werner, J. Huang, N. Kashyap, V. Gupta, State estimation in electric power grids: meeting new challenges presented by requirements of the future grid, *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 29, no. 5, 2012, pp. 33-43.
- [19] X. Cao, P. Cheng, J. Chen, S.S. Ge, Y. Cheng, Y. Sun, Cognitive radio based state estimation in cyber-physical systems, *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communication*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2014, pp. 489-502.
- [20] S. Deshmukh, B. Natarajan, A. Pahwa, State estimation over a lossy network in spatially distributed cyber-physical systems, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 15, 2014, pp. 3911-3923.
- [21] Z. Zhang, C. Xia, S. Chen, T. Yang, Z. Chen, Reachability Analysis of Networked Finite State Machine With Communication Losses: A Switched Perspective, *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 38, no. 5, 2020, pp. 845-853.
- [22] B. Chen, G. Hu, W. Zhang, L. Yu, Information fusion estimation for spatially distributed cyber-physical systems with communication delay and bandwidth constraints, *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, Chicago, USA, 2015, pp. 5152-5157.
- [23] B. Chen, D.W.C. Ho, G. Hu, L. Yu, Secure fusion estimation for bandwidth constrained cyber-physical systems under replay attacks, *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 48, no. 6, 2018, pp. 1862-1876.
- [24] Z. Wang, Y. Niu, Distributed estimation and filtering for sensor networks, *International Journal of System Science: Speical Issue*, vol. 42, 2011, pp. 1421-1425.
- [25] B. Chen, W. Zhang, G. Hu, L. Yu, Networked fusion kalman filtering with multiple uncertainties, *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2015, pp. 2332-2349.
- [26] B. Chen, G. Hu, D.W.C. Ho, L. Yu, Distributed covariance intersection fusion estimation for cyber-physical systems with communication constraints, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 12, 2016, pp. 4020-4026.
- [27] S. Sun, H. Lin, J. Ma, X. Li, Multi-sensor distributed fusion estimation with applications in networked systems: a review paper, *Information Fusion*, vol. 38, 2012, pp. 122-134.
- [28] J.J. Xiao, A. Ribeiro, Z.Q. Luo, G.B. Giannakis, Distributed compression-estimation using wireless sensor networks, *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2006, pp. 27-41.
- [29] J. Fang, H. Li, Hyperplane-based vector quantization for distributed estimation in wireless sensor networks, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 12, 2009, pp. 5682-5699.
- [30] X. Shen, P. K.Varshney, Y. Zhu, Robust distributed maximum likelihood estimation with dependent quantized data, *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2014, pp. 169-174.
- [31] D. Li, S. Kar, F.E. Alsaadi, S. Cui, Distributed Kalman filtering with quantized sensing state, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 19, 2015, pp. 5180-5193.
- [32] B. Chen, W.A. Zhang, L. Yu, Distributed finite-horizon fusion Kalman filtering for bandwidth and energy constrained wireless sensor networks, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 4, 2014, pp.797-812.
- [33] H. Ma, Y.H. Yang, Y. Chen, K.J. Ray Liu, Q. Wang, Distributed state estimation with dimension reduction preprocessing, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 12, 2014, pp. 3098-3110.
- [34] B. Chen, W.A. Zhang, L. Yu, G. Hu, H. Song, Distributed fusion estimation with communication bandwidth constraints, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 5, 2015, pp. 1398-1403.
- [35] I. D. Schizas, G. B. Giannkis, Z.Q. Luo, Distributed estimation using reduced-dimensionlaity sensor observations, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 55, no. 8, 2007, pp. 4284-4299.
- [36] B. Chen, G. Hu, W. Zhang, L. Yu, Distributed mixed H_2/H_∞ fusion estimation with limited communication capacity, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 3, 2016, pp. 805-810.
- [37] A. Chiuso, L. Schenato, Information fusion strategies and performance bounds in packet-drop networks, *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 7, 2011, pp. 1304-1316.
- [38] J. Ma, S. Sun, Centralized fusion estimators for multisensor systems with random sensor delays, multiple packet dropouts and uncertain observations, *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 13, 2013, pp. 1228-1235.
- [39] Y. Xia, J. Shang, J. Chen, G.P. Liu, Networked data fusion with packet losses and variable delays, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics-Part B: Cybernetics*, vol. 39, no. 5, 2009, pp. 1107-1120.
- [40] B. Chen, W.A. Zhang, L. Yu, Distributed fusion estimation with missing measurements, random transmission delays and packet dropouts, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 7, 2014, pp. 1961-1967.

- [41] R. Caballero-Aguila, A. Hermoso-Carazo, J. Linares-Perez, Fusion estimation using measured outputs with random parameter matrices subject to random delays and packet dropouts, *Signal Processing*, vol. 127, 2016, pp. 12-23.
- [42] Z. Xing, Y. Xia, Distributed federated kalman filter fusion over multi-sensor unreliable networked systems, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, vol. 63, no. 10, 2016, pp. 1714-1725.
- [43] Y. S. Lee, W. H. Kwon, Delay-dependent robust stabilization of uncertain discrete-time state-delayed systems, *Proceedings of the 15th IFAC World Congress*, Barcelona, Spain, 2002, pp. 610-615.
- [44] S.P. Boyd, L.E. Ghaoui, E. Feron, V. Balakrishnan, *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1994.
- [45] IEEE PES Distribution System Analysis Subcommittee, *Distributed Test Feeders: 4-Bus Test Feeder Cases*, [Online], Available: <http://ewh.ieee.org/soc/pes/dsacom/testfeeders/index.html>

APPENDIX

A.1: The proof of Lemma 2

Proof: It follows from (1) and (5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_i(t) &= \Phi_{K_i}(t)\tilde{x}_i(t-1) \\ &\quad + G_{K_i}(t)w(t-1) - K_i(t)v_i(t) \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

For $t_1 \geq t_2$, it is derived from (96) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_i(t_1) &= \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{t_1-t_2-1} \Phi_{K_i}(t_1-\varphi_i) \right) \tilde{x}_i(t_2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\alpha_i=1}^{t_1-t_2} \left\{ \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{\alpha_i-2} \Phi_{K_i}(t_1-\varphi_i) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \quad \times G_{K_i}(t_1-\alpha_i+1)w(t_1-\alpha_i) \left. \right\} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\alpha_i=0}^{t_1-t_2-1} \left\{ \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{\alpha_i-1} \Phi_{K_i}(t_1-\varphi_i) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \quad \times K_i(t_1-\alpha_i)v_i(t_1-\alpha_i) \left. \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

On the other hand, it is concluded from (3) and the geometric meaning of $\tilde{x}_i(t)$ that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{x}_i(t_1) \perp w(t_2) (t_2 \geq t_1) \\ \tilde{x}_i(t_1) \perp v_i(t_2) (t_2 > t_1) \\ \tilde{x}_i(t_1) \perp v_j(t_2) (i \neq j, \forall t_1, t_2) \\ w(t_1) \perp v_i(t_2) (\forall i, t_1, t_2) \end{cases} \quad (98)$$

One has by (34) that $C_o(t_1, t_2 - 1) = 1$ for $t_1 \geq t_2$, and thus the results (36)-(37) are obtained by (97) and (98). Moreover, the result (38) is directly obtained by the definitions of $\Phi_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2)$ and $\Phi_{x_i}^F(t_1, g, t_2)$ in (35), while the result (39) is obtained from (3) and (26). ■

A.2: The proof of Lemma 3

Proof: Let us define

$$\begin{cases} H_{Ad_i}(t) \triangleq A^{d_i} [I_n - H_i(t - d_i)] A \\ H_{d_i}(t) \triangleq A^{d_i} H_i(t - d_i), \bar{H}_{Ad_i}(t) = A^{d_i} - H_{d_i}(t) \end{cases} \quad (99)$$

For $t_1 \geq t_2$, it follows from (25) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_i^c(t_1) &= \sum_{h=0}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)-1} \{ H_{d_i}(f_i^h(t_1)) \tilde{x}_i(f_{i_o}^h(t_1) - d_i) \\ &\quad + \prod_{\mu=0}^{h-1} H_{Ad_i}(f_{i_o}^\mu(t_1)) \bar{H}_{Ad_i}(f_{i_o}^h(t_1)) w(f_{i_o}^{h+1}(t_1)) \} \\ &\quad + \sum_{h=1}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)-1} \{ H_{Ad_i}(f_{i_o}^{h-1}(t_1)) F_w(d_i, f_{i_o}^h(t_1)) \} \\ &\quad + \prod_{\mu=0}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)-1} H_{Ad_i}(f_{i_o}^\mu(t_1)) \tilde{x}_i^c(f_{i_o}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)}(t_1)) \\ &\quad + (1 - \delta_{t_1, t_2}) F_w(d_i, f_{i_o}^0(t_1)) \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

where $f_i(t)$ and $\chi_i(t_1, t_2)$ are defined in (40). Notice that

$$f_{i_o}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)}(t_1) < f_{i_o}^{\chi_i(t_1, t_2)-1}(t_1) < \dots < f_{i_o}^0(t_1) \quad (101)$$

Then taking the statistical property of $\gamma_\ell^i(t)$ into account yields:

$$E \left\{ \left(\prod_{\mu=0}^{h-1} H_{Ad_i}(f_{i_o}^\mu(t_1)) \bar{H}_{Ad_i}(f_{i_o}^h(t_1)) \right) \right\} = H_{Ad_i}^h \bar{H}_{Ad_i} \quad (102)$$

where H_{Ad_i} and \bar{H}_{Ad_i} are given by (43). Moreover, it is concluded from (3), (25) and (98) that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{x}_i^c(t_1) \perp w(t_2) (t_2 \geq t_1 - d_1) \\ \tilde{x}_i^c(t_1) \perp v_i(t_2) (t_2 > t_1 - d_1) \\ \tilde{x}_i^c(t_1) \perp v_j(t_2) (i \neq j, \forall t_1, t_2) \end{cases} \quad (103)$$

Thus, the result (41) is derived from (100-103). On the other hand, (42) is directly obtained from the definitions of $\Theta_{x_i}^w(t_1, t_2)$ and $F_w(g, t)$. ■

A.3: The proof of Lemma 4

Proof: It follows from (97) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_i(t) &= \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{d_j} \Phi_{K_i}(t - \varphi_i) \right) \tilde{x}_i(t - d_j - 1) + \sum_{\alpha_i=1}^{d_j+1} \\ &\quad \left\{ \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{\alpha_i-2} \Phi_{K_i}(t - \varphi_i) \right) G_{K_i}(t - \alpha_i + 1) w(t - \alpha_i) \right\} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\alpha_i=0}^{d_j} \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{\alpha_i-1} \Phi_{K_i}(t - \varphi_i) \right) K_i(t - \alpha_i) v_i(t - \alpha_i) \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

Then one has by (103) and (104) that

$$\begin{aligned} E\{\tilde{x}_i(t)[\tilde{x}_i^c(t - d_j - 1)]^T\} \\ = \left(\prod_{\varphi_j=0}^{d_j} \Phi_{K_i}(t - \varphi_i) \right) \Gamma_{ij}(t - d_j - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Meanwhile, it follows from (25) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ij}(t) &= E\{\tilde{x}_i(t)[\tilde{x}_j^c(t - d_i - 1)]^T\} H_{Ad_j}^T \\ &\quad + E\{\tilde{x}_i(t)\tilde{x}_j^T(t - d_j)\} H_{d_j}^T + E\{\tilde{x}_i(t)F_w^T(d_j, t)\} \\ &\quad + E\{\tilde{x}_i(t)w^T(t - d_j - 1)\} \bar{H}_{Ad_j}^T \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

Therefore, the result (45) is derived from (105-106) and Lemma 2. Meanwhile, according to (97), (46) can be derived from the similar derivation of (45). ■

A.4: The proof of Lemma 5

Proof: (48) can be derived from (105). On the other hand, it follows from (25) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_j^c(t - d_j - 1) &= \tilde{x}_j^c(f_j(t)) \\ &= \sum_{\kappa=1}^{\eta_{ij}-1} \left\{ \left(\prod_{v=1}^{\kappa-1} H_{Ad_j}(f_{j_o}^v(t)) \right) H_{d_j}(f_{j_o}^\kappa(t)) \right. \\ &\quad \times \tilde{x}_j(f_{j_o}^\kappa(t) - d_j) \left. \right\} + \sum_{\kappa=1}^{\eta_{ij}-1} \left\{ \left(\prod_{v=1}^{\kappa-1} H_{Ad_j}(f_{j_o}^v(t)) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \times \bar{H}_{Ad_j}(f_{j_o}^\kappa(t)) w(f_{j_o}^{\kappa+1}(t)) \left. \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\kappa=1}^{\eta_{ij}-1} \left(\prod_{v=1}^{\kappa-1} H_{Ad_j}(f_{j_o}^v(t)) \right) F_w(d_j, f_{j_o}^\kappa(t)) \\ &\quad + \left(\prod_{\kappa=1}^{\eta_{ij}-1} H_{Ad_j}(f_{j_o}^\kappa(t)) \right) \tilde{x}_j^c(f_{j_o}^{\eta_{ij}}(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

where $H_{d_j}(t)$, $H_{Ad_j}(t)$ and $\bar{H}_{Ad_j}(t)$ are defined in (99). Meanwhile, it follows from the similar derivation of (105) that

$$\begin{aligned} E\{\tilde{x}_i(t - d_i)[\tilde{x}_j^c(f_{j_o}^{\eta_{ij}}(t))]^T\} \\ = \left(\prod_{\varphi_i=0}^{\eta_{ij}(d_j+1)-1-d_i} \Phi_{K_i}(t - d_i - \varphi_i) \right) \Gamma_{ij}(f_{j_o}^{\eta_{ij}}(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

Therefore, (49) is obtained from (102), (107), (108) and Lemma 2. ■

A.5: The proof of Lemma 6

Proof: To establish the relationship between $\Upsilon_{ij}(t)$ and $\Xi_{ij}(t)$, the least common multiple of $d_i + 1$ and $d_j + 1$ is introduced, and thus one has

$$f_{i_o}^{\tau_{d_i}}(t) = f_{i_o}^{\tau_{d_j}}(t) = t - \tau_{ij} \quad (109)$$

where $f_i(t)$ is defined in (40). On the other hand, for $i \neq j$, it is concluded from the statistical property of $H_i(t)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{ij}(t) &= E\{\tilde{x}_i^c(f_i(t))[\tilde{x}_j^c(f_j(t))]^T\} \\ &= E\{\tilde{x}_i^c(f_i(t))[\tilde{x}_j^c(f_j(t))]^T\} \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_i^c(f_i(t)) &= \sum_{\kappa=1}^{\tau_{d_i}-1} H_{\text{Ad}_i}^{\kappa-1} H_{d_i} \bar{x}_i(f_{i0}^{\kappa}(t) - d_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\kappa=1}^{\tau_{d_i}-1} H_{\text{Ad}_i}^{\kappa-1} \bar{H}_{\text{Ad}_i} w(f_{i0}^{\kappa+1}(t)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\kappa=1}^{\tau_{d_i}-1} H_{\text{Ad}_i}^{\kappa-1} F_w(d_i, f_{i0}^{\kappa}(t)) \\ &\quad + H_{\text{Ad}_i}^{\tau_{d_i}-1} \bar{x}_i^c(t - \tau_{ij}) \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

Notice that when $\tau_{d_i} = 1$, $\bar{x}_i^c(f_i(t)) = \bar{x}_i^c(t - \tau_{ij})$. Then, (111) can be written as:

$$\bar{x}_i^c(f_i(t)) = (1 - \delta_{1, \tau_{d_i}}) \Sigma_i \bar{x}_{f_i}^w(t) + H_{\text{Ad}_i}^{\tau_{d_i}-1} \bar{x}_i^c(t - \tau_{ij}) \quad (112)$$

where $\bar{x}_{f_i}^w(t)$ and Σ_i are given by (51) and (53), respectively. Therefore, (52) is derived from (110) and (112). ■

A.6: The proof of Theorem 1

Proof: It is concluded from (3), (98) and (103) that

$$\bar{x}_i(t - d_i) \perp F_w(d_i, t), \bar{x}_i^c(t - d_i) \perp F_w(d_i, t) \quad (113)$$

where $F_w(d_i, t)$ is defined by (26). Notice that

$$\begin{cases} \text{E}\{\bar{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1) \bar{x}_i^T(t - d_i)\} = \Psi_{ii}^T(t) \\ \text{E}\{[I_n - H_i(t)] \odot H_i(t)\} = V_i^T \end{cases} \quad (114)$$

Then, (55) is derived from Lemma 1, (25), (98), (103), (45), (48) and (113–114). On the other hand, (25) is rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_i^c(t) &= H_{d_i}(t) \bar{x}_i(t - d_i) + H_{\text{Ad}_i}(t) \bar{x}_i^c(t - d_i - 1) \\ &\quad + \bar{H}_{\text{Ad}_i}(t) w(t - d_i - 1) + F_w(d_i, t) \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

where $H_{d_i}(t)$, $H_{\text{Ad}_i}(t)$ and $\bar{H}_{\text{Ad}_i}(t)$ are defined in (99). Meanwhile, for $i \neq j$, one has by (16) and (21) that

$$\text{E}\{H_i(t) H_j(t)\} = \text{E}\{H_i(t)\} \text{E}\{H_j(t)\} \quad (116)$$

Moreover, it is derived from (3) and (26) that

$$\begin{cases} \text{E}\{w_i(t - d_i - 1) F_w^T(d_j, t)\} C_o(d_j, d_i) Q_w(A^{d_i})^T \\ \text{E}\{F_w(d_i, t) F_w^T(d_j, t)\} = \sum_{\theta=1}^{\min\{d_i, d_j\}} A^\theta Q_w(A^\theta)^T \end{cases} \quad (117)$$

where $C_o(d_j, d_i)$ is determined by (34). Therefore, (56) is derived from (115–117) and the results in Lemmas 2–6. Furthermore, at a particular time, the optimal fusion estimation error covariance matrix of (28) can be calculated by (32), while each local estimation error covariance matrix of (15) is calculated by (55), then (57) is obtained from the results in [9], [10]. ■

A.7: The proof of Theorem 2

Proof: Consider the following stochastic system:

$$\xi_i(t + 1) = A_i(t) \xi_i(t - d_i), \quad (118)$$

where $A_i(t)$ is defined by (66). Define $\eta_i(t) \triangleq \xi_i(t) - \xi_i(t - 1)$. Then, one chooses a Lyapunov function candidate for the system (118) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\xi_i}(t) &= \text{E}\{\xi_i^T(t) D_i \xi_i(t)\} + \sum_{\kappa=t-d_i}^{t-1} \text{E}\{\xi_i^T(\kappa) S_i \xi_i(\kappa)\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\beta_i=-d_i}^{-1} \sum_{\kappa=t+\beta_i+1}^t \text{E}\{\eta_i^T(\kappa) Z_i \eta_i(\kappa)\} \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

Notice that

$$\begin{cases} \xi_i(t - d_i) = \xi_i(t) - \sum_{\kappa=t-d_i+1}^t \eta_i(\kappa) \\ \xi_i(t + 1) = A_i(t) \xi_i(t) - A_i(t) \sum_{\kappa=t-d_i+1}^t \eta_i(\kappa) \end{cases} \quad (120)$$

From the similar derivation of Theorem 1 in [43], it can be derived from (118–120) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V_{\xi_i}(t) &= V_{\xi_i}(t + 1) - V_{\xi_i}(t) \\ &\leq \xi_i^T(t) \{-D_i + X_i + Y_i^T + Y_i + d_i Z_i \\ &\quad + S_i\} \xi_i(t) + \xi_i^T(t - d_i) \text{E}\{A_i^T(t) D_i A_i(t) \\ &\quad + d_i \text{E}\{A_i^T(t) Z_i A_i(t)\} - S_i\} \xi_i(t - d_i) \\ &\quad + \xi_i^T(t) \{-Y_i - d_i Z_i \text{E}\{A_i(t)\}\} \xi_i(t - d_i) \\ &\quad + \xi_i^T(t - d_i) \{-Y_i^T - d_i \text{E}\{A_i^T(t)\} Z_i\} \xi_i(t), \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

where X_i , Y_i and Z_i are required to satisfy (71). Under this case, according to Lyapunov stability theory (see [44]: p.131), when the condition (72) holds, the system (118) is mean-square stable. This means that the state covariance matrix $\Xi_{\xi_i}(t) \triangleq \text{E}\{\xi_i(t) \xi_i^T(t)\}$ of (118) converges to zero under the conditions (71) and (72) (i.e., $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Xi_{\xi_i}(t) = 0$), where

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{\xi_i}(t + 1) &= \text{E}\{A_i(t) \xi_i(t - d_i) \xi_i^T(t - d_i) A_i^T(t)\} \\ &= f(\Xi_{\xi_i}(t - d_i)). \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

On the other hand, one has by (16), (21), (98), (103) that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\xi}_i(t - d_i) \perp \zeta_i(t) \\ \text{E}\{A_i(t) \tilde{\xi}_i(t - d_i) \tilde{\xi}_i^T(t - d_i) A_i^T(t)\} = f(\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - d_i)) \end{cases}, \quad (123)$$

where $\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) = \text{E}\{\tilde{\xi}_i(t) \tilde{\xi}_i^T(t)\}$. Then, it follows from (65) and (123) that

$$\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t + 1) = f(\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - d_i)) + Q_{\zeta_i}, \quad (124)$$

where $Q_{\zeta_i} = \text{E}\{\zeta_i(t) \zeta_i^T(t)\}$, and $f(\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - d_i))$ is calculated by (68) in Lemma 7. In what follows, we will prove that, under the conditions (71–72), the sequence $\{\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t)\}$ obtained from (124) is convergent, and the limit is independent of the initial values.

Define $\Delta \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) \triangleq \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) - \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - 1)$. Then, it is derived from (124) that

$$\Delta \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t + 1) = f(\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - d_i)) - f(\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - d_i - 1)). \quad (125)$$

Combining (70) in Lemma 7 yields that

$$\Delta \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t + 1) = f(\Delta \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - d_i)). \quad (126)$$

Notice that the recursive form of (126) is the same as that of (122), thus one has $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) = 0$, which leads to

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) = \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}. \quad (127)$$

For the recursive equation (124), let $\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}^1$ and $\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}^2(t)$ denote any matrices with different initial conditions, and define $\hat{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) \triangleq \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}^1(t) - \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}^2(t)$. In this case, it is derived from (124) and (126) that $\hat{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t + 1) = f(\hat{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t - d_i))$, whose recursive form is similar to (122). Then, it is concluded that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) = 0$, which implies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}^1(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}^2(t), \quad (128)$$

i.e., the limit $\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}$ in (127) is unique. Moreover, for $t > N_{P_i}$, it follows from the definition of $\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t)$ that

$$\tilde{\Xi}_{\xi_i}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{ii}(t) & \Gamma_{ii}^T(t) \\ \Gamma_{ii}(t) & P_{ii}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (129)$$

where P_{ii} is given by (59), while $\Gamma_{ii}(t), \Xi_{ii}(t)$ are calculated by (45) and (55). In this case, it can be concluded from (127–129) that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Xi_{ii}(t) = \Xi_{ii}$, and the limit Ξ_{ii} is independent of the initial values. ■

A.8: The proof of Theorem 3

Proof: When the CPSs (1–2) satisfy the condition (58), it is concluded from the result in [10] that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P_{ij}(t) = P_{ij}, \quad (130)$$

where $P_{ij}(t)$ is calculated by (8), and the limit P_{ij} is independent of the initial values. Then, it follows from Lemmas 2–3, (59) and (130) that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t, t - \varepsilon) = \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(\varepsilon) \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{x_i}^F(t, g, t - \varepsilon) = \Phi_{x_i}^F(\varepsilon) \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{x_i}^w(t, t - \varepsilon) = \Phi_{x_i}^w(\varepsilon) \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_{x_i}^w(t, t - \varepsilon) = \Theta_{x_i}^w(\varepsilon) \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_{x_i}^F(t, g, t - \varepsilon) = \Theta_{x_i}^F(\varepsilon) \end{array} \right., \quad (131)$$

where these limits are independent of the initial values.

Define $\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}(t) \triangleq \Phi_{x_i}^{x_j}(t, t - d_j)H_{d_j}^T + \Phi_{x_i}^F(t, d_j, t) + \Phi_{x_i}^w(t, t - d_j - 1)\bar{H}_{Ad_j}^T$. Then, one has by (59) and (131) that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{\varphi_j=0}^{d_j} \Phi_{K_i}(t - \varphi_j) \right) = \Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1} \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}(t) = \hat{\Gamma}_{ij} \end{array} \right., \quad (132)$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}$ is independent of the initial values. Thus, there must exist an integer $N_{\Gamma_i} (> N_{P_i})$ such that, for $t > N_{\Gamma_i}$, (45) reduces to:

$$\Gamma_{ij}(t) = \Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1} \Gamma_{ij}(t - d_j - 1)H_{Ad_j}^T + \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}, \quad (133)$$

where H_{Ad_j} is defined by (43). In this case, it follows from (133) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ij}(t) &= [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1}]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0} \Gamma_{ij}(f_{j_0}^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0}(t)) [H_{Ad_j}^T]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\kappa=0}^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0-1} [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1}]^{\kappa} \hat{\Gamma}_{ij} [H_{Ad_j}^T]^{\kappa}, \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

where $f_j(t)$ is defined in (40), and the variable \bar{h}_0 is determined by:

$$\bar{h}_0 = \min\{\bar{h}^* | f_{j_0}^{\bar{h}^*}(t) - N_{\Gamma_i} \geq 0\}, \quad (135)$$

which implies that $t \rightarrow \infty \Leftrightarrow \bar{h} \rightarrow \infty$. Meanwhile, it is known from (59) and (77) that Φ_{K_i} and H_{Ad_j} are stable matrices, which means that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{K_i}^t = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} H_{Ad_j}^t = 0. \quad (136)$$

Then, it is concluded from (135) and (136) that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1}]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0} \Gamma_{ij}(f_{j_0}^{\bar{h}_0}(t)) [H_{Ad_j}^T]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0} = 0 \\ \lim_{\bar{h} \rightarrow \infty} [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1}]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0-1} \hat{\Gamma}_{ij} [H_{Ad_j}^T]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0-1} = 0 \end{array} \right. . \quad (137)$$

Therefore, one has by (134) and (137) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{ij}(t) = \Gamma_{ij}. \quad (138)$$

Let $\Gamma_{ij}^1(t) = \Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1} \Gamma_{ij}^1(t - d_j - 1)H_{Ad_j}^T + \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}$ and $\Gamma_{ij}^2(t) = \Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1} \Gamma_{ij}^2(t - d_j - 1)H_{Ad_j}^T + \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}$, where $\Gamma_{ij}^1(t - d_j - 1)$ and $\Gamma_{ij}^2(t - d_j - 1)$ denote the different initial values. Then, it is known from (138) that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{ij}^1(t) = \Gamma_{ij}^1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{ij}^2(t) = \Gamma_{ij}^2$. Meanwhile, defining $\Delta\Gamma_{ij}(t) \triangleq \Gamma_{ij}^1(t) - \Gamma_{ij}^2(t)$ yields that $\Delta\Gamma_{ij}(t) = [\Phi_{K_i}^{d_j+1}]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0} \Delta\Gamma_{ij}(f_{j_0}^{\bar{h}_0}(t)) [H_{Ad_j}^T]^{\bar{h}-\bar{h}_0}$, and thus it follows from (137) that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta\Gamma_{ij}(t) = 0$, i.e.,

$$\Gamma_{ij}^1 = \Gamma_{ij}^2. \quad (139)$$

This implies that the limit Γ_{ij} in (138) is independent of the initial values.

According to the computation formulas of $\Psi_{ij}(t)$ and $\hat{\Upsilon}_{ij}(t)$, it is obtained from (131) and (138) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{ij}(t) = \Psi_{ij}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Upsilon}_{ij}(t) = \hat{\Upsilon}_{ij}, \quad (140)$$

where Ψ_{ij} and $\hat{\Upsilon}_{ij}$ are independent of the initial values. Then, combining (131) and (140) yields that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Xi}_{ij}(t) = \hat{\Xi}_{ij}, \quad (141)$$

where $\hat{\Xi}_{ij}$ is independent of the initial values. Moreover, from (141), there must exist an integer $N_{\Xi_i} (> N_{\Gamma_i})$ such that $\Xi_{ij}(t)$ (56) reduces to:

$$\Xi_{ij}(t) = H_{Ad_i}^{\tau_{d_i}} \Xi_{ij}(t - \tau_{ij}) [H_{Ad_j}^{\tau_{d_j}}]^T + \hat{\Xi}_{ij} \quad (t > N_{\Xi_i}). \quad (142)$$

When the condition (77) holds, H_{Ad_i} and H_{Ad_j} in (142) are stable matrices. In this case, the form of (142) is the same as that of (133), and thus it is obtained from the similar derivation of (138–139) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Xi_{ij}(t) = \Xi_{ij}, \quad (143)$$

and Ξ_{ij} is independent of the initial values.

Therefore, when the conditions (71), (72) and (77) hold, the result (78) can be obtained from (73) and (143). Moreover, the steady-state weighted matrices (79) can be derived from (31), the definition of $\Xi(t)$ (see (33)) and (78). Notice that the results (78) and (79) have shown that the designed DKFE is independent of the initial values, the SDKFE (80) can be thus obtained. ■