# Distributed Estimation Over a Low-Cost Sensor Network: A Review of State-of-the-Art

Shaoming He, Hyo-Sang Shin, Shuoyuan Xu and Antonios Tsourdos

School of Aerospace, Transport and Manufacturing, Cranfield University, Cranfield MK43 0AL, UK

# Abstract

Proliferation of low-cost, lightweight, and power efficient sensors and advances in networked systems enable the employment of multiple sensors. Distributed estimation provides a scalable and fault-robust fusion framework with a peer-to-peer communication architecture. For this reason, there seems to be a real need for a critical review of existing and, more importantly, recent advances in the domain of distributed estimation over a low-cost sensor network. This paper presents a comprehensive review of the state-of-the-art solutions in this research area, exploring their characteristics, advantages, and challenging issues. Additionally, several open problems and future avenues of research are highlighted.

Keywords: Distributed estimation, Low-cost sensor network, Fusion methodology, Challenging issues

# 1 1. Introduction

There has been an ever-increasing interest in utilising wireless sensor networks for target tracking or 2 estimation in recent decades, driven by its versatility and diverse range of recent applications, including 3 environmental monitoring [1], habitat monitoring [2], airborne target tracking [3], space situation awareness 4 [4], spacecraft navigation [5], etc. The availability of low-cost sensors has enabled the employment of multiple 5 sensor nodes to cooperatively perform large-scale sensing tasks, which are otherwise difficult to accomplish by individually operate these sensing devices. Since each individual sensor has its own inherent deficiencies, 7 uncertainties, and limited spatial coverage, leveraging proper fusion algorithms over the sensor network 8 could synergistically merge the redundant information and effectively complement the limitations of each 9 sensor node, thus providing the possibility to improve the tracking and perception performance. 10

Multi-sensor fusion in wireless sensor networks generally refers to the process of combining sensory data, 11 e.g., position, range, bearing angle, time of arrival, etc. from several local sensor nodes, such that the result-12 ing perception is in some sense better than when these sensors are used individually for sensing<sup>1</sup>. Note that 13 sensor fusion can be viewed as a subset of information fusion<sup>2</sup>, which exploits the synergism of information 14 gathered from different sources, i.e., sensor, database, human, for better decision-making. Multi-sensor 15 fusion can be categorised into three architectures in general: centralised, decentralised and distributed 16 [9, 10, 11, 12]. Examples of different fusion architectures are shown in Fig. 1. In the centralised fusion 17 architecture, all sensors broadcast their local measurements to a fusion centre via single-hop or multi-hop 18 communications. The fusion centre simultaneously processes the measurements provided by all sensors to 19 update the estimate. Unlike centralised fusion, the decentralised architecture utilises several fusion centres, 20

Preprint submitted to Information Fusion

June 13, 2019

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: Hyo-Sang Shin

Email address: shaoming.he@cranfield.ac.uk, h.shin@cranfield.ac.uk,shuoyuan.xu@cranfield.ac.uk,

a.tsourdos@cranfield.ac.uk (Shaoming He, Hyo-Sang Shin, Shuoyuan Xu and Antonios Tsourdos)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The term 'data fusion' has also been utilised in some works as equal with 'multi-sensor data fusion' [6, 7]. However, 'data fusion' also refers to the meaning of fusion of raw data in some other works [8]. For this reason, it is not recommended to leverage the stand-alone term 'data fusion' when discussing about sensor fusion.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ The term 'information fusion' is a broad term that encompasses all aspects of the fusion field [8].

capable of communicating with their neighbours, as backups in data integration, thus showing less vulnera-21 ble against system failure. The sensors are allocated to these fusion centres either statically or dynamically 22 depending on the application scenarios [13]. Although multi-sensor fusion through a fusion centre is ideally 23 Bayesian optimal in terms of tracking performance, this architecture normally requires very reliable sensors, 24 which are generally very expensive, and is not scalable. Furthermore, the fusion centre cannot effectively 25 communicate with all sensors for large-scale sensor networks because of physical constraints, e.g., communi-26 cation delay, limiting communication bandwidth. Each sensor node in the distributed architecture performs 27 fusion using the information only obtained from locally connected neighbours. This could provide enhanced 28 built-in redundancy, which can improve robustness against sensor failure, compared with the other two types 29 of architectures. The distributed fusion architecture can also lower the communication burden since data 30 is not required to be transmitted to the processing centre and is fused in a distributed way over multiple 31 local nodes. Unlike centralised architecture, the information in the distributed architecture is processed at 32 local nodes and the fusion process only requires the network to be partially connected. This could therefore 33 provide improved flexibility. 34



Figure 1: Examples of different multi-sensor fusion architectures. The blue circle denotes the local sensor node and the black solid lines refer to the communication between one local sensor and the fusion centre or two sensors. (a) Centralised fusion architecture: all sensor nodes are connected the fusion centre. (b) Decentralised fusion architecture: sensor nodes are allocated to several fusion centres either statically or dynamically. (c) Distributed fusion architecture: sensor nodes only communicate with their neighbours in a peer-to-peer fashion.

This paper mainly focuses on the distributed estimation over a low-cost sensor network. However, this 35 does not mean the algorithms discussed in this paper are only limited to low-cost sensors. The low-cost 36 sensors are generally battery powered with limited sensing capability, communication and computation abil-37 ities, e.g., visual camera, infrared/laser range finder, acoustic sensor, etc. Therefore, developing distributed 38 estimation algorithms with communication, computation and energy efficiency is the key enabler for success-39 ful application of low-cost sensor networks. Although distributed fusion architecture brings many attractive 40 features, challenges associated with the low-cost sensor networks have to be addressed. It is known that 41 low-cost sensor networks are generally subject to certain degree of uncertainties, meaning that the data qual-42 43 ity from such sensing hardware is mainly characterised by reduced accuracy and reliability [14, 15, 16, 17]. For this reason, the utilisation of low-cost sensor networks often encounters with several challenging issues, 44 including miss detection, false alarm, sensor bias, limited communication bandwidth, communication delay, 45 unreliable data links, and limited onboard energy to supply the device<sup>3</sup>. 46

This paper is an endeavour to investigate the state-of-the-art solutions of distributed estimation over a low-cost sensor network, including existing approaches, recent advances, challenging aspects, and remaining problems. Notice that most distributed fusion methodologies can be roughly categorised into two main classes: (1) state vector fusion (SVF); and (2) information vector fusion (IVF). Discussions of the existing solutions and recent advances are carried out based on these two different types of fusion classes. In both categories, we introduce classical sequential-based partially distributed fusion algorithms and discuss the details of recently-proposed consensus, gossip and diffusion based distributed estimators. Their advantages

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$ Notice that sensor nodes in low-cost sensor networks are usually battery powered but nodes are typically unattended because of their deployment in hazardous, hostile or remote environments. Because battery energy is limited, the use of different techniques for energy saving is needed for low-cost sensor networks.

#### Nomenclature

$\alpha_{k}$	measurement	scaling	erro
$\alpha_{k,l}$	measurement	scame	CITO

 $\beta_{k,i}$  measurement offset

 $\eta_{k,i}$  communication noise

- $\mathbf{A}_i$  optimal weighting matrix of linear unbiased minimum variance rule
- $\mathbf{b}_{k,i} \qquad \text{pseudo-offset in affine calibration function} \\ \text{tion}$

 $\mathbf{e} \qquad [\mathbb{I}_n,\mathbb{I}_n,\cdots,\mathbb{I}_n]^T$ 

 $\mathbf{F}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  system transition matrix

- $\mathbf{f}_{k,i}$  equivalent measurement offset
- $\mathbf{G}_{k,i}$  information matrix when considering false alarm
- $\mathbf{g}_{k,i}$  information vector when considering false alarm

$$\mathbf{H}_{k} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{k,1}^{T}, \mathbf{H}_{k,2}^{T}, \cdots, \mathbf{H}_{k,N}^{T} \end{bmatrix}^{T}$$

 $\mathbf{H}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$  measurement matrix

- $\mathbf{K}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  Kalman gain
- $\mathbf{Q}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  covariance of the process noise

$$\mathbf{R}_k \qquad diag\left(\mathbf{R}_{k,1},\mathbf{R}_{k,2},\cdots,\mathbf{R}_{k,N}\right)$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i}$  covariance of the measurement noise

$$\mathbf{v}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_{k,1}^T, \mathbf{v}_{k,2}^T, \cdots, \mathbf{v}_{k,N}^T \end{bmatrix}^T$$

 $\mathbf{v}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$  Gaussian measurement noise

 $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$  Gaussian process noise  $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$  system state vector

$$\mathbf{Z}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_{k,1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{k,2}^T, \cdots, \mathbf{z}_{k,N}^T \end{bmatrix}^T$$

$$\mathbf{z}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$$
 measurement vector

- $\gamma_{k,i}$  a random variable that satisfies a Bernoulli distribution to model miss detection
- $\lambda_{k,ij}$  a random variable that satisfies a Bernoulli distribution to model communication failure between sensor *i* and *j*
- $(\cdot)^T$  matrix transpose manipulation
- $\mathbb{R}$  real number
- $\omega$  optimal weight of covariance intersection
- $\omega_{k,i}$  normalisation factor of parallel consensus on measurement and consensus on information rule
- $\pi_{k,ij}$  consensus gain to fuse local estimates from sensors *i* and *j*
- $a_{k,i}$  pseudo-scaling factor in affine calibration function
- $c_{k,ij}$  diffusion weight to fuse local estimates from sensors *i* and *j*
- $g_{k,i}$  equivalent measurement scaling error
- *i* sensor index
- k time instant index

 $m \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i$ 

- $m_i$  dimension of measurement vector
- N number of sensors
- *n* dimension of system state vector
- $P_D$  detection probability
- $q\left(\cdot\right)$  quantisation operator
- $\mathcal{A}\left(\cdot\right)$  consensus protocol
- $\mathcal{N}_i$  local connected neighbours of sensor i

There have been numerous contributions proposed for the design of distributed estimation algorithms for a wireless sensor network. The state-of-the-arts are broad and rich, but quite fragmented. There exist several general [18, 19, 20] and specific [21] literature reviews of multi-sensor fusion. However, up to the best of our knowledge, there is no critical and comprehensive review of distributed estimations using low-cost sensor networks. Also, there is no survey that addresses challenges in distributed estimations using low-cost sensor networks and the techniques required for their design and implementation. This paper aims to contribute to

and disadvantages are discussed and compared in terms of different criteria, such as global optimality,
 local consistency, communication burden and specific implementation requirements. We also point out some
 challenging issues pertinent to distributed fusion over a low-cost sensor network, and discuss some remaining
 problems and future avenues of research in this area.

<sup>64</sup> such an overview. We achieve this aim by surveying the noteworthy contributions to distributed estimation <sup>65</sup> algorithms, which have great potentials for application in low-cost sensor networks, and discussing research <sup>66</sup> gaps and emerging trends in this domain. Unlike existing reviews, we identify several inherent challenges and <sup>67</sup> limitations in utilising low-cost sensor networks in distributed estimation, e.g., unreliable communication <sup>68</sup> link, sensor bias and limited energy, which have not received much attention in other works. Nonetheless, <sup>69</sup> as the focus of this paper is low-cost sensor network, computationally expensive distributed particle filters <sup>70</sup> are excluded from the discussions.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 presents a brief introduction of the benchmark centralised fusion algorithm. Section 3 reviews several existing and more recently-proposed distributed fusion methodologies. In Sec. 4, the extensions to practical scenarios are presented, followed by some challenging aspects discussed in Sec. 5. Finally, some future directions of research and concluding remarks are offered. The notations utilised in this paper are summarised in the *Nomenclature* table.

#### 76 2. Centralised Fusion: A Benchmark

An optimal fusion strategy and benchmark for performance evaluation of distributed state estimation algorithms is the centralised estimation, which processes all sensors' measurements simultaneously through a fusion centre. For this reason, this section will briefly review the centralised solution to facilitate the discussions carried out in the following sections. To begin with, consider a linear stochastic discrete-time system with N sensors as

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{w}_k$$
  
$$\mathbf{z}_{k,i} = \mathbf{H}_{k,i} \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_{k,i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$$
(1)

For simplicity, it is usually assumed that the measurement noise is uncorrelated across the sensor nodes. Notice that the measurement matrix  $\mathbf{H}_{k,i}$  becomes different for different types of sensory data<sup>4</sup>. The centralised estimation requires a fusion centre to collect measurements from all sensors as

$$\mathbf{Z}_k = \mathbf{H}_k \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k \tag{2}$$

Then, the centralised estimation of state  $\mathbf{x}_k$  can be obtained using standard Kalman filter [22, 23] as

Prediction:  

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k-1} = \mathbf{F}_{k} \mathbf{x}_{k-1|k-1}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k-1} = \mathbf{F}_{k} \mathbf{P}_{k-1|k-1} \mathbf{F}_{k}^{\mathsf{T}} + \mathbf{Q}_{k}$$
Update:  

$$\mathbf{K}_{k} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1} \mathbf{H}_{k}^{T} \left( \mathbf{R}_{k} + \mathbf{H}_{k} \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1} \mathbf{H}_{k}^{T} \right)^{-1}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k} = \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1} + \mathbf{K}_{k} \left( \mathbf{Z}_{k} - \mathbf{H}_{k} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1} - \mathbf{K}_{k} \mathbf{H}_{k} \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}$$
(3)

It is known that the information form of Kalman filter is a suitable formula to address multi-sensor data fusion problem in a distributed manner. This information-form variant is functionally identical to the original Kalman filter, but has computational advantages for high-dimensional data. Based on the property of estimators with information form, incorporating additional information from other sensors could be achieved by summation of the corresponding information terms. This implies that the update procedure of the Bayesian optimal centralised Kalman filter can be formulated in an alternative way as [11]

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$$
(4)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Notice that the algorithms discussed in this paper are not restricted to homogeneous sensory data and are applicable to heterogenous sensors, i.e.,  $\mathbf{H}_{k,i} \neq \mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ , for  $i \neq j$ .

It is clear that centralised estimation (4) requires full information of all sensors. Considering the fact that each sensor usually can only communicate with its neighbors due to communication limit, the centralised Kalman filter is generally not applicable in practical low-cost sensor networks. However, the Bayesian optimal centralised solution will be utilised as a benchmark for the performance comparison and evaluation of the distributed fusion algorithms discussed in the following sections.

## 82 3. Different Approaches of Distributed Estimation

Generally, most existing multi-sensor fusion algorithms can be categories into two classes: (1) SVF; and (2) IVF. SVF refers to direct fusion of local state estimations over a sensor network [24] while IVF refers to direct or indirect exchanges of local measurements among sensor nodes. This section will provide a detailed review and critical assessment of existing distributed estimation algorithms in terms of these two different cases.

As there is no processing centre in the distributed fusion architecture, the fundamental problem naturally 88 arises: how to effectively perform either SVF or IVF using only neighbours' information? Depending on how 89 the local sensor nodes communicate with their neighbours, four representative distributed fusion strategies 90 have been proposed in the existing literature: sequential fusion, consensus protocol, gossip process and 91 diffusion strategy. The main characteristics of these four different fusion strategies are summarised in Table 92 1. Based on these facts, the reviews and discussions of both SVF and IVF will be carried out by considering 93 these four different fusion strategies. The main criteria and performance metrics that are utilised in algorithm 94 assessment are summarised in Table 2. Note that when we discuss about the possibility of global convergence 95 or *global optimality* for a specific distributed estimation algorithm, we assume that the sensor network is 96 strongly connected. However, this does not mean the algorithm assessed requires the network to be strongly 97

<sup>98</sup> connected in implementation.

Fusion strategy	Approach	Communication	Advantage	Disadvantage
Sequential fusion	Repeatedly perform two-sensor fusion sequentially	Sequential communication between two sensors	Simple and straightforward	Require sequential connected topology and all nodes can observe the target
Consensus protocol	Network-wide average computation	Each sensor node communicate with all its connected neighbours iteratively	Global convergence and applicability to a generic topology	Require multiple (or infinite in the ideal case) iterations and global information, e.g., maximum degree of the graph
Gossip process	Network-wide average computation	Each sensor node randomly or deterministically communicate with one of its connected neighbours iteratively	Global convergence and applicability to a generic topology	Require multiple (or infinite in the ideal case) iterations
Diffusion	Convex combination of local information	Each sensor node communicate with all its connected neighbours once	Fully distributed estimation and low communication burden	No global convergence

#### Table 1: Characteristics of different fusion strategies.

Metric	Physical meaning		
Clobal optimality	The algorithm is able to converge to the Bayesian-optimal centralised		
Gibbai Optimanty	solution asymptotically or in finite time		
Local consistency	The fused estimate can preserve local consistency, i.e., the actual local		
Local consistency	covariance is always bounded by the fused covariance		
Fully, distributed	The fusion algorithm requires no global information, e.g., network size,		
Fully distributed	node number		
Communication burden The number of communication rounds during the fusion proc			
Specific topology	Whether or not the fusion algorithm requires specific network topology		

Table 2: Performance Metrics in Algorithm Assessment.

## 99 3.1. Distributed State Vector Fusion Kalman Filter

Based on different fusion strategies, this subsection first reviews existing solutions of distributed implementation of SVF and then summarises the characteristics of different SVF algorithms.

<sup>102</sup> 3.1.1. Sequential-Fusion-Based Algorithms

Bar-Shalom and Campo [25] first suggested a SVF algorithm for two sensors by considering one local estimate as a pseudo measurement of another sensor. This idea was later extended to a sensor network with N nodes in [26] by maximising the joint likelihood (MJL) function. The resultant fusion rule was given by a matrix weighted SVF [27, 28]. Using the weighted least square (WLS) criterion, Li et al. [29] suggested an optimal fusion algorithm for the cases where measurement noises are arbitrarily correlated across sensor nodes, over time, and/or arbitrarily correlated with the estimates. Later in [30, 31], MJL and WLS algorithms were proven to be equivalent under Gaussian assumption and also optimal in the linear unbiased minimum variance (LUMV) sense. The final fusion rule by minimising the LUMV is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} \tag{5}$$

where the optimal weighting matrices  $\mathbf{A}_i$  are determined by  $[\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_N] = (\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{e})^{-1} \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}$  with the (i, j)th element of matrix  $\mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{nN \times nN}$  being the cross covariance  $\mathbf{P}_{k|k,ij}$ .

Although algorithms [26, 27, 28, 30, 31] are locally optimal, it can be noted that the implementation 105 requires the computation of cross covariance  $\mathbf{P}_{k|k,ij}$  among sensor nodes, which is clearly computationally 106 expensive. To reduce the complexity, diagonal matrix and scalar weighted fusion rules were proposed in 107 [32, 33]. The performance comparison of these algorithms was theoretically analysed in [34]. Even though 108 algorithms [25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33] are only designed for locally connected sensor nodes in a decentralised 109 fashion, global performance can be somehow ensured via the sequential fusion implementation in a similar 110 way as [35] provided that the network is sequentially connected, e.g., ring/chain communication topology. 111 Otherwise, sequential fusion for global estimation is not applicable and therefore this fusion strategy cannot 112 be viewed as a fully distributed approach. 113

# 114 3.1.2. Consensus-Based Algorithms

With the development of network theory, the control-theoretic consensus algorithm [36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41] was found to be a powerful tool in designing distributed estimation filters that guarantee global convergence. This can be attributed to the fact that this algorithm enables performing network-wide computation tasks, such as averaging of quantities and functions. Olfati-Saber [42] suggested a distributed algorithm, termed as Kalman consensus filter (KCF), by performing average consensus on local estimates. This work seems to be the pioneer work in the domain of globally distributed estimation over a sensor network. The stability and performance bounds were theoretically analysed later in [43]. The fused estimate at the *l*th consensus

iteration step is given as

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k,i}^{(l)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \pi_{k,ij} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,j}^{(l-1)} \tag{6}$$

where the consensus gain  $\pi_{k,ij} > 0$  is normally chosen based on the degree of the network graph [44]. Maximum-degree weights and metropolis weights are two widely-used suboptimal consensus gains to achieve average consensus [45]. As the consensus gain poses great effect on the overall estimation performance, the work in [46] studied how to jointly optimise the consensus gain  $\pi_{k,ij}$  and Kalman gain  $\mathbf{K}_{k,i}$  for KCF by minimising the trace of the estimation error covariance.

The limitation of KCF lies in that it weights all local neighbours' prior states equally and thus the 120 performance degrades drastically when some sensors cannot detect the target due to limited field-of-view. 121 For better illustration, let us consider a two-sensor fusion application example. Assuming that the first 122 sensor can detect the target while the second sensor miss the target, then  $\mathbf{x}_{k|k,1}$  should be closer to the 123 true target state  $\mathbf{x}_k$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{k|k,2}$  inevitably has much higher uncertainty due to target loss. Simply averaging 124 between  $\mathbf{x}_{k|k,1}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{k|k,2}$  using KCF definitely cannot improve the estimation performance and might cause 125 erroneous estimation results if one sensor has long-term target loss. The limited sensing range, together with 126 sparse communication network topologies, will have a profound effect on the transient behaviour of KCF and 127 even result in divergent estimation. To mitigate this issue, the authors of [47] proposed a generalised KCF 128 (GKCF) via weighting neighbours' prior states by their corresponding prior covariance matrices. Although 129 GKCF outperforms KCF in terms of estimation accuracy, it cannot guarantee global optimality, i.e., its 130 accuracy does not converge to that of the centralised filter (4) even with infinite number of consensus 131 iterations. The reason is that GKCF never utilises the useful local posterior covariance information in 132 sensor fusion. Many due to this fact, both KCF and GKCF are suboptimal. However, it is worth pointing 133 out that the major merit of consensus-based distributed estimators is that they guarantee global performance 134 convergence because the detectability/observability of a linear plant via a sensor network can be ensured 135 through interconnections [48]. 136

#### 137 3.1.3. Gossip-Based Algorithms

Instead of average consensus, Ma et al. [49] developed a gossip distributed Kalman filter (GDKF) by 138 performing randomised gossip process to local state estimate. At every round of gossip iteration, each sen-139 sor using GDKF randomly selects a locally-connected neighbour node and performs averaging on these two 140 local state estimations. The main positive feature of GDKF is that it has relatively low communication 141 burden since each sensor only needs to communicate with one connected sensor node during one gossip iter-142 ation. Compared to GDKF, a sensor node running KCF receives information from all its locally-connected 143 neighbours and hence generates better estimation performance in terms of accuracy at the price of high 144 communication cost. Notice that both KCF and GKCF only utilise local state estimates in the fusion 145 process. This means that GDKF also cannot recover the performance of centralised estimation even with 146 infinite number of gossip iterations. Another benefit of utilising gossip process in distributed estimation is 147 that gossip-based algorithms are applicable to asynchronous fusion. However, gossip-based estimators under 148 asynchronous condition show much slower convergence speed than the synchronous mode [50]. 149

#### 150 3.1.4. Diffusion-Based Algorithms

Except for consensus and gossip algorithms, diffusion strategy [51, 52, 53, 54, 55] was found to be another popular way for the design of distributed estimation algorithms. The authors of [56] first suggested a distributed Kalman filter for a sensor network using diffusion strategy. Unlike KCF and GKCF, the diffusion Kalman filter (DKF) utilised a single-step convex combination of the estimates of local neighbours as

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} c_{k,ij} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,j} \tag{7}$$

It follows from Eq. (7) that the fused estimate at every sensor node provided by the diffusion strategy is a linear combination of the estimates available within the connected neighbours. This observation reveals that the scalar weights  $c_{k,ij}$  pose significant impact on the fusion performance. For this reason, the authors

of [57] discussed the optimal choice of the combination weights and formulated a constrained optimisation 154 problem for this purpose. As the optimal solution requires the knowledge of full observation model at 155 every sensor node, a gradient-descent-based solution was proposed to find the suboptimal weights. By 156 using the optimised weights, an adaptive DKF (ADKF) was proposed for real-time implementation. Except 157 for the optimisation-based approach [57], the combination weights  $c_{k,ij}$  of the diffusion step can also be 158 selected by using covariance intersection (CI) approach [58]. The theoretical performance analysis in [56] 159 revealed that DKF guarantees unbiased and bounded estimation if the system is locally observable. To relax 160 this assumption, Hu et al. [58] developed a new version of DKF by integrating consensus approach with 161 diffusion strategy (CDKF). But still there is no guarantee that the performance of this filter will converge to 162 the benchmark centralised filter. Instead of exchanging all intermediate estimated state vectors, the partial 163 DKF (PDKF) proposed in [59] only requires sharing a subset of local estimations, thus showing advantages 164 in low communication loads. 165

#### <sup>166</sup> 3.1.5. Summary of Existing Distributed State Vector Fusion Algorithms

The main characteristics of the aforementioned distributed SVF estimators are summarised in Table 3. 167 As can be noted from this table, the major drawback of SVF algorithms is that they cannot ensure theoretical 168 convergence to the optimal centralised solution. Although the one-iteration-only diffusion-based methods 169 [56, 57, 58, 59] have great potentials in fully distributed estimation and reduction of communication burden, 170 consensus/gossip based distributed SVF estimators usually provide better performance in terms of tracking 171 accuracy, if multiple rounds of communications are allowed in the applications. For practical situations 172 where the target cannot be observed by some local sensor nodes due to limited sensing range, both KCF 173 [42, 43, 46] and GDKF [47] show performance degradation as they cannot preserve the local consistency. 174 Although GKCF [47] is capable of improving the tracking performance for such scenarios, it requires the 175 network topology to select the consensus gain. 176

From Table 3, we can also note that the sequential fusion strategy requires specific topology, i.e., the network needs to be sequentially connected, e.g., chain, ring, and therefore this method is not applicable when the topology condition is not satisfied. Another drawback of sequential fusion is that it usually requires each sensor's field-of-view to cover the entire surveillance region; otherwise, the actual fusion cannot improve the overall tracking performance. Compared with sequential fusion, the other three fusion strategies are more flexible and hence they are more preferred in real applications.

Fusion	Algorithm	Global	Local	Fully	Communication	Specific
stategy	Algorithm	optimality	consistency	distributed	burden	topology
Sequential fusion	Sequential SVF [25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33]	No	Yes	No	High	Yes
Average	KCF [42, 43, 46]	No	No	No	High	No
consensus	GKCF $[47]$	No	Yes	No	High	No
Gossip algorithm	GDKF [49]	No	No	Yes	Medium	No
	DKF [56]	No	No	Yes	Low	No
Diffusion	ADKF $[57]$	No	No	Yes	Low	No
Diffusion	CDKF [58]	No	Yes	Yes	Low	No
	PDKF [59]	No	No	Yes	Low	No

Table 3: Characteristics of Different Distributed State Vector Fusion Estimators.

183 3.2. Distributed Information Vector Fusion Kalman Filter

Instead of SVF, IVF provides another alternative way for distributed estimation. This subsection will
 first give a review on distributed implementation of IVF using different fusion strategies and then summarises
 the main properties of different IVF algorithms.

# 187 3.2.1. Sequential-Fusion-Based Algorithms

Willner et al. [60] first suggested a measurement vector fusion (MVF) algorithm to directly exchange local measurement vectors to obtain fused pseudo measurement in the minimum mean square error (MMSE) sense for two sensors. The pseudo measurement is given by

$$\overline{\mathbf{z}}_{k,i} = \mathbf{z}_{k,i} + \mathbf{R}_{k,i} \left( \mathbf{R}_{k,i} + \mathbf{R}_{k,j} \right)^{-1} \left( \mathbf{z}_{k,j} - \mathbf{z}_{k,i} \right)$$
(8)

with its covariance  $\bar{\mathbf{R}}_{k,i}$  being  $\bar{\mathbf{R}}_{k,i} = \left(\mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} + \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1}\right)^{-1}$ .

Similar to SVF, the MVF can also be implemented in a sequential way. The performance analysis, shown 189 in [61], reveals that direct MVF [60] shows performance improvement in terms of error covariance reduction, 190 compared to standard SVF [25]. Another extension of MVF to multiple sensors was reported in [62]. This 191 algorithm was developed by converting the measurement set to a proxy and homologous measurement via 192 simple moment matching. As stated in [63], the moment-preserving approximation, which simply merges 193 all Gaussian mixtures, is accurate enough provided that the distance between Gaussian terms is far enough. 194 If two local measurements are not well-spaced, the resulting Gaussian mixture exhibits multi-modality and 195 thus this approximation may destroy valuable information. 196

Apart from MVF, the well-established CI rule [64, 65, 66, 67] provides another alternative way to perform IVF in a distributed way. The fused estimate  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k|k,i}$  and its corresponding covariance  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k|k,i}$  obtained from the CI rule for two sensors is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k|k,i}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{k|k,i} = \omega \mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} + (1-\omega) \mathbf{P}_{k|k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,j}$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k|k,i}^{-1} = \omega \mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} + (1-\omega) \mathbf{P}_{k|k,j}^{-1}$$
(9)

where the weight  $\omega$  is normally optimised by minimising the trace of the fused covariance  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k|k,i}$ . This optimisation problem can be easily solved by using some numerical methods, e.g., golden section method.

The basic idea behind CI is the geometric interpretation of estimation error covariance. CI encloses the 199 intersection region between two local error covariances if the two local estimates have overlapped covariance 200 ellipsoid. The utilisation of CI ensures consistency of the fused estimates even when the correlation between 201 the two local estimates is unknown. The work in [35] studied a distributed estimation filter for a sensor 202 network by repeatedly applying the CI rule to every two sensors in a sequential way. Theoretical performance 203 analysis reveals that the accuracy of sequential CI fusion is lower than that of ideal batch CI fusion. The 204 problem associated with the CI fusion algorithms is that they are pessimistic since the ellipse of fused 205 estimate is larger than it needs to be. Ellipsoid CI (ECI)[68] and inverse CI (ICI) [69] are two improvements 206 over the original CI. Both ECI and ICI provide increased confidence level, i.e., smaller ellipsoid region, 207 compared to the CI, and they can also be applied for multi-sensor fusion in a sequential fusion. 208

#### 209 3.2.2. Consensus-Based Algorithms

Similar to KCF, average consensus algorithm can also be exploited to implement MVF [70, 71, 72]. The resultant fusion structure, termed as consensus-based MVF Kalman filter (CMVFKF), aims to achieve average consensus on the innovation term of Kalman filter. In order to guarantee global convergence to the centralised estimation, Olfati-Saber [73] utilised the concept of consensus on measurement in Kalman filter (CMKF). The idea of CMKF is to compute the information terms  $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$  in a distributed manner through average consensus protocol  $\mathcal{A}(\cdot)$  to match with the centralised Kalman filter. By exchanging the local information vector  $\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i}$  and information matrix  $\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$ , the update rule of CMKF is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,i}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,i} + N\mathcal{A}\left(\mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,j}\right)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,i}^{-1} + N\mathcal{A}\left(\mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\right), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}$$
(10)

The convergence and stability of CMKF was analysed in [74]. A new rule of selecting the fusion weights for CMKF was studied in [75] by minimising the lower detectability Gramian bound. The advantage of

CMKF is that it is asymptotically optimal at each time instant provided that the priors are converged. 212 However, since only finite number of consensus iterations is tractable in practice, convergence will not be 213 fully achieved. Therefore, all local estimates are auto-correlated during the fusion phase and thus CMKF 214 suffers from the well-known auto-correlation problem. As CMKF never exploits the prior information in 215 fusion, it constrains the posterior estimates as the prior estimates if the sensor and its neighbors cannot 216 detect the target within allowable number of consensus iterations due to limited field-of-view. Also note from 217 Eq. (10) that CMKF weights the local prior estimate using its own prior covariance matrix, which means 218 it cannot preserve the consistency of local estimates since the observability condition of local sensor can 219 only be ensured with enough number of iterations. Apparently, this issue becomes more severe for sparse 220 networks. Therefore, the performance of CMKF with small number of consensus iterations will degrade 221 significantly. 222

To solve the associated problems of CMKF, the authors of [76, 77] presented a distributed CI Kalman filter (CIKF) based on the concept of generalised CI [78] as

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} = \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{P}_{k|k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,j} \right) = \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,j} + \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,j} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} = \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{P}_{k|k,j}^{-1} \right) = \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,j}^{-1} + \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,j} \right), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}$$
(11)

For CIKF with single-step consensus, He et al. [79] proposed an optimal fusion weight design algorithm 223 using convex optimisation to minimise the fusion uncertainty. The CIKF was proven to generate unbiased 224 local estimates and to be equivalent to perform consensus on the Kullback-Leibler average of local probability 225 density functions in [80]. Due to the nature of the CI fusion rule, CI-based distributed estimators ensure the 226 consistency of local estimate and hence generally shows better performance than CMKF when the number 227 of consensus iterations is limited. But, unfortunately, CIKF is not globally optimal as it underweights the information related terms  $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$ . This will generate the so-called local redundancy issue. Although ECI and ICI have great potentials to reduce the conservativeness of CI, these 228 229 230 two fusion rules currently can only be implemented in a sequential way for multiple sensors. 231

Comparing CMKF and CIKF, we can observe that these two algorithms have complementary properties: CMKF is asymptotically optimal but its performance degrades significantly when the number of consensus iterations is small; CIKF is beneficial for ensuring the consistency of fused estimates but cannot recover the performance of centralised estimator. Motivated by these observations, the authors of [81, 82] proposed a new distributed estimation algorithm, termed as information consensus filter (ICF). The fusion rule of this filter is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} = N\mathcal{A}\left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,j} + \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,j}\right)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} = N\mathcal{A}\left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,j}^{-1} + \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,j}\right), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}$$
(12)

The ICF algorithm is able to converge asymptotically to the centralised filter (4) with a strongly connected undirected network topology. However, it requires some global information, e.g., degree of the sensor network and network size, in implementation. To partially relax this assumption, Yao et al. [83] suggested an average ICF (AICF), which, however, essentially coincides with the original CIKF [76, 77]. A generalised consensus fusion framework that encompasses CMKF, CIKF and ICF was presented in [84] via a parallel CM and CI (P-CMCI) as

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} = \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,j} \right) + \omega_{k,i} \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,j} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{-1} = \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,j}^{-1} \right) + \omega_{k,i} \mathcal{A} \left( \mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,j}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,j} \right), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}$$
(13)

where the normalisation factor  $\omega_{k,i} > 0$  is a design parameter to tune the filter performance. Similar to ICF, P-CMCI handles the redundancy of the priors and thus has possibility of global convergence to the centralised solution by setting the normalisation factor as the network size, i.e.,  $\omega_{k,i} = N$ , but requires double communication cost due to the inherent parallel consensus process. The main promising feature of P-CMCI filter is that it has been proved to be able to guarantee stability for any choice of the normalisation weights  $\omega_{k,i}$  and for any number of consensus steps.

Note that most consensus-based distributed estimators require sufficient number of iterations to guarantee 238 the convergence, which normally has high communication burdens. To mitigate this issue, several efforts 239 have been made to improve the convergence speed for consensus-based distributed estimation. Instead of 240 using average consensus, Petitti [85] developed a Consensus-based Distributed Target Tracking (CDTT) 241 algorithm based on a max-consensus protocol. All sensor nodes make agreement on the best local estimate 242 by finding the maximum perception confidence value  $1/\text{Trace}(\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i})$  of all local estimates. The main 243 advantage of this algorithm is that it permits finite-time convergence of the consensus iterations provided 244 that the number of consensus iterations is at least the diameter of the network (in hops). However, the 245 max consensus protocol only performs a node selection process, instead of fusion, and thus cannot reduce 246 the estimation uncertainty. As opposed to asymptotic convergence, a finite-time convergence CMKF (FT-247 CMKF) was proposed for a sensor network in [86]. This algorithm, however, is only applicable to acyclic 248 network topology. Although max consensus algorithm can be utilised to construct a spanning tree in 249 a distributed manner [87], it is unclear whether or not the integration of these two methods will pose 250 significant advance over the original CMKF. Another attempt to reduce the communication complexity was 251 reported in [88, 89], where the authors modified the CMKF by using a minimum-time consensus algorithm 252 [90] and hence the resulting filter is termed as MT-CMKF. This new variant of CMKF only uses local past 253 state estimates to form a Hankel matrix, with which all local sensor nodes achieve average consensus in a 254 minimum number of time steps. This algorithm improves the existing finite-time consensus to a minimal 255 time consensus. However, there is a trade-off between the communication burden, i.e., consensus iterations, 256 and computational complexity. Instead of exchanging information among all local neighbours, Katragadda 257 and Cavallaro [91] suggested a N-consensus Kalman filter (NCKF). The idea behind is that only neighbours 258 within N-hops are selected in information fusion to reduce the communication burden. 259

#### 260 3.2.3. Gossip-Based Algorithms

Distributed implementation of IVF has also been investigated from the perspective of gossip process in recent years. The authors of [92] developed a linear distributed estimator, which is called as gossip interactive Kalman filter (GIKF). The fundamental difference between GIKF and other consensus-based distributed Kalman filters is that GIKF runs the consensus and observation updates at the same time scale. At a random time instant, a local sensor node *i* randomly selects a neighbour  $\overline{i} \in \mathcal{N}_i$  to swap their prior estimates and the corresponding error covariances for measurement update as

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} = \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}} + \mathbf{K}_{k,i} \left( \mathbf{z}_{k,i} - \mathbf{H}_{k,i} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}} - \mathbf{K}_{k,i} \mathbf{H}_{k,i} \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}}$$
(14)

which guarantees probabilistically global convergence. Li et al. [93] developed a modified GIKF (M-GIKF) to improve the performance of GIKF by adding one additional observation mixing step.

Different from [92, 93], Qin et al. [94] developed a gossip CMKF (G-CMKF) algorithm that leverages 263 the randomised consensus in information vector fusion by replacing the average consensus in CMKF with 264 the randomised gossip algorithm. Theoretical analysis reveals that the utilisation of randomised protocols 265 helps to avoid the need of cumbersome communication, thus reducing the need of time to perform sensor 266 fusion. Although the randomised gossip process is proved to guarantee average agreement among all sensor 267 nodes with infinite number of iterations [50], the performance of G-CMKF degrades drastically due to its 268 slow convergence, compared to the original CMKF. To address this problem, a deterministic communication 269 strategy using greedy gossip was suggested in [95] to develop a new CMKF, termed as greedy gossip CMKF 270 271 (GG-CMKF), that can improve the convergence rate of the gossip process.

In principle, randomised gossip and greedy gossip have complementary characteristics. Specifically, randomised gossip has lower computational burden but its convergence rate is relatively slow because of the randomised nature. On the other hand, greedy gossip enjoys faster convergence to the average value

at expense of higher communication burden. This can be attributed to the fact that greedy gossip requires 275 each sensor node to communicate with all its connected neighbours to find an optimal path. Motivated by 276 these observations, the authors of [96] suggested a novel sample greedy gossip ICF (SGG-ICF) to exhibit 277 positive features of both randomised gossip and greedy gossip. This is achieved by utilising the greedy node 278 selection strategy among a randomly selected active sensor node set. Each node using SGG-ICF determines 279 the communication with its neighbour nodes based on a stochastic uniform sampling procedure. Once the 280 sampling result is larger than a certain threshold, the communication is triggered. Also, this algorithm 281 leverages the information weighted fusion rule while the previous gossip approaches utilised the concept 282 of measurement vector fusion. This enables the algorithm developed to preserve the consistency of local 283 estimates unlike the previous gossip algorithms. Performance evaluation reveals that the SGG-ICF algorithm 284 achieves comparable performance to the greedy gossip based algorithm with significantly less communication 285 overhead. 286

# 287 3.2.4. Diffusion-Based Algorithms

Unlike consensus-based approaches, the diffusion strategy does not require the information on the network size and has low communication burden by using single communication step. Mainly due to this fact, the one-iteration-only diffusion strategy was also found to be widely employed in IVF.

In [97], the authors proposed a cost-effective DKF (CE-DKF) by applying optimal estimation (4) to 291 local connected sensors before performing diffusion to fuse the local estimates through the network. This 292 enables diffusion not only on the local state estimations but also their corresponding covariances, hence 293 providing performance improvement compared to the original DKF [56]. Similar to the original DKF [56], 294 Zhang et al. [98] also only leveraged diffusion in state vector fusion, but the local CI was utilised to improve 295 the local estimation performance before the diffusion step and therefore the resulting algorithm is termed 296 as CI-DKF. Wang et al. [99] integrated the ideas of [97], [98] to propose a new variant of CI-DKF and 297 showed performance improvement of their new algorithm. Another improvement over [98] was reported in 298 [100], where the authors developed a distributed hybrid information fusion (DHIF) filter. This algorithm is 299 composed of two main steps: the first step utilises the batch CI to fuse local priors, in a similar way as [98], 300 and the second step applies optimal fusion (4) to local sensors to update the state estimates. Note that the 301 DHIF can be considered as a special version of P-CMCI [84] with single consensus iteration. Compared to 302 consensus and gossip based approaches, diffusion-based algorithms normally do not require the knowledge 303 on the network size and thus can be viewed as fully distributed algorithms. However, it should be pointed 304 out that the asymptotic convergence property of the consensus process is lost in diffusion. 305

# 306 3.2.5. Summary of Existing Distributed Information Vector Fusion Algorithms

The main properties of different distributed IVF estimators are summarised in Table 4. The advantages and disadvantages of the discussed distributed IVF algorithms are compared with respect to different metrics. As IVF directly or indirectly leverages local measurements in the fusion process, algorithms that using IVF have possibility of global convergence to the centralised solution and usually generate more accurate estimation results, compared to SVF-based algorithms. However, as infinite number of communication rounds is normally intractable in practical applications, the centralised estimation usually provides better performance than the distributed estimation algorithms in terms of tracking accuracy.

It is worthy pointing out that CMKF [73] and its related variants [88, 89, 86, 94, 95] are not preferred if the communication capacity is limited as the performance of these algorithms degrades drastically with small number of consensus or gossip iterations. Since ICF-based approaches [82, 83, 84, 96] are proved to be able to guarantee stability for any number of consensus steps, these algorithms are applicable for scenarios with limited communication resource.

Similar to SVF, both consensus and gossip based distributed IVF filters have capability to provide better performance in terms of tracking accuracy at the price of higher communication cost, compared with diffusion-based IVF approaches. From these observations, we can conclude that there is a significant conflict between the fusion performance and communication requirement, as a higher estimation accuracy normally requires more communication resources, either more communication iterations or higher communication bandwidth which are usually limited for low-cost sensors.

Fusion strategy	Algorithm	Global optimality	Local consistency	Fully distributed	Communication burden	Specific topology
	Sequential MVF [60, 62, 61]	No	No	No	High	Yes
Comontial fusion	Sequential CI [35]	No	Yes	No	High	Yes
- ITOIGNT IPINITAN hac	Sequential ECI [68]	No	Yes	No	High	Yes
	Sequential ICI [69]	No	Yes	No	High	Yes
	CMVFKF [70, 71, 72]	Yes	No	No	High	No
	CMKF [73, 74, 75]	Yes	No	No	High	No
	CIKF [76, 77, 79, 80]	No	Yes	No	High	No
Average consensus	ICF [81, 82]	Yes	Yes	No	High	$\mathbf{Y}$ es
•	AICF [83]	No	Yes	No	High	No
	P-CMCI [84]	No	Yes	Yes	High	No
	NCKF [91]	No	Yes	No	Medium	No
Finite-time consensus	FT-CMKF [86]	Yes	No	No	Medium	Yes
Minimum-time consensus	MT-CMKF [88, 89]	Yes	No	No	Medium	No
Max consensus	CDTT [85]	No	No	Yes	Medium	No
	GIKF [92]	No	Yes	${ m Yes}$	Medium	No
Gossip process	M-GIKF [93]	No	Yes	$\mathbf{Yes}$	Medium	$N_{O}$
	G-CMKF [94]	Yes	No	$\mathbf{Yes}$	Medium	No
Greedy gossip	GG-CMKF [95]	$\mathbf{Yes}$	No	No	High	No
Sample greedy gossip	SGG-ICF [96]	$\mathbf{Yes}$	$\mathrm{Yes}$	No	Medium	$N_{O}$
	CE-DKF [97]	No	No	${ m Yes}$	Low	No
Diffusion	CI-DKF [98, 99]	No	$\mathrm{Yes}$	${ m Yes}$	Low	No
	DHIF [100]	No	$\mathbf{Yes}$	$\mathbf{Yes}$	Low	No

Table 4: Characteristics of Different Distributed Information Vector Fusion Estimators.

# 325 3.3. Numerical Evaluation of Representative Algorithms

In order to provide better insights into different distributed estimation approaches, extensive Monte-Carlo 326 comparisons of several representative algorithms are carried out in this subsection. Since sequential fusion 327 is not applicable to a generic sensor network topology, distributed estimation algorithms using this fusion 328 strategy is excluded in the simulation analysis for simplicity. As for other three different fusion strategies, we 329 pick several representative algorithms for each fusion strategy. Table 5 summarises the selected distributed 330 estimation algorithms and their corresponding communication requirement. When implementing DKF, we 331 utilise the well-known CI rule to choose the diffusion weights [58]. The sensor activation probability is set 332 as 0.5 in the implementation of SGG-ICF. 333

Fusion Strategy	Algorithm	Exchanged information during fusion	Number of sensors communicated with the <i>i</i> th node during each iteration
	$\mathrm{KCF}\ [42,43,46]$	$\mathbf{x}_{k k,i}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $
	CMKF [73, 74, 75]	$\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i},  \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $
Average consensus	CIKF [76, 80]	$\mathbf{x}_{k k,i},\mathbf{P}_{k k,i}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $
	ICF [81, 82]	$\frac{\mathbf{x}_{k k-1,i},  \mathbf{P}_{k k-1,i},}{\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i},  \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $
	P-CMCI [84]	$\mathbf{x}_{k k-1,i},\mathbf{P}_{k k-1,i},\ \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T\mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{k,i},\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T\mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{k,i}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $
	GDKF [49]	$\mathbf{x}_{k k,i}$	Random one sensor from $\mathcal{N}_i$
Gossip process	G-CMKF [94]	$\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i},  \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$	Random one sensor from $\mathcal{N}_i$
	GG-CMKF [95]	$\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i},  \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $
	SCC ICE [06]	$\mathbf{x}_{k k-1,i},  \mathbf{P}_{k k-1,i},$	Random $0.5 \mathcal{N}_i $ sensors from
	5GG-ICF [90]	$\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i},  \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$	$\mathcal{N}_i$ in average sense
	DKF $[56, 58]$	$\mathbf{x}_{k k,i},\mathbf{P}_{k k,i}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $
Diffusion	DHIF [100]	$\frac{\mathbf{x}_{k k-1,i}, \mathbf{P}_{k k-1,i},}{\mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i}, \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^T \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}}$	$ \mathcal{N}_i $

Table 5: Selected distributed estimation algorithms and their corresponding communication requirement.

 $|\mathcal{N}_i|$  denotes the cardinality, i.e., the number of elements, of set  $\mathcal{N}_i$ 

## 334 3.3.1. Simulation Setup

All simulations in this subsection are performed in a  $500m \times 500m$  rectangular monitoring area and every 335 sensor has a limited sensing range of 100m. We carried out extensive performance evaluation and comparison 336 based on six different types of network topologies. Considering the similar tendency in the results, this 337 paper demonstrates the simulation results on the two representative types of network topologies: random 338 geometric network topology with 20 sensors, and deterministic grid network topology with 16 sensors. Note 339 that these two types of topologies are widely utilised in analysing the performance of distributed network-340 wide estimation algorithms [101]. For the random geometric network, each sensor is randomly placed inside 341 the surveillance region and two sensors are connected if their relative distance is less than 300m. Examples 342 of these two different sensor topologies are presented Fig. 2. 343

Each target's state is represented by a 4-D vector, with 2-D position and 2-D velocity components. In estimation update, the system equation is assumed to be the well-known constant velocity model, e.g.,

$$\mathbf{F}_{k} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & T_{s} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & T_{s} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(15)



Figure 2: Examples of two different network topologies. The red circles denote the sensor locations and the blue lines refer to the connections between sensor nodes. (a) Random geometric topology . (b) Deterministic grid topology.

with  $T_s = 1s$  being the sampling time. The variance of process noise of the considered constant velocity model is determined as

$$\mathbf{Q}_{k} = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 10 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(16)

Each sensor collects position measurements at regular time instants  $t_k = kT_s, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$ , as

$$\mathbf{H}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(17)

The measurement noise is subject to a Gaussian white noise as  $\mathbf{v}_{k,i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\cdot; 0, \mathbf{R}_{k,i})$  with  $\mathbf{R}_{k,i} = diag(\sigma_r^2, \sigma_r^2), \sigma_r = 10m$ . For initialisation, the covariance matrix of the target at sensor node *i* is chosen as  $\mathbf{P}_{0|0,i} = diag(100, 100, 10, 10)$ . The initial state estimates are generated from a Gaussian distribution around the true target state with the covariance  $\mathbf{P}_{0|0,i}$ . The starting point of the target is also randomly generated inside the surveillance region at every Monte-Carlo run.

# 349 3.3.2. Performance Metric

For rigorous evaluation, the performance of the selected algorithms is examined against four different metrics: root mean square error (RMSE), root of the trace of error covariance (RTRC), mean standard deviation (MSTD) and running time. Let  $\mathbf{p}_{k|k,i}^{j}$  denote the estimated position of the target provided by sensor node *i* at time instant *k* of the *j*th Monte Carlo run and  $\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{j}$  be the corresponding error covariance matrix. Define  $\mathbf{p}_{k}^{j}$  represent the true target position at time instant *k* of the *j*th Monte Carlo run. The RMSE, RTRC and MSTD of position estimation averaged over *T* time instants and *N* sensors, are defined

$$\operatorname{RMSE}_{j} = \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{T}\left\|\mathbf{p}_{k|k,i}^{j} - \mathbf{p}_{k}^{j}\right\|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\operatorname{RTRC}_{j} = \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{T}\operatorname{trace}\left(\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i}^{j}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\operatorname{MSTD}_{j} = \left[\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{T}\left\|\mathbf{p}_{k|k,i}^{j} - \mathbf{p}_{k}^{j}\right\|^{2} - \left(\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{T}\left\|\mathbf{p}_{k|k,i}^{j} - \mathbf{p}_{k}^{j}\right\|\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
(18)

For performance evaluation of the selected algorithms, the average RMSE, RTRP and MSTD over MMonte Carlo runs are utilised. These three metrics are computed as

$$RMSE_{avg} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} RMSE_{j}$$

$$RTRC_{avg} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} RTRC_{j}$$

$$MSTD_{avg} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} MSTD_{j}$$
(19)

Besides these three accuracy-related metrics, the average running time is also leveraged in algorithm 350 evaluation. Note that these four different metrics can reflect the characteristics of the selected algorithms. 351 The RMSE can be utilised to evaluate the tracking accuracy and global optimality. If the algorithm provides 352 global optimality, its RMSE will asymptotically converge to that of the centralised solution. The RTRC is an 353 indicator of local consistency and conservativeness. If the algorithm guarantees local consistency, its RMSE 35 should be upper bounded by (and very close to) its RTRC. Also, if the RMSE is much smaller than the 355 RTRC, the estimation provided by the algorithm is very conservative, which, in turn, will indirectly increase 356 the tracking error. Under various different conditions, the MSTD can be leveraged as an metric to quantify 357 the robustness of the algorithm evaluated. Finally, the running time is an reflection of the communication 358 cost and computational complexity, which are of paramount importance to low-cost sensors. 359

# 360 3.3.3. Simulation Results

The simulation results obtained from 2000 Monte-Carlo runs are presented in Figs. 3 and 4, where Fig. 3 is for random geometric network topology and Fig. 4 is for deterministic grid network topology.

From Figs. 3 (a) and 4 (a), it is clear that both KCF and GDKF cannot converge to the centralised 363 Kalman filter for all tested sensor networks since these two algorithms only utilise the state estimations 364 in the fusion process. Although KCF provides acceptable performance for random geometric network, its 365 performance degrades drastically when applying it to the grid sensor network. This can be attributed to the 366 fact that KCF has no strategy to deal with the naive sensor nodes. Compared to KCF, GDKF only utilises 367 one local node's information in the fusion process and therefore generates less accurate tracking performance. 368 As both KCF and GDKF never share the error covariance, their RTRCs remain almost the same regardless 369 of the number of consensus iterations, as confirmed by Figs. 3 (b) and 4 (b). Comparing Figs. 3 (a) with 370 3 (b) and Figs. 4 (a) with 4 (b), one can also observe that KCF and GDKF provide very conservative 371 estimations, which will have adverse effect on the tracking performance. However, as can be noted from 372 Table 5 that both KCF and GDKF only require share the local state estimations among locally-connected 373 sensors, it can reduce the communication cost and computational burden, compared to other distributed 374 fusion algorithms, as confirmed by Figs. 3 (d) and 4 (d). With these facts in mind, it can be concluded that 375

as



Figure 3: Comparison results of different distributed estimation algorithms with respect to different metrics under random geometric network topology.

KCF and GDKF are suitable for applications when sensors' computational and communication burden are very limited.

From Figs. 3 (a) and 4 (a), it can be noted that CMKF-based algorithms, i.e., original CMKF [73], G-378 CMKF [94] and GG-CMKF [95], can recover the performance of the optimal centralised solution with enough 379 number of communication iterations, but these algorithms provide relatively poor estimation performance 380 when the number of consensus/gossip iterations is limited. The reason is that CMKF-based algorithms can-381 not preserve local consistency, as confirmed by comparing RMSE and RTRC in Figs. 3 and 4. Interestingly, 382 it can be noted that leveraging greedy gossip algorithm for sensor fusion, e.g., GG-CMKF, can significantly 383 improve the performance of CMKF with small number of communication iterations. This can be attributed 384 to the fact that the greedy gossip algorithm finds the best neighbour of each sensor node for information 385 exchange and therefore can partially avoid the drawback of CMKF. However, this greedy node selection 386 strategy significantly increases the execution time, as confirmed by Figs. 3 (d) and 4 (d). 387

Compared to CMKF, CIKF [80] shows strong robustness against the variation of the number of communication iterations. However, CIKF generates less accurate tracking performance for both network topologies



Figure 4: Comparison results of different distributed estimation algorithms with respect to different metrics under deterministic grid network topology.

with enough communication resources. Among all the tested algorithms, ICF [82], P-CMCI [84] and SGG-390 ICF [96], provide more accurate performance in all tested scenarios. The reason of this fact is clear: these 391 algorithms exploit the benefits of both CMKF and CIKF: they guarantee local consistency when the number 392 of communication iterations is small and provide asymptotically global convergence to the centralised solu-393 tion. Another benefit of SGG-ICF algorithm is that it provides great flexibility and well balance between 394 communication cost and convergence performance. If enough resource is available for communication, then 395 a higher sensor activation probability can be chosen to increase the convergence rate; otherwise, a relatively 396 small value of sensor activation probability is desirable. 397

For the two selected diffusion-based estimators, i.e., DKF with CI weights [58] and DHIF [100], their performance is comparable to that of ICF, P-CMCI and SGG-ICF with one communication iteration. The quaranteed. However, the convergence to the centralised fusion is lost in both DKF and DHIF as these two algorithms apply one-iteration-only fusion strategies. With these facts in mind, these approaches are suitable to scenarios where the sensors' communication resource is very limited. From Figs. 3 (c) and 4 (c), we can observe that using only local measurements in sensor fusion, i.e., CMKF and its related algorithms, is sensitive to environmental variations. As a comparison, leveraging the CI rule brings improved robustness against parameter variations, which is helpful for applications in a dynamic scenario. Another conclusion, drawn from the MSTD results, is that the sensitivity to parameter variations can be mitigated by increasing the number of communication iterations for consensus/gossip-based algorithms.

# 410 3.3.4. Summary of Numerical Analysis

Based on the simulation results, it can be concluded that utilising hybrid CMKF and CIKF, e.g., ICF, 411 P-CMCI and SGG-ICF, helps to achieve global convergence to the optimal centralised solution (induced 412 by CMKF), guarantee local consistency and improve robustness against parameter variations (induced by 413 CIKF). However, these algorithms require multiple rounds of communications to improve the estimation per-414 formance. For this reason, one fundamental question of using these using distributed estimation algorithms 415 is how to how to properly determine the number of iterations with allowable error bounds. As the SGG-ICF 416 algorithm provides great flexibility and well balance between communication cost and tracking performance, 417 it has strong potentials in distributed estimation over a low-cost sensor network. In extreme situations where 418 the communication resource is very limited, diffusion-based algorithms could be wise options. 419

## 420 4. Extensions of Existing Algorithms to Practical Scenarios

Notice that most previous methods mentioned in Sec. 3 are dedicated for linear Gaussian discrete-time
systems with no uncertainties and no state constraints. Considering this fact, we will present a brief review
of several extensions of existing algorithms to practical scenarios in this section. Table 6 summarises the
representative works and their corresponding baseline approaches as well as fusion strategies.

Scenario	Baseline filter	Fusion strategy
Nonlinear system	EKF [102, 103, 104], UKF [105, 106], CKF [107, 4, 108]	KCF [104], CMKF [107], CIKF [105], ICF [102, 4], P-CMCI [103, 108], Diffusion [106]
Continuous-time	Kalman-bucy filter [109, 110, 111]	KCF [110], CMKF [109], CIKF [111]
system		
Unknown statistics of measurement noise	VB Kalman filter [112, 113]	P-CMCI [112], Diffusion [113]
	$H_{\infty}$ filter	KCF [124, 120], CMKF
Unknown dynamics	[114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120],	[114, 116, 118, 123, 121], Hybrid KCF
model	IMM Kalman filter	and CMKF [115, 117, 119], ICF [114],
	[121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126]	P-CMCI [122], Diffusion [125, 126]
Constrained system	Moving horizon filter [127, 128, 129]	Diffusion [127, 128, 129]

Table 6: Extensions of Existing Algorithms to Practical Scenarios.

As most practical systems are nonlinear, either system model or measurement model, developing non-425 linear filtering algorithms for sensor network is necessary. For example, if system states are defined in 426 Cartesian coordinate, e.g., 3D position, 3D velocity and 3D acceleration, and sensor measurements are 427 given by range, bearing angle or time of arrival, then the measurement model is a nonlinear function of 428 system states. The extended Kalman filter (EKF), by far, is the most-widely used nonlinear filter, which 429 approximates the nonlinear dynamics through first-order linearisation. Combing the EKF concept with the 430 consensus algorithm, EKF was embedded into P-CMCI [103] to accommodate nonlinear range and angle 431 measurements. For scenarios where pinhole cameras are utilised as local sensors, EKF-based KCF [104] and 432 ICF [102] were reported to address the nonlinear issue of pinhole camera measurement model. The major 433 shortcoming of EKF is that the estimation might diverge with large initialisation error or highly nonlinear 434

dynamics. Attacking this problem, unscented Kalman filter (UKF) and cubature Kalman filter (CKF) were later embedded into CMKF [107], CIKF [105], ICF [4], P-CMCI [108] and DKF [106], to accommodate nonlinear range and range rate [107], sinusoidal measurement [105], bearing angle [4], range and bearing angle [108] and range [106].

Although discrete-time distributed Kalman filter can be applied to real-world continuous systems, it is
more beneficial to directly design continuous-time distributed estimation algorithms to mitigate the approximation errors of discretisation. For this reason, continuous-time distributed Kalman-bucy filters for sensor
networks were proposed in [109, 110, 111] based on average consensus protocols and different fusion rules,
e.g., KCF [110], CMKF [109] and CIKF [111].

Although the statistics of measurement noise, which is dependent on the sensors and the application 444 scenarios, can be tested through extensive offline experiments, it might not be cost-effective and they are 445 typically unavailable for low-cost sensors. Furthermore, the statistics of measurement noise of the same sen-446 sor might change in a great deal in a dynamic environment. For example, in a vision-based target tracking 447 mission using camera networks, measurements are typically extracted from various object detection algorithms, ranging from classical template matching to recent deep learning method. Obviously, the statistics 449 of measurement noise is different when applying different object detection algorithms. Therefore, the usual 450 assumption on the exact knowledge of the statistics of measurement noise over time might be impractical 451 and a sophisticated variant of Kalman filter is required to estimate the statistical parameters. To tackle this 452 issue, variational Bayesian (VB) inference was embedded into P-CMCI [112] and DKF [113] to dynamically 453 estimate the covariance of the measurement noise. 454

Except for unknown statistical parameters, the dynamics model utilised in distributed Kalman filters 455 also might have uncertainties. Significant mismatch of the dynamics model could result in erroneous tracking 456 outputs. One popular way to mitigate the effect of model uncertainty is to incorporate the  $H_{\infty}$  concept 457 with typical distributed Kalman filters, such as KCF [120], CMKF [114, 116, 118], hybrid KCF and CMKF 458 [115, 117, 119] and ICF [114]. However, distributed  $H_{\infty}$  filters only consider the worst case and therefore 459 is conservative. An alternative choice for handling model uncertainty is the widely-accepted multiple model 460 methodology, which utilises several dynamics models in parallel with each model representing one possible 461 target dynamics. Since the propagation of mixture is computationally intractable in practical applications, 462 interactive multiple model (IMM) was proposed to approximate the mixture distribution by a single dis-463 tribution using moment-preserving. By embedding the IMM concept into KCF [124], CMKF [121, 123], 46 P-CMCI [122], DKF [125, 126], several consensus/diffusion-based distributed estimation algorithms have 465 been suggested for systems with uncertain model. 466

In some practical applications, system states might have some constraints. For example, when tracking a ground moving vehicle, the target's position naturally needs to be constrained inside the road boundary. As stated in [130], the algorithms based on classical Kalman filter might become unstable for constrained systems. Furthermore, it has been proved that the utilisation of the information on constraint in filter design is helpful in improving the tracking performance [131, 132]. For this reason, the authors of [127, 128, 129] developed distributed estimation algorithms for constrained systems using moving horizon estimation approach and diffusion fusion strategy.

#### 474 5. Challenges in Low-Cost Sensor Network

In recent years, low-cost sensor networks have been widely-utilised in many practical applications for distributed target tracking, especially in autonomous systems. Two representative application examples are presented in Fig. 5. Fig. 5 (a) provides an example of using multi-sensor fusion to aid autonomous driving in an uncertain or unknown dynamic environment [133]. The autonomous vehicle leverages a variety of different sensors, e.g., surrounding radars and acoustic sensors, front camera, to estimate the landmarks and obstacles for safe and reliable navigation. Fig. 5 (b)<sup>5</sup> shows an example of using multiple sensors in a

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$ This application scenario is taken from our previous project *EuroSwarm*. Detailed descriptions of this project can be found at: https://www.cranfield.ac.uk/research-projects/euroswarm-developing-technology-for-uav

<sup>481</sup> persistent surveillance and monitoring mission for situation awareness. A swarm of heterogeneous sensors,

e.g., moving aerial sensors and stationary ground sensors, capable of communicating with each other, are
leveraged to cooperatively localise and track the targets of interest in an attempt to improve the perception

<sup>484</sup> performance.



Figure 5: Recent applications of low-cost sensor networks in distributed estimation. (a) An autonomous vehicle utilises multisensor fusion for navigation. (b) A swarm of heterogeneous autonomous robots cooperatively track targets of interest.

Despite their wide applications, low-cost sensor networks are generally subject to a certain degree of 485 random uncertainties. These include, but not limited to, miss detection, false alarm, sensor bias, and 486 communication-related issues, e.g., limited communication bandwidth and communication delay, and limited 487 onboard energy. Therefore, developing distributed estimation algorithms for low-cost sensor network is more 488 challenging, compared to the utilisation of reliable and expensive sensors. Mainly due to this fact, there 489 is a strong necessity in developing new distributed estimators for low-cost sensor networks to fit practical 490 applications. This section will give a detailed overview of the low-cost-sensor-network-induced issues and 491 discuss existing solutions as well as some remaining challenges. 492

# 493 5.1. Miss Detection

<sup>494</sup> Notice that low-cost sensors are generally subject to low detection probability. For this reason, dis-<sup>495</sup> tributed estimation over a low-cost sensor network should take into account this factor to support practical <sup>496</sup> applications. Up to now, most existing solutions model this random miss detection, also known as *inter-*<sup>497</sup> *mittent observation*, in a probabilistic way by either Bernoulli distribution or Markovian chain, and conduct <sup>498</sup> performance analysis and algorithm development based on the probabilistic model.

When considering miss observations, the measurement model can be modified as [134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139]

$$\mathbf{z}_{k,i} = \gamma_{k,i} \mathbf{H}_{k,i} \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_{k,i} \tag{20}$$

where the miss detection is modelled by is a random variable  $\gamma_{k,i}$  that satisfies a Bernoulli distribution, 499 i.e.,  $\gamma_{k,i}$  takes the value 1 with probability  $P_D$  and the value 0 with probability  $1 - P_D$ . Stability and 500 performance of classical Kalman filter with Bernoulli-distribution-based miss observations was analysed in 501 the literature [134, 137]. Extensions to EKF and UKF were, respectively, reported in [135], [136]. Under 502 the assumption that the system is controllable and observable, the general conclusion is that there exists a 503 critical value p such that if the detection probability satisfies  $P_D > p$ , then the expectation of the estimation 504 error covariance is bounded; otherwise, the estimation might diverge for some initial conditions. Except 505 for the Bernoulli distribution model, Markovian chain model was also utilised in [140] to analyse the mean 506 square error performance of Kalman filter with miss observations. However, the advantage of this model 507 over the popular Bernoulli model was not justified in [140]. 508

Under the condition of miss detection, the centralised fusion solution reduces to [141]

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \gamma_{k,i} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{k,i}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \gamma_{k,i} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$$
(21)

Comparing Eqs. (4) and (21), it can be noted that the performance of centralised estimation degrades 509 as the miss detection results in inevitable information loss. This means that the achievable performance 510 of distributed estimation will also degrade with miss observations. Although each sensor node is subject 511 to limited sensing capability, the stochastic stability of distributed estimation can be ensured by collective 512 observability of the sensor network, i.e., any two sensor nodes are direct (one-hop) or indirect connected 513 (multi-hop). However, if the target is miss detected, the condition of collective observability might be 514 violated. Therefore, the primary question to be answered under lossy network is that whether or not the 515 existing distributed estimation algorithms guarantee stable target tracking process. For this reason, the 516 authors of [142, 143] analysed the stability of KCF with possible miss detections based on the analysis 517 tools utilised in [134, 135, 137]. The results reveal that KCF is strictly stable provided that the detection 518 probability is larger than a lower bound. The drawback of the stability analysis presented in [142, 143] is 519 that the critical value of the detection probability only characterises the boundedness of the expectation 520 of estimation error and its covariance. To completely characterise the effect of intermittent observation on 521 the tracking performance, it is more desirable to calculate the probability distribution of estimation error 522 instead of only considering the boundedness of its expectation. 523

Improvement over KCF with intermittent observations was reported in [144], where the Kalman gain of a 524 local sensor node was optimised by the minimisation of mean square estimation error in this reference. The 525 sufficient condition for guaranteeing exponentially bounded mean square estimation error was also derived as 526 an appropriate guideline for the choice of consensus gains. Another attempt to improve the performance of 527 KCF with miss detections was proposed in [145], where the consensus gain was adaptively updated depending 528 on the value of  $\gamma_{k,i}$  by adding one additional binary information exchange between two neighbours. This 529 adaptation process places more weighting on the nodes that currently detect the target, thus providing the 530 possibility of substantial performance improvement. Following similar procedures shown in [144], Li et al. 531 [146] revisited the DKF by finding the optimal Kalman gain with intermittent observations to minimise the 532 estimation uncertainty. A three-layer architecture was proposed in [147] to tackle the issue of distributed 533 estimation with miss observations. The first layer utilised an average consensus protocol to fuse the received 534 measurements from different sensors; the second layer applied the minimum variance filter [148] to improve 535 the local estimation performance; and the third layer, again, leveraged the average consensus algorithm, 536 similar to KCF, to get the fused estimate. 537

Table 7 summarises the representative works that consider the effect of miss detection in distributed estimation. Except for KCF and DKF, the discussions and analysis of other distributed filters, shown in Tables 3 and 4, related to miss observations, however, are rare. Analogous to KCF and DKF, there are two fundamental questions need to be answered for other distributed Kalman filters: (1) Whether or not these filters are stable with intermittent observations? and (2) How to optimise the Kalman gain and consensus/diffusion gain to improve the estimation performance with miss detection?

#### 544 5.2. False Alarm

Except for target-generated measurement, low-cost sensors also might randomly or occasionally receive false alarms or clutters, also known as *spurious measurements*. Under this condition, the source origins of received measurements become uncertain: the mappings between the target and the measurements are unknown. To resolve this issue, data association technique is usually integrated into existing distributed estimation algorithms to discern target-generated measurement from clutters. Depending on the types of decisions, data association can be generally categorised into two main classes: hard decision and soft

Fusion strategy	Reference	Approach
KCF	[142, 143]	Deriving the lower bound of the detection probability for ensuring
		stochastic stability
KCF	[144]	Optimising the Kalman gain to minimise the estimation uncertainty
KCF	[145]	Adaptively updating the consensus gain to minimise the estimation
	[140]	uncertainty
KCE [147]		Utilising the minimum variance filter to mitigate the effect of miss
KUF	[147]	detection
DKF	[146]	Optimising the Kalman gain to minimise the estimation uncertainty

Table 7: Existing Distributed Estimation Algorithms Considering Miss Detection.

decision. Hard decision utilises only one specific measurement for updating target estimation while soft decision considers all possible measurements for in track update.

Since hard decision data association finds the most likely measurement to update each target, the mea-553 surement update can be carried out using typical Kalman filter and its related algorithms as long as the 554 data association process is finished. This means that the local filter shares similar structure as traditional 555 information-form Kalman filter. Therefore, the fusion algorithms discussed in Tables 3 and 4 can be di-556 rectly applied to fuse local estimates. An example of this type of distributed estimation algorithm was 557 nearest-neighbour-CMKF [149], where the local filter utilises the nearest neighbour approach [150] in data 558 association and the fusion strategy is based on CMKF. Although hard decision is easy for real implemen-559 tation, it prunes all other feasible measurements from the association and therefore the overall tracking 560 performance degrades drastically for nontrivial scenarios. For this reason, it is more desirable to conduct 561 data association using a probabilistic or Bayesian decision process. 562

Unlike hard decision, utilising soft decision in local filter introduces additional terms related to data association uncertainty in the fusion statge. By analysing the effect of data association uncertainty, the authors of [151] revealed that the centralised probabilistic data association filter becomes

$$\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k|k}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k|k-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{g}_{k,i}$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k|k}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}^{T} \mathbf{R}_{k,i}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{k,i}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}_{k|k-1}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{G}_{k,i}$$
(22)

The difference between Eq. (22) and Eq. (4) is resulted from the measurement origin uncertainty. This is reflected by the two information-related terms  $\mathbf{g}_{k,i}$  and  $\mathbf{G}_{k,i}$ . Note that the centralised estimation (22) reduces to the original one, i.e., Eq. (4), if there is no data association uncertainty. Comparing Eqs. (4) and (22), it is clear that simply applying the existing distributed estimation algorithms, as shown in Tables 3 and 4, cannot recover the performance of centralised estimation due to data association uncertainty and therefore sensor fusion with false alarms requires careful adjustment.

By formulating a Bayesian framework for identifying spurious measurements, a sequential multi-sensor 569 fusion algorithm was proposed in [152]. Except for local estimates, this newly-developed algorithm utilised 570 an additional term in the fusion process between two connected sensors. This term corresponds to the 571 probability that the received data is not spurious and is formulated using Bayesian theory. Both maximum 572 573 a posterior (MAP) and MMSE solutions are derived in this work. In the presence of false alarms, direct extension of previous distributed estimation algorithms, shown in Tables 3 and 4, is not straightforward due 574 to the measurement origin uncertainty and hence requires careful adjustment. By leveraging the concept 575 of equivalent measurement (EM), the authors of [153] proposed a distributed estimation algorithm using 576

probabilistic data association (PDA) [154]. Each local sensor runs Kalman filter backward to calculate the 577 EM and transmits this information to a neighbour for information fusion. Similar to the sequential CI 578 [35], a distributed PDA target tracking algorithm considering clutters was proposed by sequentially fusing 579 the information between two connected sensors [155, 156]. Although this strategy is scalable, it requires 580 each sensor's field-of-view to cover the entire surveillance region, which might be impractical [156]. The 581 authors of [157, 158, 159] integrated KCF and PDA in distributed target tracking to resolve the clutter 582 issue. An adaptive update law for the consensus gain was also suggested in [159] to improve the tracking 583 performance. The adaptive law places more weight on the nodes that have higher probability of receiving a 584 target-originated measurement, thus enabling substantial performance improvement. As KCF requires every 585 sensor node and its neighbours have joint observability or at least detectability about the target of interest, 586 PDA was integrated into ICF to relax this assumption in [160, 161]. However, this algorithm requires 587 the global information on the network size, i.e., total number of sensors, in implementation. In practice, 588 an unexpected sensor failure will inevitably change the total number of nodes, leading to performance 589 degradation if the original value of network size is used. Ref. [151] extended CM and CI strategies to 590 cater for the clutter issue, addressing the inherent data association uncertainty issue, and proposed a fully 591 distributed target tracking algorithm with a hybrid fusion strategy. The network size was dynamically 592 estimated in this work through a max consensus algorithm. A consensus Bernoulli filter was proposed in 593 [162] for target tracking over a network of separately located Doppler-shift sensors using generalised CI [163]. 594 This algorithm avoids the data association process by using the random finite set theory. 595

Table 8 summarises the main solutions to the problem of false alarm in distributed estimation. From these published works, it is clear that the integration of previous distributed estimation algorithms with data association could be a possible way to solve the clutter problem. However, theoretical stochastic stability analysis of these integrated algorithms remains a challenging task.

roach
bour data association into IKF
e spurious measurement
ential SVF based distributed an filter
PDA into KCF
PDA into ICF
le counting algorithm into MCI
er and consensus protocol

Table 8: Existing Distributed Estimation Algorithms Considering False Alarms.

#### 500 5.3. Limited Communication Resource

In distributed estimation over a sensor network, iterative communication is usually required to improve the fusion performance. However, low-cost sensors generally have limited communication bandwidth and onboard power. With the increase of the network size, distributed estimators inevitably suffer from the problem of limited energy, computational power, and communication resources. These considerations motivate the growing interest towards the development of distributed estimation algorithm to reduce the communication load. Data quantisation/compression and event-triggered communication scheduling are two main tools available that have been exploited to reduce the communication burden in distributed estimation.

Data quantisation is a popular way to save bandwidth in communication, which is closely related to the optimisation of bandwidth allocation and sensor power [164, 165, 166]. Instead of reconstructing the original signal, the objective is to find optimal estimators using quantised observations. The authors of [167] utilised a linear transformation to compress the raw measurements of each sensor to reduce the onboard communication

load for the two-sensor fusion and extended this algorithm to multiple sensors using sequential fusion. The 612 implementation, therefore, requires the network to be sequentially connected and this algorithm cannot be 613 applied to a generic network topology. Taking into account the stringent communication constraints, Ribeiro 614 et. al. [168] suggested a decentralised single-bit quantised innovation filter, termed as sign-of-innovations 615 Kalman filter (SOI-KF). This filter quantises observations as a sequence of the sign of the innovations, i.e., 616 1 or -1, before sending messages to the fusion processor. The most prominent feature of SOI-KF lies in that 617 it enables a simple recursive implementation form with complexity very close to the original Kalman filter. 618 However, this rough '1 or -1' quantisation inevitably results in large estimation errors and is only limited 619 to a 1-bit per observation quantiser. Fundamentally, improved estimation performance can be resulted 620 by neglecting an innovation that is close to zero rather than quantising it into 1 or -1 in updating the 621 state estimation. Based on this concept, a modified SOI-KF using dead zone technique was proposed in 622 [169]. More specifically, only when an innovation is outside the dead zone, it is quantised by its sign in 623 measurement update. The quantisation threshold of the dead zone is obtained by optimising the filter error 624 covariance. In principle, there is a trade-off between communication requirements (reflected by the number 625 of quantisation bits) and overall estimation performance. To address this dilemma, the authors of [170] 626 suggested a multi-bit quantisation filter and the estimation performance using 2 to 3 bits was shown to 627 be very close to the optimal Kalman filter, with only moderate increase in the computational complexity. 628 Instead of quantising the innovation, the authors of [171] suggested an one-bit quantisation scheme over 629 measurement and utilised sequential fusion for distributed estimation. In this approach, each local sensor 630 node accumulates earlier information received from other sensor nodes and uses the accumulated value as 631 the threshold to dynamically modulate the quantisation process. 632

Different from innovation and observation quantisation, Li et al. [172] proposed a quantised GIKF (QGIKF) by randomly swapping the quantised local estimates with a locally-connected neighbour as

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} = q\left(\mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}}\right) + \mathbf{K}_{k,i}\left[\mathbf{z}_{k,i} - \mathbf{H}_{k,i}q\left(\mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}}\right)\right]$$
(23)

The associated estimation error covariance is determined as

$$\mathbf{P}_{k|k,i} = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{x}_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i}\right)^{T} \left| q\left(\mathbf{x}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}}\right), q\left(\mathbf{P}_{k|k-1,\bar{i}}\right), \bar{i}, \mathbf{z}_{k,i} \right] \right]$$
(24)

Similar to GIKF [92, 93], QGIKF also guarantees probabilistic convergence to a unique invariant measure. However, how to tackle the quantisation error has not been addressed in this reference. Even though data quantisation is a promising technique, bit quantisations [168, 170, 169] bring a stochastic approximation error with unknown covariance. Therefore, simple implementation of Kalman filter with an empirical covariance matrix is not a wise option. For this reason, Ge et al. [173] proposed an adaptive quantised Kalman filter by dynamically estimating the covariance matrix using variational Bayesian approach. This algorithm was extended to multi-sensor network via a sequential fusion rule in [174].

Apart from data quantisation, another efficient approach to limit data transmission is event-triggered (or data-driven) strategy to schedule data communication. As pointed out in [175], information is transmitted 641 to the processor only when an event occurs in event-triggered state estimations. Currently, most works 642 in this domain focus on the centralised algorithms with different triggering conditions. For example, the 643 communication between the fusion centre and local sensor node can be triggered via periodic transmission at 644 a prescribed rate [175], when the innovation is bigger than a threshold [176, 177], via solving a constrained 645 stochastic optimisation problem that minimises the trace of error covariance [178], when the difference 646 between the current sensor value and the previously transmitted one is greater than a threshold [179], when 647 the difference of error covariance between a full-communication Kalman filter and an event-based Kalman filter is larger than a threshold [180], when the difference between the predicted state and updated state is 649 bigger than a lower bound [181]. 650

Based on the original KCF, the authors of [182, 183, 184, 185] developed several variants of eventtriggered KCFs using different triggering conditions. One common triggering condition that is utilised in these works is the difference between two local estimates, i.e., two sensors exchange their local estimates if the difference is larger than a lower threshold. The approach proposed in [183] additionally considered the local estimation error covariance as the triggering condition, i.e., the local estimation error covariance exceeds a

given threshold. Except for local state estimations, Ref. [185] leverages local measurement as additional 656 triggering condition, i.e., the different of local measurement between two consecutive time instants is bigger 657 than a lower bound. Refs. [182, 184, 185] also optimised the Kalman gain for event-triggered KCF by 658 minimising the trace of the error covariance. Conversely, event-triggered measurement-based transmission 659 was developed in [186, 187]. More specifically, Ref. [186] developed a variant of CMKF by triggering 660 the communication when the difference between current and last innovations exceeds a lower bound, while 661 Ref. [187] utilised hybrid KCF/CMKF and the communication was triggered by the difference between 662 current and last measurements. To counteract the drawback of KCF, the authors of [188] developed event-663 triggered P-CMCI and the communication triggered by the difference between two local estimates. Further 664 improvement over [188] can also be found in [189], where the communication is triggered only when the 665 Kullback-Leibler divergence between the predicted and updated distributions exceeds a certain threshold. 666 This newly developed algorithm guarantees bounded mean-square performance provided that the network 667 is strongly connected and the system is collectively observable. 668

Table 9 summarises the main solutions to reduce the communication burden of existing distributed estimation algorithms. From this table, it can be noted that, except for GIKF, the integration of data 670 quantisation with other distributed Kalman filters, e.g., KCF, DKF, etc, still remains an open problem. 671 Also, it is clear that the event-triggered concept can be easily integrated into existing distributed Kalman 672 filters, especially consensus-based and diffusion-based algorithms, with a specific triggering condition to 673 reduce the communication burden. However, most triggering conditions in distributed fusion are constructed 674 heuristically and the performance analysis of different triggering conditions still needs further explorations 675 to support practical applications. A more promising way to tackle this problem is to modify the centralised 676 stochastic optimisation approach [178] into a distribution version such that an optimal triggering condition 677

can be found given specific communication constraint. 678

ion strategy	Reference		Approach			
				-	-	

Table 9: Existing Distributed Estimation Algorithms Considering Limited Communication Resource.

Reference	Approach	
[167]	Compressing the raw measurements using a linear transformation	
[171]	Quantising the observation of each local sensor node into an one-bit	
	binary data	
[172]	Embedding data quantisation method into GIKF	
[182, 183,	Communication is triggered if the difference between two local	
184,  185]	estimates exceeds certain threshold	
[186]	Communication is triggered if the difference between current and last	
[180]	innovations exceeds certain threshold	
[187]	Communication is triggered if the difference between current and last	
[107]	measurements exceeds certain threshold	
[188]	Communication is triggered if the difference between two local	
[188]	estimates exceeds certain threshold	
[180]	Communication is triggered if the Kullback-Leibler divergence between	
[189]	the predicted and updated distributions exceeds certain threshold	
	Reference         [167]         [171]         [172]         [182, 183, 184, 185]         [186]         [187]         [187]         [188]         [189]	

#### 5.4. Asynchronous Fusion 679

In a low-cost sensor network, random communication delay is inevitable during information exchange 680 among sensor nodes due to limited communication bandwidth and network congestion. Moreover, practical 681 sensors might have different processing rates depending on the type of the sensor. These factors, obviously, 682 will result in the misalignment in the clocks of local sensor nodes, meaning that the synchronisation as-683 684 sumption in typical distributed fusion algorithms is not valid. For this reason, asynchronous distributed fusion has received much attention in recent years in an attempt to fit the practical applications. Current 685 works related to this topic mainly focus on clock synchronisation of received information or fusion using 686 most recent information. 687

Based on projection theory and induction hypothesis, a distributed fusion algorithm was proposed in 688 [190] for two sensors with different sampling rates. This algorithm was also theoretically proven to be optimal 689 in the sense of MMSE. Similar to sequential SVF, this approach can also be extended to multiple sensor 690 distributed fusion in a sequential manner. Motivated by the idea of [30, 31], a matrix weighted optimal, in the 691 sense of LUMV, SVF algorithm was proposed in [191] for multiple sensors with different sampling rates. This 692 work formulated the state space model at the measurement sampling points, thus manually synchronising 693 local fusion. Considering the local sensor node has higher sampling rate than the information exchange rate 69 among the sensor nodes, the authors of [192] developed a sequential fusion algorithms using lifting technique 695 [193], which models the multi-rate estimation system as single-sampling-rate system with multiple stochastic 696 parameters. For a sensor network with non-uniform estimation rates, Zhang et al. [194] proposed a matrix 697 weighted fusion algorithm using innovation analysis and lifting technique. A set of recursive equations to 698 compute the estimation error cross-covariance were also presented to support the implementation. Zhu 699 et al. [195] suggested a sequential asynchronous fusion algorithms for target tracking in a wireless sensor 700 network by a newly-introduced concept, called to-be-estimated state, which utilises each sensor's own state 701 and most recently-received measurements for update. The limitation of this algorithm is that it didn't 702 consider the processing delay at the local sensor node. Based on a new communication constraint model 703 with compensation for communication constraints and random delays, a recursive distributed sequential CI 704 estimator was proposed for a sensor network in [196]. It has also been proved that this distributed estimator 705 guarantees probabilistically bounded estimation errors under a delay-dependent and probability-dependent 706 condition. Assuming that the number of communication delay frames is subject to a known probability mass 707 function, Xing and Xia [197] derived an suboptimal distributed federated Kalman filter using sequential CI 708 fusion rule with the help of a finite length buffers to accommodate the measurement delay. One major 709 drawback of the aforementioned asynchronous fusion algorithms is that they are not suitable for a generic 710 network topology due to the nature of sequential fusion. 711

With reference to more recent consensus-based distributed Kalman filters, Ref. [198] analysed the asymp-712 totic stability of KCF in the presence of random communication delays. The problem is posed in terms of 713 linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) and the maximum permissible upper bound of the communication delay 714 can be obtained by solving the LMIs. Following similar approach of [198], the author of [199] analysed the 715 stochastic stability of KCF by leveraging a Markov chain with known transition probability to model the 716 network-induced delays. The main issue related to consensus-based distributed Kalman filters with com-717 munication delay is that the consensus process becomes unstable when the delay is larger than a threshold 718 [200, 201]. For this reason, the consensus gain should be carefully tuned to guarantee the stability of the 719 consensus process. 720

By assuming that the random communication delay satisfies a Bernoulli distribution, a distributed es-721 timator for sensor networks using jump Markovian system theory was proposed in [202], where each mode 722 represents one possible time delay. The asynchronous implementation of the CDTT algorithm [85] for net-723 works of sensors with random communication delays and possibly time-variant clocks was proposed in [203] 724 by leveraging an asynchronous max-consensus algorithm. The basic assumption made in this work is that 725 the time interval between two consecutive updates of each local sensor node is not arbitrarily long, which is 726 also known as the partial asynchronous assumption [204]. Because the tracking algorithm, proposed in [203], 727 never fuses local information of the sensors, it does not reduce the uncertainty on the estimate. Assuming 728 that the relative measurement receiving offset between two sensors is known, the authors of [205] presented 729 an average consensus-based asynchronous filter (ACAF), which can be considered as an asynchronous im-730 plementation of ICF. ACAF temporally aligns the data in the same time scale, depending on the known 731 reception instants of local estimates, before performing fusion. More specifically, once a local sensor node 732 receives its neighbour's information, it stores the received information and its corresponding reception time 733 instant in a buffer. During the fusion process, each sensor node predicts the target state of other nodes based 734 on the received information along with its time instant. Each local sensor node fuses the temporally-aligned 735 736 local measurements and the predicted target information using ICF. A further improvement over ACAF was reported in [206], where both processing delay and communication delay are considered simultaneously in 737 aligning the time instants of local estimates. 738

Table 10 summarises the representative distributed estimation algorithms that consider asynchronous

fusion. Notice that most existing solutions require the knowledge of the delay, either the exact value or 740 a specific model, which might be difficult for practical applications. For this reason, a more beneficial 741 and promising solution is to dynamically estimate target states in conjunction with the random delays. 742 Except for manually enforcing time consistency among the sensor nodes, another efficient way to solve the 743 asynchronous fusion problem is designing consensus protocols in consideration of communication delays 744 [207, 208, 209]. These approaches, however, require careful adjustment of the consensus gain to guarantee 745 the stability of the fusion process. The integration of these asynchronous consensus algorithms with existing 746 distributed estimators, shown in Tables 3 and 4, also needs further explorations. 747

Fusion strategy	Reference	Approach	
Sequential SVE [190]		Using projection theory to fuse two local estimates with different	
Sequential SVI	[130]	sampling rates	
Sequential SVF	[101]	Formulating the state space model at the measurement sampling points	
Sequential SVI	[101]	for synchronisation	
Sequential SVF	[102 104]	Modelling the multi-rate estimation system as a single-sampling-rate	
Sequential SVF	[192, 194]	system for synchronisation	
Sequential SVF	[195]	Utilising the most recently-received measurements in fusion	
Sequential CI [106]	Establishing a new communication constraint model with		
Sequential OI	[190]	compensation for random delays	
Sequential CI	[198]	Using finite length buffers to accommodate the measurement delay	
KCF	[197, 199]	Finding the upper bound of communication delay using LMI	
KCF	[202]	Modelling the communication delay as a known Bernoulli distribution	
CDTT	[203]	Modifying CDTT using asynchronous max-consensus algorithm	
ICF	[205 206]	Manually aligning the data in the same time scale before performing	
ICF	[205, 200]	fusion	

Table 10: Existing Distributed Estimation Algorithms Considering Asynchronous Fusion.

## 748 5.5. Unreliable Communication Link

In a wireless sensor network, local information is exchanged in a multi-hop structure. This means that the fusion performance is heavily dependent on the reliability of communication links. Unfortunately, lowcost sensor networks might experience some undesirable communication disturbances, e.g., communication noises and communication loss/failures, induced by multipath fading, signal attenuation, background noise, external block, etc [210]. These unexpected factors will obviously degrade the fusion performance among the sensor nodes. Up to now, most existing solutions to unreliable communication link model this effect as a random process. More specifically, the noisy data transmitted from local sensor node i to node j is modelled as [211]

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k,i}' = \lambda_{k,ij} \mathbf{x}_{k|k,i} + \eta_{k,i} \tag{25}$$

where the communication failure  $\lambda_{k,ij}$  is modelled as a random binary variable (1 and 0), usually subject to

a known Bernoulli distribution or generated from a pre-determined Markovian chain. The random variable  $\lambda_{k,ij}$  takes value 1 for successful communication between sensor nodes *i* and *j*, and 0 for sudden link failure. Except for communication link failure, the communication noise  $\eta_{k,i}$  is also considered to accommodate the

<sup>753</sup> communication disturbances and uncertainties.

One fundamental question to be answered for network-wide cooperative estimation under unreliable communication links is that whether or not the estimation process is stable, i.e., the error covariance is uniformly bounded or upper bounded by a constant. With known probability of data link failure, Deshmukh et al. [211] derived the stochastic stability condition of the centralised Kalman filter for a sensor network. The stochastic stability is given by a bounded region that is defined as the critical probabilities of receiving measurements on individual communication links. By modelling the data link failure as a Bernoulli process, the stochastic stability of KCF with unreliable network was analysed in [212], where the theoretical bound <sup>761</sup> on link failure rate, that guarantees the convergence of the filter, was derived. Assuming that the the link <sup>762</sup> failures are known at the receiving side, Liu et al. [213] analysed the performance of CIKF and derived <sup>763</sup> sufficient conditions that ensure the boundedness of the estimation error covariance. The results revealed <sup>764</sup> that the estimation error covariance of CIKF is stochastically bounded when the system is collectively <sup>765</sup> observable and the sensor network topology satisfies certain conditions.

Generally, the overall tracking performance of distributed estimators largely depends on the reliability of 766 the underlying data exchange link. When the failure sequence is unknown at the receiving side, the authors 767 of [214] extended CIKF to the case of unreliable networks by introducing a failure detection strategy: each 768 local sensor node is endowed with a detector to inspect possible link failures before performing the consensus 769 process. The authors of [215] suggested a variant of CMKF for sensor networks with random communication 770 failures and the Kalman gain was also optimised to minimise the error covariance. As a result of the link 771 loss/failure, the steady-state value of the average consensus process becomes a random variable. Under this 772 condition, it is shown that the algorithm, proposed in [215], provides unbiased estimations. 773

Table 11 summarises the existing distributed estimation algorithms that are applicable to scenarios with unreliable communication link. Notice that most existing works utilise the Markovian chain or Bernoulli process, that is specified by a failure probability, to describe the link loss/failure. However, it is difficult to obtain the full statistics for these models due to the random nature of link failure. For this reason, one promising research direction in this domain is to leverage the random communication graph/topology in design and analysis of distributed estimation algorithms [216, 217, 218].

As the information exchange among local sensor nodes usually involves unknown noise, Garulli and 780 Giannitrapani [219] analysed the performance of average consensus with noisy communication. The results 781 in this work reveal that the information discrepancy among local sensor nodes is bounded, but asymptotic 782 convergence is lost, resulting in a bias error. To resolve the bias-variance dilemma induced by noisy consensus, 783 two new average consensus algorithms, termed as  $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{ND}$  and  $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{NC}$  were proposed in [220] for networks 784 with intermittent links and noisy channels. Li et al. [221] extended [220] to a more practical case that 785 considers both multiplicative and additive communication disturbances. Using the random communication 786 link model shown in Eq. (25), the authors of [222] proposed a distributed parameter estimation algorithm for 787 unreliable networks in both discrete-time and continuous-time domains. Even though consensus algorithms 788 [220, 221, 222] are appealing to perform average consensus in an unreliable network, how to integrate them 789 with existing consensus-based distributed Kalman filters still remains open and needs further explorations. 790

Fusion strategy	Reference	Approach
KCF	[212]	Finding the theoretical bound on link failure rate
CIKF	[213]	Finding the stochastically stable condition of CIKF
CIKF	[214]	Embedding a failure detection strategy into CIKF
CMKF	[215]	Optimising the Kalman gain to reduce estimation uncertainty

Table 11: Existing Distributed Estimation Algorithms Considering Unreliable Communication Link.

# 791 5.6. Sensor Bias

It is known that the data quality of low-cost sensors is a concern because the sensing hardware of such sensors is generally characterised by reduced accuracy and reliability. Additionally, sensors drift from their initial factory calibration during the lifetime or due to environmental changes, e.g., temperature, humidity, etc. For these reasons, the measurements generated by low-cost sensors might not be useful or can even be misleading. Therefore, obtaining high-quality data through sensor calibration, also known as sensor registration, is of paramount importance when employing low-cost sensors in real applications. In sensor calibration, the generalised sensor measurement model is given by

$$\mathbf{z}_{k,i} = \alpha_{k,i} \mathbf{H}_{k,i} \mathbf{x}_k + \beta_{k,i} + \mathbf{v}_{k,i} \tag{26}$$

Typically, sensor calibration can be framed as a parameter estimation or identification problem. In the single sensor case, online sensor calibration is well-established by simply augmenting the system state  $\mathbf{x}_{k,i}$ 

with  $\alpha_{k,i}$  and  $\beta_{k,i}$ . However, achieving good quality of the measurement data in a sensor network, especially 794 in a distributed way, is challenging since individual calibration of a large-scale sensor network could be 795 cumbersome and cost prohibitive. For this reason, sensor network calibration demands a new methodology. 796 Currently, most network-level sensor calibration algorithms are limited to the centralised solution. For ex-797 ample, the authors in [223, 224] framed network calibration as a general parameter estimation problem. For 798 each local node, the parameter is calibrated by numerically optimising the overall network-wide response. 799 800 However, this algorithm suffers from the problem numerical complexity and is only applicable to certain network topologies where the calibration parameters are actually over-constrained. For densely-connected 801 networks, the authors of [225] suggested a cooperative calibration scheme by exploiting the redundancies of 802 local measurements among locally-connected sensors. To relax the assumption on dense networks, a cen-803 tralised blind calibration algorithm was proposed in [226] to recover the scaling error and offset. The benefit 804 of blind calibration is that it never relies on controlled stimuli input or high-fidelity ground-truth data. 805 By modelling the spatio-temporal correlation of neighbouring sensors using support vector regression, the 806 authors of [227] suggested a dynamic network calibration algorithm based on UKF. However, this approach 807 can only estimate the sensor offset and has no measure to counteract the error of scaling factor. Notice that 808 most previously-mentioned centralised algorithms formulate sensor network calibration as a constrained op-809 timisation problem, i.e., find the calibration parameters that maximise the system performance. A potential 810 extension of these results to distributed calibration is to use recently-developed distributed optimisation 811 algorithms. For example, we could utilise distributed convex optimisation approaches [228, 229, 230, 231] 812 to solve the optimisation problem formulated in [232] for sensor network calibration. 813

Assuming that the sensor network is composed of two types of sensors, namely calibrated and uncalibrated, Miluzzo et al. [233] proposed a distributed and scalable protocol to automatically calibrate the imperfect sensors. However, the assumption on the availability of ground truth nodes is too strong and the algorithm developed is therefore unsuitable for a general sensor network. By treating sensor calibration as a parameter estimation problem, a consensus-based distributed least-square parameter identification algorithm was proposed in [234]. The limitation of this approach is that it requires a reference sensor node and therefore is not generic. Naturally, significant interests are approaches for distributed sensor network calibration without referring to any reference nodes or external signals. These potentially important calibration techniques are normally called as blind calibration. Under the condition that there is no measurement noise, e.g.,  $\mathbf{v}_{k,i} = \mathbf{0}$ , the authors of [235, 236] suggested a distributed sensor network calibration algorithm using standard consensus protocols [36]. The idea in this work is to find the equivalent scaling factor and offset instead of calibrating the original bias. The final calibration rule was given by a distributed gradient-type recursive form, which ensures that all equivalent scaling factors and offsets converge to the same values asymptotically. The corrected sensor output  $\mathbf{y}_{k,i}$ , also known as the affine calibration function, is defined as

$$\mathbf{y}_{k,i} = a_{k,i}\mathbf{z}_{k,i} + \mathbf{b}_{k,i} = g_{k,i}\mathbf{H}_{k,i}\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{f}_{k,i}$$
(27)

where the equivalent scaling factor  $g_{k,i}$  and additive offset  $\mathbf{f}_{k,i}$  are determined as  $g_{k,i} = a_{k,i}\alpha_{k,i}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{k,i} = a_{k,i}\beta_{k,i} + \mathbf{b}_{k,i}$ , respectively.

In presence of additive measurement noise, it was shown in [237] that the gradient algorithm proposed 816 in [235, 236] is not applicable. To solve this problem, Stanković et al. [237] developed a new instrumental 817 variable type recursive algorithm for distributed sensor network calibration. Theoretical analysis reveals that 818 all equivalent scaling factors and offsets converge to the same values asymptotically in the mean square sense 819 and with probability one. An extension of [237] was reported in [238], where the authors presented a more 820 flexible distributed sensor network calibration algorithm. This approach provides much faster convergence 821 rate when the sensor network has one reference node, i.e., calibrated node. However, this does not mean 822 the algorithm developed in [238] requires ground truth nodes in calibration. 823

Table 12 summarises the existing main works of distributed sensor network calibration algorithms. As algorithms [235, 236, 237, 238] all considered the sensor calibration problem separately from target estimation, it is unclear how they will affect the target tracking algorithm when we tackle target tracking and sensor calibration problems in an integrated manner. The preliminary work on the integration issue was found in [239], where joint target tracking and sensor network calibration was formulated as a Bayesian inference problem. However, this framework only considers sensor offset and analytic solution of the Bayesian
 inference problem is practically intractable.

Suitability	Reference	Approach	
Sensor network			
with reference	[233, 234]	Average consensus to the reference nodes	
nodes			
Sensor network		Cradient type recursive consensus to the equivalent	
without	[235, 236]	scaling factor and additive offset	
measurement noise		scaling factor and additive onset	
Generic sensor	[037 038]	Instrumental-variable-type recursive consensus to the	
network	[257, 250]	equivalent scaling factor and additive offset	

Table 12: Existing Distributed Sensor Network Calibration Algorithms.

#### 831 5.7. Limited Energy

As stated before, sensor nodes of low-cost sensor networks are generally battery powered and are difficult 832 to be recharged or replaced in some harsh environments, e.g., battlefields, disaster areas. For this reason, 833 developing proper sensor scheduling or activation algorithms to save energy is of paramount importance 834 for low-cost sensor networks. Unfortunately, energy efficiency and estimation performance are two conflict 835 requirements of low-cost sensor network: if the energy consumption is reduced, the quality of the estimations 836 is highly likely to be negatively influenced [245]. For example, if some sensor nodes are forced to be sleeping 837 to enhance the energy efficiency, the network coverage will be definitely lowered and this, in turn, will result 838 in the reduction of information gain. Therefore, the main purpose of sensor scheduling is to dynamically 839 allocate the energy to a subset of sensor nodes to enhance energy efficiency with limited tracking performance 840 841 loss

Deterministic and probabilistic target trajectory prediction techniques are the most popular approaches 842 in sensor scheduling to improve energy efficiency for sensor networks [240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246]. 843 Deterministic approaches, e.g., [240, 241, 242], usually leverage a fixed kinematics model to predict target's 84 future trajectory and use distance-based rule to active the sensor node, i.e., if the distance between the 845 predicted target's location and a sensor node is lower than a given threshold, this sensor node is activated. 846 Different from [240, 241, 242], a deterministic optimisation problem is formulated in [243] to optimally 847 activate the sensor nodes. Apart from the sensor index, this algorithm also finds the optimal sampling 848 interval for each local node given specified predicted tracking accuracy. Notice that the information on true 849 target position is not available to local sensor nodes in practical applications. This means that deterministic 850 predictions are usually subject to certain amount of errors. These prediction errors also accumulate as time 851 goes. Therefore, it more desirable to utilise probabilistic Bayesian inference approaches to activate local 852 sensor nodes. Unlike the deterministic predictions, probabilistic methods, e.g., [244, 245, 246], additionally 853 consider the possibilities of target movement and/or target detection. The local sensor nodes are then 854 activated using Bayesian inference. For example, the probabilistic information-driven approach, proposed in 855 [244], schedules sensor nodes by maximising the information gain while minimising the energy consumption 856 given a predesigned target detection model. In [245], a probability-based prediction and sleep scheduling 857 (PPSS) algorithm is proposed to improve energy efficiency of sensor networks in target tracking. Both 858 fixed kinematics model and theory of probability are leveraged to predict target position in PPSS. Based 859 on the prediction results, PPSS activates several local sensors nodes and reduces their activation time, so 860 as to improve the energy efficiency with a relatively small sacrifice on the estimation performance. To 861 prolong the life time of a sensor network, the authors of [246] optimised the energy consumption considering 862 863 a  $\alpha$ -k-coverage constraint. This constraint guarantees that the target trajectory is covered by at least k sensors with at least  $\alpha$  probability. Although these deterministic and probabilistic approaches are proved to 864 be effective in enhancing energy efficiency for sensor networks, most of them are dedicated for centralised 865 estimation. 866

Compared to centralised algorithms, there are few, however, sensor scheduling approaches for distributed 867 estimation. The authors of [247] introduced a stochastic sensor activation strategy to improve the energy 868 efficiency of sensor networks for distributed target tracking. The activation of each sensor node is modelled 869 by a random binary variable, which is subject to a known Bernoulli distribution. Under this probabilistic 870 scheduling framework, the optimal Kalman gain of KCF was analytically derived and the stochastic stability 871 of this new algorithm was also analysed. The results revealed that the consensus gain and the lower bound of 872 the activation probability are critical parameters that determine the stability of this distributed estimation 873 algorithm. Although the stochastic sensor activation scheme, developed in [247], is easy to implement 874 in practice, all sensor nodes are subject to the same activation distribution. This might be impractical 875 in some scenarios, especially when utilising heterogeneous sensors. In order to address this problem, a 876 new probabilistic sensor activation scheme was recently proposed in [248], which models the activation 877 distribution of each sensor with individual energy constraint. By embedding this sensor scheduling approach 878 into KCF, the authors derived the optimal Kalman gain and analysed the stochastic stability of KCF. As 879 the activation probability poses great impact on the estimation performance, a convex optimisation problem 880 was also formulated to optimise the activation probability by minimising the estimation uncertainty while 881 subject to the energy budget. Unlike [247, 248], one recent work [249] leveraged the dynamic cluster concept 882 in KCF to reduce the energy consumption of sensor networks. This concept closely resembles previous 883 trajectory prediction approaches: sensor nodes are activated by the distance between their locations and 884 the target. 885

Table 13 summarises the existing distributed estimation algorithms that consider energy constraint.

Following similar activation schemes as [247, 248, 249], we can develop more advanced distributed target tracking algorithms by using more powerful fusion strategies, e.g., ICF, CIKF, gossip process. However, the

tracking algorithms by using more powerful fusion strategies, e.g., ICF, CIKF, gossip process. How performance and stability analysis need to be carefully analysed to support practical applications.

Table 13: Existing Distributed Estimation Algorithms Considering Energy Consumption.

Fusion strategy	Reference	Approach
KCF	[247]	All sensors are activated by a Bernoulli distribution
KCF	[248]	Each sensor is activated by an individual Bernoulli distribution subject to its own energy constraint
KCF	[249]	Each sensor is activated by the distance to the target

#### 890 6. Potential Future Research Venues

Based on the literature reviewed, it is clear that the research on distributed estimation, especially for low-cost sensor networks, is gaining dramatically increasing attention. As we pointed out in the previous two sections, various theoretical gaps and practical challenges still remain open and require further explorations. Considering these facts, future research will potentially emphasise theoretical analysis, modelling and integration issues at various levels. To this end, there are a number of potential research venues that will most likely be highly active in the near future as follows:

(1) Performance and stochastic stability analysis of existing distributed estimators, e.g., KCF, DKF,
 etc, with multiple low-cost-sensor-network-induced issues, as described in Sec. 5, is a clear bottleneck. The
 main challenge of this problem is to find a proper mathematical model that can capture or describe several
 low-cost-sensor-network-induced issues in an integrated form. In practice, theoretical analysis of stochastic
 stability is important in ensuring confidence in the performance and reliability of the estimation algorithm,
 especially for some safety-critical applications such as autonomous driving.

(2) Robust fusion that resolves several low-cost-sensor-network-induced issues in a unified manner is an
 especially difficult and challenging research direction. The main challenge stems from the coupling effect
 between information exchange and low-cost-sensor-network-induced phenomena. It is known that there
 exists a tradeoff between the overall estimation performance and several low-cost sensor network related

<sup>907</sup> issues. How to properly address this dilemma and find a well-balanced tradeoff becomes the key enabler
 <sup>908</sup> of successful deployment of multiple low-cost robots in a surveillance mission, especially when localising a
 <sup>909</sup> high-value target.

(3) As stated before, there is a significant conflict between the fusion performance and communication 910 requirement, i.e., if we force to reduce the communication burden, the quality of the fusion performance 911 will be highly likely to be negatively affected. For this reason, developing distributed fusion algorithms that 912 achieve reasonable performance but with significantly reduced communication cost is still an interesting and 913 challenging topic. Notice that reducing the communication burden is of paramount importance for small-914 scale robots due to their physical constraints. From the discussions of Sec. 3, it seems that incorporating 915 the sample greedy gossip process with proper fusion rules could be a potential solution: if enough resource 916 is available for communication, then a higher sensor activation probability can be chosen to increase the 917 convergence rate; otherwise, a relatively small value of sensor activation probability is desirable. 918

(4) Despite of its advantages, distributed estimation algorithms usually suffer from the problem of un-919 known auto-correlations if the number of consensus/gossip iterations is small [82]. Although this problem 920 can be resolved by using the information of cross-covariance among local sensor nodes, the calculation itself 921 is computationally expensive and therefore might not be a wise option for low-cost sensors. Except for lever-922 aging cross-covariance, increasing the number of consensus/gossip iterations can also partially mitigate the 923 autocorrelation problem. This, however, will also result in the increase of communication and computation 924 overheads, which might be prohibitive for applications using small-scale robots. It is known that the CI rule 925 is insensitive to unknown autocorrelations, but this approach has been proved to be conservative in terms of 926 tracking accuracy. For this reason, integration of robust ECI [68] and ICI [69] rules with consensus/gossip 927 algorithms is an interesting problem to be explored. Successful integration will bring significant benefits for 928 safe and autonomous navigation in unknown urban areas. 929

(5) Joint sensor calibration and target tracking in a distributed way is an important yet challenging 930 problem for practical application of low-cost sensor networks. A potential way to solve this problem is to 931 integrate the concept of 'affine calibration function' [235, 236, 237] with consensus or gossip based distributed 932 Kalman filters. Notice that reliable sensor calibration is the key foundation of some passive target localisation 933 missions. For example, when utilising strapdown sensors, the measurements are described in terms of 934 local body frame. For the purpose of target localisation, we need to utilise the knowledge of vehicle's 935 position and attitude in formulating the measurement model. This inevitably introduces several biases in 936 the measurement equation due to the uncertainties of onboard GPS and IMU. This issue has already been 937 identified in our previous project EuroSwarm<sup>6</sup>. 938

As a result, these potential research venues are also anticipated to motivate more extensive research on topics related to many practical applications of distributed fusion using low-cost sensor networks, such as robotics, transportation management, unmanned swarm systems.

# 942 7. Conclusions

Distributed estimation over a low-cost sensor network is a central issue in many recent applications, 943 especially in autonomous systems. Numerous contributions for the design of distributed estimation algo-944 rithms for a wireless sensor network have been proposed. The state-of-the-art is broad and rich, but quite 945 fragmented. This paper presented a critical and comprehensive review of several existing and recently-946 developed distributed fusion algorithms. Their main advantages and disadvantages are discussed in terms 947 of global optimality, local consistency, communication burden and specific topology requirements. This pro-948 vides readers deeper understanding about how to speedup capturing a given algorithm then comprehensive 949 characterisations of that algorithm, how it complements other approaches, and how it can be integrated 950 with them. 951

<sup>952</sup> With respect to low-cost sensor networks, we have outlined several challenging aspects in distributed <sup>953</sup> estimation, including miss detection, false alarm, sensor bias, limited energy, and several network-induced

 $<sup>{}^{6}</sup> https://www.cranfield.ac.uk/research-projects/euroswarm-developing-technology-for-uav.$ 

problems, and discussed possible solutions as well as their potential concerns. It is indeed clear from our 954

survey that most works only consider one specific challenge issue or concentrate on the centralised solution 955

to address the network-induced problems. Based on this exposition, it is expected that future researches 956

in distributed estimation over a low-cost sensor network will put more emphasises on theoretical analysis, 957

network-induced phenomenon modelling and integration issues at various levels. It is our hope for this 958 paper to serve as a comprehensive review of recent developments in distributed low-cost sensor fusion and 959

to provide readers a better insight into this domain and a useful step for permitting further advances. 960

#### References 961

975

976

979

980

982

984

985

988

- [1] B. Silva, R. M. Fisher, A. Kumar, G. P. Hancke, Experimental link quality characterization of wireless sensor networks 962 963 for underground monitoring, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics 11 (5) (2015) 1099–1110.
- A. Mainwaring, D. Culler, J. Polastre, R. Szewczyk, J. Anderson, Wireless sensor networks for habitat monitoring, in: 964
- Proceedings of the 1st ACM international workshop on Wireless sensor networks and applications, Acm, 2002, pp. 88–97. 965 T. Sun, M. Xin, Multiple uav target tracking using consensus-based distributed high degree cubature information filter, 966
- in: AIAA Guidance, Navigation, and Control Conference, 2015. 967 B. Jia, K. D. Pham, E. Blasch, D. Shen, Z. Wang, G. Chen, Cooperative space object tracking using space-based optical [4]968
- 969 sensors via consensus-based filters, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems 52 (4) (2016) 1908–1936. T. T. Vu, A. R. Rahmani, Distributed consensus-based kalman filter estimation and control of formation flying spacecraft:
- [5]970 971 Simulation and validation, in: AIAA Guidance, Navigation, and Control Conference, 2015. 972
  - E. Waltz, J. Llinas, et al., Multisensor data fusion, Vol. 685, Artech house Boston, 1990.
- [7]D. L. Hall, S. A. McMullen, Mathematical techniques in multisensor data fusion, Artech House, 2004. 973
- W. Elmenreich, An introduction to sensor fusion, Vienna University of Technology, Austria 502. 974
  - [9] M. E. Liggins, C.-Y. Chong, I. Kadar, M. G. Alford, V. Vannicola, S. Thomopoulos, Distributed fusion architectures and algorithms for target tracking, Proceedings of the IEEE 85 (1) (1997) 95-107.
- [10]D.-J. Lee, Unscented information filtering for distributed estimation and multiple sensor fusion, in: AIAA Guidance, 977 Navigation and Control Conference and Exhibit, 2008. 978
  - [11] S. K. Sengijpta, Fundamentals of statistical signal processing: Estimation theory (1995).
- M. Taj, A. Cavallaro, Distributed and decentralized multicamera tracking, IEEE Signal Processing Magazine 28 (3) [12](2011) 46–58. 981
- [13]H. Medeiros, J. Park, A. Kak, Distributed object tracking using a cluster-based kalman filter in wireless camera networks, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing 2 (4) (2008) 448-463. 983
  - Q. Liang, Z. Yi, Q. Hu, Y. Zhang, Low-cost sensor fusion technique for surface roughness discrimination with optical [14]and piezoelectric sensors, IEEE Sensors Journal 17 (23) (2017) 7954-7960.
- [15] J. Segura-Garcia, S. Felici-Castell, J. J. Perez-Solano, M. Cobos, J. M. Navarro, Low-cost alternatives for urban noise 986 nuisance monitoring using wireless sensor networks, IEEE Sensors Journal 15 (2) (2015) 836-844. 987
- [16]T. P. Lambrou, C. C. Anastasiou, C. G. Panayiotou, M. M. Polycarpou, A low-cost sensor network for real-time monitoring and contamination detection in drinking water distribution systems, IEEE Sensors Journal 14 (8) (2014) 2765–2772. 989
- [17] I. F. Akyildiz, W. Su, Y. Sankarasubramaniam, E. Cayirci, A survey on sensor networks, IEEE Communications Magazine 990 40 (8) (2002) 102–114. 991
- [18] R. C. Luo, C.-C. Yih, K. L. Su, Multisensor fusion and integration: approaches, applications, and future research 992 directions, IEEE Sensors Journal 2 (2) (2002) 107-119. 993
- [19]M. S. Mahmoud, H. M. Khalid, Distributed kalman filtering: a bibliographic review, IET Control Theory & Applications 994 7 (4) (2013) 483-501. 995
- [20]S. Sun, H. Lin, J. Ma, X. Li, Multi-sensor distributed fusion estimation with applications in networked systems: A review 996 paper, Information Fusion 38 (2017) 122-134. 997
- 998 [21]R. C. Luo, C.-C. Chang, Multisensor fusion and integration: A review on approaches and its applications in mechatronics, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics 8 (1) (2012) 49-60. 999
- [22]R. E. Kalman, A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems, Journal of Basic Engineering 82 (1) (1960) 1000 35 - 45.1001
- [23]H. Musoff, P. Zarchan, Fundamentals of Kalman filtering: a practical approach, American Institute of Aeronautics and 1002 1003 Astronautics, 2009.
- D. L. Hall, J. Llinas, An introduction to multisensor data fusion, Proceedings of the IEEE 85 (1) (1997) 6-23. 1004 [24]
- [25]Y. Bar-Shalom, L. Campo, The effect of the common process noise on the two-sensor fused-track covariance, IEEE 1005 Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems AES-22 (6) (1986) 803–805. 1006
- [26]K. H. Kim, Development of track to track fusion algorithms, in: American Control Conference, Vol. 1, IEEE, 1994, pp. 1007 1037-1041. 1008
- 1009 [27]N. A. Carlson, Federated square root filter for decentralized parallel processors, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems 26 (3) (1990) 517-525. 1010
- [28]Z.-L. Deng, Y. Gao, L. Mao, Y. Li, G. Hao, New approach to information fusion steady-state kalman filtering, Automatica 1011 41 (10) (2005) 1695-1707. 1012
- [29]X. R. Li, Y. Zhu, J. Wang, C. Han, Optimal linear estimation fusion-part i: Unified fusion rules, IEEE Transactions on 1013 Information Theory 49 (9) (2003) 2192–2208. 1014

- [30] S.-L. Sun, Z.-L. Deng, Multi-sensor optimal information fusion kalman filter, Automatica 40 (6) (2004) 1017–1023.
- [31] S.-l. Sun, Multi-sensor optimal information fusion kalman filters with applications, Aerospace Science and Technology
   8 (1) (2004) 57–62.
- [32] S.-L. Sun, Distributed optimal component fusion weighted by scalars for fixed-lag kalman smoother, Automatica 41 (12)
   (2005) 2153–2159.
- [33] S.-L. Sun, Multi-sensor information fusion white noise filter weighted by scalars based on kalman predictor, Automatica
   40 (8) (2004) 1447–1453.
- [34] Z. Deng, P. Zhang, W. Qi, G. Yuan, J. Liu, The accuracy comparison of multisensor covariance intersection fuser and three weighting fusers, Information Fusion 14 (2) (2013) 177–185.
- [35] Z. Deng, P. Zhang, W. Qi, J. Liu, Y. Gao, Sequential covariance intersection fusion kalman filter, Information Sciences
   189 (2012) 293–309.
- [36] R. Olfati-Saber, J. A. Fax, R. M. Murray, Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems, Proceedings of the IEEE 95 (1) (2007) 215–233.
- [37] W. Ren, R. W. Beard, E. M. Atkins, A survey of consensus problems in multi-agent coordination, in: American Control
   Conference, 2005. Proceedings of the 2005, IEEE, 2005, pp. 1859–1864.
- [38] Y. Cao, W. Yu, W. Ren, G. Chen, An overview of recent progress in the study of distributed multi-agent coordination,
   IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics 9 (1) (2013) 427–438.
- [39] W. Ren, R. W. Beard, E. M. Atkins, Information consensus in multivehicle cooperative control, IEEE Control Systems
   27 (2) (2007) 71–82.
- [40] R. Olfati-Saber, J. S. Shamma, Consensus filters for sensor networks and distributed sensor fusion, in: Decision and
   Control, 2005 and 2005 European Control Conference. CDC-ECC'05. 44th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2005, pp. 6698–
   6703.
- [41] R. Olfati-Saber, Flocking for multi-agent dynamic systems: Algorithms and theory, IEEE Transactions on Automatic
   Control 51 (3) (2006) 401–420.
- [42] R. Olfati-Saber, Distributed kalman filtering for sensor networks, in: Decision and Control, 2007 46th IEEE Conference
   on, IEEE, 2007, pp. 5492–5498.
- [43] R. Olfati-Saber, Kalman-consensus filter: Optimality, stability, and performance, in: Decision and Control, 2009 held
   jointly with the 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference. CDC/CCC 2009. Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on,
   IEEE, 2009, pp. 7036–7042.
- [44] L. Xiao, S. Boyd, Fast linear iterations for distributed averaging, Systems & Control Letters 53 (1) (2004) 65–78.
- [45] L. Xiao, S. Boyd, S. Lall, A scheme for robust distributed sensor fusion based on average consensus, in: Information
   Processing in Sensor Networks, 2005. IPSN 2005. Fourth International Symposium on, IEEE, 2005, pp. 63–70.
- [46] R. Carli, A. Chiuso, L. Schenato, S. Zampieri, Distributed kalman filtering based on consensus strategies, IEEE Journal
   on Selected Areas in Communications 26 (4).
- [47] A. T. Kamal, C. Ding, B. Song, J. A. Farrell, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, A generalized kalman consensus filter for wide-area
   video networks, in: Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC), 2011 50th IEEE Conference
   on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 7863–7869.
- [48] V. Ugrinovskii, Conditions for detectability in distributed consensus-based observer networks, IEEE Transactions on
   Automatic Control 58 (10) (2013) 2659–2664.
- [49] K. Ma, S. Wu, Y. Wei, W. Zhang, Gossip-based distributed tracking in networks of heterogeneous agents, IEEE Com munications Letters 21 (4) (2017) 801–804.
- [50] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, D. Shah, Randomized gossip algorithms, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory
   52 (6) (2006) 2508–2530.
- [51] F. S. Cattivelli, C. G. Lopes, A. H. Sayed, A diffusion rls scheme for distributed estimation over adaptive networks, in:
   Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications, 2007. SPAWC 2007. IEEE 8th Workshop on, IEEE, 2007, pp. 1–5.
- [52] F. S. Cattivelli, C. G. Lopes, A. H. Sayed, Diffusion recursive least-squares for distributed estimation over adaptive
   networks, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 56 (5) (2008) 1865–1877.
- [53] C. G. Lopes, A. H. Sayed, Diffusion least-mean squares over adaptive networks: Formulation and performance analysis,
   IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 56 (7) (2008) 3122–3136.
- [54] F. S. Cattivelli, A. H. Sayed, Diffusion lms strategies for distributed estimation, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing
   58 (3) (2010) 1035–1048.
- [55] M. G. Bruno, S. S. Dias, A bayesian interpretation of distributed diffusion filtering algorithms [lecture notes], IEEE
   Signal Processing Magazine 35 (3) (2018) 118–123.
- [56] F. S. Cattivelli, A. H. Sayed, Diffusion strategies for distributed kalman filtering and smoothing, IEEE Transactions on
   Automatic Control 55 (9) (2010) 2069–2084.
- [57] F. Cattivelli, A. H. Sayed, Diffusion distributed kalman filtering with adaptive weights, in: Signals, Systems and Computers, 2009 Conference Record of the Forty-Third Asilomar Conference on, IEEE, 2009, pp. 908–912.
- [58] J. Hu, L. Xie, C. Zhang, Diffusion kalman filtering based on covariance intersection, IEEE Transactions on Signal
   Processing 60 (2) (2012) 891–902.
- 1075 [59] V. Vahidpour, A. Rastegarnia, A. Khalili, W. Bazzi, S. Sanei, Partial diffusion kalman filtering, arXiv preprint 1076 arXiv:1705.08920.
- [60] D. Willner, C. Chang, K. Dunn, Kalman filter algorithms for a multi-sensor system, in: Decision and Control including
   the 15th Symposium on Adaptive Processes, 1976 IEEE Conference on, Vol. 15, IEEE, 1976, pp. 570–574.
- 1079 [61] J. Roecker, C. McGillem, Comparison of two-sensor tracking methods based on state vector fusion and measurement

- 1000 fusion, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems 24 (4) (1988) 447–449.
- [62] T. Li, J. Prieto, H. Fan, J. M. Corchado, A robust multi-sensor phd filter based on multi-sensor measurement clustering,
   IEEE Communications Letters.
- [63] Y. Bar-Shalom, X. R. Li, T. Kirubarajan, Estimation with applications to tracking and navigation: theory algorithms
   and software, John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [64] S. J. Julier, J. K. Uhlmann, A non-divergent estimation algorithm in the presence of unknown correlations, in: American
   Control Conference, 1997. Proceedings of the 1997, Vol. 4, IEEE, 1997, pp. 2369–2373.
- [65] S. B. Lazarus, I. Ashokaraj, A. Tsourdos, R. Zbikowski, P. M. Silson, N. Aouf, B. A. White, Vehicle localization using
   sensors data fusion via integration of covariance intersection and interval analysis, IEEE Sensors Journal 9 (7) (2007)
   1302–1314.
- [66] J. Sequeira, A. Tsourdos, S. B. Lazarus, Robust covariance estimation for data fusion from multiple sensors, IEEE
   Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement 60 (12) (2011) 3833–3844.
- [67] X. Yang, W.-A. Zhang, L. Yu, K. Xing, Multi-rate distributed fusion estimation for sensor network-based target tracking,
   IEEE Sensors Journal 16 (5) (2016) 1233–1242.
- [68] J. Sijs, M. Lazar, State fusion with unknown correlation: Ellipsoidal intersection, Automatica 8 (48) (2012) 1874–1878.
- [69] B. Noack, J. Sijs, M. Reinhardt, U. D. Hanebeck, Decentralized data fusion with inverse covariance intersection, Automatica 79 (2017) 35-41.
- 1097 [70] D. Ding, Z. Wang, H. Dong, H. Shu, Distributed  $h_{\infty}$  state estimation with stochastic parameters and nonlinearities 1098 through sensor networks: the finite-horizon case, Automatica 48 (8) (2012) 1575–1585.
- 1099 [71] H. Dong, Z. Wang, H. Gao, Distributed  $h_{\infty}$  filtering for a class of markovian jump nonlinear time-delay systems over 1100 lossy sensor networks, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics 60 (10) (2013) 4665–4672.
- [72] J. Liang, Z. Wang, X. Liu, Distributed state estimation for discrete-time sensor networks with randomly varying nonlin earities and missing measurements, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks 22 (3) (2011) 486–496.
- [73] R. Olfati-Saber, Distributed kalman filter with embedded consensus filters, in: Decision and Control, 2005 and 2005
   European Control Conference. CDC-ECC'05. 44th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2005, pp. 8179–8184.
- [74] M. Kamgarpour, C. Tomlin, Convergence properties of a decentralized kalman filter, in: Decision and Control, 2008.
   CDC 2008. 47th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2008, pp. 3205–3210.
- [75] W. Li, G. Wei, D. W. Ho, D. Ding, A weightedly uniform detectability for sensor networks, IEEE Transactions on Neural
   Networks and Learning Systems 29 (11) (2018) 5790–5796.
- [76] O. Hlinka, O. Sluciak, F. Hlawatsch, M. Rupp, Distributed data fusion using iterative covariance intersection, in: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2014 IEEE International Conference On, IEEE, 2014, pp. 1861–1865.
- [77] G. Wei, W. Li, D. Ding, Y. Liu, Stability analysis of covariance intersection-based kalman consensus filtering for time varying systems, IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems.
- [78] W. Niehsen, Information fusion based on fast covariance intersection filtering, in: Information Fusion, 2002. Proceedings
   of the Fifth International Conference on, Vol. 2, IEEE, 2002, pp. 901–904.
- [79] X. He, W. Xue, H. Fang, Consistent distributed state estimation with global observability over sensor network, Automatica 92 (2018) 162–172.
- [80] G. Battistelli, L. Chisci, Kullback–leibler average, consensus on probability densities, and distributed state estimation
   with guaranteed stability, Automatica 50 (3) (2014) 707–718.
- [81] A. T. Kamal, J. A. Farrell, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, Information weighted consensus, in: Decision and Control (CDC),
   2012 IEEE 51st Annual Conference on, IEEE, 2012, pp. 2732–2737.
- [82] A. T. Kamal, J. A. Farrell, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, et al., Information weighted consensus filters and their application in distributed camera networks, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 58 (12) (2013) 3112–3125.
- [83] P. Yao, G. Liu, Y. Liu, Average information-weighted consensus filter for target tracking in distributed sensor networks
   with naivety issues, International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing 32 (5) (2018) 681–699.
- [84] G. Battistelli, L. Chisci, G. Mugnai, A. Farina, A. Graziano, Consensus-based linear and nonlinear filtering, IEEE
   Transactions on Automatic Control 60 (5) (2015) 1410–1415.
- [85] A. Petitti, D. Di Paola, A. Rizzo, G. Cicirelli, Consensus-based distributed estimation for target tracking in heterogeneous sensor networks, in: Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC), 2011 50th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 6648–6653.
- [86] Z. Wu, M. Fu, Y. Xu, R. Lu, A distributed kalman filtering algorithm with fast finite-time convergence for sensor networks, Automatica 95 (2018) 63–72.
- [87] K. Xie, Q. Cai, Z. Zhang, M. Fu, A fast convergent distributed algorithm for weighted average consensus, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control.
- [88] J. Thia, Y. Yuan, L. Shi, J. Gonçalves, Distributed kalman filter with minimum-time covariance computation, in: Decision
   and Control (CDC), 2013 IEEE 52nd Annual Conference on, IEEE, 2013, pp. 1995–2000.
- [89] Y. Yuan, L. Shi, J. Liu, Z. Chen, H.-T. Zhang, J. Goncalves, Distributed kalman filtering with minimum-time consensus algorithm, arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.05438.
- [90] Y. Yuan, G.-B. Stan, L. Shi, M. Barahona, J. Goncalves, Decentralised minimum-time consensus, Automatica 49 (5)
   (2013) 1227–1235.
- [91] S. Katragadda, A. Cavallaro, Neighbour consensus for distributed visual tracking, in: ISSNIP, 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [92] S. Kar, J. M. Moura, Gossip and distributed kalman filtering: Weak consensus under weak detectability, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 59 (4) (2011) 1766–1784.
- [93] D. Li, S. Kar, J. M. Moura, H. V. Poor, S. Cui, Distributed kalman filtering over massive data sets: analysis through
   large deviations of random riccati equations, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 61 (3) (2015) 1351–1372.

- [94] J. Qin, J. Wang, L. Shi, Y. Kang, Randomized consensus based distributed kalman filtering over wireless sensor networks,
   arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02531.
- [95] C. Wan, Y. Gao, X. R. Li, E. Song, Distributed filtering over networks using greedy gossip, in: 2018 21st International
   Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION), IEEE, 2018, pp. 1968–1975.
- [96] H.-S. Shin, S. He, A. Tsourdos, Sample greedy gossip distributed kalman filter, arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11531.
- [97] S. P. Talebi, S. Kanna, Y. Xia, D. P. Mandic, Cost-effective diffusion kalman filtering with implicit measurement exchanges, in: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2017 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2017, pp. 4411–4415.
- [98] Y. Zhang, C. Wang, N. Li, J. Chambers, Diffusion kalman filter based on local estimate exchanges, in: Digital Signal
   Processing (DSP), 2015 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2015, pp. 828–832.
- [99] G. Wang, N. Li, Y. Zhang, Diffusion distributed kalman filter over sensor networks without exchanging raw measurements,
   Signal Processing 132 (2017) 1–7.
- [100] S. Wang, W. Ren, On the convergence conditions of distributed dynamic state estimation using sensor networks: A
   unified framework, IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology 26 (4) (2018) 1300–1316.
- [101] D. Ustebay, B. N. Oreshkin, M. J. Coates, M. G. Rabbat, Greedy gossip with eavesdropping, IEEE Transactions on
   Signal Processing 58 (7) (2010) 3765–3776.
- [102] A. T. Kamal, J. H. Bappy, J. A. Farrell, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, Distributed multi-target tracking and data association in vision networks, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 38 (7) (2016) 1397–1410.
- [103] G. Battistelli, L. Chisci, Stability of consensus extended kalman filter for distributed state estimation, Automatica 68
   (2016) 169–178.
- [104] W. Li, Y. Jia, J. Du, Distributed consensus extended kalman filter: a variance-constrained approach, IET Control Theory
   & Applications 11 (3) (2016) 382–389.
- [105] W. Li, G. Wei, F. Han, Y. Liu, Weighted average consensus-based unscented kalman filtering, IEEE Transactions on
   Cybernetics 46 (2) (2016) 558–567.
- [106] S. Wang, Y. Lyu, W. Ren, Unscented-transformation-based distributed nonlinear state estimation: Algorithm, analysis,
   and experiments, IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology.
- [107] L. Yu, H. You, W. Haipeng, Squared-root cubature information consensus filter for non-linear decentralised state estimation in sensor networks, IET Radar, Sonar & Navigation 8 (8) (2014) 931–938.
- [108] Q. Chen, C. Yin, J. Zhou, Y. Wang, X. Wang, C. Chen, Hybrid consensus-based cubature kalman filtering for distributed
   state estimation in sensor networks, IEEE Sensors Journal 18 (11) (2018) 4561–4569.
- [109] W. Ren, U. M. Al-Saggaf, Distributed kalman-bucy filter with embedded dynamic averaging algorithm, IEEE Systems
   Journal 12 (2) (2018) 1722–1730.
- [110] J. Wu, A. Elser, S. Zeng, F. Allgöwer, Consensus-based distributed kalman-bucy filter for continuous-time systems, IFAC-PapersOnLine 49 (22) (2016) 321–326.
- [111] H. Ji, F. L. Lewis, Z. Hou, D. Mikulski, Distributed information-weighted kalman consensus filter for sensor networks,
   Automatica 77 (2017) 18–30.
- [112] K. Shen, Z. Jing, P. Dong, A consensus nonlinear filter with measurement uncertainty in distributed sensor networks,
   IEEE Signal Processing Letters 24 (11) (2017) 1631–1635.
- [113] J. Li, F. Deng, J. Chen, A fast distributed variational bayesian filtering for multisensor ltv system with non-gaussian
   noise, IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics.
- [114] Y. Yu, Consensus-based distributed linear filter for target tracking with uncertain noise statistics, IEEE Sensors Journal
   17 (15) (2017) 4875–4885.
- 1187 [115] B. Shen, Z. Wang, Y. Hung, G. Chesi, Distributed  $h_{\infty}$  filtering for polynomial nonlinear stochastic systems in sensor 1188 networks, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics 58 (5) (2011) 1971–1979.
- 1189 [116] V. P. Bhuvana, M. Huemer, C. S. Regazzoni, Distributed object tracking based on square root cubature  $h_{\infty}$  information 1190 filter, in: Information Fusion (FUSION), 2014 17th International Conference on, IEEE, 2014, pp. 1–6.
- 1191 [117] B. Shen, Z. Wang, Y. S. Hung, Distributed  $h_{\infty}$  consensus filtering in sensor networks with multiple missing measurements: 1192 the finite-horizon case, Automatica 46 (10) (2010) 1682–1688.
- 1193 [118] V. Ugrinovskii, Gain-scheduled synchronization of parameter varying systems via relative  $h_{\infty}$  consensus with application 1194 to synchronization of uncertain bilinear systems, Automatica 50 (11) (2014) 2880–2887.
- 1195 [119] F. Han, G. Wei, Y. Song, W. Li, Distributed  $h_{\infty}$  consensus filtering for piecewise discrete-time linear systems, Journal 1196 of the Franklin Institute 352 (5) (2015) 2029–2046.
- [120] F. Rastgar, M. Rahmani, Consensus-based distributed robust filtering for multisensor systems with stochastic uncertainties, IEEE Sensors Journal 18 (18) (2018) 7611–7618.
- 1199 [121] W. Li, Y. Jia, Consensus-based distributed multiple model ukf for jump markov nonlinear systems, IEEE Transactions 1200 on Automatic Control 57 (1) (2012) 227–233.
- [122] G. Battistelli, L. Chisci, C. Fantacci, A. Farina, A. Graziano, Consensus-based multiple-model bayesian filtering for
   distributed tracking, IET Radar, Sonar & Navigation 9 (4) (2015) 401–410.
- [123] W. Li, Y. Jia, Consensus-based distributed information filter for a class of jump markov systems, IET Control Theory
   & Applications 5 (10) (2011) 1214–1222.
- [124] R. Deshmukh, O. Thapliyal, C. Kwon, I. Hwang, Distributed state estimation for a stochastic linear hybrid system over
   a sensor network, IET Control Theory & Applications 12 (10) (2018) 1456–1464.
- [125] S. Wang, W. Ren, J. Chen, Fully distributed dynamic state estimation with uncertain process models, IEEE Transactions
   on Control of Network Systems.
- 1209 [126] W. Li, Y. Jia, Distributed estimation for markov jump systems via diffusion strategies, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace

and Electronic Systems 53 (1) (2017) 448–460.

- 1211 [127] M. Farina, G. Ferrari-Trecate, R. Scattolini, Distributed moving horizon estimation for linear constrained systems, IEEE 1212 Transactions on Automatic Control 55 (11) (2010) 2462–2475.
- [128] M. Farina, G. Ferrari-Trecate, R. Scattolini, Distributed moving horizon estimation for nonlinear constrained systems,
   IFAC Proceedings Volumes 43 (14) (2010) 909–914.
- [129] M. Farina, G. Ferrari-Trecate, R. Scattolini, Distributed moving horizon estimation for nonlinear constrained systems,
   International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control 22 (2) (2012) 123–143.
- [130] C. V. Rao, Moving horizon strategies for the constrained monitoring and control of nonlinear discrete-time systems,
   Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin–Madison (2000).
- [131] A. Benavoli, L. Chisci, A. Farina, L. Ortenzi, G. Zappa, Hard-constrained versus soft-constrained parameter estimation,
   IEEE transactions on aerospace and electronic systems 42 (4).
- [132] R. Ding, M. Yu, H. Oh, W.-H. Chen, New multiple-target tracking strategy using domain knowledge and optimization
   47 (4) (2017) 605–616.
- 1223 [133] J. Yi, Sensor fusion and vehicular communication systems part ii (2016).
- 1224 URL https://www.futurecar.com/342/Sensor-Fusion-and-Vehicular-Communication-Systems-Part-II
- 1225 [134] B. Sinopoli, L. Schenato, M. Franceschetti, K. Poolla, M. I. Jordan, S. S. Sastry, Kalman filtering with intermittent 1226 observations, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 49 (9) (2004) 1453–1464.
- [135] S. Kluge, K. Reif, M. Brokate, Stochastic stability of the extended kalman filter with intermittent observations, IEEE
   Transactions on Automatic Control 55 (2) (2010) 514–518.
- 1229 [136] L. Li, Y. Xia, Stochastic stability of the unscented kalman filter with intermittent observations, Automatica 48 (5) (2012) 1230 978–981.
- 1231 [137] K. Plarre, F. Bullo, On kalman filtering for detectable systems with intermittent observations, IEEE Transactions on 1232 Automatic Control 54 (2) (2009) 386–390.
- 1233 [138] S. He, H.-S. Shin, A. Tsourdos, Joint probabilistic data association filter with unknown detection probability and clutter 1234 rate, Sensors 18 (1) (2018) 269.
- [139] S. He, H.-S. Shin, A. Tsourdos, Multi-sensor multi-target tracking using domain knowledge and clustering, IEEE Sensors
   Journal 18 (19) (2018) 8074–8084.
- 1237 [140] K. You, M. Fu, L. Xie, Mean square stability for kalman filtering with markovian packet losses, Automatica 47 (12) 1238 (2011) 2647–2657.
- [141] G. Wang, N. Li, Y. Zhang, Diffusion nonlinear kalman filter with intermittent observations, Proceedings of the Institution
   of Mechanical Engineers, Part G: Journal of Aerospace Engineering (2017) 0954410017716192.
- 1241 [142] S. S. Stanković, M. S. Stanković, D. M. Stipanović, Consensus based overlapping decentralized estimation with missing 1242 observations and communication faults, IFAC Proceedings Volumes 41 (2) (2008) 9338–9343.
- [143] S. S. Stanković, M. S. Stanković, D. M. Stipanović, Consensus based overlapping decentralized estimation with missing
   observations and communication faults, Automatica 45 (6) (2009) 1397–1406.
- [144] W. Li, Y. Jia, J. Du, Distributed kalman consensus filter with intermittent observations, Journal of the Franklin Institute
   352 (9) (2015) 3764–3781.
- [145] N. Ilić, M. S. Stanković, S. S. Stanković, Adaptive consensus-based distributed target tracking in sensor networks with
   limited sensing range, IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology 22 (2) (2014) 778–785.
- [146] W. Li, Y. Jia, J. Du, et al., Diffusion kalman filter for distributed estimation with intermittent observations, in: American Control Conference (ACC), 2015, IEEE, 2015, pp. 4455–4460.
- [147] Y. Wang, C. Li, X. Liu, Consensus-based filter designing for wireless sensor networks with packet loss, ISA Transactions
   53 (2) (2014) 578–583.
- 1253 [148] Y. Liu, B. Xu, Filter designing with finite packet losses and its application for stochastic systems, IET Control Theory 1254 & Applications 5 (6) (2011) 775–784.
- 1255 [149] Y. Yu, Distributed target tracking in wireless sensor networks with data association uncertainty, IEEE Communications 1256 Letters 21 (6) (2017) 1281–1284.
- [150] X. R. Li, Y. Bar-Shalom, Tracking in clutter with nearest neighbor filters: analysis and performance, IEEE Transactions
   on Aerospace and Electronic Systems 32 (3) (1996) 995–1010.
- [151] S. He, H.-S. Shin, A. Tsourdos, Distributed joint probabilistic data association filter with hybrid fusion strategy, IEEE
   Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement.
- [152] M. Kumar, D. P. Garg, R. A. Zachery, A method for judicious fusion of inconsistent multiple sensor data, IEEE Sensors
   Journal 7 (5) (2007) 723–733.
- 1263 [153] T. Song, H. Kim, D. Musicki, Distributed (nonlinear) target tracking in clutter, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and 1264 Electronic Systems 51 (1) (2015) 654–668.
- [154] D. Musicki, R. Evans, S. Stankovic, Integrated probabilistic data association, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control
   39 (6) (1994) 1237–1241.
- [155] L. Y. Pao, L. Trailovic, The optimal order of processing sensor information in sequential multisensor fusion algorithms,
   IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 45 (8) (2000) 1532–1536.
- [156] L. Trailovic, L. Y. Pao, Computing budget allocation for efficient ranking and selection of variances with application to target tracking algorithms, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 49 (1) (2004) 58–67.
- [157] N. F. Sandell, R. Olfati-Saber, Distributed data association for multi-target tracking in sensor networks, in: Decision
   and Control, 2008. CDC 2008. 47th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2008, pp. 1085–1090.
- 1273 [158] S. S. Stanković, N. Ilić, K. O. Al Ali, M. S. Stanković, Distributed consensus based ipdaf for tracking in vision networks, 1274 in: Multisensor Fusion and Integration for Intelligent Systems (MFI), 2016 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE,

1275 2016, pp. 304–309.

- [159] K. O. Al Ali, N. Ilić, M. S. Stanković, S. S. Stanković, Consensus-based distributed adaptive target tracking in camera networks using integrated probabilistic data association, EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing 2018 (1)
   (2018) 13.
- [160] A. T. Kamal, J. A. Farrell, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, Information consensus for distributed multi-target tracking, in:
   Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2013, pp. 2403–2410.
- [161] Y. Chen, Q. Zhao, Z. An, P. Lv, L. Zhao, Distributed multi-target tracking based on the k-mtscf algorithm in camera networks, IEEE Sensors Journal 16 (13) (2016) 5481–5490.
- [162] M. B. Guldogan, Consensus bernoulli filter for distributed detection and tracking using multi-static doppler shifts, IEEE
   Signal Processing Letters 21 (6) (2014) 672–676.
- [163] D. Clark, S. Julier, R. Mahler, B. Ristic, Robust multi-object fusion with unknown correlation, in: Proceedings of the
   2010 Sensor Signal Processing for Defense Conference (SSPD 2010), 2010.
- [164] H. C. Papadopoulos, G. W. Wornell, A. V. Oppenheim, Sequential signal encoding from noisy measurements using
   quantizers with dynamic bias control, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 47 (3) (2001) 978–1002.
- [165] A. Ribeiro, G. B. Giannakis, Bandwidth-constrained distributed estimation for wireless sensor networks-part ii: unknown
   probability density function, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 54 (7) (2006) 2784–2796.
- [166] K. You, W. Su, M. Fu, L. Xie, Attainability of the minimum data rate for stabilization of linear systems via logarithmic
   quantization, Automatica 47 (1) (2011) 170–176.
- [167] H. Chen, K. Zhang, X. Li, Optimal data compression for multisensor target tracking with communication constraints,
   in: Decision and Control, 2004. CDC. 43rd IEEE Conference on, Vol. 3, IEEE, 2004, pp. 2650–2655.
- [168] A. Ribeiro, G. B. Giannakis, S. I. Roumeliotis, Soi-kf: Distributed kalman filtering with low-cost communications using
   the sign of innovations, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 54 (12) (2006) 4782–4795.
- [169] K. You, L. Xie, S. Sun, W. Xiao, Quantized filtering of linear stochastic systems, Transactions of the Institute of
   Measurement and Control 33 (6) (2011) 683–698.
- [170] E. J. Msechu, S. I. Roumeliotis, A. Ribeiro, G. B. Giannakis, Decentralized quantized kalman filtering with scalable communication cost, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 56 (8) (2008) 3727–3741.
- [171] H. Li, J. Fang, Distributed adaptive quantization and estimation for wireless sensor networks, IEEE Signal Processing
   Letters 14 (10) (2007) 669–672.
- [172] D. Li, S. Kar, F. E. Alsaadi, A. M. Dobaie, S. Cui, Distributed kalman filtering with quantized sensing state, IEEE
   Transactions on Signal Processing 63 (19) (2015) 5180-5193.
- [173] Q. Ge, C. Wen, X. Wang, X. Shen, Vb-aqkf-stf: A novel linear state estimator for stochastic quantized measurements systems, in: Control Conference (ASCC), 2013 9th Asian, IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–6.
- [174] Q. Ge, Z. Wei, M. Liu, J. Yu, C. Wen, Adaptive quantized estimation fusion using strong tracking filtering and variational bayesian, IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems.
- [175] G. Battistelli, A. Benavoli, L. Chisci, Data-driven communication for state estimation with sensor networks, Automatica
   48 (5) (2012) 926–935.
- 1311 [176] D. Han, Y. Mo, J. Wu, S. Weerakkody, B. Sinopoli, L. Shi, Stochastic event-triggered sensor schedule for remote state 1312 estimation, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 60 (10) (2015) 2661–2675.
- [177] D. Shi, T. Chen, L. Shi, An event-triggered approach to state estimation with multiple point-and set-valued measurements,
   Automatica 50 (6) (2014) 1641–1648.
- [178] L. Shi, K. H. Johansson, L. Qiu, Time and event-based sensor scheduling for networks with limited communication
   resources, in: World Congress of the International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC), Vol. 18, 2011, pp. 13263–
   1317 13268.
- [179] Y. S. Suh, V. H. Nguyen, Y. S. Ro, Modified kalman filter for networked monitoring systems employing a send-on-delta method, Automatica 43 (2) (2007) 332–338.
- [180] S. Trimpe, R. D'Andrea, Event-based state estimation with variance-based triggering, IEEE Transactions on Automatic
   Control 59 (12) (2014) 3266–3281.
- [181] K. Dormann, B. Noack, U. D. Hanebeck, Optimally distributed kalman filtering with data-driven communication, Sensors
   18 (4) (2018) 1034.
- [182] X. Meng, T. Chen, Optimality and stability of event triggered consensus state estimation for wireless sensor networks,
   in: American Control Conference (ACC), 2014, IEEE, 2014, pp. 3565–3570.
- [183] N. Wu, L. Guo, C. Yang, Distributed kalman consensus filtering algorithm based on event-driven, in: Information and
   Automation, 2015 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2015, pp. 211–215.
- [184] W. Li, Y. Jia, J. Du, Event-triggered kalman consensus filter over sensor networks, IET Control Theory & Applications
   10 (1) (2016) 103-110.
- [185] C. Zhang, Y. Jia, Distributed kalman consensus filter with event-triggered communication: Formulation and stability
   analysis, Journal of the Franklin Institute 354 (13) (2017) 5486–5502.
- [186] Q. Liu, Z. Wang, X. He, D.-H. Zhou, Event-based recursive distributed filtering over wireless sensor networks, IEEE
   Transactions on Automatic Control 60 (9) (2015) 2470–2475.
- [187] L. Yan, X. Zhang, Z. Zhang, Y. Yang, Distributed state estimation in sensor networks with event-triggered communication, Nonlinear Dynamics 76 (1) (2014) 169–181.
- [188] Q. Tan, X. Dong, Q. Li, Z. Ren, Distributed event-triggered cubature information filtering based on weighted average
   consensus, IET Control Theory & Applications 12 (1) (2017) 78–86.
- [189] G. Battistelli, L. Chisci, D. Selvi, A distributed kalman filter with event-triggered communication and guaranteed stability,
   Automatica 93 (2018) 75–82.

- [190] Y. Liu, L. Yan, Y. Xia, M. Fu, B. Xiao, Multirate multisensor distributed data fusion algorithm for state estimation with
   cross-correlated noises, in: Control Conference (CCC), 2013 32nd Chinese, IEEE, 2013, pp. 4682–4687.
- [191] H. Lin, S. Sun, Distributed fusion estimator for multisensor multirate systems with correlated noises, IEEE Transactions
   on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems 48 (7) (2018) 1131–1139.
- [192] L. Yan, L. Jiang, Y. Xia, M. Fu, State estimation and data fusion for multirate sensor networks, International Journal
   of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing 30 (1) (2016) 3–15.
- [193] Y. Liang, T. Chen, Q. Pan, Multi-rate optimal state estimation, International Journal of Control 82 (11) (2009) 2059–
   2076.
- [194] W.-A. Zhang, S. Liu, L. Yu, Fusion estimation for sensor networks with nonuniform estimation rates, IEEE Transactions
   on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers 61 (5) (2014) 1485–1498.
- [195] G. Zhu, F. Zhou, L. Xie, R. Jiang, Y. Chen, Sequential asynchronous filters for target tracking in wireless sensor networks,
   IEEE Sensors Journal 14 (9) (2014) 3174–3182.
- [196] B. Chen, G. Hu, D. W. Ho, L. Yu, Distributed covariance intersection fusion estimation for cyber-physical systems with
   communication constraints, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 61 (12) (2016) 4020–4026.
- [197] Z. Xing, Y. Xia, Distributed federated kalman filter fusion over multi-sensor unreliable networked systems, IEEE Trans actions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers 63 (10) (2016) 1714–1725.
- [198] P. Millán, L. Orihuela, C. Vivas, F. R. Rubio, Distributed consensus-based estimation considering network induced delays
   and dropouts, Automatica 48 (10) (2012) 2726–2729.
- [199] D. Liya, Distributed consensus-based estimation with random delays, in: Proceedings of the 2nd Czech-China Scientific
   Conference 2016, InTech, 2017.
- 1360 [200] P. Lin, Y. Jia, L. Li, Distributed robust  $h_{\infty}$  consensus control in directed networks of agents with time-delay, Systems 1361 & Control Letters 57 (8) (2008) 643–653.
- [201] P. Lin, Y. Jia, J. Du, F. Yu, Average consensus for networks of continuous-time agents with delayed information and
   jointly-connected topologies, in: American Control Conference, 2009. ACC'09, IEEE, 2009, pp. 3884–3889.
- [202] C. Han, W. Wang, Distributed consensus-based filter for linear systems with random transmission delays and packet dropouts, in: Intelligent Control and Automation (WCICA), 2016 12th World Congress on, IEEE, 2016, pp. 1897–1902.
   [203] S. Giannini, A. Petitti, D. Di Paola, A. Rizzo, Asynchronous consensus-based distributed target tracking, in: Decision
- and Control (CDC), 2013 IEEE 52nd Annual Conference on, IEEE, 2013, pp. 2006–2011. [204] D. P. Bertsekas, J. N. Tsitsiklis, Parallel and distributed computation: numerical methods, Prentice hall Englewood
- [204] D. P. Bertsekas, J. N. Tsitsiklis, Parallel and distributed computation: numerical methods, Prentice hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989.
- [205] S. Katragadda, C. S. Regazzoni, A. Cavallaro, Average consensus-based asynchronous tracking, in: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2017 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2017, pp. 4401–4405.
- [206] S. Katragadda, A. Cavallaro, A batch asynchronous tracker for wireless smart-camera networks, in: Advanced Video and
   Signal Based Surveillance (AVSS), 2017 14th IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [207] H. Wang, Consensus of networked mechanical systems with communication delays: A unified framework, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 59 (6) (2014) 1571–1576.
- [208] O. Slučiak, M. Rupp, Reaching consensus in asynchronous wsns: Algebraic approach, in: Acoustics, Speech and Signal
   Processing (ICASSP), 2011 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 3300–3303.
- [209] H.-T. Wai, A. Scaglione, Consensus on state and time: Decentralized regression with asynchronous sampling, IEEE
   Transactions on Signal Processing 63 (11) (2015) 2972–2985.
- [210] L. Paradis, Q. Han, A survey of fault management in wireless sensor networks, Journal of Network and systems management 15 (2) (2007) 171–190.
- [211] S. Deshmukh, B. Natarajan, A. Pahwa, State estimation over a lossy network in spatially distributed cyber-physical systems, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 62 (15) (2014) 3911–3923.
- [212] S. S. Alam, B. Natarajan, A. Pahwa, Agent based optimally weighted kalman consensus filter over a lossy network, in:
   Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), 2015 IEEE, IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [213] Q. Liu, Z. Wang, X. He, D. Zhou, On kalman-consensus filtering with random link failures over sensor networks, IEEE
   Transactions on Automatic Control 63 (8) (2018) 2701–2708.
- [214] S. Battilotti, F. Cacace, M. dAngelo, A. Germani, Distributed kalman filtering over sensor networks with unknown
   random link failures, IEEE Control Systems Letters.
- [215] D. Alonso-Román, B. Beferull-Lozano, Adaptive consensus-based distributed kalman filter for wsns with random link
   failures, in: Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems (DCOSS), 2016 International Conference on, IEEE, 2016, pp.
   187–192.
- [216] I. Matei, J. S. Baras, C. Somarakis, Convergence results for the linear consensus problem under markovian random
   graphs, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 51 (2) (2013) 1574–1591.
- [217] K. You, Z. Li, L. Xie, Consensus condition for linear multi-agent systems over randomly switching topologies, Automatica
   49 (10) (2013) 3125–3132.
- [218] Y. Zhang, Y.-P. Tian, Consentability and protocol design of multi-agent systems with stochastic switching topology,
   Automatica 45 (5) (2009) 1195–1201.
- [219] A. Garulli, A. Giannitrapani, Analysis of consensus protocols with bounded measurement errors, Systems & Control
   Letters 60 (1) (2011) 44–52.
- 1401[220] S. Kar, J. M. Moura, Distributed consensus algorithms in sensor networks with imperfect communication: Link failures1402and channel noise, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 57 (1) (2009) 355–369.
- [221] B. Li, H. Leung, C. Seneviratne, Distributed consensus in noisy wireless sensor networks, in: Information Fusion (FU SION), 2016 19th International Conference on, IEEE, 2016, pp. 1356–1363.

- [222] Q. Zhang, J.-F. Zhang, Distributed parameter estimation over unreliable networks with markovian switching topologies,
   IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 57 (10) (2012) 2545-2560.
- [223] K. Whitehouse, D. Culler, Calibration as parameter estimation in sensor networks, in: Proceedings of the 1st ACM
   International Workshop on Wireless Sensor Networks and Applications, ACM, 2002, pp. 59–67.
- [224] K. Whitehouse, D. Culler, Macro-calibration in sensor/actuator networks, Mobile Networks and Applications 8 (4) (2003)
   463–472.
- [225] V. Bychkovskiy, S. Megerian, D. Estrin, M. Potkonjak, A collaborative approach to in-place sensor calibration, in:
   Information Processing in Sensor Networks, Springer, 2003, pp. 301–316.
- [226] L. Balzano, R. Nowak, Blind calibration of sensor networks, in: Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Information Processing in Sensor Networks, ACM, 2007, pp. 79–88.
- [227] M. Takruri, S. Challa, R. Yunis, Data fusion techniques for auto calibration in wireless sensor networks, in: Information
   Fusion (FUSION), 2009 12th International Conference on, IEEE, 2009, pp. 132–139.
- [228] S. S. Ram, A. Nedić, V. V. Veeravalli, Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization,
   Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications 147 (3) (2010) 516–545.
- 1419 [229] B. Gharesifard, J. Cortés, Distributed continuous-time convex optimization on weight-balanced digraphs, IEEE Trans-1420 actions on Automatic Control 59 (3) (2014) 781–786.
- [230] M. Zhu, S. Martínez, On distributed convex optimization under inequality and equality constraints, IEEE Transactions
   on Automatic Control 57 (1) (2012) 151–164.
- [231] F. Zanella, D. Varagnolo, A. Cenedese, G. Pillonetto, L. Schenato, Newton-raphson consensus for distributed convex optimization, in: Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC), 2011 50th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 5917–5922.
- [232] C. Bilen, G. Puy, R. Gribonval, L. Daudet, Convex optimization approaches for blind sensor calibration using sparsity,
   IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 62 (18) (2014) 4847–4856.
- [233] E. Miluzzo, N. D. Lane, A. T. Campbell, R. Olfati-Saber, Calibree: A self-calibration system for mobile sensor networks,
   in: International Conference on Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems, Springer, 2008, pp. 314–331.
- [234] S. Bolognani, S. Del Favero, L. Schenato, D. Varagnolo, Consensus-based distributed sensor calibration and least-square parameter identification in wsns, International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control: IFAC-Affiliated Journal 20 (2) (2010) 176–193.
- [235] M. S. Stanković, S. S. Stanković, K. H. Johansson, Distributed blind calibration in lossy sensor networks via output
   synchronization, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 60 (12) (2015) 3257–3262.
- [236] M. S. Stanković, S. S. Stanković, K. H. Johansson, Distributed macro calibration in sensor networks, in: Control & Automation (MED), 2012 20th Mediterranean Conference on, IEEE, 2012, pp. 1049–1054.
- [237] M. S. Stanković, S. S. Stanković, K. H. Johansson, Asynchronous distributed blind calibration of sensor networks under
   noisy measurements, IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems 5 (1) (2018) 571–582.
- 1439 [238] M. Stanković, Distributed asynchronous consensus-based algorithm for blind calibration of sensor networks with au-1440 tonomous gain correction, IET Control Theory & Applications 12 (16) (2018) 2287–2293.
- [239] C. Taylor, A. Rahimi, J. Bachrach, H. Shrobe, A. Grue, Simultaneous localization, calibration, and tracking in an ad hoc
   sensor network, in: Proceedings of the 5th international conference on Information processing in sensor networks, ACM,
   2006, pp. 27–33.
- [240] S. Pattem, S. Poduri, B. Krishnamachari, Energy-quality tradeoffs for target tracking in wireless sensor networks, in:
   Information processing in sensor networks, Springer, 2003, pp. 32–46.
- [241] J. Jeong, T. Hwang, T. He, D. Du, Mcta: Target tracking algorithm based on minimal contour in wireless sensor networks, in: IEEE INFOCOM 2007-26th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications, IEEE, 2007, pp. 2371–2375.
- 1449 [242] W. Zhang, G. Cao, Dctc: dynamic convoy tree-based collaboration for target tracking in sensor networks, IEEE Trans-1450 actions on Wireless Communications 3 (5) (2004) 1689–1701.
- <sup>1451</sup> [243] J. Lin, W. Xiao, F. L. Lewis, L. Xie, Energy-efficient distributed adaptive multisensor scheduling for target tracking in <sup>1452</sup> wireless sensor networks, IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement 58 (6) (2009) 1886–1896.
- <sup>1453</sup> [244] J. Hare, S. Gupta, J. Wilson, Decentralized smart sensor scheduling for multiple target tracking for border surveillance, <sup>1454</sup> in: Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2015 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2015, pp. 3265–3270.
- <sup>1455</sup> [245] B. Jiang, B. Ravindran, H. Cho, Probability-based prediction and sleep scheduling for energy-efficient target tracking in <sup>1456</sup> sensor networks, IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing 12 (4) (2013) 735–747.
- <sup>1457</sup> [246] K. Shi, H. Chen, Y. Lin, Probabilistic coverage based sensor scheduling for target tracking sensor networks, Information <sup>1458</sup> sciences 292 (2015) 95–110.
- [247] W. Yang, G. Chen, X. Wang, L. Shi, Stochastic sensor activation for distributed state estimation over a sensor network,
   Automatica 50 (8) (2014) 2070–2076.
- [248] W. Yang, C. Yang, H. Shi, L. Shi, G. Chen, Stochastic link activation for distributed filtering under sensor power
   constraint, Automatica 75 (2017) 109–118.
- [249] H. Zhang, X. Zhou, Z. Wang, H. Yan, J. Sun, Adaptive consensus-based distributed target tracking with dynamic cluster
   in sensor networks, IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics.