

Secure Filtering against Spatio-Temporal False Data under Asynchronous Sampling

Zishuo Li, Anh Tung Nguyen, André M. H. Teixeira, Yilin Mo, Karl H. Johansson

Abstract—This paper addresses the state estimation problem in continuous LTI systems under attacks with non-periodic and asynchronous sampled measurements. The non-periodic and asynchronous sampling requires sensors to transmit not only the measurement values but also the sampling time-stamps to the fusion center via unprotected communication channels. This communication scheme leaves the system vulnerable to a variety of malicious activities such as (i) manipulating measurement values, (ii) manipulating time-stamps, (iii) hybrid manipulations such as generating fake measurements or eliminating the measurement. To deal with such more powerful attacks, we propose a decentralized local estimation algorithm where each sensor maintains its local state estimate based on its measurements in an asynchronous fashion. The local states are synchronized by time-prediction and fused in an event-triggered manner. In the absence of attacks, local estimates are proved to recover the optimal Kalman estimation by our carefully designed weighted least square problem, given that the sample time is non-pathological. In the presence of attacks, an ℓ_1 regularized least square problem is proposed to generate secure estimates with uniformly bounded error as long as the observability redundancy is satisfied. The effectiveness of the proposed algorithm is demonstrated through a benchmark example of the IEEE 14-bus system.

Index Terms—False-data manipulation, secure state estimation, time-stamp, asynchronous Kalman filter

I. INTRODUCTION

Many real-world large-scale systems, such as power systems, water distribution networks, and transportation networks, are examples of cyber-physical systems where physical processes are tightly coupled with digital devices and infrastructure. Due to their large-scale description, those cyber-physical systems are generally divided into many smaller partitions that are jointly monitored and controlled via wired or wireless communications, leaving the systems vulnerable to malicious attackers. The attackers might exploit unprotected communication channels to manipulate data shared among the systems, to intentionally disrupt the systems. Recent reports have shown the disastrous consequences of malware for an industrial control system in Iran and a Ukrainian power grid [1], [2]. Motivated by these and many other examples in [2], security is an essential element of cyber-physical systems. In particular, the challenge of securely estimating unmeasured states under malicious activities has been widely addressed [3]–[9], given the crucial role of state estimation in control systems. This challenge, known as secure state estimation of control systems, is mainly addressed by considering asynchronous non-periodic sampled systems in this paper.

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant no. 62273196, by the Swedish Research Council under the grant 2021-06316, and by the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research.

Zishuo Li and Yilin Mo are with the Department of Automation, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China. {lizs19@mails, ylmo@mail}.tsinghua.edu.cn.

Anh Tung Nguyen and André M. H. Teixeira are with the Department of Information Technology, Uppsala University, PO Box 337, SE-75105, Uppsala, Sweden. {anh.tung.nguyen, andre.teixeira}@it.uu.se).

Karl H. Johansson is with School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm SE-100 44, Sweden. kallej@kth.se.

To deal with the problem of secure state estimation against false data injection attacks, three research directions consisting of the sliding window method, the estimator switching method, and the local decomposition-fusion method, have been mainly developed in recent years [3]–[6]. The sliding window method considers the past sensor measurements in a finite time horizon to do the state estimation via batch optimization problems [5], [10]. The estimator switching method maintains multiple parallel estimators that utilize the measurements given by a subset of all the sensors [6], [11]. In the local decomposition fusion, multiple decentralized estimators, each of which samples the measurement of one local sensor, are designed to solve a combinatorial complex problem of the full state estimation. Then, local estimated states provided by such local state estimators are fused by a convex optimization problem to generate secure estimation [3], [4].

Denial-of-service attacks block the measurement transmitted to the state estimator, undoubtedly worsening the state estimation performance. To handle such attacks conducted to multiple transmission channels, a class of partial observers that provide reliable partial state estimates is proposed in [8]. On the other hand, to handle Denial-of-Service attacks, which are conducted on multiple transmission channels, a class of partial observers that provide reliable partial state estimates is proposed in [8]. The authors in [12] propose a detection-compensation scheme to detect the presence of DoS attacks and then effectively reconstruct missing state estimates through past available states. This scheme eventually mitigates the attack’s impact on the performance of the state estimation. One of the most ubiquitous techniques used to effectively deal with DoS attacks is event-triggered mechanisms [9]. On the other hand, event-triggered mechanisms have received much attention since they deal with DoS attacks very effectively. Flexible event-triggered mechanisms such as a newly proposed dynamic event-triggered state estimation [9] are very efficient in alleviating the performance loss of the state estimation caused by DoS attacks.

In asynchronous non-periodic sampled systems, where measurement data is sampled at different rates, data packages of the measurement, sent to the estimator over unprotected communication channels, are vulnerable to malicious attackers. In this paper, we propose a novel model of false data attacks on the asynchronous non-periodic sampled system (see Fig. 1). This novel attack includes both integrity attacks such as false-data injection [7], and availability attacks such as denial-of-service attacks [8], [9]. Moreover, we investigate the influence of time-stamp manipulation caused by malicious attackers. Apart from those attacks, injecting fake data packages into authentic measurement streams is also a serious threat to the asynchronous non-periodic sampled system due to its stealthiness. Our introduced attack model unifies all the above attacks into one framework without excluding the possibility of their combinations.

To the best of our knowledge, comparatively little progress has been made toward studying the negative influence of time-stamp manipulation on the state estimation performance, especially on asynchronous sampled systems. Li et al. [13] and Guo et al. [14] propose Kalman Filter (KF)-based algorithms for non-uniformly sampled multi-rate systems. To deal with the problem of the asynchronous linear and nonlinear sampled systems, the authors in [15] propose




Fig. 1: Examples of the spatio-temporal false data attack that can manipulate both the time-stamp value and the measurement value.

a class of continuous-discrete observers, resulting in a differential Riccati equation. They show the stability of such a differential Riccati equation, which guarantees the convergence of the observers. Ding et al. [16] analyze the observability degradation problem of multi-rate and non-periodic sampled systems. For time-stamp-related attacks, the negative impact of time synchronization attacks on smart grids is studied by the authors in [17].

In this paper, we first study the novel spatio-temporal false data attack model, as depicted in Fig. 1, which is first proposed in the preliminary version of this paper [18]. Then, we design a secure estimation algorithm to recover the system state in the presence of such a spatio-temporal false data attack on a fixed number of sensors (say p corrupted sensors). The algorithm has the following merits:

- (1) The proposed algorithm adopts an asynchronous non-periodic sampling framework. Thus, the algorithm is capable of including synchronous sampling and multi-rate sampling scenarios.
- (2) The impact of the data-space and time-stamp-space false data attacks are both transformed into the value manipulation of local state estimates. This transformation enables us to handle such temporal-spatial attacks in a unified framework and to propose a resilient fusion algorithm.
- (3) Given the $2p$ -sparse observability of the system, we show that the proposed estimation has a stable error. Moreover, we give explicit estimation error in the presence of spatio-temporal false data attacks.

We conclude this section by introducing the notation that will be utilized throughout this paper.

Notation: The sets of positive integers, non-negative integers, and non-negative real numbers are denoted as $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, respectively. The cardinality of a set \mathcal{S} is denoted as $|\mathcal{S}|$. Denote the span of row vectors of matrix A as $\text{rowspan}(A)$. All-zero and all-one matrices with an appropriate size are denoted as $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$, respectively. We denote I as an identity matrix with an appropriate dimension. The spectral radius of matrix A is denoted as $\rho(A)$. For a vector x , $[x]_j$ stands for its j -th entry. $\text{diag}(x)$ denotes the diagonal matrix with vector x on the diagonal. We denote the continuous time

index in a pair of parenthesis (\cdot) and the discrete-time index in a pair of brackets $[\cdot]$. $\partial f(x)$ is the subgradient of function f at x .

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We first introduce the system, the modeling of asynchronous measurements, and several assumptions that will be used throughout this paper. Secondly, we present a novel spatio-temporal false data attack. Finally, the secure estimation problem is formulated.

A. Systems with asynchronous measurements

Throughout this paper, we consider an LTI system mathematically described by n states and measured by m sensors. Let us denote the state index set as $\mathcal{J} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and the sensor index set as $\mathcal{I} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. The LTI system is modeled as follows:

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

$$y_i(t) = C_i x(t) + v_i(t), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad (2)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the system state, $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Wiener process noise, $y_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the measurement value given by sensor i , and $v_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is Gaussian measurement noise with time-varying covariance $R_i(t)$. The process noise from time t_1 to t_2 is denoted as $w(t_1, t_2)$ and the corresponding covariance is $Q \cdot (t_2 - t_1)$ where Q is a positive semi-definite matrix. Let us denote the measurement matrix of all the sensors $C \triangleq [C_1^\top, \dots, C_m^\top]^\top$ where the scalar measurement matrix C_i is given. The initial state $x(0)$ is assumed to be a Gaussian random vector with a known covariance and is independent of the measurement noise, i.e., $x(0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ where Σ is known. Let us introduce the following assumptions.

Assumption 1: For every sensor $i \in \mathcal{I}$, its corresponding measurement noise covariance $R_i(t)$ satisfies the following: $0 \leq R_i(t) \leq \bar{r}$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where \bar{r} is a given positive constant scalar. \triangleleft

Assumption 2: The system (A, C) is $2p$ -sparse observable, i.e., the system $(A, C_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{M}})$ is observable for any subset $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{I}$ where $|\mathcal{M}| = 2p$ and the matrix $C_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{M}}$ represents the matrix composed of rows of C with row indices in $\mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{M}$. \triangleleft

In practice, the information about the upper bound of measurement noises can be provided by sensor manufacturers, validating the use of Assumption 1. The observability redundancy in Assumption 2 is a necessary condition and is commonly used in literature [6], [8], [10], [11], [19] when systems under sensor attacks are studied.

In this paper, we consider a general sampling scenario where the sensors sample and send the measurements to an estimation operator in a non-periodic and asynchronous manner. The sensors send not only the measurement values but also their sensor indices and sampling time-stamps in a packet to the estimation operator. More specifically, the estimation operator receives measurement triples from sensor $i \in \mathcal{I}$, which has the following form:

$$\text{measurement triple: } (i, t, y_i(t)), \quad (3)$$

where i is the sensor index, t is the sampling time-stamp, and $y_i(t)$ is the measurement value given by sensor i .

Define the set of sampling time-stamps from sensor i as Γ_i . Without loss of generality, the time when the estimation starts working is set as $t_0 = 0$. In order to guarantee system observability under non-uniform asynchronous measurements, we introduce the following notation and assumptions. Define the set of sampling time intervals and cumulative sampling time from sensor i as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &\triangleq \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{T}_i, \quad \mathcal{T}_i \triangleq \{t_k - t_{k-1} \mid t_k, t_{k-1} \in \Gamma_i, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}} &\triangleq \bigcup_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_i, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_i \triangleq \{t_k - t_j \mid t_k, t_j \in \Gamma_i, k > j, k, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define the system pathological sampling interval set [16] as

$$\mathcal{T}^* \triangleq \left\{ T > 0 \mid e^{\lambda_i T} = e^{\lambda_j T}, i \neq j, \lambda_i, \lambda_j \in \text{sp}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

To prevent system observability degradation problems due to discrete-time samplings, the following assumption, which is also seen in [16], [20], is introduced.

Assumption 3 (non-pathological sampling time): Given a positive number T_{\max} , the sampling time interval sets \mathcal{T} and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfy the following conditions: $\sup \mathcal{T} \leq T_{\max}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \cap \mathcal{T}^* = \emptyset$. \triangleleft

B. Modeling of spatial-temporal false data attacks

We introduce a new spatio-temporal false data attack that generalizes integrity attacks and availability attacks (see Figure 1 for more detail). More specifically, the adversary may manipulate the entire measurement triple (3) sent by several sensors rather than only the measurement value. Let us denote $\mathcal{S}(t)$ as the set of all the measurement triples with time-stamp t , which is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{S}(t) \triangleq \{(i, t, y_i(t)) \mid i \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{S}^a(t)$ denotes the set of measurement triples with time-stamp t after being manipulated by the attacker. Denote the set of corrupted sensors as \mathcal{C} , which is fixed over time and unknown to the operator. Now, we are ready to define the new spatio-temporal false data attack as follows:

Definition 1 (Spatio-Temporal False Data Attack): The attacker can manipulate measurement triples given by corrupted sensor $i \in \mathcal{C}$ in the following four ways where $(i, t, y_i(t)) \in \mathcal{S}(t)$ is the original measurement triple and $(i, t^f, y_i^f(t)) \notin \mathcal{S}(t)$ is the fake measurement triple. $y_i^a(t)$ and t^a are manipulated values from $y_i(t)$ and t .

(1) **false-data injection:**

$$\mathcal{S}^a(t) \triangleq [\mathcal{S}(t) \setminus (i, t, y_i(t))] \cup (i, t, y_i^a(t))$$

(2) **time-stamp manipulation:**

$$\mathcal{S}^a(t) \triangleq [\mathcal{S}(t) \setminus (i, t, y_i(t))] \cup (i, t^a, y_i(t))$$

(3) **denial-of-service:**

$$\mathcal{S}^a(t) \triangleq \mathcal{S}(t) \setminus (i, t, y_i(t))$$

(4) **fake-data generation:**

$$\mathcal{S}^a(t) \triangleq \mathcal{S}(t) \cup (i, t^f, y_i^f(t))$$

Further, if the set of corrupted sensors satisfies $|\mathcal{C}| \leq p$, malicious activities are called p -sparse spatio-temporal false data attacks. \triangleleft

In the scope of this paper, we mainly study the p -sparse spatio-temporal false data attack. Given several sensors under the proposed p -sparse spatio-temporal attack, the manipulated time-stamp set Γ^a is defined as follows:

$$\Gamma^a \triangleq \bigcup_{i=1}^m \Gamma_i^a, \quad \Gamma_i^a \triangleq \{t \mid (i, t, y_i(t)) \in \mathcal{S}^a(t)\}. \quad (4)$$

Due to various delays, received measurement time-stamps may not be in increasing order, resulting in the out-of-sequence problem [21]–[23]. This problem is generally dealt with by utilizing the *Buffering* method that sorts the received measurement triples based on their time-stamps in increasing order (see more details in [21]–[23]). In this paper, we assume a similar buffering system is working before the secure estimation, enabling us to employ the following assumption.

Assumption 4: The received measurement triples are in an order such that their corresponding time-stamps are in an increasing order, i.e., $\Gamma^a = \{t_0, t_1, t_2, \dots\}$ and $0 = t_0 < t_i \leq t_{i+1}$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. \triangleleft

In this paper, we design a secure estimation algorithm that provides a state estimate $\hat{x}(t)$ of the true state $x(t)$ with uniformly bounded error as:

$$|\tilde{x}_j[k] - x_j[k]| \leq F(A, C, Q, \Sigma, \bar{r}, \gamma), \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, \quad (5)$$

where design parameter γ is a positive scalar and $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}[x(0)x(0)^\top]$. Notice that the value of function $F(\cdot)$ depends only on the system parameters and is independent to attacks.

In the following section, we present the sampled-data KF and its local linear decomposition, with the former known to be optimal and the latter recovering the former exactly. The decomposition has the potential to give us a secure state estimation in the presence of the introduced spatio-temporal false data attacks by isolating the impact of attack at local sensor. The secure estimator based on the local decomposition of sampled-data KF will be introduced in Section IV.

III. ASYNCHRONOUS SAMPLED-DATA KF AND ITS DECOMPOSITION

We first introduce the sampled-data KF with asynchronous sampling measurements. The remainder of the section presents the decomposition of the sampled-data KF and how it recovers the state estimate provided by the sampled-data KF.

A. Preliminary: Asynchronous sampled-data KF

For linear continuous-time systems with synchronous discrete-time measurements, the sampled-data KF provides optimal estimation by combining continuous-time prediction steps and discrete-time update steps [24]. We define the measurement availability index $\phi_i[k] \in \{0, 1\}$ where $\phi_i[k] = 1$ if sensor i has a measurement with time-stamp t_k and $\phi_i[k] = 0$ otherwise. The notation $[k]$ stands for the discrete-time instant. For convenience, let us define the following matrices that will be used to estimate the state at each discrete time instant k :

$$A[k] \triangleq \exp(A \cdot (t_{k+1} - t_k)), \quad Q[k] \triangleq Q \cdot (t_{k+1} - t_k),$$

$$C[k] \triangleq \text{diag}(\phi[k]) C, \quad R[k] \triangleq \text{diag}(\phi[k]) R(t_k),$$

where $\phi[k] \triangleq (\phi_1[k], \dots, \phi_m[k])^\top$. We consider the estimation at sampling instant and the estimator reduces to a discrete time-variant system, on which we implement the following asynchronous sampled-data KF:

Prediction steps:

$$\hat{x}[k] = A[k-1]\hat{x}[k-1], \quad (6a)$$

$$P[k] = A[k-1]P[k-1]A^\top[k-1] + Q[k-1], \quad (6b)$$

Update steps:

$$K[k] = P[k]C^\top[k] \left(C[k]P[k]C^\top[k] + R[k] \right)^\dagger, \quad (6c)$$

$$P[k] = (I - K[k]C[k])P[k], \quad (6d)$$

$$\hat{x}[k] = \hat{x}[k] + K[k](y[k] - C[k]\hat{x}[k]), \quad (6e)$$

where $y[k] \triangleq y(t_k)$, initial condition $\hat{x}[0] = 0$, $P[0] = \Sigma$, and $(\cdot)^\dagger$ stands for the Moore-Penrose inverse. Notice that when $\phi_i[k] = 0$, $C_i[k] = \mathbf{0}^\top$ and thus based on (6c), the i -th column Kalman gain is zero, i.e., $K_i[k] = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, one has $K[k]C[k] = K[k]C$ for all time index k .

In the following section, we will decompose the KF (6e) into a linear sum of local estimations and propose an optimization-based fusion scheme that provides a state estimate exactly the same as the one given by the KF (6e).

B. Linear decomposition of the sampled-data KF

Define

$$\Pi[k-1] \triangleq A[k-1] - K[k]CA[k-1]. \quad (7)$$

The local estimator at sensor i is defined as:

$$\zeta_i[k] \triangleq \Pi[k-1]\zeta_i[k-1] + K_i[k]y_i[k], \quad (8)$$

which is initialized as $\zeta_i(0) = \mathbf{0}$. From (6e), (7), and (8), one obtains the following property

$$\hat{x}[k] = \sum_{i=1}^m \zeta_i[k]. \quad (9)$$

In the following, we show the relationship between $\zeta_i[k]$ and $x(t_k)$, and prove that $\zeta_i[k]$ is a stable estimate of $G_i[k]x[k]$ where $G_i[k]$ satisfies the following dynamics:

$$G_i[k] \triangleq \Pi[k-1]G_i[k-1]A^{-1}[k-1] + K_i[k]C_i. \quad (10)$$

It is worth noting that $G_i[k]$ plays a crucial role in designing a secure state estimation algorithm throughout the paper. Therefore, we analyze its structure and show that $G_i[k]$ has a time-invariant form in the next subsection.

C. Structure of $G_i[k]$

We need the following assumption to prevent the observability degradation problems.

Assumption 5: The geometric multiplicity of all the eigenvalues of A is 1. \triangleleft

Assumption 5 simplifies the observability structure of system (A, C) , which can be seen from Lemma 1 later. The reason is that Assumption 5 ensures that the Jordan blocks of A are linearly independent, which enables the definition of state observability, i.e., define \mathcal{E}_j as the index set of sensors that can observe state j , i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}_j \triangleq \left\{ i \in \mathcal{I} \mid O_i^\top \mathbf{e}_j \neq \mathbf{0} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{e}_j is the canonical basis vector with 1 on the j -th entry and 0 on the other entries. Moreover,

$$O_i \triangleq [C_i^\top, (C_i A)^\top, \dots, (C_i A^{n-1})^\top]^\top$$

is the observability matrix of the system (A, C_i) . Since we focus on the observable system, the state observability index set \mathcal{E}_j is not empty, i.e. $\mathcal{E}_j \neq \emptyset, \forall j \in \mathcal{J}$. With Assumption 5, the following results characterize the structure of $G_i[k]$.

Lemma 1: Given the dynamics (10), if $\text{rowspan}(G_i[0]) = \text{rowspan}(O_i)$, the following always holds $\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$:

$$\text{rowspan}(G_i[k]) = \text{rowspan}(O_i) = \text{rowspan}(H_i), \quad (12)$$

where $H_i \triangleq \text{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_1}(i), \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_2}(i), \dots, \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_n}(i))$ and $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}}(i)$ is the indicator function that takes the value 1 when $i \in \mathcal{E}$ and value 0 when $i \notin \mathcal{E}$. As a result, there exists an invertible matrix $V_i[k]$ such that $V_i[k]G_i[k] = H_i$. \triangleleft

Proof: See Appendix A.5. \blacksquare

Lemma 2: Given the dynamics (7) and (10), if $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[0] = I$, the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$: $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[k] = I$. \triangleleft

Proof: See Appendix A.6. \blacksquare

The results presented in Lemmas 1-2 will be later utilized to design a sensor fusion algorithm that is an alternative state estimation solution in the following subsection.

Remark 1: In the view of Lemmas 1-2, we initialize sequence $G_i[k]$ as $G_i[0] = \text{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_1}(i)/|\mathcal{E}_1|, \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_2}(i)/|\mathcal{E}_2|, \dots, \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_n}(i)/|\mathcal{E}_n|)$. Recalling that we focus on observable systems and $\mathcal{E}_i \neq \emptyset, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n$, the initialization is thus well-defined. Moreover, this initialization satisfies the assumptions in Lemmas 1-2, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[0] = I$ and $\text{rowspan}(G_i[0]) = \text{rowspan}(O_i)$. \triangleleft

D. Least-square state estimation fusion

Define the local residue as $\epsilon_i[k] \triangleq \zeta_i[k] - G_i[k]x[k]$ and the global residue as $\epsilon[k] \triangleq [\epsilon_1[k]^\top \dots \epsilon_m[k]^\top]^\top$. Then, we have the dynamics of the local residue and the covariance matrix of the global residue in the following lemma.

Lemma 3: For a fixed sensor i , the local residual $\epsilon_i[k]$ satisfies the following dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i[k+1] &= \Pi[k]\epsilon_i[k] - \Pi[k]G_i[k]A^{-1}[k]w[k] \\ &\quad + K_i[k+1]v_i[k+1]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Moreover, the covariance matrix of the global residue $\epsilon[k]$ is computed as follows:

$$\text{Cov}(\epsilon[k+1]) = \Pi[k] \text{Cov}(\epsilon[k]) \Pi^\top[k] + \mathbf{Q}[k], \quad (14)$$

where $\Pi[k] \triangleq I_m \otimes \Pi[k]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}[k] &\triangleq \text{Cov} \left(\Pi[k]G_i[k]A^{-1}[k]w[k] - K_i[k+1]v_i[k+1] \right) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \Pi[k]G_1[k]A^{-1}[k] \\ \vdots \\ \Pi[k]G_m[k]A^{-1}[k] \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}[k] \begin{bmatrix} \Pi[k]G_1[k]A^{-1}[k] \\ \vdots \\ \Pi[k]G_m[k]A^{-1}[k] \end{bmatrix}^\top \\ &\quad + \begin{bmatrix} K_1[k+1] \\ \vdots \\ K_m[k+1] \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1[k+1] \\ \vdots \\ K_m[k+1] \end{bmatrix}^\top \circ (R[k+1] \otimes \mathbf{1}_{n \times n}), \end{aligned}$$

the notation \circ denotes the element-wise matrix multiplication, and \otimes denotes the Kronecker product. \triangleleft

Proof: See Appendix A.7. \blacksquare

The result of Lemma 3 shows that the $\zeta_i[k]$ is the stable estimate of $G_i[k]x[k]$. The expression (14) enables us to consider the matrix sequence $\mathbf{W}[k]$ that satisfies the following recursive equation

$$\mathbf{W}[k+1] = \Pi[k]\mathbf{W}[k]\Pi^\top[k] + \mathbf{Q}[k]. \quad (15)$$

The following lemma shows that $\mathbf{W}[k]$ is non-singular.

Lemma 4: If Assumption 3 is satisfied and $\mathbf{W}[k]$ is initialized to be a non-singular, i.e., $\mathbf{W}[0] \succ 0$, then there exists a positive constant scalar \bar{W} such that for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

$$0 \prec \mathbf{W}[k] \preceq \bar{W} \cdot I, \quad (16)$$

where I is the identity matrix of size $mn \times mn$. \triangleleft

Proof: See Appendix A.1. \blacksquare

The results of Lemmas 1 and 4 show the non-singularity of matrices $V_i[k]$ and $\mathbf{W}[k]$, enabling us to propose the following least square problem that provides a state estimate $x_{\text{ls}}[k]$:

$$\underset{x_{\text{ls}}[k], \theta[k]}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \theta[k] \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{V}[k]\zeta[k] = \mathbf{H}x_{\text{ls}}[k] + \theta[k] \quad (17b)$$

where $\zeta[k] \triangleq [\zeta_1^\top[k], \zeta_2^\top[k], \dots, \zeta_m^\top[k]]^\top$, $\mathbf{H} \triangleq [H_1^\top, H_2^\top, \dots, H_m^\top]^\top$, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \triangleq \mathbf{V}[k]\mathbf{W}[k]\mathbf{V}^\top[k]$, $\mathbf{V}[k] \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(V_1[k], V_2[k], \dots, V_m[k])$, and $\text{blkdiag}(\cdot)$ stands for a block diagonal matrix. Note that $\zeta_i[k]$ is defined in (8) while matrices $V_i[k]$ and H_i are defined in Lemma 1. The following theorem shows that the minimizer $x_{\text{ls}}[k]$ of (17) can exactly recover the Kalman state estimate $\hat{x}[k]$ based on local estimators $\zeta_i[k]$.

Theorem 1: Suppose that $x_{\text{ls}}[k]$ is the solution to the problem (17) and there exists a strictly positive definite Hermitian matrix $\mathbf{W}[0]$. Then, the solution $x_{\text{ls}}[k]$ equals to the asynchronous sampled-data Kalman state estimate $\hat{x}[k]$ defined in (6e), i.e., $x_{\text{ls}}[k] = \hat{x}[k]$. \triangleleft

Proof: See Appendix A.2. \blacksquare

Remark 2: Instead of directly computing the state estimate in (9), we solve the least square problem (17) to obtain the state estimate, which has the same result, as proved by Theorem 1. Although the least square (17) is more complex, it has a decentralized form and its modified version is resilient to the spatio-temporal attacks, as will be introduced in the next section. \triangleleft

IV. SECURE STATE ESTIMATION

In this section, we propose a secure state estimation algorithm against the spatio-temporal false data attacks that were introduced in Definition 1. Prior to the secure fusion, we present an analysis of the spatio-temporal attacks in the following subsection.

A. Attack analysis

In this subsection, we carry out an analysis on the spatio-temporal attacks to show how malicious activities impact the state estimation.

False-data injection: this attack strategy remains the correct time-stamps, but manipulates the measurement values. More specifically, at sampling-time k , one can formulate the false-data injection as follows:

$$y_i^o[k] \triangleq y_i[k] + a_i[k], \text{ if } \phi_i[k] = 1 \text{ and } i \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (18)$$

where $y_i^o[k]$ is the attacked measurement, $y_i[k]$ is the correct measurement, and $a_i[k]$ is the attack signal. The correct time-stamp guarantees the correctness of $\Pi[k-1]$ in (8). As a consequence, the impact of the false data injected into the measurement value can be described in the local estimator as follows:

$$\zeta_i[k] \triangleq \zeta_i^o[k] + \zeta_i^f[k], \quad (19)$$

where $\zeta_i^o[k]$ is the oracle local estimator computed by (8) and $\zeta_i^f[k] \triangleq \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}(k) \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (\prod_{p=0}^{k-1-l} \Pi[k-1-p]) K_i[l] a_i[l] + K_i[k] a_i[k]$ is the malicious impact. Denote $\zeta^o[k] \triangleq [\zeta_1^o[k], \dots, \zeta_m^o[k]]^\top$.

Time-stamp manipulation: this attack strategy remains the correct measurement value, but manipulates the time-stamp from the correct time-stamp t to the attacked time-stamp t^a ($t^a \neq t$). Although the measurement value $y_i(t)$ remains unchanged, the time-stamp manipulation consequently forces the estimation center to treat $y_i(t)$ at the attacked time-stamp t^a . As a consequence, there is a mismatch of the measurement value at time-stamp t^a , which is $y_i(t) - y_i(t^a)$. One can formulate the measurement value at time t^a received by the estimation center as follows: $y_i(t^a) = y_i(t^a) + (y_i(t) - y_i(t^a))$, if $i \in \mathcal{C}$. This formulation enables us to convert the time-stamp manipulation at time t into the false-data manipulation at time t^a . Therefore, the malicious impact can be described in the local estimator as shown in (19).

Denial-of-service: this attack strategy, motivated by jamming attacks such as [25], can be viewed by the time-stamp manipulation where the attack time-stamp t^a is set at infinity.

Fake-data generation: this attack strategy can be described as the combination of false-data injection and time-stamp manipulation. As a result, the malicious impact of the fake-data generation can also be described in the local estimator (19).

In summary, the malicious impact of the spatio-temporal attack can be formulated as the false data injected into the local estimators of the corrupted sensors in (19). This formulation enables us to design the secure fusion in the following subsection.

B. Secure fusion

In light of the previous analysis, the malicious impact of the attacks can be isolated at separate local estimators that correspond

to corrupted sensors. This observation enables us to modify the least square problem (17) to propose the following secure fusion:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\tilde{x}[k], \mu[k], \vartheta[k]}{\text{minimize}} && \frac{1}{2} \mu[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \mu[k] + \gamma \|\vartheta[k]\|_1 && (20a) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{V}[k] \zeta[k] = \mathbf{H} \tilde{x}[k] + \mu[k] + \vartheta[k]. && (20b) \end{aligned}$$

In the remainder of this section, we analyze the minimizer $\tilde{x}[k]$ without and with the spatio-temporal attack. The analysis will take the solution to (17) in the absence of attacks as ground truth, i.e., the solution $(x_{1s}[k], \theta[k])$ obtained by solving (17) with $\zeta[k] = \zeta^o[k]$.

Recall the least square optimization problem (17), its minimizer $\theta[k]$ (see Appendix A.2) can be computed by the following: $\theta[k] = [I - \mathbf{G}[k](\mathbf{1}_m^\top \otimes I)] \zeta[k]$, which enables us to evaluate the solution to the problem (20) in the absence of the attacks in the next theorem.

Theorem 2: Consider the least square problems (17) and (20) with a given $\gamma > 0$, let $(x_{1s}[k], \theta[k])$ be the minimizer for the problem (17) and $(\tilde{x}[k], \mu[k], \vartheta[k])$ be the minimizer for the problem (20). In the absence of the attacks, if the following condition holds

$$\gamma > \|\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \theta[k]\|_\infty, \quad (21)$$

then $\tilde{x}[k] = x_{1s}[k]$, $\mu[k] = \theta[k]$, and $\vartheta[k] = 0$. \triangleleft

Proof: See Appendix A.3. \blacksquare

Let us make use of the following definition of a function that will help us in evaluating the minimizer $\tilde{x}[k]$ of (20) against the spatio-temporal attack in the subsequent theorem.

Definition 2: Given an n -dimensional vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a positive integer a , we define a function $h_a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $h_a(x)$ takes the a -th largest value of the vector x .

Theorem 3 (Secure fusion): Consider the least square problems (17) and (20) with a given $\gamma > 0$, let $(x_{1s}[k], \theta[k])$ be the minimizer for the problem (17) in the absence of the attacks and $(\tilde{x}[k], \mu[k], \vartheta[k])$ be the minimizer for the problem (20) in the presence of the attacks. In the presence of the attacks, the error between $x_{1s}[k]$ and $\tilde{x}[k]$ has the following upper bound:

$$|[\tilde{x}[k]]_j - [x_{1s}[k]]_j| \leq \max \{ |h_c(\eta^j[k])|, | -h_c(-\eta^j[k])| \}, \quad \forall j \in J, \quad (22)$$

where the function $h_c(\cdot)$ is defined in Definition 2, $\eta^j[k]$ is a $|\mathcal{E}_j \setminus \mathcal{C}|$ -dimensional vector where its i -th element $[\eta^j[k]]_i \triangleq [\theta_i[k]]_j + \gamma e_{n(i-1)+j}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \vartheta[k]$ ($\forall i \in \mathcal{E}_j \setminus \mathcal{C}$), with

$$\vartheta[k] \in \partial \|\mathbf{V}[k] \zeta^f[k] - \vartheta[k]\|_1, \quad c \triangleq \lceil \frac{|\mathcal{E}_j \setminus \mathcal{C}| - |\mathcal{E}_j \cap \mathcal{C}|}{2} \rceil. \quad \triangleleft$$

Proof: See Appendix A.4. \blacksquare

It is worth noting that the vectors $\eta^j[k]$ in Theorem 3 are independent of information provided by attacked sensors for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$ by definition and $\vartheta[k]$ is bounded in a range $[-1, 1]$. Consequently, the result of Theorem 3 shows us that the upper bound of the estimation error under the spatio-temporal attacks, which is $|[\tilde{x}[k]]_j - x[k]]_j| \leq |[\tilde{x}[k]]_j - [x_{1s}[k]]_j| + |[x_{1s}[k]]_j - [x[k]]_j|$, is independent of the malicious activities for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Thus, the secure state estimate $\tilde{x}[k]$ is resilient to such attacks, satisfying uniform error bound (5).

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

To validate the obtained results, the proposed secure state estimation (20) is implemented in the IEEE 14-bus system depicted in Fig. 2. The IEEE 14-bus system contains 28 state variables (a phase angle and an angular frequency variables for each bus) and 42 sensors (an electric power, a phase angle, and an angular frequency sensors for each bus). By leveraging the structure of the block diagonal $\mathbf{V}[k]$ and the asynchronous sampling, the elements of $\mathbf{V}[k] \zeta[k]$ in




Fig. 2: The IEEE 14-bus system contains 14 buses and 20 transmission lines. Each bus has two state variables (phase angle and angular frequency) and three sensors (power, phase angle, and angular frequency). Buses 2, 3, 4, and 5 are corrupted by the proposed spatio-temporal false data attack.




Fig. 3: The estimation error comparison among using the sampled-data KF (6) and the least square problem (17), and the least square problem (20) with two different values of γ in the absence of the attack. No vividly observable difference is witnessed among the state estimates provided by KF, (17), and (20) with $\gamma = 400$, which validates the results of Theorems 1 and 2.

(20), which correspond to off-sampling sensors, are true since they are computed based on system modeling. Consequently, we can set elements of $\vartheta[k]$ in (20), which correspond to those true values, are zero in the implementation. In the following, we validate the results obtained in Theorems 1-3.

In the first scenario, we conduct the state estimation using the KF, the proposed least square (17), and the proposed secure least square (20) with two different values of γ , i.e., $\gamma = 2$ and $\gamma = 400$, in the absence of the attack. The estimation errors of the three methods are shown in Fig. 3. No vividly observable difference is witnessed among the three methods, validating the results of Theorems 1-2.

It remains to validate the result of Theorem 3. In the second scenario, we conduct the following spatio-temporal attacks: false data injection on the phase angle sensor of bus 3, time-stamp manipulation on the power sensor of bus 5, denial-of-service on the angular frequency sensor of bus 4, and fake data generation on the power sensor of bus 2 (see Fig. 4). The state estimates provided by the sampled-data KF (6) w/o attacks and the secure least square problem (20) with $\gamma = 2$ under attacks are illustrated in Fig. 5. A clearly observable difference between the estimation errors is witnessed in Fig. 6. While the state estimate provided by the secure least square problem (20) is resilient to the attacks, that provided by the sampled-data KF exhibits a very large error. This illustration shows the effectiveness of our proposed secure state estimation algorithm.




Fig. 4: The spatio-temporal attacks are launched on sensors of buses 2, 3, 4, and 5 where false data injection on the phase angle sensor of bus 3, time-stamp manipulation on the power sensor of bus 5, denial-of-service on the angular frequency sensor of bus 4, and fake data generation on the power sensor of bus 2.




Fig. 5: The horizontal axes represent time in seconds. The least-square problem (20) provides a resilient state estimate against the attacks while the KF fails to provide a resilient state estimate.




Fig. 6: The estimation error comparison between using the KF (6) and the secure least square problem (20). The estimation error of the secure least square problem (20) is unaffected by the attacks and close to the oracle KF without attacks, validating Theorem 3.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper presented a secure state estimation algorithm for continuous LTI systems with non-periodic and asynchronous measurements under the novel spatio-temporal false data attack. The secure estimation was developed based on the decomposition of the sampled-data KF to provide the state estimate which is 1) exactly the same as the one provided by the sampled-data KF in the absence of attacks and 2) resilient to the spatio-temporal false data attack. The effectiveness of the proposed secure state estimation was validated through an IEEE benchmark for power systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Falliere, L. O. Murchu, and E. Chien, "W32. stuxnet dossier," *White paper, symantec corp., security response*, vol. 5, no. 6, p. 29, 2011.
- [2] N. Kshetri and J. Voas, "Hacking power grids: A current problem," *Computer*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 91–95, 2017.

- [3] X. Liu, Y. Mo, and E. Garone, "Local decomposition of kalman filters and its application for secure state estimation," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 66, no. 10, pp. 5037–5044, 2020.
- [4] Z. Li and Y. Mo, "Efficient secure state estimation against sparse integrity attack for regular linear system," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 209–236, 2023.
- [5] Y. Shoukry and P. Tabuada, "Event-triggered state observers for sparse sensor noise/attacks," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 61, no. 8, pp. 2079–2091, 2015.
- [6] Y. Nakahira and Y. Mo, "Attack-resilient \mathcal{H}_2 , \mathcal{H}_∞ , and ℓ_1 state estimator," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 4353–4360, 2018.
- [7] L. Hu, Z. Wang, Q.-L. Han, and X. Liu, "State estimation under false data injection attacks: Security analysis and system protection," *Automatica*, vol. 87, pp. 176 – 183, 2018.
- [8] A.-Y. Lu and G.-H. Yang, "Resilient observer-based control for cyber-physical systems with multiple transmission channels under denial-of-service," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 50, no. 11, pp. 4796–4807, 2019.
- [9] Y. Liu and G.-H. Yang, "Resilient event-triggered distributed state estimation for nonlinear systems against dos attacks," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 9076–9089, 2021.
- [10] H. Fawzi, P. Tabuada, and S. Diggavi, "Secure estimation and control for cyber-physical systems under adversarial attacks," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1454–1467, 2014.
- [11] S. Mishra, Y. Shoukry, N. Karamchandani, S. N. Diggavi, and P. Tabuada, "Secure state estimation against sensor attacks in the presence of noise," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 49–59, 2017.
- [12] L. Su and D. Ye, "A cooperative detection and compensation mechanism against denial-of-service attack for cyber-physical systems," *Information Sciences*, vol. 444, pp. 122–134, 2018.
- [13] W. Li, S. L. Shah, and D. Xiao, "Kalman filters in non-uniformly sampled multirate systems: For fdi and beyond," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 199–208, 2008.
- [14] G. Hui-dong, Z. Xin-hua, X. Lin-zhou, S. Yuan, X. Ce, and T. Shaobo, "Asynchronous multisensor data fusion based on minimum trace of error covariance," in *2006 9th International Conference on Information Fusion*, 2006, pp. 1–5.
- [15] A. Feddaoui, N. Boizot, E. Busvelle, and V. Hugel, "High-gain extended kalman filter for continuous-discrete systems with asynchronous measurements," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 93, no. 8, pp. 2001–2014, 2020.
- [16] F. Ding, L. Qiu, and T. Chen, "Reconstruction of continuous-time systems from their non-uniformly sampled discrete-time systems," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 324–332, 2009.
- [17] Z. Zhang, S. Gong, A. D. Dimitrovski, and H. Li, "Time synchronization attack in smart grid: Impact and analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 87–98, 2013.
- [18] Z. Li, A. T. Nguyen, A. M. Teixeira, Y. Mo, and K. H. Johansson, "Secure state estimation with asynchronous measurements against malicious measurement-data and time-stamp manipulation," in *2023 62nd IEEE CDC*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 7073–7080.
- [19] L. An and G.-H. Yang, "Secure state estimation against sparse sensor attacks with adaptive switching mechanism," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 2596–2603, 2017.
- [20] Muhammad, G. Mustafa, A. Q. Khan, and M. Abid, "On the observability of non-uniformly sampled systems," in *2014 12th International Conference on Frontiers of Information Technology*, 2014, pp. 87–90.
- [21] N. Kaempchen and K. C. J. Dietmayer, "Data synchronization strategies for multi-sensor fusion," in *World Congress on Intelligent Transport Systems*, 2003.
- [22] A. Westenberg, M. Gabb, M. Muntzinger, M. Fritzsche, and K. Dietmayer, "State and existence estimation with out-of-sequence measurements for a collision avoidance system," in *2013 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2013, pp. 612–617.
- [23] K. J. Uribe-Murcia, Y. S. Shmaliy, C. K. Ahn, and S. Zhao, "Unbiased fir filtering for time-stamped discretely delayed and missing data," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2155–2162, 2020.
- [24] S. Särkkä, "Recursive bayesian inference on stochastic differential equations," Ph.D. dissertation, Helsinki University of Technology, 2006.
- [25] Y. Li, L. Shi, P. Cheng, J. Chen, and D. E. Quevedo, "Jamming attacks on remote state estimation in cyber-physical systems: A game-theoretic approach," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 2831–2836, 2015.

APPENDIX

A.1. PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Before showing the proof of Lemma 4, we present the following supporting results.

Lemma 5: Denote sub-blocks $\mathbf{W}_{ij}[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ where $\mathbf{W}[k] = (\mathbf{W}_{ij}[k])_{m \times m}$. For all sensor index $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and arbitrary time $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[k] = P[k]G_i^\top[k]. \quad (23)$$

Proof: See Appendix A.8. \blacksquare

Proposition 1 (Stability of Asynchronous KF [15]): Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. The estimation covariance $P(t)$ of the sampled-data KF defined in (6) satisfies the following properties:

$$pI \preceq P(t) \preceq \bar{p}I, \forall t \geq 0, \quad (24)$$

where p, \bar{p} are constant scalars regardless to the sampling times. \triangleleft

Proof of Lemma 4: We first prove the upper bound. Based on Lemma 5, we have $\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[k] = P[k]G_i^\top[k]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Summing both sides over i and recalling that $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[k] = I$ from Lemma 2, one obtains $\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[k] = P[k]$, where $P[k]$ is the estimation covariance of asynchronous Kalman estimator defined in (6d). On the other hand, the result of Proposition 1 can yield $\alpha \cdot I \preceq P[k] \preceq \bar{\alpha} \cdot I$, resulting in that for each index i , the diagonal block satisfy $\mathbf{W}_{ii}[k] \preceq \bar{\alpha}I$ considering that every block $\mathbf{W}_{ij}[k]$ is semi-positive definite. As a result, there exists a constant \bar{W} such that $\mathbf{W}[k] \preceq \bar{W} \cdot I$ holds for all time index k . \blacksquare

A.2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Firstly, since $\mathbf{V}[k]$ is non-singular based on Lemma 1, we multiply both sides of (17b) with $\mathbf{V}^{-1}[k]$. After using the notations $\mathbf{G}[k] \triangleq [G_1^\top[k], G_2^\top[k], \dots, G_m^\top[k]]^\top$ and $\hat{\theta}[k] = \mathbf{V}^{-1}[k]\theta[k]$, one obtains the following equivalent least square problem:

$$\text{minimize}_{x_{1s}[k], \hat{\theta}[k]} \frac{1}{2} \hat{\theta}[k]^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1}[k] \hat{\theta}[k] \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \zeta[k] = \mathbf{G}[k]x_{1s}[k] + \hat{\theta}[k]. \quad (25b)$$

Secondly, we prove that if the initial value of $\mathbf{W}[k]$ is Hermitian and strictly positive definite and satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[0] = \Sigma \cdot G_i^\top[0]$, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, then Theorem 1 holds. The initialization and Lemma 5 imply that the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$:

$$[I \ \cdots \ I] \mathbf{W}[k] = P[k] \begin{bmatrix} G_1^\top[k] & \cdots & G_m^\top[k] \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

which resulting in

$$\mathbf{G}^\top[k] \mathbf{W}^{-1}[k] \mathbf{G}[k] = P^{-1}[k] [I \ \cdots \ I] \mathbf{G}^\top[k].$$

On the other hand, the solution to (25) is given by

$$x_{1s}[k] = \left(\mathbf{G}^\top[k] \mathbf{W}^{-1}[k] \mathbf{G}[k] \right)^{-1} \mathbf{G}^\top[k] \mathbf{W}^{-1}[k] \zeta[k].$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[k] = I$ from Lemma 2, we finally concludes that

$$x_{1s}[k] = P[k] \mathbf{G}^\top[k] \mathbf{W}^{-1}[k] \zeta[k] = [I \ \cdots \ I] \zeta[k] = \hat{x}[k],$$

where the second equality comes from (26) and the third equality comes from (9). Finally, we show the existence of $\mathbf{W}[0]$ in Appendix A.9. \blacksquare

A.3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Let us introduce two new variables $\alpha[k]$ and $\beta[k]$ as the deviations between the two solutions to the problems (17) and (20) such that $\alpha[k] \triangleq \hat{x}[k] - x_{1s}[k]$ and $\beta[k] \triangleq \mu[k] - \theta[k]$. The proof will be completed if we show that $\alpha[k] = 0$ and $\beta[k] = 0$ in the absence of the attacks. It is worth noting that the absence of the attacks implies the same $\zeta[k]$ in (17) and (20), resulting in $\mathbf{H}\alpha[k] + \beta[k] + \vartheta[k] = 0$. As a result of utilizing the new deviation variables $\alpha[k]$ and $\beta[k]$, solving (20) is equivalent to solving the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\alpha[k], \beta[k], \vartheta[k]}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \beta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \beta[k] + \theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \beta[k] + \gamma \|\vartheta[k]\|_1 \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{H}\alpha[k] + \beta[k] + \vartheta[k] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Let us consider the second term of the objective function (27) which can be rewritten based on its constraint as follows:

$$\theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \beta[k] = -\theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \vartheta[k], \quad (28)$$

where the equality comes from the fact that $\theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \mathbf{H} = 0$ based on the KKT condition of the problem (17).

On the other hand, the condition (21) implies the following property for an arbitrary vector $\vartheta[k]$:

$$\gamma \|\vartheta[k]\|_1 \geq \theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \vartheta[k], \quad (29)$$

where the equality occurs if, and only if, $\vartheta[k] = 0$. This result together with (28) implies that the minimum value of the objective (27) is zero if, and only if, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \beta[k] = 0$ and $\vartheta[k] = 0$. The empty null space of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k]$ gives us $\beta[k] = 0$. As a consequence, the constraint (27) results in $\alpha[k] = 0$ since the matrix \mathbf{H} has an empty null space. The proof is completed. ■

A.4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Before going to the proof of Theorem 3, let us introduce a support result in the following lemma.

Lemma 6: Given a scalar variable x , let us consider the following function: $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^a |x + \omega_i| + \sum_{j=1}^b |x + \nu_j|$, where a and b are given positive integers; ω_i and ν_j are given real numbers for all $1 \leq i \leq a$ and $1 \leq j \leq b$. We denote $c \triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{b-a}{2} \right\rfloor$ and $\nu \triangleq [\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_b]^\top$. Suppose that the minimum value of $f(x)$ occurs at the optimal solution x^* . If $b \geq a + 1$, then the optimal solution x^* only depends on the value of ν and fulfills the following: $|x^*| \leq \max\{|h_c(\nu)|, |h_c(-\nu)|\}$, where $\max\{y, z\}$ takes the greater value between y and z . ◁

Proof of Theorem 3: Recall the analysis in Section IV-A and (19), let us consider the problem (17) with the oracle local estimator $\zeta^o[k]$. Note that the fusion center does not know the oracle value of $\zeta^o[k]$ to find the optimal state estimate $x_{1s}[k]$. However, this optimal solution $(x_{1s}[k], \theta[k])$ can be utilized as a ground truth. On the other hand, we consider the problem (20) in the presence of the attacks, i.e., the corrupted local estimator $\zeta[k] \neq \zeta^o[k]$.

Let us reuse the two deviation variables $\alpha[k]$ and $\beta[k]$ in Appendix A.3 such that $\alpha[k] \triangleq \hat{x}[k] - x_{1s}[k]$ and $\beta[k] \triangleq \mu[k] - \theta[k]$. Next, we plan to show that $\|\alpha[k]\|$ lies in a small ball and is independent of the malicious activities. The constraint of (20) in the presence of the attacks and the constraint of (17) in the absence of the attacks give us the following relationship: $\beta[k] = \mathbf{V}[k] \zeta^f[k] - \mathbf{H}\alpha[k] - \vartheta[k]$. As a consequence, solving (20) in the presence of the attacks is equivalent to solving the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\alpha[k], \beta[k], \vartheta[k]}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \beta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \beta[k] + \theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \beta[k] + \gamma \|\vartheta[k]\|_1 \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \beta[k] = \mathbf{V}[k] \zeta^f[k] - \mathbf{H}\alpha[k] - \vartheta[k]. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Let us denote $\hat{\vartheta}[k] \triangleq \mathbf{V}[k] \zeta^f[k] - \vartheta[k]$ and $\check{\vartheta}[k] \in \partial \|\hat{\vartheta}[k]\|_1$, i.e., the sub-gradient with respect to $\vartheta[k]$. It is worth noting that the i -th element of the sub-gradient $\check{\vartheta}[k]$ takes a value between -1 and 1 . Since $\mathbf{V}[k]$ is a block diagonal matrix, we have the following property: $\mathbf{V}_i[k] \zeta_i^f[k] \neq 0$ when $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathbf{V}_i[k] \zeta_i^f[k] = 0$ otherwise.

With the help of the KKT condition of (17), which is $\theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \mathbf{H} = 0$, the optimization problem (30) can be solved by considering the following optimization problem:

$$\underset{\alpha[k], \hat{\vartheta}[k]}{\text{minimize}} \quad L(\alpha[k], \hat{\vartheta}[k]), \quad (31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L(\alpha[k], \hat{\vartheta}[k]) & \triangleq \theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \hat{\vartheta}[k] + \gamma \|\mathbf{V}[k] \zeta^f[k] - \hat{\vartheta}[k]\|_1 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{\vartheta}[k] - \mathbf{H}\alpha[k] \right)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \left(\hat{\vartheta}[k] - \mathbf{H}\alpha[k] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Let us denote $(\hat{\vartheta}^*[k], \alpha^*[k])$ as the solution to (31), which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L(\alpha[k], \hat{\vartheta}[k])}{\partial \hat{\vartheta}[k]}(\hat{\vartheta}^*[k], \alpha^*[k]) & = \hat{\vartheta}^*[k] - \mathbf{H}\alpha^*[k] \\ & + \theta[k] + \gamma \tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \check{\vartheta}[k] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Then, substituting (33) into (32) and leveraging $\theta[k]^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \mathbf{H} = 0$, which is the KKT condition of (17), give us the following:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\hat{\vartheta}^*[k], \alpha^*[k]) & = -\frac{1}{2} \theta^\top[k] \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^{-1}[k] \theta[k] + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \check{\vartheta}^\top[k] \tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \check{\vartheta}[k] \\ & + \gamma \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \left| [V_i[k] \zeta_i^f[k] + \theta_i[k]]_j - [H_i \alpha^*[k]]_j \right| \\ & + \gamma e_{n(i-1)+j}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \check{\vartheta}[k] + \gamma \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \left| [\theta_i[k]]_j \right| \\ & + \gamma e_{n(i-1)+j}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \check{\vartheta}[k] - [H_i \alpha^*[k]]_j \Big| \Big|. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

For the state with index j , let us recall the index set of sensors that observe state j , which was denoted as \mathcal{E}_j in (11), and the structure of the matrix H_i in Lemma 1, resulting in

$$[H_i \alpha^*[k]]_j = \begin{cases} [\alpha^*[k]]_j, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{E}_j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

where $[\alpha^*[k]]_j$ is the j -th element of $\alpha^*[k]$. In the following, we consider the function $L_j(\hat{\vartheta}^*[k], \alpha^*[k])$ that is a collection of terms containing $[\alpha^*[k]]_j$ in $L(\hat{\vartheta}^*[k], \alpha^*[k])$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L_j(\hat{\vartheta}^*[k], \alpha^*[k]) & = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_j \cap \mathcal{C}} \left| [V_i[k] \zeta_i^f[k] + \theta_i[k]]_j - [\alpha^*[k]]_j \right| \\ & + \gamma e_{n(i-1)+j}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \check{\vartheta}[k] + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}_j \setminus \mathcal{C}} \left| [\theta_i[k]]_j \right| \\ & + \gamma e_{n(i-1)+j}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}}[k] \check{\vartheta}[k] - [\alpha^*[k]]_j \Big|. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Due to the fact that the system is $2p$ -observable, one has $2|\mathcal{E}_j \cap \mathcal{C}| \leq 2|\mathcal{C}| \leq 2p < |\mathcal{E}_j|$, resulting in $|\mathcal{E}_j \cap \mathcal{C}| < |\mathcal{E}_j \setminus \mathcal{C}|$. This result implies that the number of $[\alpha^*[k]]_j$ in the first term of (36) is less than that of $[\alpha^*[k]]_j$ in the second term of (36). This observation enables us to apply the result of Lemma 6 to (36) together with the definition $[\alpha^*[k]]_j = [\hat{x}[k]]_j - [x_{1s}[k]]_j$, resulting in (22). The proof is completed. ■

A.5. PROOF OF LEMMA 1

The second equality of (12) holds by the definition of the observability matrix O_i and H_i . By induction method, we show the first equality of (12). Let us assume $\text{rowspan}(G_i[k]) = \text{rowspan}(O_i)$. We need to show that $\text{rowspan}(G_i[k+1]) = \text{rowspan}(O_i)$.

According to Assumption 5, one obtains

$$\text{rowspan}(G_i[k]A^{-1}[k]) = \text{rowspan}(O_iA^{-1}[k]) = \text{rowspan}(O_i)$$

and $\text{rowspan}(\Pi[k]G_i[k]A^{-1}[k]) = \text{rowspan}(O_i)$. Moreover, since $\text{rowspan}(K_i[k+1]C_i) \subseteq \text{rowspan}(O_i)$ and one obtains that $\text{rowspan}(G_i[k+1]) \subseteq \text{rowspan}(O_i)$.

If $((A[k] - K[k+1]CA[k])G_i[k]A^{-1}[k] + K_i[k+1]C_i)^\top e_j = 0$, we alter $K_i[k+1]$ slightly so that the equation does not hold while the performance of the estimator is not influenced. As a result, $\text{rowspan}((A[k] - K[k+1]CA[k])G_i[k]A^{-1}[k] + K_i[k+1]C_i) = \text{rowspan}(G_i[k+1])$ and the proof is completed. ■

A.6. PROOF OF LEMMA 2

The proof is presented by the induction. Assume that $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[k] = I$ and we show that $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[k+1] = I$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m G_i[k+1] &= \sum_{i=1}^m \Pi[k]G_i[k]A^{-1}[k] + K_i[k+1]C_i[k+1] \\ &= \Pi[k]A^{-1}[k] + K[k+1]C = I, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality comes from the assumption that $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i[k] = I$ and the last equality comes from the definition of $\Pi[k]$ in (7). ■

A.7. PROOF OF LEMMA 3

According to the definition of $\epsilon_i[k]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i[k+1] &= \zeta_i[k+1] - G_i[k+1]x[k+1] \\ &= \Pi[k]\zeta_i[k] + K_i[k+1](C_iA[k]x[k] + C_iw[k] + v_i[k+1]) \\ &\quad - G_i[k+1](A[k]x[k] + w[k]) \\ &= \Pi[k]\zeta_i[k] - (G_i[k+1]A[k] - K_i[k+1]C_iA[k])x[k] \\ &\quad - (G_i[k+1] - K_i[k+1]C_i)w[k] + K_i[k+1]v_i[k+1] \\ &= \Pi[k](\zeta_i[k] - G_i[k]x[k]) - \Pi[k]G_i[k]A^{-1}[k]w[k] \\ &\quad + K_i[k+1]v_i[k+1], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from (10). The proof is completed. ■

A.8. PROOF OF LEMMA 5

According to (15), we know that $\mathbf{W}_{ij}[k]$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{ij}[k+1] &= \Pi[k]\mathbf{W}_{ij}[k]\Pi^\top[k] + \\ &\quad \Pi[k]G_i[k]A^{-1}[k]Q[k]\left(\Pi[k]G_j[k]A^{-1}[k]\right)^\top + \\ &\quad K_i[k+1]K_j^\top[k+1] \circ (R_{ij}[k+1] \otimes \mathbf{1}_{n \times n}), \end{aligned}$$

where scalar $R_{ij}[k+1]$ is the element of the matrix $R[k+1]$ on i -th row and j -th column. On the other hand, since $\sum_{i=0}^m G_i[k] = I$ is shown in Lemma 2, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[k+1] \\ &= \Pi[k]\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[k]\right)\Pi^\top[k] \\ &\quad + (I - K[k+1]C)Q[k]\left(\Pi[k]G_j[k]A^{-1}[k]\right)^\top \\ &\quad + K[k+1]R_j[k+1]K_j^\top[k+1]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

In the following, we prove that $P[k]G_j^\top[k]$ satisfies the same dynamics with $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[k]$, where $P[k]$ is defined in (6d). According to (6), $P[k]$ and $K[k]$ satisfy the following:

$$\begin{aligned} P[k+1] &= (I - K[k+1]C)\left(A[k]P[k]A^\top[k] + Q[k]\right), \\ K[k+1]R[k+1] &= \Pi[k]P[k]A^\top[k]C^\top[k+1] \\ &\quad + (I - K[k+1]C)Q[k]C^\top[k+1]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Considering the dynamics of $G_j[k]$ in (10) gives us the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &P[k+1]G_j^\top[k+1] \\ &= \Pi[k]P[k]A^\top[k]G_j^\top[k+1] + (I - K[k+1]C)Q[k]G_j^\top[k+1] \\ &= \Pi[k]P[k]G_j^\top[k]\Pi^\top[k] + \Pi[k]P[k]A^\top[k]C_j^\top[k+1]K_j^\top[k+1] \\ &\quad + (I - K[k+1]C)Q[k]G_j^\top[k+1] \\ &= \Pi[k]P[k]G_j^\top[k]\Pi^\top[k] \\ &\quad + (I - K[k+1]C)Q[k]\left(\Pi[k]G_j[k]A^{-1}[k]\right)^\top \\ &\quad + \left(\Pi[k]P[k]A^\top[k] + (I - K[k+1]C)Q[k]\right) \times \\ &\quad \quad \quad C_j^\top[k+1]K_j^\top[k+1]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

From (37)-(39), one obtains (23). ■

A.9. THE CONSTRUCTION OF $W[0]$

Construct

$$\mathbf{W}[0] \triangleq \mathbf{D} \circ (\mathbf{1}_{m \times m} \otimes \Sigma),$$

where

$$\mathbf{D} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{11} & \mathbf{D}\mathbf{D}_{12} & \cdots & \mathbf{D}_{1m} \\ \mathbf{D}_{21} & \mathbf{D}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{D}_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{D}_{m1} & \mathbf{D}_{m2} & \cdots & \mathbf{D}_{mm} \end{bmatrix}.$$

One can verify that, if the following three constraints are satisfied, $\mathbf{W}[0]$ is Hermitian, strictly positive definite and satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{ij}[0] = \Sigma \cdot G_i^\top[0]$.

- (1) $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}^\top$,
- (2) $\mathbf{D} \succ 0$,
- (3) $\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{D}_{ij} = G_i[0]$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

We design the blocks \mathbf{D}_{ij} to be the following diagonal matrices:

$$\mathbf{D}_{ij} \triangleq \begin{cases} -I_n, & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ G_i[0] + (m-1) \cdot I_n, & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

where I_n represents an $n \times n$ identity matrix.

By definition (40), the conditions (1) and (3) are satisfied. We proceed to prove that \mathbf{D} is positive definite. Denote $\mathbf{D}_{ij}^{[k]}$ as the k -th diagonal element of \mathbf{D}_{ij} . We have that $\mathbf{D}_{ii}^{[k]} \geq \sum_{j \neq i} \left| \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{[k]} \right|$ for all $k \in \mathcal{J}$ since $G_i[0]$ is non-negative diagonal matrix. According to Gershgorin circle theorem, \mathbf{D} is positive semi-definite.

We proceed to prove that \mathbf{D} is positive definite after elementary matrix operation. Since the system is observable, for each state index $j \in \mathcal{J}$, there exists a sensor i such that $i \in \mathcal{E}_j$. Denote such index i as $\iota(j)$. For each $j \in \mathcal{J}$, we do the following examination procedure. For all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, if $i \notin \mathcal{E}_j$, then multiply the $1/\mathbf{D}_{\iota(j)j}^{(j)}$ times of $(\iota(j) - 1)n + j$ -th row of \mathbf{D} on $(i-1)n + j$ -th row of \mathbf{D} . After this elementary matrix operation, one can verify that every diagonal matrix of \mathbf{D} satisfies $\mathbf{D}_{ii}^{[k]} > \sum_{j \neq i} \left| \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{[k]} \right|$ for all $k \in \mathcal{J}$. Therefore, \mathbf{D} is positive definite according to the fact that matrix rank does not degrade after an elementary matrix operation.