

On the Effects of Modeling Errors on Distributed Continuous-time Filtering

Xiaoxu Lyu ^a, Shilei Li ^b, Dawei Shi ^b, Ling Shi ^a

^a*Department of Electronic and Computer Engineering, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China*

^b*School of Automation, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081, China*

Abstract

This paper offers a comprehensive performance analysis of the distributed continuous-time filtering in the presence of modeling errors. First, we introduce two performance indices, namely the nominal performance index and the estimation error covariance. By leveraging the nominal performance index and the Frobenius norm of the modeling deviations, we derive the bounds of the estimation error covariance and the lower bound of the nominal performance index. Specifically, we reveal the effect of the consensus parameter on both bounds. We demonstrate that, under specific conditions, an incorrect process noise covariance can lead to the divergence of the estimation error covariance. Moreover, we investigate the properties of the eigenvalues of the error dynamical matrix. In the context of switching topological configurations, we provide a sufficient condition that ensures the stability of the error dynamical matrix. Furthermore, we explore the magnitude relations between the nominal performance index and the estimation error covariance. Finally, we present some numerical simulations to validate the effectiveness of the theoretical results.

Key words: Distributed continuous-time filtering; Modeling error; Performance analysis; Divergence analysis; Sensor networks.

Sensor networks have been extensively employed in various domains, including satellite navigation [6, 17], environmental monitoring [5, 18], and robot cooperative mapping [9, 27]. In addition to attributing the success of sensor networks to the remarkable advancements achieved in networking, computation, and communication technologies, it is crucial to recognize the significant role played by distributed state estimation theories [2, 3, 20, 21]. Distributed state estimation is utilized to estimate the system state for each intelligent sensor within sensor networks by leveraging the collective information from its own observations as well as the shared knowledge from its local neighbors.

Distributed state estimation can be classified into two primary categories: distributed continuous-time filter and distributed discrete-time filter, which are based on two distinct types of state space model frameworks. In comparison to the distributed discrete-time filters, fewer research advancements have been achieved in the stochastic continuous-time model setting, primarily

due to its inherent complexity. The consensus theory also offers significant tools for information fusion in both distributed continuous-time filters and distributed discrete-time filter [15, 16, 22, 29]. Some results of distributed continuous-time state estimation are presented as follows. Olfati-Saber [20] proposed a distributed continuous-time Kalman filter by integrating the consensus fusion term of the state estimate into the Kalman-Bucy filter [13]. It is important to note that a crucial requirement for this distributed filter was the availability of the prior knowledge of the initial state and covariance, and its stability was proven under the assumption of a noise-free scenario. To tackle the issue of unguaranteed boundedness of covariance matrices in the absence of each sensor's observability [20], Kim et al. [14] proposed algorithms by exchanging covariance matrices among sensors. However, the stability and the parameter conditions were also derived under the noise-free assumption. Similarly to the filter structure presented in [20], Wu et al. [30] utilized the inverse of covariance matrices as weights for the consensus terms. Nonetheless, this method encountered similar issues as discussed above. Ren and Al-Saggaf [23] presented a distributed Kalman-Bucy filter for time-varying systems by incorporating a dynamic averaging algorithm,

Email addresses: eelyuxiaoxu@ust.hk (Xiaoxu Lyu), shileili@bit.edu.cn (Shilei Li), daweshi@bit.edu.cn (Dawei Shi), eesling@ust.hk (Ling Shi).

including performance analysis in two scenarios: no measurement noise and the bounded noise. Battilotti et al. [1] exhibited an asymptotically optimal distributed filter, and provided a comprehensive analysis of its convergence and optimality. Duan et al. [7] further proposed a distributed filter for continuous-time systems with time-correlated measurement noise. In this paper, the fundamental filter framework for performance analysis in the presence of modeling errors will be based on the distributed continuous-time filter presented in [1]. This choice is motivated by the less restrictive stability conditions and the asymptotically optimal properties exhibited by this filter. It is worth mentioning that the analysis methods employed in this framework can be adapted to other filters with ease.

In practical scenarios, obtaining precise models is rarely feasible, and modeling errors are widespread. The modeling errors involve deviations in the state matrix, deviations in the measurement matrix, and mismatched noise covariances. Such modeling errors have the potential to result in a decline in the filter performance and even lead to system failure. Several studies have explored the performance of continuous-time filters for a single sensor when confronted with modeling errors. T. Nishimura [19] established a conservative design criterion to ensure the upper bound of the estimation error covariance for continuous-time systems with incorrect noise covariances. Griffin and Sage [10] conducted a thorough sensitivity analysis of filtering and smoothing algorithms, exploring both large and small-scale scenarios, in the presence of the modeling errors. Fitzgerald [8] investigated into the divergence of the Kalman filter, highlighting the mean square error may become unbounded due to the incorrect process noise covariance. Toda and Patel [28] derived performance index bounds and mean square error bounds for the suboptimal filters, considering the presence of modeling errors. Sangsuk-Iam and Bullock [25] analyzed the behavior of the continuous-time Kalman filter under mismatched noise covariances. However, these studies primarily focus on the single-sensor systems. When shifting the focus to the distributed filters, numerous challenges arise. These challenges include dealing with the new distributed filter structure, addressing the coupling terms, and handling the behavior of the consensus parameter. This paper will investigate the effect of the modeling errors on the distributed continuous-time filters.

Motivated by the aforementioned observations, the primary objective of this paper is to offer a comprehensive performance analysis of the distributed continuous-time filter in the presence of modeling errors. This analysis aims to enrich individuals' comprehension and prognostication of the filters' behavior. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- (1) We define two performance indices, namely the nominal performance index and the estimation error

covariance, as metrics to assess the performance of the filter. By utilizing the nominal performance index and the norm of the modeling deviations, the bounds of the estimation error covariance are determined (**Theorem 1**). Moreover, the lower bound of the nominal performance index is also presented (**Proposition 3**). Especially, the effect of the consensus parameter on both bounds is revealed. These results play an important role in evaluating the estimation error covariance by utilizing the nominal models in the presence of the modeling errors.

- (2) It reveals that an incorrect process noise covariance can lead to the divergence of the estimation error covariance for undirected connected networks, regardless of the magnitude of the consensus parameter (**Theorem 2**). It is demonstrated that the nominal parameters must be reasonably designed to ensure the convergence of the estimation error covariance (**Theorem 2, Proposition 1**).
- (3) Under the switching topological configurations, a sufficient condition is provided to guarantee the stability of the error dynamical matrix (**Theorem 3**). The relations between the nominal performance index and the estimation error covariance, including their magnitude relations and the norm bound of their difference, are analyzed based on the characteristics of the noise covariance deviations (**Theorem 4**). This result offers insights into the judicious selection of the nominal covariance to ensure a conservative estimation.

The subsequent sections of this paper are structured as follows. Section 1 provides the necessary preliminaries and problem statement. Section 2 presents the nominal distributed filter and the estimation error covariance. Section 3 focuses on analyzing bounds of the estimation error covariances, divergence, the eigenvalues of the error dynamical matrix under switching topological configurations, and relations between different performance indices. Section 4 exhibits three examples to validate the effectiveness of the theoretical results. Section 5 concludes this paper.

Notations: Throughout this paper, define \mathcal{R}^n and $\mathcal{R}^{n \times m}$ as the sets of n -dimensional real vectors and $n \times m$ -dimensional real matrices, respectively. The notation $\text{Re}(\cdot)$ represents the operation of taking the real part. The vector 1_N is an N -dimensional vector, where all its elements are equal to 1. For a matrix $A \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times m}$, let $\|A\|_F$ and $\|A\|_2$ represent the Frobenius norm and the spectral norm, respectively, and A^T and A^{-1} denote its transpose and inverse, respectively. Let $\sigma_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n(A)$ denote the decreasingly ordered singular values of the matrix A , and $\bar{\sigma}(A)$ and $\underline{\sigma}(A)$ represent the maximum and minimum singular values, respectively. Similarly, let $\lambda_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A)$ denote the decreasingly ordered eigenvalues of a Hermitian matrix A , and $\bar{\lambda}(A)$ and $\underline{\lambda}(A)$ denote the maximum and minimum eigenval-

ues of the matrix A . Moreover, the matrix inequality $A > B$ ($A \geq B$) means that $A - B$ is positive definite (positive semi-definite). The symbol \otimes denotes the Kronecker product, $[A]_{ij}$ represents the (i, j) -th element of the matrix A , $\mathbb{E}\{x\}$ denotes the expectation of the random variable x , $\text{Tr}(A)$ is the trace, and $\text{vec}(A)$ refers to the column vector obtained by concatenating the columns of the matrix A . The logarithmic norm is defined as $\mu(A)$, and the three most common logarithmic norms are $\mu_1(A) = \sup_j (\text{Re}(a_{jj}) + \sum_{i \neq j} |a_{ij}|)$, $\mu_2(A) = \bar{\lambda}(\frac{A+A^T}{2})$, and $\mu_\infty(A) = \sup_i (\text{Re}(a_{ii}) + \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|)$.

1 Preliminaries and Problem Statement

1.1 Graph Theory

A sensor network's nodes and communication links can be represented as the communication topology $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where the node set and the edge set are denoted as $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$, respectively. For $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$, if the information can be transmitted from node j to node i , node j is called a neighbor of node i , denoted as (j, i) . The neighbor set of node i is represented as $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j | (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$, and $|\mathcal{N}_i|$ is the cardinality of the neighbors of node i . The adjacent matrix is $S = [s_{ij}]_{N \times N}$, where $s_{ij} = 1$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$, and $s_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The Laplacian matrix is defined as $\mathcal{L} = D - S$, where $D = \text{diag}\{|\mathcal{N}_1|, \dots, |\mathcal{N}_N|\}$. If $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ implies $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$, the edge (i, j) is called undirected. If every edge is undirected, the communication graph is termed undirected. A directed path from node i_1 to node i_m exists in the graph G , if there is a sequence of connected edges $(i_k, i_{k+1}), k = 1, \dots, m - 1$. The undirected communication graph is connected if there exists a path between every two nodes.

1.2 Supporting Lemmas

Lemma 1 [24] For matrices $A, B \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$ and $q = \min\{m, n\}$, the following inequalities hold for the decreasingly ordered singular values of A , B , and $A + B$: $\sigma_{i+j-1}(A + B) \leq \sigma_i(A) + \sigma_j(B)$, and $|\sigma_i(A + B) - \sigma_i(A)| \leq \sigma_1(B)$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq q$ and $i + j \leq q + 1$.

Lemma 2 [24] For a matrix $A \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$, define $H(A) = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^*)$. Then, it holds $\lambda_i(H(A)) \leq \sigma_i(A)$, where $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Lemma 3 [11] For Hermitian matrices $A, B \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$, it follows $\lambda_i(A) + \lambda_j(B) \leq \lambda_{i+j-n}(A + B)$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $i + j \geq n + 1$.

Lemma 4 [24] For matrices $A \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ and $B \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$, if $\lambda(A) = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m\}$ and $\lambda(B) = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$, then $\lambda((I_n \otimes A) + (B \otimes I_m)) = \{\tau_i + \mu_j, i = 1, \dots, m, j =$

$1, \dots, n\}$. In particular, one has $\lambda((I_n \otimes A) + (B \otimes I_m)) = \lambda((I_m \otimes B) + (A \otimes I_n))$.

Lemma 5 [26] For matrices A and B with the appropriate dimensions, the following properties of the logarithmic norm $\mu(\cdot)$ hold:

- (1) $\mu(\gamma A) = \gamma \mu(A)$ for scalar $\gamma > 0$,
- (2) $\mu(A + B) \leq \mu(A) + \mu(B)$,
- (3) $\|e^{tA}\| \leq e^{t\mu(A)}$ for $t \geq 0$,
- (4) $\mu_2(A) = \bar{\lambda}(\frac{A+A^*}{2})$.

Lemma 6 [28] For matrices A and B with the appropriate dimensions, if $A > 0$ and $B \geq 0$, then $\text{Tr}(AB) \leq \text{Tr}(A)\bar{\sigma}(B) \leq \text{Tr}(A)\text{Tr}(B)$, and $\text{Tr}(A^{-1}B) \geq (\bar{\sigma}(A))^{-1}\text{Tr}(B) \geq [\text{Tr}(A)]^{-1}\text{Tr}(B)$.

Lemma 7 [31] For matrices A , B , and C with the appropriate dimensions, consider the Sylvester equation $AX + XB = C$. There exists a unique solution X if and only if $\lambda_i(A) + \lambda_j(B) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$.

1.3 Problem Statement

Consider a continuous-time linear stochastic system, measured by a sensor network of N sensors, described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + \omega(t), \\ y_i(t) &= C_i x(t) + \nu_i(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where t is the time index, $x(t) \in \mathcal{R}^n$ is the system state, $y_i(t) \in \mathcal{R}^{m_i}$ is the measurement of sensor i , $A \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ is the state matrix, $C_i \in \mathcal{R}^{m_i \times n}$ is the measurement matrix of sensor i , $\omega(t) \in \mathcal{R}^n$ is the process noise, and $\nu_i(t) \in \mathcal{R}^{m_i}$ is the measurement noise of sensor i . It is assumed that $\omega(t)$ and $\nu_i(t)$ are zero-mean white noise processes, and these noise processes are uncorrelated with each other and with the initial state $x(0)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}\{\omega(t)\omega^T(\tau)\} = Q\delta(t - \tau)$, $\mathbb{E}\{\nu_i(t)\nu_i^T(\tau)\} = R_i\delta(t - \tau)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\mathbb{E}\{\omega(t)\nu_i^T(\tau)\} = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $\mathbb{E}\{\nu_i(t)\nu_j^T(\tau)\} = 0$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N, i \neq j$, $Q \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ and $R_i \in \mathcal{R}^{m_i \times m_i}$ denote the process noise covariance and the measurement noise covariance of sensor i , respectively, and $\delta(t)$ represents the Dirac delta function, given by $\delta(t - \tau) = 1$ if $t = \tau$ and 0 otherwise.

A classical distributed continuous-time Kalman filter in [1] is displayed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_{i,s}(t) &= A\hat{x}_{i,s}(t) + K_{i,s}(y_i(t) - C_i\hat{x}_{i,s}(t)) \\ &\quad + \gamma_s P_s(\infty) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (\hat{x}_{j,s}(t) - \hat{x}_{i,s}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where the subscript 's' represents the counterpart in the distributed filter with the accurate model, $K_{i,s} =$

$NP_s(\infty)C_i^T R_i^{-1}$, $P_s(\infty)$ is the solution of

$$0 = AP_s(\infty) + P_s(\infty)A^T + Q - P_s(\infty)C_c^T R_d^{-1} C_c P_s(\infty), \quad (2)$$

$C_c = [C_1^T, \dots, C_N^T]^T$ is the augmented measurement matrix, and $R_d = \text{diag}\{R_1, \dots, R_N\}$ is the augmented measurement noise covariance.

Remark 1 Several distributed continuous-time filters have been proposed in the existing literature [1, 4, 7, 12, 14, 20, 23]. However, two primary issues arise in most of these algorithms. First, the number of the published results of distributed continuous-time filters is much lower than that of distributed discrete-time filters due to the inherent challenges associated with the former. Second, the stability conditions of some filters are rigorous, and the performance analysis of these distributed filters is insufficient. In this paper, the distributed continuous-time filter proposed in [1] is adopted as the fundamental algorithm based on the fact that this algorithm guarantees asymptotically optimal performance and provides adequate analysis. It is worth mentioning that the analytical framework of this algorithm can be extended to other algorithms with ease.

However, implementing accurate model parameters, such as A , C_i , Q , and R_i , is often infeasible. Consequently, the effectiveness of the filter diminishes in the presence of the modeling errors. The main objective of this paper is to analyze the effect of the modeling errors on the distributed continuous-time filter. The problem of the effects of the modeling errors on distributed continuous-time filtering is formulated as follows:

- (1) Establish performance indices in the presence of the modeling errors to assess the performance of the distributed filter. Derive the bounds of the estimation error covariance by utilizing the known nominal information.
- (2) Explain how the incorrect process noise covariance can lead to the divergence of the distributed filter. Analyze the eigenvalues of the error dynamical matrix under the switching topology. Investigate the relations between different performance indices.

2 Performance Indices

This section provides two performance indices, namely the nominal performance index and the estimation error covariance, and the estimation error covariance is derived based on the nominal distributed Kalman filter.

2.1 Nominal Distributed Kalman Filter

It is assumed that the parameters employed in the practical filter are A_u , $C_{i,u}$, Q_u , and $R_{i,u}$, and the subscript ‘ u ’ is utilized to represent the nominal counterpart. In

addition, the relations between the nominal parameters and the actual parameters are defined as $A_u = A + \Delta A$, $C_{i,u} = C_i + \Delta C_i$, $Q_u = Q + \Delta Q$, and $R_{i,u} = R_i + \Delta R_i$, where ΔA , ΔC_i , ΔQ , and ΔR_i are the corresponding deviations. Similarly to the standard distributed Kalman filter, the nominal distributed Kalman filter with known and inaccurate parameters can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_{i,u}(t) = & A_u \hat{x}_{i,u}(t) + K_{i,u}(y_i(t) - C_{i,u} \hat{x}_{i,u}(t)) \\ & + \gamma_u P_u(\infty) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (\hat{x}_{j,u}(t) - \hat{x}_{i,u}(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $K_{i,u} = NP_u(\infty)C_{i,u}^T R_{i,u}^{-1}$, $P_u(\infty)$ is the solution of

$$0 = A_u P_u(\infty) + P_u(\infty)A_u^T + Q_u - P_u(\infty)C_{c,u}^T R_{d,u}^{-1} C_{c,u} P_u(\infty), \quad (4)$$

$C_{c,u} = [C_{1,u}^T, \dots, C_{N,u}^T]^T$ is the augmented nominal measurement matrix, and $R_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{R_{1,u}, \dots, R_{N,u}\}$ is the augmented nominal measurement noise covariance.

For further analysis, some notations are defined. The subscript ‘ u ’ represents the nominal counterpart, the subscript ‘ c ’ denotes the column vector, and the subscript ‘ d ’ indicates the diagonal matrix. Define $A_d = \text{diag}\{A, \dots, A\}$, $A_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{A_u, \dots, A_u\}$, $C_d = \text{diag}\{C_1, \dots, C_N\}$, $C_{c,u} = [C_{1,u}^T, \dots, C_{N,u}^T]^T$, $C_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{C_{1,u}, \dots, C_{N,u}\}$, $R_{c,u} = [R_{1,u}^T, \dots, R_{N,u}^T]^T$, $R_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{R_{1,u}, \dots, R_{N,u}\}$, $R_c = [R_1^T, \dots, R_N^T]^T$, $R_d = \text{diag}\{R_1, \dots, R_N\}$, and $\nu_c(t) = [\nu_1^T(t), \dots, \nu_N^T(t)]^T$.

2.2 Estimation Error Covariance

This subsection derives the bounds of the estimation error covariance by utilizing the nominal performance index and the norm of the modeling deviations, and presents the lower bound of the nominal performance index. Particularly, the effect of the consensus parameter on both bounds is revealed.

The subscript ‘ a ’ is utilized to represent the actual performance index. The estimation error and the estimation error covariance are defined as $\eta_i(t) = x(t) - \hat{x}_{i,u}(t)$, and $\Sigma_{i,a}(t) = \mathbb{E}\{\eta_i(t)\eta_i^T(t)\}$, respectively. Then, the dynamics of $\eta_i(t)$ and $\Sigma_{i,a}(t)$ can be computed as $\dot{\eta}_i(t) = \dot{x}(t) - \dot{\hat{x}}_{i,u}(t)$, and $\dot{\Sigma}_{i,a}(t) = \mathbb{E}\{\dot{\eta}_i(t)\eta_i^T(t) + \eta_i(t)\dot{\eta}_i^T(t)\}$, respectively. Define the augmented estimation error as $\eta_c(t) = [\eta_1^T(t), \dots, \eta_N^T(t)]^T$, the augmented estimation error covariance as $\Sigma_a(t) = \mathbb{E}\{\eta_c(t)\eta_c^T(t)\}$, $S(t) = \mathbb{E}\{\eta_c(t)(1_N \otimes x(t))^T\}$, and $X(t) = \mathbb{E}\{(1_N \otimes x(t))(1_N \otimes x(t))^T\}$. Then, their expressions are presented as follows.

Proposition 1 *The estimation error, the augmented estimation error, and the augmented estimation error covariance can be expressed as follows:*

(1) The estimation error is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\eta}_i(t) &= F_{i,u}x(t) + G_{i,u}\eta_i(t) + \omega(t) - K_{i,u}\nu_i(t) \\ &\quad - \gamma_u P_u(\infty) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (\eta_i(t) - \eta_j(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $F_{i,u} = A - A_u - K_{i,u}(C_i - C_{i,u})$ and $G_{i,u} = A_u - K_{i,u}C_{i,u}$.

(2) The augmented estimation error is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\eta}_c(t) &= F_{d,u}(1_N \otimes x(t)) + \mathcal{A}_u \eta_c(t) \\ &\quad + 1_N \otimes \omega(t) - K_{d,u} \nu_c(t), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $F_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{F_{1,u}, \dots, F_{N,u}\}$, $G_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{G_{1,u}, \dots, G_{N,u}\}$, $K_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{K_{1,u}, \dots, K_{N,u}\}$, and

$$\mathcal{A}_u = G_{d,u} - \gamma_u (\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty)). \quad (7)$$

(3) The augmented estimation error covariance is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Sigma}_a(t) &= \mathcal{A}_u \Sigma_a(t) + \Sigma_a(t) \mathcal{A}_u^T + F_{d,u} S^T(t) \\ &\quad + S(t) F_{d,u}^T + K_{d,u} R_d K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\dot{S}(t) = \mathcal{A}_u S(t) + S(t) A_d^T + F_{d,u} X(t) + U_N \otimes Q$, and $\dot{X}(t) = A_d X(t) + X(t) A_d^T + U_N \otimes Q$.

PROOF. Please refer to Appendix A. \square

To conduct a more comprehensive analysis, the following performance indices are established. Assuming that users only possess knowledge of the nominal model, the nominal performance index is constructed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Sigma}_u(t) &= \mathcal{A}_u \Sigma_u(t) + \Sigma_u(t) \mathcal{A}_u^T \\ &\quad + K_{d,u} R_{d,u} K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The nominal performance index has the same form as the estimation error covariance given in [1]. It is worth mentioning that if $F_{d,u} = 0$, the estimation error covariance (8) is simplified as

$$\dot{\Sigma}_a(t) = \mathcal{A}_u \Sigma_a(t) + \Sigma_a(t) \mathcal{A}_u^T + K_{d,u} R_d K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q. \quad (10)$$

3 Performance Analysis

This section provides an in-depth performance analysis for the distributed continuous-time filtering from multiple different aspects: bounds of the estimation error covariance, divergence analysis, switching topological configurations, and relations between the different performance indices.

First, some assumptions are presented here for further analysis.

Assumption 1 The communication graph is undirected and connected.

Assumption 2 $(A_u, C_{c,u})$ is detectable, $(A_u, Q_u^{1/2})$ have no uncontrolled mode on the imaginary axis, and $\Sigma_u(0) > 0$.

Assumption 3 Under Assumption 1 and 2, there exists γ_{u_0} such that for all $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$, \mathcal{A}_u is Hurwitz stable.

Assumption 4 If $F_{d,u} \neq 0$, A is a Hurwitz matrix. If $F_{d,u} = 0$, no additional conditions apply.

Given Assumption 3, if $\gamma_u = \gamma_{u_0}$, the parameter \mathcal{A}_{u_0} is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}_{u_0} = G_{d,u} - \gamma_{u_0} (\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty)). \quad (11)$$

It is worth mentioning that these assumptions are primarily provided for the nominal parameters rather than the actual parameters. Assumption 1 is the basic assumption of the communication networks. Assumption 2 ensures the stability of the centralized filter under the nominal model. Assumption 3 extends the stability criterion of the centralized filter to that of the distributed filter based on [1]. Assumption 4 guarantees the convergence of the estimation error covariance in the presence of the modeling errors.

3.1 Bounds of the Estimation Error Covariance

This subsection provides the bounds of the estimation error covariance by utilizing the nominal performance index, and presents the lower bound of the nominal performance index. Moreover, it reveals the effect of the consensus parameter on both bounds.

Proposition 2 For $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$, it holds

(1) Under Assumption 3, $\Sigma_u(t)$ converges to $\bar{\Sigma}_u$, where $\bar{\Sigma}_u$ is the solution of the following Lyapunov equation

$$\mathcal{A}_u \bar{\Sigma}_u + \bar{\Sigma}_u \mathcal{A}_u^T + K_{d,u} R_{d,u} K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u = 0. \quad (12)$$

(2) Under Assumption 3 and 4, $\Sigma_a(t)$ converges to $\bar{\Sigma}_a$, where $\bar{\Sigma}_a$ is the solution of the following Lyapunov equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_u \bar{\Sigma}_a + \bar{\Sigma}_a \mathcal{A}_u^T + F_{d,u} \bar{S}^T + \bar{S} F_{d,u}^T \\ + K_{d,u} R_d K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where \bar{S} and \bar{X} are the solutions of the following equations $\mathcal{A}_u \bar{S} + \bar{S} A_d^T + F_{d,u} X(t) + U_N \otimes Q = 0$, and $A_d \bar{X} + \bar{X} A_d^T + U_N \otimes Q = 0$, respectively.

PROOF. Please refer to Appendix B. \square

Remark 2 It should be emphasized that $F_{d,u}$ plays a critical role in the convergence of the augmented estimation error covariance Σ_a . Therefore, Assumption 4 has been made to provide a unified expression and analysis for these two cases. The proof of the convergence shows that the stability of \mathcal{A}_u is a necessary condition to guarantee the convergence of $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$, and the properties of \mathcal{A}_u will be investigated in Section 3.2 and 3.3.

For the distributed filter with the nominal model, it is desired that the steady-state estimation error covariance $\bar{\Sigma}_a$ can be evaluated by the nominal performance index $\bar{\Sigma}_u$. Consequently, the bounds of the steady-state estimation error covariance are given in the following.

Since \mathcal{A}_u incorporates γ_u , and γ_u may tend to infinity. Hence, it is crucial to identify the effect of γ_u . Define $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u = (I_{Nn} \otimes \mathcal{A}_u) + (\mathcal{A}_u \otimes I_{Nn})$. Then, the bound of $\|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\|_2$ is presented as follows.

Lemma 8 For any $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$, if $\bar{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*) < 0$, then

$$\|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{-\bar{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*)}.$$

PROOF. It is known that the spectral norm of an invertible matrix is exactly the reciprocal of its minimum singular value. Hence, it holds

$$\|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\|_2 = \frac{1}{\underline{\sigma}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u)}. \quad (14)$$

Defining the identity $H(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u) = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^*)$ and utilizing Lemma 2, it ensures that $\underline{\sigma}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u) \geq \underline{\lambda}(H(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u))$.

Under Assumption 2, there exists $\gamma_{u_0} > 0$ such that for all $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$, \mathcal{A}_u is Hurwitz stable. From (11), one obtains $\mathcal{A}_u = \mathcal{A}_{u_0} - (\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})(\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty))$. Based on the properties of the singular value, it follows $\underline{\sigma}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u) \geq \underline{\lambda}(H(-\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u))$.

Then, $H(-\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u)$ can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} H(-\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u) &= -\frac{1}{2}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^*) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}((I_{Nn} \otimes \mathcal{A}_u) + (\mathcal{A}_u \otimes I_{Nn})) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}((I_{Nn} \otimes \mathcal{A}_u^*) + (\mathcal{A}_u^* \otimes I_{Nn})) \\ &= W_{\mathcal{A}_{u_0}} + W_{\mathcal{L}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_{\mathcal{A}_{u_0}} = -\frac{1}{2}(I_{Nn} \otimes (\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*) + (\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*) \otimes I_{Nn})$ and $W_{\mathcal{L}} = (\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})[I_{Nn} \otimes (\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty)) + (\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty)) \otimes I_{Nn}]$.

According to Lemma 3, one has

$$\underline{\lambda}(H(-\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u)) \geq \underline{\lambda}(W_{\mathcal{L}}) + \underline{\lambda}(W_{\mathcal{A}_{u_0}}). \quad (15)$$

Based on Lemma 4, the properties of the Kronecker product, and the properties of the Laplacian matrix, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\lambda}(W_{\mathcal{L}}) &= (\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})\underline{\lambda}(I_{Nn} \otimes (\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty)) \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty)) \otimes I_{Nn}) \\ &= 2(\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})\underline{\lambda}((\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty))) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*) < 0$, then $\underline{\lambda}(W_{\mathcal{A}_{u_0}}) = -\bar{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*)$. By combining (14) and (15), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{\underline{\sigma}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{-\bar{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

It can be observed that as $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$, γ_u has no impact on the bounds of $\|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\|_2$. \square

Remark 3 Lemma 8 indicates that the spectral norm of $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}$ associated with the consensus parameter γ_u can be determined by utilizing the maximum eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*$ associated with the consensus parameter γ_{u_0} . Hence, even if the consensus parameter γ_u tends to infinity, this term can still be evaluated by a smaller consensus parameter.

Theorem 1 If Assumption 3 holds, then

(1) $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$ is bounded as follows

$$\max\{0, \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) - \rho\} \leq \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) \leq \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) + \rho,$$

where $\bar{D} = -F_{d,u}\bar{S}^T - \bar{S}F_{d,u}^T$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \|(\text{vec}(I))^T \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1} (K_{d,u} \otimes K_{d,u})\|_2 \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N \|\Delta R_j\|_F^2} \\ &\quad + \|(\text{vec}(I))^T \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\|_2 \left(N \sqrt{\|\Delta Q\|_F^2} + \|\bar{D}\|_F \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

(2) For any $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$, if $\bar{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*) < 0$, then $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$, where $\bar{\rho}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho} &= \frac{\|(\text{vec}(I))^T\|_2}{-\bar{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{A}_{u_0}^*)} \left(\|K_{d,u} \otimes K_{d,u}\|_2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N \|\Delta R_j\|_F^2} + N \sqrt{\|\Delta Q\|_F^2} + \|\bar{D}\|_F \right). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Item 1): By defining $\bar{D} = -F_{d,u}\bar{S}^T - \bar{S}F_{d,u}^T$, (13) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{A}_u\bar{\Sigma}_a + \bar{\Sigma}_a\mathcal{A}_u^T + K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u \\ & = K_{d,u}\Delta R_d K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes \Delta Q + \bar{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Now, consider the vectorization of (17). According to the identity $\text{vec}(XYZ) = (Z^T \otimes X)\text{vec}(Y)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u\text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) + \text{vec}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u) \\ & = (K_{d,u} \otimes K_{d,u})\text{vec}(\Delta R_d) + \text{vec}(U_N \otimes \Delta Q) + \text{vec}(\bar{D}), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u = (I_{Nn} \otimes \mathcal{A}_u) + (\mathcal{A}_u \otimes I_{Nn})$. Similarly to (18), (12) can be calculated as

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u\text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) + \text{vec}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u) = 0. \quad (19)$$

By combining (18) and (19), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u\text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) & = \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u\text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) + (K_{d,u} \otimes K_{d,u})\text{vec}(\Delta R_d) \\ & \quad + \text{vec}(U_N \otimes \Delta Q) + \text{vec}(\bar{D}). \end{aligned}$$

By utilizing the properties of the Kronecker sum and the fact that \mathcal{A}_u is Hurwitz stable, it can be deduced that $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_u$ is also Hurwitz stable. Hence, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) & = \text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}(K_{d,u} \otimes K_{d,u})\text{vec}(\Delta R_d) \\ & \quad + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\text{vec}(U_N \otimes \Delta Q) + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\text{vec}(\bar{D}). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

By utilizing the identity $\text{Tr}(X) = (\text{vec}(I))^T \text{vec}(X)$, (20) can be rewritten as

$$\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) = \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) + \rho_b, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_b & = (\text{vec}(I))^T \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}(K_{d,u} \otimes K_{d,u})\text{vec}(\Delta R_d) \\ & \quad + (\text{vec}(I))^T \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\text{vec}(U_N \otimes \Delta Q) \\ & \quad + (\text{vec}(I))^T \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\text{vec}(\bar{D}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, based on the properties of (21), one has $\|\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) - \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)\|_2 = \|\rho_b\|_2$. According to the identity $\|\text{vec}(X)\|_F = \|X\|_F$ and $\|X\|_2 \leq \|X\|_F$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_b\|_2 & \leq \|(\text{vec}(I))^T \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}(K_{d,u} \otimes K_{d,u})\|_2 \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N \|\Delta R_j\|_F^2} \\ & \quad + \|(\text{vec}(I))^T \bar{\mathcal{A}}_u^{-1}\|_2 \left(N\sqrt{\|\Delta Q\|_F^2} + \|\bar{D}\|_F \right). \end{aligned}$$

By defining ρ as stated in (16), it can be deduced that $\|\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) - \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)\|_2 \leq \rho$. After performing some calculations, this item can be proven.

Item 2): Based on Lemma 8 and (16), $\bar{\rho}$ can be computed by performing some calculations. \square

Remark 4 *Theorem 1 provides bounds of the steady-state performance of the distributed continuous-time filter. These bounds can be evaluated utilizing the nominal performance index and the knowledge of the Frobenius norms of ΔA , ΔC_i , ΔQ , and ΔR_i . Item 1 provides a more compact upper bound compared to Item 2. Item 2 is utilized to demonstrate the effect of the consensus parameter for any γ_u satisfying $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$, revealing that the bound of the corresponding estimation error covariance can be determined by the parameter \mathcal{A}_{u_0} associated with the consensus parameter γ_{u_0} .*

Furthermore, it is desired to establish the lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$, which can also be utilized to evaluate the estimation error covariance. The lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$ is provided as follows.

Proposition 3 *If Assumption 3 holds, the lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$ is*

$$\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) \geq \frac{\text{Tr}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u)}{2\text{Tr}(-\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + 2(\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})\text{Tr}(\mathcal{L})\text{Tr}(P_u(\infty))}. \quad (22)$$

PROOF. Taking the trace operation on (12), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}_u\bar{\Sigma}_u) + \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u\mathcal{A}_u^T) \\ & = -\text{Tr}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T) - \text{Tr}(U_N \otimes Q_u). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Based on the property of the trace $\text{Tr}(XY) = \text{Tr}(YX)$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}_u^T) & = \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u^{-1}\bar{\Sigma}_u\mathcal{A}_u^T) \\ & = \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u\mathcal{A}_u^T\bar{\Sigma}_u^{-1}) \\ & = \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u^{-1}\mathcal{A}_u\bar{\Sigma}_u). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

According to (24) and (12), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} 2\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}_u^T) & = \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u^{-1}(\bar{\Sigma}_u\mathcal{A}_u^T + \mathcal{A}_u\bar{\Sigma}_u)) \\ & = -\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u^{-1}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u)). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

By utilizing Lemma 6 and the fact that $K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u > 0$ and $\bar{\Sigma}_u > 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u^{-1}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u)) \\ & \geq (\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u))^{-1}\text{Tr}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

By combining (25) and (26), it follows

$$2\text{Tr}(-\mathcal{A}_u)\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) \geq \text{Tr}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u). \quad (27)$$

Since all eigenvalues of \mathcal{A}_u are negative, (27) can be rewritten as

$$\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\text{Tr}(-\mathcal{A}_u))^{-1}\text{Tr}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u). \quad (28)$$

Note that there exists

$$-\mathcal{A}_u = -\mathcal{A}_{u_0} + (\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})(\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty)). \quad (29)$$

Based on (29), it holds

$$\text{Tr}(-\mathcal{A}_u) = \text{Tr}(-\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + (\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})\text{Tr}(\mathcal{L})\text{Tr}(P_u(\infty)).$$

Therefore, (28) can be simplified as

$$\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u) \geq \frac{\text{Tr}(K_{d,u}R_{d,u}K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes Q_u)}{2\text{Tr}(-\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + 2(\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})\text{Tr}(\mathcal{L})\text{Tr}(P_u(\infty))}. \quad (30)$$

Remark 5 By combining Proposition 3 and Theorem 1, the lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$ can be directly evaluated without the need for computing $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$. The relations between the lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$ and the model parameters are presented in Proposition 3, and the consensus parameter is separated in the lower bound. It is shown that as the consensus parameter tends to infinity, the lower bound converges to 0.

3.2 Divergence Analysis

This subsection considers the divergence of the distributed continuous-time filter due to the incorrect process noise covariance.

Lemma 9 Let r be a real number, j be the imaginary unit, and e be a vector with the appropriate dimension. If $A_u^T e = rje$ and $Q_u e = 0$, then rj is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{A}_u^T with the eigenvector $1_N \otimes e$, i.e., $\mathcal{A}_u^T(1_N \otimes e) = rj(1_N \otimes e)$, for any consensus parameter γ_u and any undirected connected topology \mathcal{L} .

PROOF. If $A_u^T e = rje$ and $Q_u e = 0$, one has $e^* A_u = -rje^*$. By pre-multiplying with e^* and post-multiplying with e in (4), the subsequent expression is derived

$$\begin{aligned} e^* A_u P_u(\infty) e + e^* P_u(\infty) A_u^T e + e^* Q_u e \\ - e^* P_u(\infty) C_{c,u}^T R_{d,u}^{-1} C_{c,u} P_u(\infty) e = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Based on $A_u^T e = rje$, $e^* A_u = -rje^*$, and $Q_u e = 0$, (31)

can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} e^* P_u(\infty) C_{c,u}^T R_{d,u}^{-1} C_{c,u} P_u(\infty) e \\ = \sum_{j=1}^N e^* P_u(\infty) C_{j,u}^T R_{j,u}^{-1} C_{j,u} P_u(\infty) e \\ = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Since $e^* P_u(\infty) C_{j,u}^T R_{j,u}^{-1} C_{j,u} P_u(\infty) e \geq 0$, it can be concluded that

$$R_{i,u}^{-1} C_{i,u} P_u(\infty) e = 0, i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (33)$$

Utilizing (7) and the property of the undirected connected graph, post-multiply \mathcal{A}_u^T by the vector $1_N \otimes e$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_u^T(1_N \otimes e) &= G_{d,u}^T(1_N \otimes e) - \gamma_u(\mathcal{L}^T \otimes P_u(\infty))(1_N \otimes e) \\ &= [\bar{e}_1^T, \dots, \bar{e}_N^T]^T, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $\bar{e}_i = A_u^T e - NC_{i,u}^T R_{i,u}^{-1} C_{i,u} P_u(\infty) e$. Exploiting the fact $A_u^T e = rje$ and (33), it is evident that $\mathcal{A}_u^T(1_N \otimes e) = rj(1_N \otimes e)$. Consequently, rj is a purely imaginary eigenvalue of \mathcal{A}_u . \square

Remark 6 Lemma 9 highlights that if A_u^T possesses an eigenvalue rj on the imaginary axis, which is linked to the right eigenvector e in the right null space of Q_u , then \mathcal{A}_u^T will also have rj as its eigenvalue with the right eigenvector $1_N \otimes e$. It is important to note that the consensus term, the communication topology, and the coupling among different sensor nodes have no impact on this property, regardless of the magnitude of the consensus parameter γ_u .

Theorem 2 Under the conditions that $\Delta F_{d,u} = 0$ and the same conditions specified in Lemma 9, i.e., $A_u^T e = rje$ and $Q_u e = 0$, if $Q_e \neq 0$, it holds

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (1_N^T \otimes e^*) \Sigma_a(t) (1_N \otimes e) \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. Lemma 9 and (33) lead to the conclusion that $R_{i,u}^{-1} C_{i,u} P_u(\infty) e = 0$. Considering the expression $K_{d,u} = \text{diag}\{K_{1,u}, \dots, K_{N,u}\}$, it can be inferred that $K_{d,u}^T(1_N \otimes e) = 0$. Additionally, Lemma 9 demonstrates that $\mathcal{A}_u^T(1_N \otimes e) = rj(1_N \otimes e)$. By pre-multiplying with $1_N^T \otimes e^*$, and post-multiplying with $1_N \otimes e$ in (10), one

has

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1_N^T \otimes e^*) \dot{\Sigma}_a(t) (1_N \otimes e) \\
&= (1_N^T \otimes e^*) \mathcal{A}_u \Sigma_a(t) (1_N \otimes e) \\
&\quad + (1_N^T \otimes e^*) \Sigma_a(t) \mathcal{A}_u^T (1_N \otimes e) \\
&\quad + (1_N^T \otimes e^*) K_{d,u} R_d K_{d,u}^T (1_N \otimes e) \\
&\quad + (1_N^T \otimes e^*) U_N \otimes Q (1_N \otimes e) \\
&\geq (1_N^T \otimes e^*) U_N \otimes Q (1_N \otimes e) > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

It can be observed that (35) as t tends to infinity, $(1_N^T \otimes e^*) \Sigma_a(t) (1_N \otimes e)$ will continuously increase. Consequently, this term diverges, and the proof is concluded. \square

Remark 7 *Theorem 2 reveals that an incorrect process noise covariance can lead to the divergence of the estimation error covariance in the distributed continuous-time filter, even though the nominal performance index may converge. Therefore, it is advisable to ensure that the nominal model can be designed in such a way that Assumption 2 holds, thus avoiding the presence of pure imaginary eigenvalues.*

Remark 8 *The research [8] explored the situation where A_u has uncontrollable modes associated with zero eigenvalues for a single sensor. Furthermore, [25] examined the scenario where A_u comprises uncontrollable modes associated with purely imaginary eigenvalues for a single sensor. Lemma 9 and Theorem 2 extend these results to the distributed continuous-time filter in sensor networks in the presence of the coupling terms in the distributed filter. The effect of the consensus parameter on our conclusion is eliminated. It is important to note that the prerequisite for the communication graph to be undirected must be fulfilled. Otherwise, this inference may not be valid when assuming a directed graph.*

3.3 Switching Topological Configurations

In the aforementioned sections, it is shown that \mathcal{A}_u plays an important role in the convergence of the estimation error covariance Σ_a . However, for the distributed state estimation problem, the communication topology may change frequently, and such fluctuations can potentially lead to the divergence of the filter. Hence, it becomes imperative to obtain estimates for the eigenvalues of \mathcal{A}_u when dealing with switching communication topologies.

Define the matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_u$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_u = G_{d,u} - \tilde{\gamma}_u (\tilde{\mathcal{L}} \otimes P_u(\infty)). \tag{36}$$

It can be found that the matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_u$ has the different communication topology $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ and the consensus parameter $\tilde{\gamma}_u$ from \mathcal{A}_u . A sufficient condition to assess the eigenvalues of \mathcal{A}_u is presented as follows.

Theorem 3 *Under Assumption 3, if the switching communication topology $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ and the consensus gain $\tilde{\gamma}_u$ satisfy the following inequality*

$$\|\gamma_u \mathcal{L} - \tilde{\gamma}_u \tilde{\mathcal{L}}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2\bar{\sigma}(P_u(\infty))\bar{\sigma}(\bar{P})},$$

where \bar{P} is the solution of $\mathcal{A}_u \bar{P} + \bar{P} \mathcal{A}_u^T = -I$. Then, it can be ensured that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_u$ is Hurwitz stable.

PROOF. Based on (7) and (36), one has $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_u = \mathcal{A}_u + \Delta \mathcal{A}_u$, where $\Delta \mathcal{A}_u = (\gamma_u \mathcal{L} - \tilde{\gamma}_u \tilde{\mathcal{L}}) \otimes P_u(\infty)$. Given the Hurwitz stability of \mathcal{A}_u , there exists a unique solution \bar{P} of the following Lyapunov equation $\mathcal{A}_u \bar{P} + \bar{P} \mathcal{A}_u^T = -I$. Now, consider the modified communication topology and the corresponding Lyapunov equation $(\mathcal{A}_u + \Delta \mathcal{A}_u) \bar{P} + \bar{P} (\mathcal{A}_u + \Delta \mathcal{A}_u)^T = \Delta \mathcal{A}_u \bar{P} + \bar{P} \Delta \mathcal{A}_u^T - I$. Based on the Lyapunov stability theory, it can be established that $\bar{P} > 0$ and

$$\Delta \mathcal{A}_u \bar{P} + \bar{P} \Delta \mathcal{A}_u^T - I < 0, \tag{37}$$

and it implies that $\mathcal{A}_u + \Delta \mathcal{A}_u$ is Hurwitz stable. A sufficient condition to make (37) hold can be derived as $\|\Delta \mathcal{A}_u\|_2 < \frac{\sigma(I)}{2\bar{\sigma}(\bar{P})}$. Next, based on the properties of the operator norm of the Kronecker product, this proof can be concluded. \square

Remark 9 *Theorem 3 shows that the stability of the distributed filter under the switching topology can be evaluated based on the altered topology and the known matrix \mathcal{A}_u . Additionally, the gain parameter $\tilde{\gamma}_u$ can be designed to adapt to the topology changes.*

3.4 Relations between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$

Section 3.1 shows that the bounds of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$ can be evaluated by $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$ and the Frobenius norms of the parameter deviation information. Furthermore, this subsection explores the relation between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$ by relying on the information about the magnitude relation between $R_{i,u}$ and R_i as well as between Q_u and Q . It is assumed that $\Delta A = 0$ and $\Delta C_{i,u} = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$.

First, define the difference $E_{ua}(t)$ between the nominal performance index $\Sigma_u(t)$ and the estimation error covariance $\Sigma_a(t)$ as $E_{ua}(t) = \Sigma_u(t) - \Sigma_a(t)$. Then, by utilizing (9) and (10), the differential equation of $\dot{E}_{ua}(t)$ can be computed as $\dot{E}_{ua}(t) = \mathcal{A}_u E_{ua}(t) + E_{ua}(t) \mathcal{A}_u^T + K_{d,u} \Delta R_d K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes \Delta Q$.

Define the time index h satisfying $t \geq h \geq 0$. Drawing upon the principles of the linear system theory, a precise

analytical solution can be calculated as

$$E_{ua}(t) = e^{\mathcal{A}_u(t-h)} E_{ua}(h) e^{\mathcal{A}_u^T(t-h)} + \int_h^t e^{\mathcal{A}_u(t-\tau)} \times (K_{d,u} \Delta R_d K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes \Delta Q) e^{\mathcal{A}_u^T(t-\tau)} d\tau. \quad (38)$$

For further analysis, define

$$\Delta D = K_{d,u} \Delta R_d K_{d,u}^T + U_N \otimes \Delta Q. \quad (39)$$

The subsequent theorem shows the relations between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$. Moreover, it demonstrates how the upper bound of the spectral norm of the difference between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$ changes as time progresses.

Theorem 4 *Under Assumption 3, $\Delta A = 0$, and $\Delta C_{i,u} = 0, i = 1, \dots, N$, it holds*

- (1) *If $\Delta D \geq 0$ and $E_{ua}(h) \geq 0$, then $\Sigma_u(t) \geq \Sigma_a(t)$. If $\Delta D \leq 0$ and $E_{ua}(h) \leq 0$, then $\Sigma_u(t) \leq \Sigma_a(t)$.*
- (2) *Define $\bar{\mu}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) = \mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}^T)$ and $\mathcal{L}_\gamma = -(\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})(\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty))$. Then, $\|E_{ua}(t)\|_2$ has the following bound*

$$\|E_{ua}(t)\|_2 \leq \|E_{ua}(h)\|_2 e^{\bar{\mu}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0})(t-h)} e^{2\mu(\mathcal{L}_\gamma)(t-h)} + \|\Delta D\|_2 \int_h^t e^{\bar{\mu}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0})(t-\tau)} e^{2\mu(\mathcal{L}_\gamma)(t-\tau)} d\tau. \quad (40)$$

Specifically, when the logarithmic norm is chosen as $\mu_2(\cdot)$, one has $\mu_2(\mathcal{L}_\gamma) = 0$.

PROOF. Item 1): By combining (38), these conclusions can be easily drawn.

Item 2): Taking the spectral norm of (38), it follows

$$\|E_{ua}(t)\|_2 \leq \|E_{ua}(h)\|_2 \|e^{\mathcal{A}_u(t-h)}\|_2 \|e^{\mathcal{A}_u^T(t-h)}\|_2 + \|\Delta D\|_2 \int_h^t \|e^{\mathcal{A}_u(t-\tau)}\|_2 \|e^{\mathcal{A}_u^T(t-\tau)}\|_2 d\tau. \quad (41)$$

Based on Lemma 5, one has

$$\|e^{\mathcal{A}_u(t-\tau)}\|_2 \|e^{\mathcal{A}_u^T(t-\tau)}\|_2 \leq e^{\mu(\mathcal{A}_u)(t-\tau)} e^{\mu(\mathcal{A}_u^T)(t-\tau)} \leq e^{(\mu(\mathcal{A}_u) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_u^T))(t-\tau)}. \quad (42)$$

Similarly to Theorem 1, based on the definition that $\mathcal{A}_{u_0} = G_{d,u} - \gamma_{u_0}(\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty))$, $\mathcal{L}_\gamma = -(\gamma_u - \gamma_{u_0})(\mathcal{L} \otimes P_u(\infty))$, and $\mathcal{A}_u = \mathcal{A}_{u_0} + \mathcal{L}_\gamma$, $e^{(\mu(\mathcal{A}_u) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_u^T))(t-\tau)}$ can be rewritten as

$$e^{(\mu(\mathcal{A}_u) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_u^T))(t-\tau)} = e^{(\mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}^T))(t-\tau)} e^{2\mu(\mathcal{L}_\gamma)(t-\tau)}. \quad (43)$$

By combining (42) and (43), (41) can be rewritten as

$$\|E_{ua}(t)\|_2 \leq \|E_{ua}(h)\|_2 e^{(\mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}^T))(t-h)} e^{2\mu(\mathcal{L}_\gamma)(t-h)} + \|\Delta D\|_2 \int_h^t e^{(\mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}^T))(t-\tau)} \times e^{2\mu(\mathcal{L}_\gamma)(t-\tau)} d\tau. \quad (44)$$

Define $\bar{\mu}(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) = \mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}) + \mu(\mathcal{A}_{u_0}^T)$, and (40) can be obtained.

Based on Assumption 1, the Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L} is positive semi-definite with one zero eigenvalue. According to the definition of $\mu_2(\cdot)$ and the property of \mathcal{L}_γ , it can be deduced that $\mu_2(\mathcal{L}_\gamma) = 0$.

□

Remark 10 *On the one hand, Theorem 4 shows that the relative relation between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$ can be determined by utilizing ΔD and $E_{ua}(h)$. On the other hand, the evolution process of the upper bound of the spectral norm of the difference is presented. Item 2 provides a distinct separation of the consensus parameter in the upper bound. The logarithmic norm $\mu_2(\mathcal{L}_\gamma) = 0$ means that the magnitude of the coefficient of the exponential term is influenced by the logarithmic norm of \mathcal{A}_{u_0} associated with γ_{u_0} , and the consensus parameter γ_u satisfying $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$ have no impact on the bound.*

Remark 11 *There are some common logarithmic norms, including $\mu_1(\cdot)$, $\mu_2(\cdot)$, and $\mu_\infty(\cdot)$, and these norms can be employed to evaluate this bound in different scenarios. If $\Delta D = 0$, Item 2 show the convergence rate between the nominal performance index $\Sigma_u(t)$ and the estimation error covariance $\Sigma_a(t)$.*

4 Simulations

In this section, numerical experiments are conducted on vehicle tracking to validate the effectiveness of the theoretical results. The sensor network used in the experiments consists of six sensors, and its communication topology is illustrated in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Illustration of the communication topology.

Consider that the vehicle is moving in a plane. Let $x(t) = [x_1^T(t), x_2^T(t), x_3^T(t), x_4^T(t)]^T$ denote the state, where $x_1(t)$ and $x_3(t)$ are the horizontal velocity and the vertical velocity, respectively, and $x_2(t)$ and $x_4(t)$ are the horizontal position and the vertical position, respectively. The vehicle dynamics is described by

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The process noise covariance is given as

$$Q = \text{diag}\{0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05\}.$$

Two kinds of sensors are deployed in the sensor network, and their measurement matrices are defined as

$$H_i = [0, 1, 0, 0], \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

and

$$H_i = [0, 0, 0, 1], \quad i = 4, 5, 6.$$

The measurement noise covariances are set as $R_i = 0.2$, $i = 1, \dots, 6$. The initial state is $x(0) = [0.2; 1; 0.2; 1]$, and the initial covariance is $\Sigma_{i,a}(0) = \text{diag}\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$.

The Monte Carlo method is adopted to evaluate the performance of the distributed filter, and the mean square error (MSE) is utilized as a metric, given by

$$\text{MSE}(t) = \frac{1}{MN} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^M \|\hat{x}_{i,u}^{(l)}(t) - x^{(l)}(t)\|_2^2,$$

where N is the sensor number and M is the trail number.

To demonstrate the theoretical results, three cases are considered. Case 1 validates the theoretical theories of the bounds of the estimation error covariance, the bounds of the nominal performance index, the estimation error covariance, and the collective observability condition. Case 2 illustrates the divergence of the distributed filter caused by an incorrect process noise covariance. Case 3 shows the relations between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$.

Case 1: Consider the bounds of the estimation error covariance. The nominal parameters are set as $A_u = A$, $C_{i,u} = C_i$, $Q_u = \text{diag}\{0.03, 0.03, 0.03, 0.03\}$, and $R_{i,u} = 0.3$, $i = 1, \dots, 6$.

Fig. 2 displays $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$, the upper bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$ ($\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a) + \rho$) referring to (16), the lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$ referring to (22), and MSE with the increasing consensus parameter γ_u . It is shown that




Fig. 2. MSE, $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$, the upper bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$, and the lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$ with the increasing consensus parameter in Case 1.

- (1) The curves of MSE and $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$ exhibit nearly overlapping, demonstrating the correctness of the theoretical value $\bar{\Sigma}_a$.
- (2) As the consensus parameter γ_u increases, four indices decline. Moreover, both MSE and $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$ are constrained by the upper bound, as established Theorem 1.
- (3) As the consensus parameter γ_u tends to infinity, the lower bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_u)$ converges to 0 (See Proposition 3). Furthermore, the upper bound of $\text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}_a)$ regarding γ_u can be given by that regarding γ_{u_0} satisfying Assumption 3 and $\gamma_{u_0} < \gamma_u$.
- (4) It is worth mentioning that each subsystem (F, H_i) is not observable for each sensor, but the global system $(F, [H_1; \dots; H_6])$ is observable. This collective observability condition ensures the convergence of all sensors' estimates.




Fig. 3. Illustration of the divergence caused by the incorrect covariance with the increasing time in Case 2.

Case 2: To verify the effectiveness of Lemma 9 and Theorem 2, the divergence of the distributed filter resulting from the incorrect covariance are considered. Let us establish the nominal process noise covariance as $Q_u = \text{diag}\{0, 0.03, 0.03, 0.03\}$, and set the consensus parameter as $\gamma_u = 10$. First, compute the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of A_u . All eigenvalues of A_u^T are

0, with the corresponding eigenvectors are $[1, 0, 0, 0]^T$, $[-1, 0, 0, 0]^T$, $[0, 0, 1, 0]^T$, and $[0, 0, -1, 0]^T$. Consider the condition $A_u^T e = rje$ and $Q_u e = 0$ in Lemma 9. From this, it can be deduced that $r = 0$, and $e = [1, 0, 0, 0]^T$ or $e = [-1, 0, 0, 0]^T$. Ultimately, it can be calculated that $\mathcal{A}_u^T(1_N \otimes e) = 0$ (See Lemma 9). Fig. 3 shows MSE of the distributed filter, and it can be observed that the actual estimation error has diverged due to utilizing an incorrect process noise covariance (See Theorem 2).

Case 3: Consider the relations between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$. The nominal parameters are set as $A_u = A$, $C_{i,u} = C_i$, $Q_u = \text{diag}\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$, $R_{i,u} = 0.3$, $i = 1, 4$, and $R_{i,u} = 0.2$, $i = 2, 3, 5, 6$. The initial estimation error covariance and the initial performance index are chosen as the identity matrix. As stated in (39), it follows $\Delta D > 0$.




Fig. 4. Illustration of the relations between $\Sigma_u(t)$ and $\Sigma_a(t)$ with the increasing time in Case 3.

Fig. 4 exhibits the trace of the estimation error covariance and the nominal performance index. This figure illustrates that the nominal performance index provides an upper bound of the estimation error covariance, which aligns with the theoretical results (See Theorem 4). It means that the estimation error covariance of the distributed filter can be evaluated by utilizing the nominal performance index, if the nominal parameters are appropriately designed.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, the performance analysis of the distributed continuous-time filter in the presence of the modeling errors is conducted from two primary aspects. On the one hand, the convergence condition and the corresponding convergence analysis of two performance indices in the presence of the modeling errors are provided. Then, it is demonstrated that an incorrect noise covariance can lead to the divergence of the distributed filter. On the other hand, this paper focuses on the performance evaluation from the nominal performance index and the estimation error covariance. The bounds of the estimation error are derived by utilizing the nominal performance

index and the model deviation information. The relative magnitude relations between them are also presented. These results shed light on the performance of the distributed filter in the presence of the modeling errors and provide guidance for engineering applications. In the future, we aim to develop the corresponding distributed algorithms to handle the effects of the modeling errors.

A PROOF of Proposition 1

Item 1) and Item 2): For the sake of computational simplification, the time index is omitted. By combining (1) with (3), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\eta}_i &= \dot{x} - \dot{\hat{x}}_{i,u} \\ &= (A - A_u)x + A_u\eta_i + \omega - K_{i,u}(C_i - C_{i,u})x \\ &\quad - K_{i,u}C_{i,u}\eta_i - K_{i,u}\nu_i - \gamma_u P_u(\infty) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (\eta_i - \eta_j). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

By performing some calculations, (5) and (6) can be derived from (45).

Item 3): Define $\xi = [\eta_c^T, (1_N \otimes x)^T]^T$ [10], and it follows $\dot{\xi} = \mathcal{F}\xi + \mathcal{B}\rho$, where $\rho = [\nu_c^T, (1 \otimes \omega)^T]^T$,

$$\mathcal{F} = \begin{bmatrix} A_u & F_{d,u} \\ 0 & A_d \end{bmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B} = \begin{bmatrix} -K_{d,u} & I \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Define $\Sigma_\xi = \mathbb{E}\{\xi\xi^T\}$ and $\Phi = \mathbb{E}\{\rho\rho^T\}$, and one has

$$\dot{\Sigma}_\xi = \mathcal{F}\Sigma_\xi + \Sigma_\xi\mathcal{F}^T + \mathcal{B}\Phi\mathcal{B}^T, \quad (48)$$

and

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} R_d & 0 \\ 0 & U_N \otimes Q \end{bmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

Finally, the term $\dot{\Sigma}_a$ can be obtained based on (48), and the detailed expression is given in (8).

B PROOF of Proposition 2

Item 1): Based on the results in [1], it can be deduced that if Assumption 2 holds, there exists $\gamma_{u_0} > 0$ such that for all $\gamma_u \geq \gamma_{u_0}$, \mathcal{A}_u is Hurwitz stable. Since $K_{d,u}$, $R_{d,u}$, and Q_u are bounded, it follows from Lemma 7 that $\Sigma_u(t)$ will converge to $\bar{\Sigma}_u$.

Item 2): In the scenario where $F_{d,u} \neq 0$, the convergence of $S(t)$ affects that of $\Sigma_a(t)$. If A is a stable matrix, it can be concluded that $X(t)$, $S(t)$, and $\Sigma_a(t)$ converge based on Lemma 7. In the other case, if $F_{d,u} = 0$, the convergence of $\Sigma_a(t)$ can be derived based on the boundedness of Q and R_d , along with the principles of the Lyapunov equation theory.

References

- [1] Stefano Battilotti, Filippo Cacace, Massimiliano d'Angelo, and Alfredo Germani. Asymptotically optimal consensus-based distributed filtering of continuous-time linear systems. *Automatica*, 122:109189, 2020.
- [2] Giorgio Battistelli and Luigi Chisci. Kullback–Leibler average, consensus on probability densities, and distributed state estimation with guaranteed stability. *Automatica*, 50(3):707–718, 2014.
- [3] Giorgio Battistelli, Luigi Chisci, Giovanni Mugnai, Alfonso Farina, and Antonio Graziano. Consensus-based linear and nonlinear filtering. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(5):1410–1415, 2014.
- [4] Filippo Cacace. Comments on “distributed information-weighted Kalman consensus filter for sensor networks”. *Automatica*, 109:108552, 2019.
- [5] Udaya Dampage, Lumini Bandaranayake, Ridma Wanasinghe, Kishanga Kottahachchi, and Bathiya Jayasanka. Forest fire detection system using wireless sensor networks and machine learning. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):46, 2022.
- [6] Andrew G Dempster and Ediz Cetin. Interference localization for satellite navigation systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(6):1318–1326, 2016.
- [7] Peihu Duan, Jiachen Qian, Qishao Wang, Zhisheng Duan, and Ling Shi. Distributed state estimation for continuous-time linear systems with correlated measurement noise. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(9):4614–4628, 2022.
- [8] Robert Fitzgerald. Divergence of the Kalman filter. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 16(6):736–747, 1971.
- [9] Lin Gao, Giorgio Battistelli, and Luigi Chisci. Random-finite-set-based distributed multirobot SLAM. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 36(6):1758–1777, 2020.
- [10] R Griffin and A Sage. Large and small scale sensitivity analysis of optimum estimation algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 13(4):320–329, 1968.
- [11] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [12] Honghai Ji, Frank L Lewis, Zhongsheng Hou, and Dariusz Mikulski. Distributed information-weighted Kalman consensus filter for sensor networks. *Automatica*, 77:18–30, 2017.
- [13] Rudolph E Kalman and Richard S Bucy. New results in linear filtering and prediction theory. *Journal of Basic Engineering*, 83(1):95–108, 1961.
- [14] Jaeyong Kim, Hyungbo Shim, and Jingbo Wu. On distributed optimal Kalman-Bucy filtering by averaging dynamics of heterogeneous agents. In *the 55th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 6309–6314, 2016.
- [15] Zhongkui Li, Zhisheng Duan, Guanrong Chen, and Lin Huang. Consensus of multiagent systems and synchronization of complex networks: A unified viewpoint. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, 57(1):213–224, 2009.
- [16] Yuezu Lv, Zhongkui Li, Zhisheng Duan, and Jie Chen. Distributed adaptive output feedback consensus protocols for linear systems on directed graphs with a leader of bounded input. *Automatica*, 74:308–314, 2016.
- [17] Y Jade Morton, Frank van Diggelen, James J Spilker Jr, Bradford W Parkinson, Sherman Lo, and Grace Gao. *Position, navigation, and timing technologies in the 21st century: Integrated satellite navigation, sensor systems, and civil applications, volume 1*. John Wiley & Sons, 2021.
- [18] Lalatendu Muduli, Devi Prasad Mishra, and Prasanta K Jana. Application of wireless sensor network for environmental monitoring in underground coal mines: A systematic review. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 106:48–67, 2018.
- [19] T Nishimura. Error bounds of continuous Kalman filters and the application to orbit determination problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 12(3):268–275, 1967.
- [20] Reza Olfati-Saber. Distributed Kalman filtering for sensor networks. In *the 46th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 5492–5498, 2007.
- [21] Reza Olfati-Saber. Kalman-consensus filter: Optimality, stability, and performance. In *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control held jointly with the 28th Chinese Control Conference*, pages 7036–7042, 2009.
- [22] Reza Olfati-Saber, J Alex Fax, and Richard M Murray. Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 95(1):215–233, 2007.
- [23] Wei Ren and Ubaid M Al-Saggaf. Distributed Kalman–Bucy filter with embedded dynamic averaging algorithm. *IEEE Systems Journal*, 12(2):1722–1730, 2017.
- [24] Horn Roger and R Johnson Charles. *Topics in matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, UK, 1994.
- [25] Suwanchai Sangsuk-Iam and Thomas E Bullock. Analysis of continuous-time Kalman filtering under incorrect noise covariances. *Automatica*, 24(5):659–669, 1988.
- [26] Gustaf Söderlind. The logarithmic norm. History and modern theory. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 46:631–652, 2006.
- [27] Yulun Tian, Yun Chang, Fernando Herrera Arias, Carlos Nieto-Granda, Jonathan P How, and Luca Carlone. Kimera-multi: Robust, distributed, dense metric-semantic SLAM for multi-robot systems. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 38(4), 2022.
- [28] Mitsuhiro Toda and Rajnikst Patel. Performance bounds for continuous-time filters in the presence of modeling errors. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, (6):912–919, 1978.
- [29] Guanghui Wen, Yu Zhao, Zhisheng Duan, Wenwu Yu, and Guanrong Chen. Containment of higher-order multi-leader multi-agent systems: A dynamic output approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(4):1135–1140, 2015.
- [30] Jingbo Wu, Anja Elser, Shen Zeng, and Frank Allgöwer. Consensus-based distributed Kalman-Bucy filter for continuous-time systems. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(22):321–326, 2016.
- [31] Kemin Zhou and John Comstock Doyle. *Essentials of robust control*, volume 104. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1998.