

# Asymptotic tracking control of dynamic reference over homomorphically encrypted data with finite modulus <sup>★</sup>

Shuai Feng<sup>a</sup>, Junsoo Kim<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Automation, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing 210094, China*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Electrical and Information Engineering, Seoul National University of Science and Technology, Korea*

---

## Abstract

This paper considers a tracking control problem, in which the dynamic controller is encrypted with an additively homomorphic encryption scheme and the output of a process tracks a dynamic reference asymptotically. Our paper is motivated by the following problem: When dealing with both asymptotic tracking and dynamic reference, we find that the control input is generally subject to overflow issues under a finite modulus, though the dynamic controller consists of only integer coefficients. First, we provide a new controller design method such that the coefficients of the tracking controller can be transformed into integers leveraging the zooming-in factor of dynamic quantization. By the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, we represent the control input as linear combination of the previous control inputs. Leveraging the property above, we design an algorithm on the actuator side such that it can restore the control input from the lower bits under a finite modulus. A lower bound of the modulus is also provided. As an extension of the first result, we further solve the problem of unbounded internal state taking place in the actuator. In particular, the actuator can restore the correct control input under the same modulus. A simulation example is provided to verify the control schemes proposed in our paper.

---

## 1 Introduction

The recent decade has witnessed revolutions in communication and computation technologies. Leveraging 5G/Wifi 6, edge and cloud computation to name a few, cyber physical systems (CPSs) can improve the performance and meanwhile even reduce the budget. In general, cloud computing service is outsourced to a third party. Therefore, the challenges of protecting the confidentiality of the CPSs' data operated in the cloud computing centers arise [1–3].

Homomorphic encryption (HE) is promising in simultaneously allowing for data operation and securing its confidentiality during cloud computing processes. To be specific, the computation can be directly performed over encrypted data without decryption. After the initial attempt of applying HE to control systems [4], various HE-based algorithms have been established to deal with networked control [5], encrypted MPC [6], secured consensus [7], cloud-based optimization [8], state estimation [9] and formation control [10] to name a few.

The overflow problem, in which the controller's state/control input exceeds the modulus of a cryptosystem (the size of the message space), is one of the most critical problems when applying HE to dynamic control systems. Therefore,

the overflow issue in HE-based control has attracted substantial attention, and the representative solutions such as re-encryption [4], state reset [11] and controller having only integer coefficients [12, 13] have been proposed. By exploiting observability and re-encryption, the recent paper [14] proposes a framework such that any dynamic controller can be transformed into a comparable form consisting of only integer coefficients. The comparable dynamic controller can prevent overflow and operate for infinite horizon without resetting and bootstrapping.

In [15], the authors propose a HE-based control scheme to realize asymptotic stabilization given a constant reference signal. When applying the algorithm in [15] to deal with tracking control, we find the following issues (see Section 2.3):

- 1) Overflow will occur in general, under a finite modulus, when one deals with *asymptotic* tracking and a *dynamic* reference.
- 2) Overflow does not occur under a finite modulus, when one aims at achieving practical tracking of a dynamic reference.
- 3) Overflow does not occur under a finite modulus, when one deals with asymptotic tracking of a constant reference.

The result in [12] suggests that a controller with integer coefficients can solve the overflow problem caused by the multiplication between controller's state and non-integer numbers. However, even when the "original controller" has integer coefficients as suggested in [12], the overflow problem in 1) cannot be fixed. This is because the control input is

---

<sup>★</sup> Corresponding author: Junsoo Kim. The material in this paper was not presented at any conference.

*Email addresses:* s.feng@njust.edu.cn (Shuai Feng), junsookim@seoultech.ac.kr (Junsoo Kim).

also amplified by the scaling factor in the dynamic quantization mechanism. If overflow occurs, it will be difficult for the actuator to restore the correct control input. In an ideal case, if the cryptosystem is allowed to have an unlimited modulus, i.e., the size of the message space is infinitely large, there is no overflow issue. However, in practice, the modulus is limited.

This paper aims to solve a tracking control problem by HE with a finite modulus, in which the output of a process should track a dynamic reference, asymptotically. First, we provide a conventional controller to realize quantized asymptotic tracking control by the results in output regulation/tracking [16, 17] and dynamic quantization [15, 18–20], in which the controller coefficients are not necessarily integers. To make the controller have all integer coefficients, instead of using matrix conversion [14], we use the zooming-in factor in dynamic quantization to scale controller parameters into integers. By such a method, re-encryption that was utilized in [4, 14] is not required in this work. Leveraging the Cayley–Hamilton theorem [21], we represent the control input as a linear combination of previous control inputs. By doing so, on the actuator side, we design an algorithm such that the actuator can restore the control input from the lower bits, taking advantage of the previous control inputs stored in the actuator’s memory. Importantly, this work provides an explicit lower bound of the modulus. Although a finite modulus is chosen and unchanged with time, it will be shown that asymptotic tracking of a dynamic reference can be achieved without the overflow problem.

By extending the first result, in the second part of the paper, we briefly address the problem of unbounded internal state that exists in [15] and also in the first control scheme of our paper. It refers to the following issue: the actuator needs to generate an internal integer state, whose norm will grow to the infinity. To solve this problem, instead of directly transmitting the cipher control input as in the first control scheme, the controller transmits a linear combination of current and previous cipher control inputs. In particular, for restoring the correct control input, the cryptosystem requires the same modulus as that in the first control scheme.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the overflow issue in asymptotic tracking of a dynamic reference under HE, and the control objectives. Section 3 presents the main result and its extension solving the problem of unbounded internal state. A numerical example is presented in Section 4, and finally Section 5 ends the paper with conclusions.

**Notation.** We let  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}$  denote the sets of real, rational and integer numbers, respectively. For  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $\lfloor b \rfloor$  be the floor function such that  $\lfloor b \rfloor = \max\{c \in \mathbb{Z} \mid c \leq b\}$ . We let  $I_n$  denote the identity matrix with dimension  $n$  and  $\mathbf{0} := [0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0]^T$ . Let  $\chi \in \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar before quantization and  $q_t(\cdot)$  be the quantization function such that  $q_t(\chi) = \psi$  if  $(2\psi - 1)/2 \leq \chi < (2\psi + 1)/2$ , and  $q_t(\chi) = -q_t(-\chi)$  if  $\chi \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ , where  $\psi = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ .

The vector version of the quantization function is defined as  $Q(x) := [q_t(x_1) \ q_t(x_2) \ \dots \ q_t(x_n)]^T \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , where  $x = [x_1 \ x_2 \ \dots \ x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . For a vector  $x$  and a matrix  $\Omega$ , let  $\|x\|$  and  $\|x\|_\infty$  denote the 2- and  $\infty$ -norms of  $x$ , respectively, and  $\|\Omega\|$  and  $\|\Omega\|_\infty$  represent the corresponding induced norms of matrix  $\Omega$ . Moreover,  $\rho(\Omega)$  denotes the spectral radius of  $\Omega$ . Let  $\mathbf{0}$  denote a vector with only zero elements in a compatible size. For  $g \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $q \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , the modulo operation is defined by  $g \bmod q := g - \lfloor \frac{g}{q} \rfloor q$ . The set of integers modulo  $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{Z}_q = \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}$ . For a vector  $v = [v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_n] \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ ,  $v \bmod q$  denotes the element-wise modulo operation such that  $v \bmod q = [v_1 \bmod q \ v_2 \bmod q \ \dots \ v_n \bmod q]^T$ . In this paper, by an “integer matrix” and an “integer vector”, they refer to a matrix and a vector, respectively, whose elements are all integers. Any integer vector  $v$  can be written as  $v = v_1 q + v \bmod q$  in which  $v_1$  is some integer vector having the same dimension of  $v$  and  $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In our paper, we abuse the notations “higher bits” and “lower bits” such that the “higher bits” refers to  $v_1$  and the “lower bits” refers to  $v \bmod q$ .

## 2 Problem formulation

### 2.1 Preliminaries of additively homomorphic encryption

There are two types of partially homomorphic encryption schemes, additively and multiplicatively homomorphic encryptions. For example, the Paillier and the ElGamal cryptosystems are well-known additively and multiplicatively homomorphic encryption algorithms, respectively [22, 23].

In our paper, we apply additively homomorphic encryption to secure the control systems. In an additively homomorphic encryption scheme, the spaces of plaintexts and ciphertexts are  $\mathbb{Z}_q^n$  and  $\mathcal{C}^n$ , respectively. For a vector in  $\mathbb{Z}_q^n$ , its encryption and decryption processes are given by  $\mathbf{Enc}(\cdot) : \mathbb{Z}_q^n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^n$  and  $\mathbf{Dec}(\cdot) : \mathcal{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ , respectively. Secret and public keys are also involved in  $\mathbf{Enc}(\cdot)$  and  $\mathbf{Dec}(\cdot)$ , but for simplicity they are omitted. The properties of additive homomorphic encryption are listed as follows:

1. For  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ , one has  $\mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{Enc}(x)) = x$ .
2. Consider the ciphertexts  $\mathbf{c}_1 \in \mathcal{C}^n$  and  $\mathbf{c}_2 \in \mathcal{C}^n$ . There exists an operation  $\oplus$  such that  $\mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{c}_1 \oplus \mathbf{c}_2) = \mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{c}_1) + \mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{c}_2) \bmod q$ .
3. Consider a matrix in plaintext  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_q^{m \times n}$  and a vector in ciphertext  $\mathbf{c}_3 \in \mathcal{C}^n$ . There exists an operation “ $\cdot$ ” representing multiplication such that  $\mathbf{Dec}(M \cdot \mathbf{c}_3) = M \mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{c}_3) \bmod q$ .

In light of the preliminaries above, we call  $q$  the modulus of a cryptosystem, which should be a finite integer to be shown later. For more information about additively homomorphic encryption algorithms and their properties, we refer the readers to the survey papers [1–3] and [22].

## 2.2 Tracking control of a dynamic reference

In this paper, we consider a discrete-time process

$$x_p(k+1) = Ax_p(k) + Bu(k) \quad (1a)$$

$$y_p(k) = Cx_p(k) \quad (1b)$$

where  $x_p(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denotes the state of the process,  $u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^w$  denotes the control input and  $y_p(k) \in \mathbb{R}^v$  denotes the output. We assume  $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{Q}^{n \times w}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{Q}^{v \times n}$ ,  $(A, B)$  stabilizable and  $(A, C)$  observable. Namely, there exist  $K \in \mathbb{Q}^{w \times n}$  and  $L \in \mathbb{Q}^{n \times v}$  such that  $\rho(A + BK) < 1$  and  $\rho(A - LC) < 1$ , respectively. We also assume that the initial condition  $x_p(0)$  is not ‘‘infinitely large’’ such that there exists  $C_{x_p(0)}$  satisfying  $\|x_p(0)\|_\infty \leq C_{x_p(0)}$  [24, 25].

This paper aims at solving a tracking control problem. The dynamics of the reference is described by an exosystem

$$v_p(k+1) = Sv_p(k) \quad (2)$$

with  $v_p(k) \in \mathbb{R}^v$  and  $S \in \mathbb{Q}^{v \times v}$ . Similarly, we assume that there exists  $C_{v_p(0)}$  such that  $\|v_p(0)\|_\infty \leq C_{v_p(0)}$  [24, 25]. We say that the process can asymptotically track the reference if

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|y_p(k) - v_p(k)\|_\infty = 0. \quad (3)$$

To make the problem meaningful, we assume  $\rho(S) \geq 1$ . Otherwise, one can simply design a stabilizing controller to steer  $x_p(k) \rightarrow 0$  without involving the reference  $v_p(k)$ .

## 2.3 Overflow issue in asymptotic tracking control

We assume that there exists a pair of matrices  $(\Gamma \in \mathbb{Q}^{n \times v}, V \in \mathbb{Q}^{w \times v})$  satisfying  $\Gamma S = A\Gamma + BV$  and  $I_v = C\Gamma$ , where  $I_v$  is the identity matrix with dimension  $v$ . This is a standard assumption in regulation/tracking problems. We refer the readers to the seminal paper [16] and its citations for more information.

The problem (3) has been well studied (e.g., in [16, 17]). It can be solved by the following controller

$$\hat{x}(k+1) = A\hat{x}(k) + Bu(k) + L(y_p(k) - C\hat{x}(k)) \quad (4a)$$

$$u(k) = K\hat{x}(k) + (V - K\Gamma)v_p(k) \quad (4b)$$

in which  $\rho(A + BK) < 1$ ,  $\rho(A - LC) < 1$ ,  $\hat{x}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state of the observer (4a). To apply homomorphic encryption schemes,  $y_p(k)$  and  $v_p(k)$  should be received in the form of integer vectors. This requires quantization. Thus, (4) involving quantized information can be described by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}(k+1) &= A\hat{x}(k) + Bu(k) \\ &\quad + L \left( l(k)Q \left( \frac{y_p(k)}{l(k)} \right) - C\hat{x}(k) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5a)$$

$$\hat{v}(k+1) = S\hat{v}(k) + l(k)Q \left( \frac{Sv_p(k) - S\hat{v}(k)}{l(k)} \right) \quad (5b)$$

$$u(k) = K\hat{x}(k) + (V - K\Gamma)\hat{v}(k) \quad (5c)$$

in which  $\hat{v}(k)$  is the estimation of  $v_p(k)$  and  $Q(\cdot)$  is the quantization function in the Notation. In (5), the scaling factor updates as follows

$$l(k+1) = \gamma l(k), \quad 0 < \gamma < 1, \quad l(0) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \quad (6)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the so-called zooming-in factor in dynamic quantization [18]. By defining

$$\bar{x}(k) := \frac{\hat{x}(k)}{l(k)}, \quad \bar{y}(k) := \frac{y_p(k)}{l(k)}, \quad \bar{u}(k) := \frac{u(k)}{l(k)},$$

$$\bar{v}_p(k) := \frac{v_p(k)}{l(k)}, \quad \bar{v}(k) := \frac{\hat{v}(k)}{l(k)}$$

the controller (5) can be written as

$$\bar{x}(k+1) = \frac{A - LC}{\gamma} \bar{x}(k) + \frac{B}{\gamma} \bar{u}(k) + \frac{L}{\gamma} Q(\bar{y}(k)) \quad (7a)$$

$$\bar{v}(k+1) = \frac{S}{\gamma} \bar{v}(k) + \frac{1}{\gamma} Q(S\bar{v}_p(k) - S\bar{v}(k)) \quad (7b)$$

$$\bar{u}(k) = K\bar{x}(k) + (V - K\Gamma)\bar{v}(k). \quad (7c)$$

By the results in [12], one needs to transform the matrices in (7), particularly  $(A - LC)/\gamma$  and  $S/\gamma$ , to integer matrices. In this section, for the ease of presenting the overflow issue in encrypted tracking control, we assume that  $A, B, L, K$  and  $V - K\Gamma$  in (4) are integer matrices, under which the dynamic controller should have been free of overflow [12]. Moreover, we assume that  $\gamma$  is selected such that  $(A - LC)/\gamma, S/\gamma, B/\gamma, L/\gamma, S/\gamma, 1/\gamma$  in (7) consist of integers. The second assumption above will be removed by the results later in Lemma 1.

**Constant reference:** For a constant reference, i.e.,  $S$  in (2) is an identity matrix, we present the algorithm of restoring the control input  $u(k)$  on the actuator side [15]. Let  $\bar{u}(k)$  denote the ciphertext of  $u(k)$ . The algorithm on the actuator side is given as

$$\begin{aligned} u_a(k) &= l(k) \left( \text{Dec}(\bar{u}(k)) - \left\lfloor \frac{\text{Dec}(\bar{u}(k)) - \frac{u(k-1)}{l(k)} + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q \right) \\ &= l(k) \left( \frac{u(k)}{l(k)} - \left\lfloor \frac{\frac{u(k) - u(k-1)}{l(k)} + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q \right) = u(k). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Note that the last equality in (8) holds because there must exist a finite  $q$  such that  $\|\frac{u(k) - u(k-1)}{l(k)}\|_\infty < \frac{q}{2}$  for all  $k$ . For more details about (8), we refer the readers to Lemma 2 in [15].

**Dynamic reference:** In the following, we show that when the process tracks the dynamic reference (2) (i.e.,  $S$  is not an identity matrix and  $\rho(S) \geq 1$ ), the actuator cannot restore  $u(k)$  by (8). Specifically, substituting (5c), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{u(k) - u(k-1)}{l(k)} \\ &= (K\hat{x}(k) + (V - K\Gamma)\hat{v}(k) \\ &\quad - (K\hat{x}(k-1) + (V - K\Gamma)\hat{v}(k-1)))/l(k) \\ &= (Kp(k) - Kp(k-1) + V\hat{v}(k) - V\hat{v}(k-1))/l(k) \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

in which  $p(k)/l(k)$  and  $p(k-1)/l(k) = p(k-1)/(\gamma l(k-1))$  are upper bounded to be shown in the proof of Theorem 1 but  $\hat{v}(k) - \hat{v}(k-1)$  does not converge to zero. Thus, as  $l(k) \rightarrow 0$ , one must have  $\frac{u(k) - u(k-1)}{l(k)} \rightarrow \infty$ . This implies that for any bounded  $q$ , one will surely encounter  $\|\frac{u(k) - u(k-1)}{l(k)}\|_\infty > \frac{q}{2}$ , i.e. **overflow issue**, and it will be impossible to restore  $u(k)$  from  $\text{Dec}(\bar{u}(k))$  by (8) when overflow occurs. Note that if  $l(k)$  is lower bounded, one can avoid the overflow issue. However, it is not possible to realize asymptotic tracking control (3). One can only achieve practical tracking, namely,  $\|y_p(k) - v_p(k)\|_\infty < \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Please note that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v}(k) - \hat{v}(k-1) \neq 0$  in (9) is not due to the application of  $\hat{v}(k)$  in  $u(k)$ . Assume that (5b) is perfectly designed such that  $\hat{v}(k) = v_p(k)$  for all  $k$ . In light of (9), one still has  $\frac{u(k) - u(k-1)}{l(k)} \rightarrow \infty$ . At last, we emphasize that a controller with integer coefficients cannot solve the overflow problem because we have derived (9) by assuming that  $A, B, L, K$  and  $V - K\Gamma$  in (4) are integer matrices.

In a nutshell, in encrypted control problems, when dealing with dynamic reference and asymptotic tracking simultaneously, one would encounter overflow issues under a finite modulus, though the dynamic controller consists of only integer matrices.

**Control objectives:** In view of the process (1) and dynamic reference (2),

1. design controllers operated over encrypted data utilizing additively homomorphic encryption;
2. design algorithms on the actuator side that can restore the control input  $u(k)$  in (5c) from encrypted messages under a finite  $q$

such that asymptotic tracking control (3) is realized.

The control schemes to be designed should be subject to the constraints 1)-3) in Section II-B in [14]. Moreover, in our paper, we present two additional constraints. i) The actuator does not have access to the reference  $v_p(k)$  and the process output  $y_p(k)$ . ii) The actuator does not perform ‘‘re-encryption’’.

### 3 Encrypted tracking control

#### 3.1 Encrypted controller design and finite modulus

We first transform (7) into a controller with integer coefficients. We define the following state

$$\tilde{x}(k) := s\bar{x}(k), \tilde{v}_p(k) := s\bar{v}_p(k), \tilde{v}(k) := s\bar{v}(k) \quad (10)$$

with  $0 < s < 1$ . Then, (7) can be transformed into

$$\tilde{x}(k+1) = \frac{A-LC}{\gamma} \tilde{x}(k) + \frac{sB}{\gamma} \bar{u}(k) + \frac{sL}{\gamma} Q(\bar{y}(k)) \quad (11a)$$

$$\tilde{v}(k+1) = \frac{S}{\gamma} \tilde{v}(k) + \frac{s}{\gamma} Q \left( \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}_p(k) - \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}(k) \right) \quad (11b)$$

$$\bar{u}(k) = \frac{K}{s} \tilde{x}(k) + \frac{V-K\Gamma}{s} \tilde{v}(k) \quad (11c)$$

with  $\tilde{x}(0) = s\hat{x}(0)/l(0)$  and  $\tilde{v}(0) = s\hat{v}(0)/l(0)$ .

**Lemma 1** Consider the controller (11). Its matrices can be converted to integer matrices by the following steps:

1. Select  $(K, L)$  such that  $\max\{\rho(A+BK), \rho(A-LC)\}$  is sufficiently small.
2. Select  $s \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $\frac{s}{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{v \times v}$  and  $\frac{K}{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{w \times n}$ .
3. Choose  $\gamma \in (\max\{\rho(A+BK), \rho(A-LC)\}, 1)$  such that  $\frac{A-LC}{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\frac{sB}{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times w}$ ,  $\frac{sL}{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times v}$ ,  $\frac{s}{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}^{v \times v}$  and  $\frac{s}{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Note that such a  $\gamma$  always exists.

**Proof.** To show the existence of  $\gamma$  that scales the matrices in (11a)-(11b) into integer matrices, it is sufficient to show that  $\gamma$  can be chosen arbitrarily small. One can always select  $(K, L)$  such that  $\max\{\rho(A+BK), \rho(A-LC)\} = 0$ . Then, there must exist a sufficiently small  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that the matrices in (11a)-(11b) are integer matrices. The reason of selecting  $\gamma \in (\max\{\rho(A+BK), \rho(A-LC)\}, 1)$  is for ensuring closed-loop stability, which will be shown in the Appendix. For (11c), it is straightforward that there always exists a sufficiently small  $s$  such that  $\frac{s}{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{v \times v}$  and  $\frac{K}{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{w \times n}$ . ■

**Remark 1** By the results in Lemma 1, one can see that it is possible to scale the controller matrices into integer matrices by the zooming-in factor  $\gamma \in (\max\{\rho(A+BK), \rho(A-LC)\}, 1)$ . One may worry about that  $\gamma$  is lower bounded by  $\max\{\rho(A+BK), \rho(A-LC)\}$  and cannot be very small. However, since the eigenvalues of  $A+BK$  and  $A-LC$  can be arbitrarily placed, one can always place all their eigenvalues at 0 or arbitrarily close to 0. Hence,  $\gamma$  is lower bounded by 0 or an arbitrarily small positive number, respectively. We emphasize that our method of converting controller matrices into integer matrices does not require re-encryption by observing that  $\bar{u}(k)$  in (11a) can be taken from (11c), instead of being generated by the sensor or the actuator. ■

**Remark 2** The matrices in (11) can also be transformed into integer matrices by the approach in [14] if  $(S, V-K\Gamma)$  observable. First, select  $(K, L, L_0)$  such that  $\max\{\rho(A+BK), \rho(A-LC), \rho(S-L_0(V-K\Gamma))\} = 0$ . Then, we write (11b) into  $\tilde{v}(k+1) = \frac{S}{\gamma} \tilde{v}(k) + \frac{s}{\gamma} Q \left( \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}_p(k) - \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}(k) \right) - \frac{sL_0}{\gamma} \bar{u}(k) + \frac{sL_0}{\gamma} \bar{u}(k)$ . Substituting  $\bar{u}(k)$  in (11c) and  $x_T(k) := T^{-1}[\tilde{x}^T(k) \ \tilde{v}^T(k)]^T$  with  $T = \text{diag}(T_1, T_2)$  invertible, (11) can be transformed into

$$x_T(k+1) = \frac{1}{\gamma} T^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A-LC \\ L_0K \quad S-L_0(V-K\Gamma) \end{bmatrix} T x_T(k) + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{sT_1^{-1}B}{\gamma} \\ \frac{sT_2^{-1}L_0}{\gamma} \end{bmatrix} \bar{u}(k) + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{sT_1^{-1}L}{\gamma} Q(\bar{y}(k)) \\ \frac{sT_2^{-1}}{\gamma} Q \left( \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}_p(k) - \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}(k) \right) \end{bmatrix} \quad (12a)$$

$$\bar{u}(k) = \frac{1}{s} [KT_1 \quad (V-K\Gamma)T_2] x_T(k). \quad (12b)$$

Because of  $\max\{\rho(A-LC), \rho(S-L_0(V-K\Gamma))\} = 0$ , there must exist  $T$  such that  $T^{-1}[A-LC, 0; L_0K, S-L_0(V-K\Gamma)]T$  is an integer matrix. Afterwards, one can

select sufficiently small  $s$  and  $\gamma$  such that  $\frac{KT_1}{s}$ ,  $\frac{(V-KT)T_2}{s}$ ,  $\frac{sT_1^{-1}B}{\gamma}$ ,  $\frac{sT_2^{-1}L_0}{\gamma}$ ,  $\frac{sT_1^{-1}L}{\gamma}$  and  $\frac{sT_2^{-1}}{\gamma}$  are integer matrices. Note that re-encryption is still not required in (12). Moreover, because the dynamic matrix of (12a) is a nilpotent matrix, (12) can be further transformed into the auto-regressive form  $\bar{u}(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+v} K_1 \bar{u}(k-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n+v} K_2 Q(\bar{y}(k-i)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n+v} K_3 Q\left(\frac{s}{s} \tilde{v}_p(k-i) - \frac{s}{s} \tilde{v}(k-i)\right)$  for some integer matrices  $K_1$ ,  $K_2$  and  $K_3$ . For more information about the encrypted controller in the auto-regressive form, we refer the readers to [26, 27]. ■

By the results in Lemma 1, all the matrices in (11) contain only integer elements, and  $\tilde{x}(0)$  and  $\tilde{v}(0)$  are integer vectors under a sufficiently small  $l(0)$ . By taking the modulo operation, we obtain the dynamics in (11) over  $\mathbb{Z}_q$

$$\tilde{x}(k+1) = \frac{A-LC}{\gamma} \tilde{x}(k) + \frac{sB}{\gamma} \bar{u}(k) + \frac{sL}{\gamma} Q(\bar{y}(k)) \bmod q \quad (13a)$$

$$\tilde{v}(k+1) = \frac{S}{\gamma} \tilde{v}(k) + \frac{s}{\gamma} Q\left(\frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}_p(k) - \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}(k)\right) \bmod q \quad (13b)$$

$$\bar{u}(k) = \frac{K}{s} \tilde{x}(k) + \frac{V-KT}{s} \tilde{v}(k) \bmod q \quad (13c)$$

with initial conditions  $\tilde{x}(0) \bmod q$  and  $\tilde{v}(0) \bmod q$ .

In Fig. 1, we present the control architecture over homomorphic encrypted data. The encrypted controller that computes cipher control inputs and the actuator that restores the control inputs from ciphertexts are designed as follows.

**Encrypted controller:** Based on (13) and the cryptosystem in Section 2.1, one can obtain the encrypted controller:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(k+1) = (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{LC}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(k) \oplus \mathbf{B} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{u}}(k) \oplus \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{Enc}(Q(\bar{y}(k)) \bmod q) \quad (14a)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(k+1) = \mathbf{S} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(k) \oplus \frac{s}{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{Enc}\left(Q\left(\frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}_p(k) - \frac{S}{s} \tilde{v}(k)\right) \bmod q\right) \quad (14b)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k) = \mathbf{K} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(k) \oplus (\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{KT}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(k) \quad (14c)$$

in which  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(k) \in \mathcal{C}^n$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k) \in \mathcal{C}^w$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(k) \in \mathcal{C}^w$  are the ciphertexts of  $\tilde{x}(k)$ ,  $\bar{u}(k)$  and  $\tilde{v}(k)$ , respectively. Its initial conditions are given by  $\mathbf{Enc}(\tilde{x}(0) \bmod q)$  and  $\mathbf{Enc}(\tilde{v}(0) \bmod q)$ . The matrices in (14) follow

$$\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{LC} := \frac{A-LC}{\gamma} \bmod q, \mathbf{B} := \frac{sB}{\gamma} \bmod q, \mathbf{L} := \frac{sL}{\gamma} \bmod q, \mathbf{K} := \frac{K}{s} \bmod q, \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{KT} := \frac{V-KT}{s} \bmod q, \mathbf{S} := \frac{S}{\gamma} \bmod q$$

where  $q$  is the modulus of the cryptosystem and will be specified later. Note that  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)$  in (14a) is generated by the encrypted controller (14c) instead of being generated by the actuator through the re-encryption technique [14].

**Algorithm on the actuator side:** We implement the follow-




Fig. 1. Encrypted control architecture. Dashed lines represent networks. The sensor and reference provider transmit  $\mathbf{Enc}(Q(\bar{y}(k)) \bmod q)$  and  $\mathbf{Enc}\left(Q\left(\frac{s}{s} \tilde{v}_p(k) - \frac{s}{s} \tilde{v}(k)\right) \bmod q\right)$  to the encrypted controller over networks, respectively. The encrypted controller sends  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)$  to the actuator over networks. The actuator computes  $\bar{u}_a(k)$  based on  $\bar{u}_a(k-j)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, v$ ), and further computes  $u_a(k)$ . It feeds  $u_a(k)$  to the process and stores  $\bar{u}_a(k)$  in the memory for being utilized at  $k+1$ .

ing algorithm

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_a(k) = \mathbf{Dec}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)) - \left\lfloor \frac{\mathbf{Dec}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)) + C_v \bar{U}_a(k-1) + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q \\ u_a(k) = l(k) \bar{u}_a(k) \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{cases} \bar{U}_a(k-1) := [\bar{u}_a^T(k-1) \bar{u}_a^T(k-2) \cdots \bar{u}_a^T(k-v)]^T \\ C_v := [c_{v-1} \ c_{v-2} \ \cdots \ c_0] \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times v} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

in which  $c_{v-1}, c_{v-2}, \dots, c_0$  are the coefficients in the characteristic polynomial of  $\bar{S} := S/\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^{v \times v}$ :

$$\det(\lambda I_v - \bar{S}) = \lambda^v + c_{v-1} \lambda^{v-1} + \cdots + c_0 I_v. \quad (17)$$

To compute  $u_a(k)$ , the actuator should have a memory to store the previous  $\bar{u}_a(k-j)$  with  $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ . By (14) and (15), one can see that the controller only transmits  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)$  to the actuator at  $k$ .

In the following lemma, we show that the control input can be represented by the previous control inputs leveraging the Cayley–Hamilton theorem.

**Lemma 2** The control input  $\bar{u}(k)$  in (11c) is equivalent to

$$\bar{u}(k) = -C_v \bar{U}(k-1) + C_{v+1} Z(k) \quad (18)$$

with  $C_v$  in (16) and

$$C_{v+1} := [1 \ c_{v-1} \ c_{v-2} \ \cdots \ c_0] \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times (v+1)} \quad (19a)$$

$$\bar{U}(k-1) := [\bar{u}^T(k-1) \ \bar{u}^T(k-2) \ \cdots \ \bar{u}^T(k-v)]^T \quad (19b)$$

$$Z(k) := [z^T(k) \ z^T(k-1) \ \cdots \ z^T(k-v)]^T \quad (19c)$$

$$z(k) := K\bar{p}(k) - K\bar{e}_x(k) - (V-KT)\bar{e}_v(k) \quad (19d)$$

$$\bar{e}_x(k) := \bar{x}_p(k) - \bar{x}(k), \quad \bar{e}_v(k) := \bar{v}_p(k) - \bar{v}(k) \quad (19e)$$

$$\bar{p}(k) := \bar{x}_p(k) - \Gamma \bar{v}_p(k). \quad (19f)$$

**Cayley–Hamilton theorem [21]:** Before presenting the proof of Lemma 2, we introduce the Cayley–Hamilton

theorem as follows. For any matrix  $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $F^n$  satisfies

$$F^n = -c_{n-1}F^{n-1} - c_{n-2}F^{n-2} - \dots - c_0I_n \quad (20)$$

in which  $c_{n-1} \dots c_0$  follow those in the characteristic polynomial of  $F$  as  $\det(\lambda I_n - F) = \lambda^n + c_{n-1}\lambda^{n-1} + \dots + c_0I_n$ .

**Proof.** By the definitions of  $\bar{p}(k)$ ,  $\bar{e}_x(k)$  and  $\bar{e}_v(k)$ ,  $\bar{u}(k)$  in (11c) is equivalent to the following form

$$\bar{u}(k) = V\bar{v}_p(k) + K\bar{p}(k) - K\bar{e}_x(k) - (V - K\Gamma)\bar{e}_v(k). \quad (21)$$

Then the dynamics of  $\bar{v}_p(k)$  and  $\bar{u}(k)$  can be written as

$$\bar{v}_p(k+1) = \bar{S}\bar{v}_p(k) \quad (22a)$$

$$\bar{u}(k) = V\bar{v}_p(k) + z(k) \quad (22b)$$

in which  $\bar{S} = S/\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^{v \times v}$ . By the Cayley–Hamilton theorem, one has  $\bar{S}^v = -c_{v-1}\bar{S}^{v-1} - c_{v-2}\bar{S}^{v-2} - \dots - c_0I_v$ . Therefore, by  $\bar{v}_p(k) = \bar{S}^v\bar{v}_p(k-v)$ , one can obtain

$$\bar{v}_p(k) = (-c_{v-1}\bar{S}^{v-1} - c_{v-2}\bar{S}^{v-2} - \dots - c_0I_v)\bar{v}_p(k-v).$$

By (22b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(k) &= -V \sum_{j=1}^v c_{v-j} \bar{S}^{v-j} \bar{v}_p(k-v) + z(k) \\ &= -V \sum_{j=1}^v c_{v-j} \bar{v}_p(k-j) + z(k) \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^v c_{v-j} [\bar{u}(k-j) - z(k-j)] + z(k) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which implies the result in (18).  $\blacksquare$

If  $u_a(k) = u(k)$  for all  $k$ , we say that the actuator is able to restore the control input. We are ready to present the main result of the paper.

**Theorem 1** Consider the encrypted controller (14) and the algorithm (15) operated in the actuator. If the modulus

$$q > 2\|C_{\bar{S}}^{v+1}\|_{\infty} \left( 2\|K\|_{\infty}C_{p,e} + \frac{\|V - K\Gamma\|_{\infty}}{2\gamma} \right) \quad (24)$$

then one has  $u_a(k) = u(k)$  for all  $k$  with  $u(k)$  in (5c). In (24),  $C_{p,e}$  is given in the Appendix. Moreover, the asymptotic tracking control problem in (3) is solved.

**Proof.** We conduct the proof by induction. We mainly show that if the actuator is able to restore the previous control inputs such that  $\bar{U}_a(k-1) = \bar{U}(k-1)$ , then it can also restore  $u(k)$  by obtaining  $\bar{u}_a(k) = \bar{u}(k)$ .

Note that one can only obtain the lower bits of  $\bar{u}(k)$  by decryption in light of  $\text{Dec}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)) = \bar{u}(k) \bmod q$ . Then, (15) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_a(k) &= \bar{u}(k) \bmod q - \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{u}(k) \bmod q + C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1) + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q \\ &= \bar{u}(k) - \left\lfloor \frac{\bar{u}(k) + C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1) + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

We are interested if  $\|\bar{u}(k) + C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1)\|_{\infty}$  is upper bounded by  $\frac{q}{2}$ . In light of  $\bar{u}(k)$  in (21),  $C_v$  in (16) and  $\bar{U}_a(k-1) = \bar{U}(k-1)$  by hypothesis, one has

$$\bar{u}(k) + C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1) = C_{v+1}Z(k). \quad (26)$$

Therefore, one has

$$\|\bar{u}(k) + C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1)\|_{\infty} \leq \|C_{v+1}\|_{\infty} \|Z(k)\|_{\infty} < \frac{q}{2}. \quad (27)$$

To derive the inequality above, we have applied the following inequalities  $\|Z(k)\|_{\infty} \leq \|[K - K]\|_{\infty} \|\bar{p}^T(k) \bar{e}_x^T(k)\|^T_{\infty} + \|V + K\Gamma\|_{\infty} \|\bar{e}_v(k)\|_{\infty}$ , in which  $\|\bar{p}^T(k) \bar{e}_x^T(k)\|^T_{\infty} \leq \|\bar{p}^T(k) \bar{e}_x^T(k)\| \leq C_{p,e}$  and  $\|\bar{e}_v(k)\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2\gamma}$  will be shown in the Appendix. Under (27), one should have  $\left\lfloor \frac{\bar{u}(k) + C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1) + q/2}{q} \right\rfloor = 0$ , and therefore  $\bar{u}_a(k) = \bar{u}(k)$  in view of (25). Then, it is simple to obtain  $u_a(k) = l(k)\bar{u}_a(k) = l(k)\bar{u}(k) = u(k)$ .

To show asymptotic tracking control, it is sufficient to show  $\|y(k) - v_p(k)\|_{\infty} = \|Cx_p(k) - C\Gamma v_p(k)\|_{\infty} = l(k)\|C\bar{p}(k)\|_{\infty} \leq l(k)\|C\|_{\infty}C_{p,e} \rightarrow 0$ , in which  $\|\bar{p}(k)\|_{\infty} \leq C_{p,e}$  and  $l(k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 3** In Theorem 1, we are able to find a finite  $q$  to restore  $u(k)$  on the actuator side. It is worth mentioning that  $C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1)$  in (15) is the key establishment of ensuring a finite  $q$ . It is simple to verify that  $\bar{u}(k) = u(k)/l(k) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $l(k) \rightarrow 0$ . Then, for any finite  $q$ , if one removes  $C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1)$ , one must encounter  $\left\lfloor \frac{\bar{u}(k) + q/2}{q} \right\rfloor \neq 0$  after some  $k$ . Then, it is not possible to obtain  $\bar{u}_a(k) = \bar{u}(k)$  by (15) or equivalently (25). Thus, we implement  $C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1)$  to “counteract” the growth of  $\bar{u}(k)$  such that  $\bar{u}(k) + C_v\bar{U}_a(k-1)$  does not diverge, and hence we are able to find a finite  $q$ . We mention that if  $q$  is allowed to be infinite, e.g.,  $q > 2\|\bar{u}(k)\|_{\infty}$ , one can simply implement  $\text{Dec}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)) - \left\lfloor \frac{\text{Dec}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)) + q/2}{q} \right\rfloor q$  to restore  $\bar{u}(k)$ .

**Remark 4** One can write  $\bar{u}(k) = \bar{u}_1(k)q + \bar{u}(k) \bmod q$  for some  $u_1(k) \in \mathbb{Z}^w$ . Recall the definitions of “higher bits” and “lower bits” in the Notation. One can see that the actuator actually receives only the lower bits of  $\bar{u}(k)$ . If we follow the methods in [5, 12], in which the controller transmits both the higher and lower bits to the controller,  $q$  should cover all the possible  $\bar{u}(k)$ . However, due to  $\bar{u}(k) \rightarrow \infty$ , covering all the possible  $\bar{u}(k)$  by a finite  $q$  is not possible. After some  $k$ , the higher bits of  $\bar{u}(k)$  will be lost during the decryption process  $\text{Dec}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)) = \bar{u}(k) \bmod q$ . Under such a situation, our method can still enable the actuator to restore  $\bar{u}(k)$  under a finite  $q$ .  $\blacksquare$

### 3.2 Unbounded internal state and the solution

**Unbounded internal state:** In Section 3.1, though the algorithm on the actuator side is able to restore the control input in light of  $u_a(k) = u(k)$ , one would encounter the problem of unbounded internal state. That is, the internal state  $\bar{u}_a(k)$  is unbounded:  $\|\bar{u}_a(k)\|_{\infty} = \|u(k)/l(k)\|_{\infty} \rightarrow$

$\infty$  in the actuator as  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} l(k) = 0$ . The issue of unbounded internal state also exists in [15], see “ $\mathbf{Dec}(u(t) \bmod (q, u(t-1)/(s_1 s_2 l(t))))$ ” in (31) in [15].

In the field of systems and control, in generally one should design a control system whose state is bounded. Moreover, in practice, numerical saturation in electronic devices would impact an unbounded state. That is, if saturation occurs,  $\bar{u}_a(k)$  in (15) is upper bounded and therefore one has  $\bar{u}_a(k) \neq \bar{u}(k)$ . This implies that the actuator must fail to restore the correct control input after some  $k$  due to  $u_a(k) = l(k)\bar{u}_a(k) \neq l(k)\bar{u}(k) = u(k)$ . In this subsection, we propose a control scheme whose internal state is bounded.

First, we present the fundamental idea by plaintexts. We assume that the controller and the actuator have memory units to store previous control inputs in ciphertexts and plaintexts, respectively. At  $k$ , the controller transmits

$$m(k) := \bar{u}(k) + C_v \bar{U}(k-1) \quad (28)$$

to the actuator, in which  $\bar{u}(k)$  follows that in (18). The actuator stores previous “control inputs”  $U_a(k-1) := [u_a^T(k-1) \ u_a^T(k-2) \ \dots \ u_a^T(k-v)]^T$  in the memory. If the actuator is able to restore previous control inputs, namely,  $U_a(k-1) = U(k-1) := [u^T(k-1) \ u^T(k-2) \ \dots \ u^T(k-v)]^T$ , then it can also restore  $u(k)$  in view of

$$\begin{aligned} l(k)m(k) - C_v \text{diag}(\gamma, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^v) U_a(k-1) \\ = l(k)(\bar{u}(k) + C_v \bar{U}(k-1)) - l(k)C_v \bar{U}(k-1) \\ = u(k) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

in which  $C_v \text{diag}(\gamma, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^v) U_a(k-1) = l(k)C_v \bar{U}(k-1)$ . Importantly,  $m(k) = \bar{u}(k) + C_v \bar{U}(k-1) = C_{v+1} Z(k)$  is bounded and hence there must exist a finite  $q$  such that

$$m(k) \bmod q - \left\lfloor \frac{m(k) \bmod q + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q = m(k), \forall k. \quad (30)$$

Overall, by (28)–(30), one can see that the actuator should be able to restore  $u(k)$  by utilizing  $m(k)$ , which in particular is a bounded state. In the following encrypted control scheme, we will use  $m(k)$  as the internal state to restore  $u(k)$  instead of  $\bar{u}_a(k)$  in Section 3.1.

In Fig. 2, we present the encrypted control architecture. The encrypted controller and the algorithm on the actuator side are provided as follows.

**Encrypted controller:** Based on the idea of the control scheme above, we present the controller over encrypted data:

$$\begin{cases} (14a) - (14b) \\ \bar{\mathbf{u}}(k) = \mathbf{K} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(k) \oplus (\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{\Gamma}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(k) \\ \mathbf{m}(k) := \bar{\mathbf{u}}(k) \oplus \mathbf{C}_v \cdot \bar{\mathbf{U}}(k-1) \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

in which  $\mathbf{C}_v := C_v \bmod q$ ,  $\mathbf{m}(k) \in \mathcal{C}^w$  is the output of the controller, and

$$\bar{\mathbf{U}}(k-1) := [\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T(k-1) \ \bar{\mathbf{u}}^T(k-2) \ \dots \ \bar{\mathbf{u}}^T(k-v)]^T \quad (32)$$




Fig. 2. Encrypted control architecture. Dashed lines represent networks. The sensor and reference provider send the same messages as in Fig. 1. The encrypted controller generates  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)$  and  $\mathbf{m}(k)$ . It transmits  $\mathbf{m}(k)$  to the actuator over networks and stores  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)$  in the memory for being utilized at  $k+1$ . The actuator computes  $m_a(k)$ , and  $u_a(k)$  based on  $u_a(k-j)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, v$ ).  $u_a(k)$  is then fed to the process and stored in the memory for being utilized at  $k+1$ .

is available at  $k$  thanks to the memory unit in the controller. Note that  $C_v$  has all integer elements because  $\bar{S}$  is an integer matrix, and hence its characteristic polynomial has only integer coefficients. (31) can be further simplified into a system consisting of (14) and  $\mathbf{m}(k)$ . However, for highlighting that  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}(k)$  is a necessary state for computing  $\mathbf{m}(k)$  and should be also stored in the memory, we do not simplify (31).

**Algorithm on the actuator side:** When the actuator receives  $\mathbf{m}(k)$  from the controller, it calculates

$$m_a(k) := \mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{m}(k)) - \left\lfloor \frac{\mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{m}(k)) + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q \quad (33a)$$

$$u_a(k) = l(k)m_a(k) - C_v \text{diag}(\gamma, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^v) U_a(k-1). \quad (33b)$$

**Proposition 1** Consider the encrypted controller (31) and the algorithm on the actuator side (33). If (24) holds, then one has  $m_a(k) = m(k)$  and  $u_a(k) = u(k)$ . Moreover, the tracking control problem in (3) is solved.

**Proof.** We conduct the proof by induction. If  $U^a(k-1) = U(k-1)$ , then one should obtain  $u_a(k) = u(k)$ . First, note that

$$\begin{aligned} m_a(k) &= m(k) - \left\lfloor \frac{m(k) + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q \\ &= m(k) - \left\lfloor \frac{C_{\bar{S}}^{v+1} Z(k) + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q = m(k) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\left\lfloor \frac{C_{\bar{S}}^{v+1} Z(k) + \frac{q}{2}}{q} \right\rfloor q = 0$  because of  $\|C_{\bar{S}}^{v+1} Z(k)\|_\infty < \frac{q}{2}$  (see (27)). Substituting  $m_a(k) = m(k)$  into (33b) and then following (29), one can obtain  $u_a(k) = u(k)$ . ■

**Remark 5** We compare the control schemes in Sections 3.1




Fig. 3. Time responses of tracking errors  $y_p(k) - v_p(k)$




Fig. 4. Time responses of  $\|\bar{u}(k) + C_v \bar{U}_a(k-1)\|_\infty$ .

and 3.2. First, note that they require the same modulus  $q$  in (24). Second, the actuator in Section 3.1 has  $\bar{u}_a(k)$  as an internal state, which becomes infinitely large as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Whereas the actuator in Section 3.2 has  $m_a(k)$  as the internal state, which is upper bounded in light of  $\|m_a(k)\|_\infty = \|m(k)\|_\infty = \|C_{v+1} \bar{Z}(k)\|_\infty < q/2$ . Third, only the actuator in Section 3.1 needs to store previous control inputs in the memory. Whereas in Section 3.2, the controller and the actuator should store the ciphertexts and plaintexts of previous control inputs, respectively. ■

## 4 Simulation

In this section, we conduct simulation to verify the results of this paper. The matrices of the process ( $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ ), the reference dynamic matrix ( $S$ ), the feedback gain ( $K$ ) and observer gain ( $L$ ) are given and calculated as follows

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, C = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1.5 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -0.5 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We select  $\gamma = 0.5$  and  $s = 0.5$ , under which all the matrices in (11) contain only integers.

We first show the simulation results corresponding to Theorem 1. Fig. 3 presents the time responses of tracking errors, in which one can see that the tracking errors converge to zero. In Theorem 1, one of the key tasks is to ensure that  $\|\bar{u}(k) + C_v \bar{U}_a(k-1)\|_\infty$  is finite and therefore one is able to find a finite  $q$ . As shown in Fig. 4,  $\|\bar{u}(k) + C_v \bar{U}_a(k-1)\|_\infty$

does not exceed 359.5 in the simulation horizon. According to the simulation result, selecting  $q = 2^{10} > 2 \times 359.5$  is sufficient. Meanwhile, according to the theoretical result in Theorem 1,  $q$  should be larger than 16878, which implies that one should select  $q = 2^{15}$ . The conservatism between the theoretical result and the simulation result is because we have followed a “worst case” type of analysis, in which have frequently used “ $\leq$ ”, “max” and “ $\|Dx + Ey\| \leq \|D\|\|x\| + \|E\|\|y\|$ ” (for some matrices  $D$  and  $E$ , and some vectors  $x$  and  $y$ ). Because Proposition 1 restores the same  $u(k)$  and requires the same  $q$ , the simulation results of Proposition 1 will be very similar to those in Figs. 3 and 4, and hence are omitted.

## 5 Conclusions

This paper investigated asymptotic tracking control of dynamic reference over homomorphically encrypted data with a finite modulus. We designed a tracking controller with only integer coefficients leveraging the zooming-in factor of dynamic quantization, under which the re-encryption technique is not required. Exploiting the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, we represented the control input as a linear combination of previous control inputs. Therefore, the algorithm on the actuator side is able to restore the control inputs with a finite modulus from the lower bits. A lower bound of the modulus is also provided in the paper. Secondly, we solved the problem of unbounded internal state in the actuator, by formulating a new controller output and algorithm on the actuator side. The actuator can restore the correct control input under the same modulus as in the first result.

## Appendix

We will show that there exists a finite  $C_{p,e}$  satisfying  $\|\bar{p}^T(k) \bar{e}_x^T(k)\| < C_{p,e}$ . We first present the dynamics of  $\bar{p}(k)$ ,  $\bar{e}_x(k)$  and  $\bar{e}_v(k)$ :

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{p}(k+1) \\ \bar{e}_x(k+1) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} A + BK & -BK \\ 0 & A - LC \end{bmatrix}}_{:=A_{cl}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{p}(k) \\ \bar{e}_x(k) \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \frac{-B(V-K\Gamma)}{\gamma} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{L}{\gamma} \end{bmatrix}}_{:=B_{cl}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{e}_v(k) \\ \bar{e}_y^q(k) \end{bmatrix} \quad (.1a)$$

$$\bar{e}_v(k+1) = \frac{S\bar{e}_v(k)}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma} Q(S\bar{e}_v(k)). \quad (.1b)$$

in which  $\|\bar{e}_v(k)\|_\infty = \frac{1}{\gamma} \|S\bar{e}_v(k) - Q(S\bar{e}_v(k))\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2\gamma}$  and  $\|\bar{e}_y^q(k)\|_\infty := \|\bar{y}(k) - Q(\bar{y}(k))\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . By the result of  $\gamma$  in Lemma 1, it is clear that  $A_{cl}$  is a Schur matrix. Then there exist  $0 < \rho < 1$  and  $C_\rho$  such that  $\|A_{cl}^k\| \leq C_\rho \rho^k$ .



Hence, by (.1a), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{p}^T(k+1) \bar{e}_x^T(k+1)\|^T &\leq C_\rho \rho^{k+1} \|\bar{p}^T(0) \bar{e}_x^T(0)\|^T \\ &+ C_\rho \sum_{i=0}^k \rho^{k-i} \|B_{cl}\| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \bar{e}_v(i) \\ \bar{e}_y^q(i) \end{bmatrix} \right\| \end{aligned} \quad (.2)$$

in which the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} C_\rho \rho^{k+1} \|\bar{p}^T(0) \bar{e}_x^T(0)\|^T &\leq C_\rho \rho^{k+1} \sqrt{2n} (\|x_p(0)\|_\infty + \|\Gamma\|_\infty \|v_p(0)\|_\infty) / l(0) \end{aligned} \quad (.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_\rho \sum_{i=0}^k \rho^{k-i} \|B_{cl}\| \|\bar{e}_v^T(i) \bar{e}_y^q(i)\|^T &\leq C_\rho \|B_{cl}\| \frac{\sqrt{2v}}{2\gamma(1-\rho)} (1 - \rho^{k+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (.4)$$

Recalling  $\|x_p(0)\|_\infty \leq C_{x_p(0)}$  and  $\|v_p(0)\|_\infty \leq C_{v_p(0)}$ , one can calculate  $C_{p,e}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{p}^T(k+1) \bar{e}_x^T(k+1)\|^T &\leq \max \left\{ C_\rho \frac{\sqrt{2n}(C_{x_p(0)} + \|\Gamma\|_\infty C_{v_p(0)})}{l(0)}, \right. \\ &\left. C_\rho \|B_{cl}\| \frac{\sqrt{2v}}{2\gamma(1-\rho)} \right\} =: C_{p,e}. \end{aligned} \quad (.5)$$

## References

- [1] J. Kim, D. Kim, Y. Song, H. Shim, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson. Comparison of encrypted control approaches and tutorial on dynamic systems using learning with errors-based homomorphic encryption. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 54:200–218, 2022.
- [2] N. Schlüter, P. Binfet, and M. S. Darup. A brief survey on encrypted control: From the first to the second generation and beyond. *Annual Reviews in Control*, page 100913, 2023.
- [3] M. S. Darup, A. B. Alexandru, D. E. Quevedo, and G. J. Pappas. Encrypted control for networked systems: An illustrative introduction and current challenges. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 41(3):58–78, 2021.
- [4] K. Kogiso and T. Fujita. Cyber-security enhancement of networked control systems using homomorphic encryption. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 6836–6843, 2015.
- [5] F. Farokhi, I. Shames, and N. Batterham. Secure and private control using semi-homomorphic encryption. *Control Engineering Practice*, 67:13–20, 2017.
- [6] M. S. Darup, A. Redder, I. Shames, F. Farokhi, and D. Quevedo. Towards encrypted MPC for linear constrained systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(2):195–200, 2017.
- [7] M. Ruan, H. Gao, and Y. Wang. Secure and privacy-preserving consensus. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(10):4035–4049, 2019.
- [8] A. B. Alexandru, K. Gatsis, Y. Shoukry, S. A. Seshia, P. Tabuada, and G. J. Pappas. Cloud-based quadratic optimization with partially homomorphic encryption. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(5):2357–2364, 2020.
- [9] Z. Zhang, P. Cheng, J. Wu, and J. Chen. Secure state estimation using hybrid homomorphic encryption scheme. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 29(4):1704–1720, 2020.
- [10] M. Marcantoni, B. Jayawardhana, M. P. Chaher, and K. Bunte. Secure formation control via edge computing enabled by fully homomorphic encryption and mixed uniform-logarithmic quantization. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:395–400, 2022.
- [11] C. Murguia, F. Farokhi, and I. Shames. Secure and private implementation of dynamic controllers using semihomomorphic encryption. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(9):3950–3957, 2020.
- [12] J. H. Cheon, K. Han, H. Kim, J. Kim, and H. Shim. Need for controllers having integer coefficients in homomorphically encrypted dynamic system. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 5020–5025, 2018.
- [13] N. Schlüter and M. S. Darup. On the stability of linear dynamic controllers with integer coefficients. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(10):5610–5613, 2021.
- [14] J. Kim, H. Shim, and K. Han. Dynamic controller that operates over homomorphically encrypted data for infinite time horizon. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(2):660–672, 2022.
- [15] J. Kim, M. S. Darup, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson. Asymptotic stabilization over encrypted data with limited controller capacity and time-varying quantizer. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 7762–7767, 2022.
- [16] B. A. Francis. The linear multivariable regulator problem. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 15(3):486–505, 1977.
- [17] A. P. Aguiar, J. P. Hespanha, and P. V. Kokotović. Performance limitations in reference tracking and path following for nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 44(3):598–610, 2008.
- [18] R. Brockett and D. Liberzon. Quantized feedback stabilization of linear systems. *IEEE transactions on Automatic Control*, 45(7):1279–1289, 2000.
- [19] S. Feng, A. Cetinkaya, H. Ishii, P. Tesi, and C. De Persis. Networked control under DoS attacks: Tradeoffs between resilience and data rate. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(1):460–467, 2021.
- [20] K. Teranishi, N. Shimada, and K. Kogiso. Stability analysis and dynamic quantizer for controller encryption. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 7184–7189, 2019.
- [21] R. A Horn and C. R Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [22] P. Paillier. Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques*, page 223–238, 1999.
- [23] T. ElGamal. A public key cryptosystem and a signature scheme based on discrete logarithms. *IEEE transactions on Information Theory*, 31(4):469–472, 1985.
- [24] D. Liberzon. On stabilization of linear systems with limited information. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(2):304–307, 2003.
- [25] S. Feng, M. Ran, B. Zhang, L. Xie, and S. Xu. The bottleneck and ceiling effects in quantized tracking control of heterogeneous multi-agent systems under DoS attacks. *Automatica*, 160:111424, 2024.
- [26] K. Teranishi, T. Sadamoto, and K. Kogiso. Input–output history feedback controller for encrypted control with leveled fully homomorphic encryption. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 11(1):271–283, 2023.
- [27] J. Lee, D. Lee, J. Kim, and H. Shim. Encrypted dynamic control exploiting limited number of multiplications and a method using ring-lwe based cryptosystem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03451*, 2023.