

Privacy-Preserving State Estimation in the Presence of Eavesdroppers: A Survey

Xinhao Yan, Guanzhong Zhou, Daniel E. Quevedo, Carlos Murguia, Bo Chen, Hailong Huang

Abstract—Networked systems are increasingly the target of cyberattacks that exploit vulnerabilities within digital communications, embedded hardware, and software. Arguably, the simplest class of attacks – and often the first type before launching destructive integrity attacks – are eavesdropping attacks, which aim to infer information by collecting system data and exploiting it for malicious purposes. A key technology of networked systems is state estimation, which leverages sensing and actuation data and first-principles models to enable trajectory planning, real-time monitoring, and control. However, state estimation can also be exploited by eavesdroppers to identify models and reconstruct states with the aim of, e.g., launching integrity (stealthy) attacks and inferring sensitive information. It is therefore crucial to protect disclosed system data to avoid an accurate state estimation by eavesdroppers. This survey presents a comprehensive review of existing literature on privacy-preserving state estimation methods, while also identifying potential limitations and research gaps. Our primary focus revolves around three types of methods: cryptography, data perturbation, and transmission scheduling, with particular emphasis on Kalman-like filters. Within these categories, we delve into the concepts of homomorphic encryption and differential privacy, which have been extensively investigated in recent years in the context of privacy-preserving state estimation. Finally, we shed light on several technical and fundamental challenges surrounding current methods and propose potential directions for future research.

Note to Practitioners—With the increasing openness and anonymization of the networked estimation systems, privacy concerns require to be paid more attention. The essence of the encryption approaches is to seek certain tradeoffs among various performance indexes. For instance, cryptography is suitable for high-performance processors, because it needs sufficient computation resources to generate and operate complicated secret keys. On the other hand, perturbation-based encryption can be realized fast, but its adverse impact on the legitimate systems should be limited not to disrupt the desired operations. In conclusion, the selection of these methods is based on the practical demands. Besides, the discussed methods are all based on the general state-space model, thus they can represent most real-world dynamics. It means that these approaches can be easily deployed to the practical engineering systems to effectively guarantee their privacy.

Index Terms—Privacy preservation, state estimation, homomorphic encryption, differential privacy, transmission scheduling, information theory

I. INTRODUCTION

State estimation refers to the process of inferring the value of a system state variable from a limited number

Xinhao Yan, Guanzhong Zhou, and Hailong Huang are with the Department of Aeronautical and Aviation Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong (email: xin-hao-shawn.yan@connect.polyu.hk; guanzhong.zhou@connect.polyu.hk; hailong.huang@polyu.edu.hk).

Daniel Quevedo and Carlos Murguia are with the School of Electrical Engineering and Robotics, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD 4000, Australia (emails: daniel.quevedo@qut.edu.au, carlos.murguia@qut.edu.au).

Bo Chen is with the Department of Automation, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, China (email: bchen@aliyun.com).

Corresponding author: Hailong Huang.

TABLE I
NOTATIONS & ACRONYMS

\triangleq	define
\mathbb{Z}	set of integers
\mathbb{Z}_+	set of positive integers
\mathbb{R}	set of real numbers
\mathbb{R}^n	set of n -dimensional real vectors
$\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$	set of $n \times m$ real matrices
$\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$	mathematical expectation
$\mathbb{P}\{\cdot\}$	probability function
$\text{Tr}\{\cdot\}$	trace of a matrix
$X > (<)0$	positive-definite (negative-definite)
$X \geq (\leq)0$	non-negative definite (non-positive definite)
d'	adjacent variable of d
A^T	transpose of real matrix A
A^\dagger	Hermitian transpose of complex matrix A
I	identity matrix with certain dimension
AVC	aerial vehicle carrier
CI	covariance intersection
CSE	centralized state estimation
DFE	distributed fusion estimation
DP	differential privacy
DSE	distributed state estimation
EKF	extended Kalman filter
FC	fusion center
FHE	fully homomorphic encryption
HE	homomorphic encryption
IF	information filter
iff	if and only if
IO	interval observer
ITS	intelligent transportation system
i.i.d.	independently and identically distributed
KF	Kalman filter
LO	Luenberger observer
LQG	linear quadratic Gaussian
LS	least square
LSE	local state estimate
MHE	moving horizon estimator
MMSE	minimum mean square error
MSE	mean square error
PHE	partially homomorphic encryption
SE	squared error
SMPC	secure multi-party computation
SNR	signal-to-noise ratio
UKF	unscented Kalman filter
WGN	white Gaussian noise
WLS	weighted least square

of measurement data [1]. In recent years, state estimation has gained considerable attention, because it can provide a valuable understanding of the dynamic behavior and condition. According to the existing literature, there are two basic state estimation structures, named centralized state estimation (CSE) [2], [3] and distributed state estimation (DSE) [4]–[10]. In the CSE structure, the information from all subsystems will be sent to an estimation center and the global state will be estimated together. On the other hand, in the DSE structure, the state of each subsystem will be estimated individually with its local measurements and the exchanged information from other subsystems. Moreover, in the multi-sensor field, there exist two fusion structures [11]–[13], namely centralized fusion estimation (CFE) [14]–[16]




Fig. 1. The organization of this paper. Section 2 gives the general state-space models and corresponding estimator. Sections 3, 4, and 5 respectively discuss cryptography, data perturbation, and transmission scheduling. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the benefits and limitations, and provides some possible future work.

and distributed fusion estimation (DFE) [17]–[22]. Within the CFE structure, all the raw measurements will be sent to a fusion center (FC) directly without any processing. By contrast, the measurements will be firstly processed at sensor sides in the DFE structure, generally into local state estimates (LSE), and then the processed data will be transmitted to the FC.

Thanks to the low wiring complexity and cost, networks have been exploited to connect the spatially deployed parties in the estimation systems [23]. However, with the openness of networks, anonymity of users, and remote connection among distributed parties, the transmissions via networks are vulnerable to a range of cyberattacks [24]–[27]. Denial-of-service (DoS) attacks aim to make real-time data unavailable to its intended users by temporarily or indefinitely disrupting the services of the sensor connected to the network [28]–[36], and false data injection (FDI) attacks insert the wrong or useless information into the communication channels to mislead the system or disrupt its functioning [37]–[46]. Note that most cyberattacks will cause direct damage to systems while eavesdropping attacks will not. Eavesdropping is a type of passive attack that only silently overhears the transmission of systems without any modification [48]–[52]. That is not to say that eavesdropping will not harm the system, because the wiretapped data can be further used to devise other more aggressive cyberattacks. Meanwhile, the data itself is very valuable, and the leakage of private information will cause unintended consequences.

For countering malicious third-parties, many privacy-preserving methods have been discussed, for instance, physical-layer encryption approaches [53], [54]. The legitimate systems can employ some protocols such as authentication [55] to prevent eavesdroppers from accessing the communication channels, thereby ensuring complete privacy through the physical layer. Note that the universality of the physical-layer encryption method may be relatively poor, as it is designed to protect data at the physical layer, and may not be effective in securing data at rest or during processing. Furthermore, constant updates and maintenance are required to ensure they are equipped with the latest security

schemes. Hence, this paper mainly concerns the data-aimed methods that are more general and can be applicable to most systems. In general, the main data-based methods consist of cryptography [56]–[61], data perturbation [62]–[70], and transmission scheduling [71]–[73]. Each method has its own benefits and drawbacks, for instance, the computation amount of cryptography is very high, but the accuracy of data can be retained. On the contrary, the computation burden for data perturbation is low, while the perturbation will affect the originally good performance of legitimate users. There are recent perturbation methods that do not lead to performance degradation [74]. They exploit ideas from system immersion theory and homomorphic encryption. The detailed description of these methods will be given in the corresponding sections.

To the best of the authors' knowledge, there is currently a scarcity of surveys that thoroughly explore the latest advancements in protecting the privacy of estimators in the presence of eavesdroppers. Therefore, it is of high significance to conduct a comprehensive survey and offer detailed analyses of recent results in privacy-preserving state estimation methods. Additionally, we provide updated assessments regarding the limitations of existing results, followed by proposing potential research directions for future exploration.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, the system model and estimator structure are revisited in Section II. Then, the cryptography, data perturbation, and transmission scheduling methods are respectively discussed in Sections III, IV, and V. In these sections, we first introduce the fundamentals of these methods and discuss relevant works. Subsequently, we focus on the discussions on estimator designs that leverage these methods, encompassing the aforementioned centralized, distributed, fusion estimation structures. Finally, Section VI summarizes the limitations of the methods, and gives some insights and possible research areas in the future. The complete organization of this paper is shown in Fig. 1, and the notations and acronyms frequently used throughout the paper are summarized in Table I.




Fig. 2. An example of state estimation. The UGV cluster on the ground and the UAV cluster in the sky establish their own communication networks. At the same time, the UAVs and UGVs also establish communication mechanisms among them for some collaborative missions. Individuals in the communication network exchange information such as positions, speeds, accelerations, remaining powers, and task processes among each other, so as to estimate the state of themselves and the targets. Meanwhile, the UAVs can also estimate the states of AVCs or UGVs for landing, and then they can complete tasks such as charging and parcel delivery.

II. PRIVACY-PRESERVING STATE ESTIMATION

A general description where the system states (physical variables of interest) evolve according to a set of nonlinear difference equations can be written as follows:

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

$$y(t) = g(x(t), t) + v(t). \quad (2)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a discrete-time variable, $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the system state, $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the measurement or system output, and $f(x(t), t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g(x(t), t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are nonlinear time-varying vector functions that model the state and measurement evolution in time. Vector $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes control actions, references, and process noise, and $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ models measurement noise caused by, for instance, inaccurate modeling and unknown physical properties.

Because, in general, models of the form (1)-(2) are highly complex and hard to work with, simplified models are often used in the literature. These models are obtained by linearizing nonlinear equations around equilibrium positions, operating points, or tracked trajectories. Linearized models can be written as follows:

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + w(t), \quad (3)$$

$$y(t) = Cx(t) + v(t), \quad (4)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denotes the state transition matrix determined by the system dynamics and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ denotes the measurement matrix determined by the sensing characteristics. Most studies in the literature about privacy-preserving state estimation focus on time-invariant linear state-space models of the form (3)-(4).

For distributed systems, the state transition of each subsystem can be written as $x_i(t+1) = A_i x_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^M A_{ij} x_j(t) + w_i(t)$. This means that each subsystem will be affected by the neighboring dynamics in addition to its own recursion. It is a common expression for platooning systems, for instance, the velocity and inter-vehicle distances of a vehicle in a platoon are regulated by the positions, velocities, and accelerations from other vehicles [75]. Due to the interconnections among subsystems in distributed models, graph theory [76], [77] can be exploited, and the surveys on DSE can be found in [4]–[6]. Moreover, in the multi-sensor case, the measurement equation is expressed as $y_i(t) = C_i x_i(t) + v_i(t)$ ($i = 1, \dots, L$),

where $L \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ denotes the total number of sensors. Multi-sensor fusion methods have been extensively used in target tracking systems [11], and the surveys on multi-sensor fusion estimation can be found in [11]–[13], [18].

For monitoring the real-time dynamics, it is vital to estimate the system states based on the measured data from sensors. An example of state estimation is shown in Fig. 2, where unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), unmanned ground vehicles (UGVs), and aerial vehicle carriers (AVCs) [81] cooperate to achieve a common objective, such as their own localization and tracking of some targets. In order to compute state estimates as precisely as possible, we need to collect all the available data of the considered system. The complete information set can be generally expressed by $\mathcal{I}(t) \triangleq \{y(1), \dots, y(t), o(1), \dots, o(t)\}$, which consists of all the measurements $y(t)$ and other information $o(t)$ such as acknowledgments (ACKs) of successful reception [72]. Based on this data, the unbiased estimate can be calculated as $\hat{x}(t) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{x(t)|\mathcal{I}(t)\}$, while the most widely used state estimators in the literature are Kalman-like filters [78], whose structure is as follows:

$$\hat{x}(t) = A\hat{x}(t-1) + K(t)(y(t) - CA\hat{x}(t-1)), \quad (5)$$

where, at time t , $\hat{x}(t)$ stands for the state estimate and $K(t)$ denotes the estimator gain.

In most cases, the estimator performance index is set as the minimum means square error (MMSE) sense, which means minimizing $P(t) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{x}^T(t)\tilde{x}(t)|\mathcal{I}(t)\}$ with $\tilde{x}(t) \triangleq x(t) - \hat{x}(t)$. This estimator is called the Kalman filter (KF) and was proposed in 1960 by Rudolf Kalman [78]. Because the KF is recursive, when disturbances affect the system at some given time, their adverse impact will propagate to all subsequent times. Hence, by employing the measurement at the current time slot, the state estimation problem can be formulated as a least square (LS) problem. The weighted LS (WLS) estimator is one of the most popular forms [79], [80], which is designed as $\hat{x}(t) = \operatorname{argmin}_x (\varepsilon^T(t)\varepsilon(t)|\mathcal{I}(t))$ with $\varepsilon(t) \triangleq y(t) - \hat{y}(t)$. Besides, some other indexes or forms are also considered under certain assumptions, such as minimum squared error (SE) [21].

During the transmission process, numerous malicious eavesdroppers attempt to access the information of the estimation systems. The eavesdroppers can employ similar

TABLE II
HOMOMORPHIC ENCRYPTION FOR KALMAN-LIKE ESTIMATORS.

Literature	[98]	[99]	[88]	[100]	[101]	[102]	[103]
Estimator	EKF	KF	KF	IF	KF	CFE & DFE	CI
HE	additive	additive	hybrid	additive	additive	additive	additive

Depending on whether both the two homomorphisms are satisfied, homomorphic schemes can be divided into two main kinds: fully homomorphic encryption (FHE) [84] and partially homomorphic encryption (PHE) [85]–[87]. FHE [84] can simultaneously support both additive and multiplicative homomorphisms, while PHE only supports one of them. Paillier [85] is a kind of classical additive HE, while RSA [86] and ElGamal [87] are typically multiplicative HE approaches. Besides, there also exists a special type called hybrid HE [88], where two different HE approaches are combined to respectively achieve multiplicative and additive homomorphisms. Note that FHE requires a long computation time, which has been demonstrated by the practical experiments in [89]. In those experiments, the estimation with PHE only requires several milliseconds, while that with FHE takes several hours, and that with garbled circuits takes several minutes. This implies that PHE is more practical for real-time state estimation in the majority of cases.

The idea of HE has been widely adopted for various scenarios, including cloud-based systems [90]–[92], Internet of Things (IoT) [93], and intelligent transportation systems (ITSs) [94], [95]. Alexandru et al. introduced PHE into cloud-based systems, where a strong cloud server was deployed for secure computation with the information gathered from some weak agents. Then, they solved the private cloud-based quadratic optimization [91] and linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control [92] problems. Hijazi et al. [93] applied FHE to develop a private learning method, where a global model was trained with encrypted model updates from distributed IoT devices. Sultan et al. [94] employed Paillier HE to encrypt the searching algorithm over the image gathered from the camera deployed in an autonomous vehicle, and Zhu et al. [95] encrypted the learning approach with the sensed data from edge devices and road side units. Besides, there are plenty of other HE applications, which can be found in the recent surveys [96], [97].

In the state estimation field, Gonzalez-Serrano et al. [98] applied the additive HE to an extended Kalman filter (EKF) by encrypting the transmitted measurements, and they also developed secure division and matrix inversion protocols. Landa and Akbar [99] proposed a secure KF for a linear time-invariant system with additive homomorphism. Since they did not encrypt system matrices, the above-mentioned secure division or matrix inversion protocols were not required. Recently, Zhang et al. [88] also studied a secure steady-state KF, but they utilized hybrid HE for simultaneously protecting the model parameters, measurements, and estimates. The raw measurements were firstly encrypted by multiplicative HE and then directly operated by the estimator. After decryption with private key of multiplicative HE, the user further encrypted the results with additive HE, and finally obtained the state estimate by resorting to the additions in estimator.

For the multi-sensor scenario, Aristov et al. [100] exploited the Paillier HE to a multi-sensor information filter (IF). Such a secure IF was more efficient than standard HE-based KF thanks to its additive structure about measurement update

equations. Ni et al. [101] considered a situation when an average estimate was calculated by combining all the LSEs in the cloud server, and such an average was then broadcasted and synchronized at each sensor. The additive HE was directly embedded, because the average fusion form is a typical kind of summation. Meanwhile, they introduced model privacy, a concept in machine learning, to state estimation field for the first time. Moreover, Emad et al. [102] considered both privacy-preserving centralized and distributed fusion estimators against sensor, cloud, and query coalitions. The Paillier HE was exploited to encrypt estimates and measurements, and the multi-party privacy with respect to semi-honest parties was further proved by resorting to the definitions about computational indistinguishability in cryptography. In addition, the HE-based covariance intersection (CI) fusion structure was discussed by Ristic [103], and an approximate solution to fast CI was derived by resorting to order revealing encryption. Besides, we summarize the HE study for Kalman-like estimators in Table. II.

Except for KF and its extended versions, HE has also been studied for other state estimators. Mohsen et al. [104] applied Paillier HE to the Luenberger observer (LO) and further derived the implementation condition on practical devices with limited memory sizes. Then, a distributed LO under a canonical decomposition was encrypted by Kim et al. [105] with additive HE. Alanwar et al. [106] proposed a secure set-based state estimator when the sets are represented by zonotopes. They also studied centralized and distributed fusion scenarios with distributed sensors and sensor groups, respectively.

Furthermore, it is crucial to note that the data intended for processing must reside within the plaintext space. This prerequisite is vital for the successful implementation of HE, but it is often overlooked. For example, the estimation performance degradation was neglected for other theoretical analyses in [101]. In order to convert data into plaintexts, the floating-point number was expressed by a positive exponent and a mantissa in [107], and the resultant representations were all integers that were able to be encrypted. This encoding method has already been employed to the state estimation field [102], [106]. Instead of the detailed representation of the whole float number, quantization $Q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is another method to transfer the data into the space of plaintext [88], [105]. In general, the quantizer only preserves the integer part and directly deletes the mantissa. For instance, a probabilistic uniform quantization was adopted in [88], where the output was chosen randomly in an interval.

B. Other Cryptographic Methods

Secure multi-party computing (SMPC) is a branch of cryptography focusing on enabling multiple parties to collectively compute desired functions while guaranteeing the privacy of their own inputs. It allows the parties to jointly perform computations on their private data without revealing any sensitive information to each other. The concept of

SMPC was proposed by Yao in [108], where the millionaire's problem was discussed. HE is a typically effective method to achieve SMPC because of the homomorphisms, and various HE-based estimators have been proved to satisfy SMPC [91], [92], [102], [106]. More concretely, multi-party privacy with respect to semi-honest behavior can be realized by analyzing the computationally indistinguishability of execution views [106]. The survey on SMPC can be found in [109]. Except for HE, secret sharing (SS) is another useful cryptographic approach [110]. A typical scheme is additive 2-out-of-2 SS, where the message is split into two parts [111].

Another classical cryptographic technique is watermarking that can transfer the received information into original data without affecting the original accuracy [112], [113]. A pseudo-random generator is a deterministic function that can expand short seeds into longer sequences of pseudo-random bits, and the encryption with pseudo-random sequence is a kind of effective watermarking method [114]. Ristic et al. [115] exploited a stream of pseudo-random Gaussian samples to degrade the performance at unprivileged estimators, while maintaining the performance at the privileged estimation. Huang et al. [116] added the pseudo-random sequence to the constantly linear transformation of innovation so that the χ^2 detector can successfully detect linear man-in-the-middle attacks. Furthermore, the watermarking with pseudo-random samples was considered for distributed state estimation by Zhou et al. [117], where the interactive neighbouring estimate was multiplied by a watermarking matrix composed of some pseudo-random numbers. Besides, the Kullback–Leibler (K–L) divergence detector in [117] was demonstrated more powerful resistance against stealthy attacks when compared to that in [116].

C. Discussion

With the assistance of secret keys, key owners can consistently decrypt the ciphertexts into their corresponding plaintexts. Particularly, based on certain homomorphisms, it is possible to do some operations on the complex ciphertexts, thereby enhancing the flexibility of cryptographic approaches. Therefore, by resorting to the tools of cryptography, legitimate users can obtain the desired data with relatively high accuracy. Meanwhile, the data privacy can be strongly guaranteed on account of the complexity theory, and the eavesdropper cannot acquire any valid information without secret keys.

Nevertheless, some cryptographic approaches still cause minor errors during preparation, encryption or decryption. Specifically, homomorphic encryption can only operate on integers, because its encryption and decryption functions are based on modular arithmetic, which is a type of arithmetic that deals with integers [106]. Also, the secure transmission and preservation of secret keys are important problems, because the secret keys should be kept in fully trusted devices. For instance, the distribution of the seed of pseudo-random sequence should be entirely secure, otherwise, it is possible for the eavesdropper to completely recover the original information.

Moreover, most cryptographic methods require large computations for successful realization due to the large key sizes and complex exponential operations. In many practical systems, such a large computation burden will affect their normal operations, especially real-time processes such as

estimation and control. For example, when the authority period of a UAV is set as 1 ms while a cryptographic method needs 10 ms at each time slot, the encryption procedures cannot be completely executed and even occupy the time for control. Particularly, the experiments have demonstrated that FHE requires much more time than PHE [89], and that is why most of the existing estimators considered PHE. Thus, it is of great demand to derive more computationally efficient cryptographic approaches.

IV. DATA PERTURBATION

Data perturbation is an extensively utilized privacy-preserving method mainly related to increasing the uncertainty of specific information. In a sense, it bears a resemblance to cryptography, as both strive to alter the values of data to confuse potential eavesdroppers. By contrast, perturbation techniques are always simpler, enabling the eavesdroppers to consistently access the obfuscated data. In other words, even though the eavesdroppers can successfully decode the packages, their finally obtained data are also inaccurate. A great benefit of data perturbation is that the computation consumption is minor since only some simple data modifications instead of long strings of secret keys are required. For disturbing information, random noise injection is one of the most effective methods. Notice that it is different from the pseudorandom sequence in cryptography [115], because the true random samples are unknown to the legitimate user instead of known as secret keys. In this case, the disturbance may simultaneously degrade the performances of legitimate users. Hence, it is required to pay attention to the utility of data while guaranteeing privacy with perturbation methods.

A. Differential Privacy

Differential privacy (DP) is known as a classical perturbation method and was proposed by Dwork et al. in 2006 [62], [63]. The artificial noises with certain distributions are required to be injected for disturbing the statistical information of a great number of elements in a database. Define a space D satisfying an adjacent relation $\text{Adj}(d, d')$, which means that $d \in D$ and $d' \in D$ only differ by certain components. Let (R, \mathcal{M}) be a measurable space, and a mechanism M is differentially private for all d and d' such that $\text{Adj}(d, d')$, one has [134]

$$\mathbb{P}(M(d) \in S) \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}(M(d') \in S) + \delta, \forall S \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (8)$$

In other words, this performance indicates that the distributions over the outputs of the mechanism are close to some extent for two adjacent datasets. The relevant works have been studied a lot, and the surveys can be found in [66]. Here, we simply introduce recent theoretical developments and then elaborate on the research about differentially private estimators.

To achieve the above index, plenty of noise mechanisms have been discussed, such as Gaussian [64], Laplace [62], uniform [118], and exponential [119]. These mechanisms concentrate on the random noise addition, i.e., $M(d) = q(d) + n$, which means injecting noise n into the original query output $q(d)$. Here, we briefly address the classical Gaussian and Laplace mechanisms in regular use. If a random variable satisfies Gaussian distribution $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, its

TABLE III
DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY FOR KALMAN-LIKE ESTIMATORS.

Literature	[134]	[137], [139]	[136], [140]	[141]	[144]	[145]	[146]	[148]
Estimator	KF	KF	DFE	CFE	set-based	UKF	EnKF	MHE
Mechanism	Laplace & Gaussian	Gaussian	Gaussian	Gaussian	truncated Laplace	Laplace	Gaussian	Gaussian

probability density function (PDF) is $p(x; \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}}$. Then, a white Gaussian noise $n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ satisfying (ϵ, δ) -DP when the following condition holds:

$$\sigma \geq \frac{\Delta_{2,q}}{2\epsilon} (K + \sqrt{K^2 + 2\epsilon}), \quad (9)$$

where $K = Q^{-1}(\delta)$ with $Q(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du$ and $\Delta_{2,q} \triangleq \sup_{\text{Adj}(d,d')} \|q(d) - q(d')\|_2$ is the sensitivity. Similarly, a Laplace variable $x \sim \mathcal{L}(0, b)$ has the PDF $p(x; b) = \frac{1}{2b} e^{-\frac{|x|}{b}}$. If a Laplace noise $n \sim \mathcal{L}(0, b^k)$ satisfies ϵ -DP, one has

$$b \geq \frac{\Delta_{1,q}}{\epsilon}. \quad (10)$$

Also, Sadeghi et al. [120] proposed an offset symmetric Gaussian tails mechanism, and the detailed distribution was acquired by using the normalized tails of two symmetric Gaussian distributions. Alghamdi et al. [121] proposed cactus mechanisms, where the optimization target that minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence was quantized for calculating near-optimal mechanisms. Muthukrishnan et al. [123] introduced a hybrid addition mechanism that resembled a Laplace distribution in the center and a Gaussian distribution in the tail. The necessary and sufficient conditions for one dimension as well as a sufficient condition for certain dimensions were further derived. Then, Kadam et al. [124] applied a tractable structure to design the probability mass function (PMF) of noise, which optimized the expected distortion with certain differentially private parameters. Balle et al. [122] argued that the variance design of the previous mechanism was not precise enough for the scenario demanding high privacy level. They proposed an optimal Gaussian mechanism calibrating the variance with Gaussian cumulative density function (CDF) instead of approximating tail bounds.

Thanks to the powerful performance and rigorous mathematical models, DP has been expanded to a wide range of fields, such as machine learning [125], optimization [126], consensus [127], game theory [128] and control theory [129]–[131]. Concretely, Han et al. [125] proposed a differentially private distributed dual averaging method for the unbalanced directed networks. The privacy index was dependent on the variance of injected Laplace noises and the Lipschitz constant of the proposed loss functions. Liu et al. [127] proposed a differentially private consensus control approach for the heterogeneous multi-agent systems. A time-varying control gain was designed to mitigate the decaying effect, and the non-decaying noises were injected to avoid the privacy leakage of reference state. Wang et al. [129] showed that the performance cost of this mechanism was related to the time horizon and the privacy parameter for stable systems, while the cost increased with time exponentially for unstable systems. Kawano et al. [130] demonstrated the relationship between DP and the input observability or left invertibility of a system. More specifically, the Gaussian mechanism effectively enhanced DP by injecting relatively small disturbance when the system was less input observable.

As a result, they proposed a confidential dynamic controller by adding minor noise, achieving superior privacy level. For a multi-agent system, Degue and Ny [131] proposed a LQG controller based on measurement aggregation, where a KF was adopted to reduce the negative impact of noise mechanism on aggregation.

Particularly, in estimation and filtering theory, the differentially private estimator was firstly proposed by J. Le Ny [132]–[135]. According to the fundamental definitions in database field, they gave the adjacency relation on states in system theory:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adj}(x, x') \text{ iff for some } i, & \|S_i x_i - S_i x'_i\| \leq \rho_i \\ (I - S_i)x_i = (I - S_i)x'_i, & \text{ and } x_j = x'_j \forall j \neq i \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where S_i is the selection matrix with binary diagonal components. It means that the distance between the adjacent state acquired by the eavesdroppers and the real state of the system is bounded. Based on this assumption, the sensitivity in mechanism (9) or (10) can be easily obtained, thus deriving the noise variance.

Notice that the final aim is to perturb the statistical information of query outputs. Hence, instead of directly adding noises to the system output, the noises can be inserted into the system inputs [134]. The two perturbation structures in system theory are demonstrated in Fig. 4. Moreover, by expanding this definition to the multi-sensor systems, these two structures respectively stand for the noise injection on local sensors and FC [136].




Fig. 4. Two perturbation structures of DP in system theory.

Building on the above fundamental architecture [134], numerous extensive studies about differentially private estimators have been conducted. For the input perturbation scheme, Yazdani and Hale [137] proposed the bounds of the prior and posterior estimation errors, as well as that of the differential entropy. Similarly, Degue and Ny [138], [139] proposed a two-stage structure that aggregates distributed information before inserting random noises. The estimator parameters were optimized by minimizing the mean square error (MSE) and the optimization problem was solved by a semi-definite program. Then, the multi-sensor case was studied by Yan et al. [136], where each sensor had the possibility of injecting local noises. A gain related to the weighting fusion matrix was applied to transfer the mechanism into the form of white noise addition, enabling that the noises can be directly

designed with the existing mechanisms in [134]. Then, Yan et al. further applied noises to simultaneously preserve the privacy of LSEs and DFE [140]. Inspired by the moving average (MA), the summation form about LSEs was proposed for being transmitted in the unreliable communication networks. Two-step sequential noises were injected into the summation results, and both of them were combined for realizing DP. Besides, to reduce the adverse effect of unknown noises, an extra privatized sensor was deployed in [141] to ensure the fusion estimation performance.

In addition to the standard KF, a substantial amount of other estimators were discussed along with DP, including multi-input multi-output (MIMO) filter [142], interval observer (IO) [143], and many nonlinear estimators [145]–[148]. In [142], Le Ny and Mohammady proposed several approximation forms of MIMO filters for guaranteeing DP. They also derived an optimal zero-forcing equalization (ZFE) mechanism to approximate single-input multiple-output (SIMO) filters and a suboptimal diagonal prefilter for general MIMO cases. Degue and Le Ny [143] proposed a confidential IO for a multi-agent system under generally bounded disturbances, and the truncated Laplace noises were added to the transmitted data at each agent. Similar to the above work, Dawoud et al. [144] considered a privacy-preserving set-based estimator with zonotopes for set representation, where DP was achieved with the above truncated Laplace mechanism.

Moreover, Wang et al. [145] proposed a differentially private unscented KF (UKF) to protect the privacy of user in IoT. After aggregating streaming data and injecting Laplace noises, the UKF was adopted to reduce the noise influence. Andre and Ny [146] applied a Gaussian mechanism to ensure the confidentiality of individual drivers, where the traffic density or velocity should be estimated. In a similar way, the noises were inserted into the measurements from static detector, and an ensemble KF (EnKF) was employed to increase the estimation accuracy. Besides, Ny [147] applied DP to a nonlinear Luenberger-type observer, where the stability was guaranteed and the level of noise was set with contraction analysis. Vishnoi et al. [148] exploited the Gaussian mechanism to a moving horizon estimator (MHE). The traffic density and relative flow of each road segment were estimated, and the noise mechanism was derived on the basis of the sensitivities for measured states. Among these nonlinear methods, the estimation performance of UKF was the best under certain privacy parameters, followed by MHE and EKF, while that of EnKF was the worst [148]. The DP study for Kalman-like estimators is shown in Table. III.

According to the existing literature, the integration of differentially private mechanisms into system theory presents a fatal drawback, that is the legitimate user can just utilize the disturbed data as what eavesdroppers receive. Unlike the process of decrypting data with cryptography, the disturbances caused by the integration of DP cannot be entirely eliminated. Such perturbation will lead to the degradation in estimation accuracy for legitimate estimators, which is a crucial performance metric for estimation systems. Generally, the negative impact of such uncertainty can be decreased with estimation methods such as KF [134] and weighting fusion [136]. In a specific case, the noises can be designed with the null space of the weighting matrices such that the noise sequences were discarded [140].

There was also recent work by Murguia et al. [164] where the data *and the estimator run by the user* were transformed using random affine transformations before disclosure. The transformed estimator was designed to work on the distorted data to produce distorted state estimates, which were fed back to the user. Then, the user extracted the correct estimate from the distorted one using the inverse of the transformation (a scheme similar to homomorphic encryption). Furthermore, this scheme was proved to provide an arbitrary level of DP without distorting the state estimates.

B. Other Perturbation Methods

In addition to meeting the index requirements of DP, the direct application of random noises also proves to be effective. Most generally, the artificial noises were directly injected into the measurements by Das and Bhattacharya [149], and the privacy-utility tradeoff was solved by formulating optimization problems. Chen et al. [150] proposed a stealthy perturbation strategy that prevented the eavesdropper from detecting the exception and acquiring precise data. The random noises were injected into the local measurements, but the variation of innovation was still bounded after such perturbation. Subsequently, the limited number of encrypted sensors was calculated by solving an optimization problem. Moradi et al. [151] proposed a privacy-preserving distributed KF for a multi-agent system by resorting to the techniques about average consensus. The considered states were divided into private and public parts, while only the public ones were perturbed by the Gaussian noises.

Moreover, Yan et al. [140] injected two-step sequential noises the moving averages about LSEs such that the difference-based estimation errors of the eavesdropper grew unbounded. Meanwhile, the partial noise was eliminated with the null space design and another part was compensated in the linear minimum variance sense, ensuring the stability of the fusion estimator for the legitimate user. Similarly, Yan et al. [152] proposed a white noise injection approach by resorting to the null space related to the fusion criterion in DFE. Different from [140], the noises designed in [152] were employed to damage the fusion estimator of the eavesdropper, because the noises were related to the eavesdropper's weighting fusion matrix. This means that the eavesdropper lost the information of certain components under such encryption scheme, resulting in a degradation of its fusion estimation performance.

Apart from direct random perturbation, there are other modifications to the transmitted data that can also safeguard the confidentiality of the systems. A typical method is called compressive privacy introduced by Kung et al. [153], applying a linear transformation or compression for mapping the desired data into a lower-dimensional space. Song et al. [154] devised an optimization problem that balances the current system utility with privacy considerations for multiple future steps. Then, they illustrated the method to determine the optimal compressive matrix, while in the multi-sensor scenario, each sensor independently optimized its local compressive mapping. In fact, the null space idea in [152] is similar to compressive privacy, because certain components are deleted under the proposed mechanism.

Shang et al. [155] employed linear encryption to defend against the stealthy attacks, which used linear transformation to avoid being detected by the χ^2 test approach [156],

and the measurements or innovations were operated with a scaling matrix and a bias vector. Also, Shang and Chen utilized the linear encryption strategy for countering the eavesdropping attacks [157], where the estimation error of legitimate use was minimized and the lower bound of the eavesdropper's steady-state estimation error covariance was maximized. The covariance of the eavesdropper was proved to grow unbounded for marginally stable or unstable systems in the single-dimensional case.

The tools of information theory can more effectively demonstrate the uncertainty or perturbation, and the related methods have been widely discussed to enhance the privacy level [158]. Some information-theoretical metrics have been considered to measure the target, such as conditional entropy [159], [160], direct information [161], and mutual information [74], [162], [163]. The discrete conditional entropy was employed to denote the uncertainty by Nekouei [159], and an optimal privacy-aware estimator was developed through minimizing the average loss while adhering to a lower privacy-related bound. Tanaka et al. [161] derived the optimal joint control and estimation approach with Kramer's causally conditioned directed information. Liu et al. [162] minimized the estimation error covariance when the mutual information is subject a boundary for guarantee the sufficient privacy. Hayati et al. [165], [166] formulated the design of privacy-preserving mechanisms as a privacy-utility tradeoff problem, where the synthesis of related Gaussian mechanisms was posed as the solution of a series of convex programs. They minimized the finite horizon [165] and infinite horizon [166] mutual information between the sequence of states and the estimates produced by worst-case eavesdroppers using KFs.

C. Discussion

Obviously, the introduction of random factors can reduce the accuracy of processed data, thereby impairing the eavesdropper's estimation performance. Different from the complex procedures about key generation and encryption-decryption, perturbation methods can be directly implemented by generating and inserting random numbers. Such a straightforward procedure of numerical addition demands fewer computational resources, thus speeding up encryption and saving time for other operations.

Unlike cryptography, most perturbation methods will simultaneously impact the performance of legitimate users due to the lack of accurate real-time disturbances. Therefore, the trade-off discussion becomes essential, which involves the considerations of legitimate users' performance, eavesdroppers' performance, and even energy consumption. Nevertheless, it is generally assumed that the unauthorized eavesdroppers and legitimate users have the same knowledge, which is not appropriate enough for estimation systems. In some cases, legitimate systems have certain private information that can be applied to enhance the privacy level, such as the initial values set in advance. Hence, it is also of great significance to strive to make full use of these unique data to compensate for loss of performance [152] or eliminating the adverse impact [140].

In fact, the eavesdropper can still acquire the rough system state on certain level thanks to the remaining information of the perturbed data [136]. This means that although the data are encrypted with stochastic samples, the low randomness may not completely affect the eavesdropper's performance by

considering the data utility for the legitimate user. Besides, the relatively low accurate data may be enough for the eavesdropper to launch malicious practical attacks, such as missile attack, but the possible dreadful consequences should not exist. Furthermore, the eavesdroppers can even speculate a more precise range about the system state by exploiting other information. To summarize, the level of privacy achieved through data perturbation methods is generally lower than that achieved through cryptography, and thus finding ways to enhance it presents a significant challenge.

V. TRANSMISSION SCHEDULING

Transmission scheduling is another type of privacy protection method relying on the fundamental assumption that all the communication channels, whether they are constructed by legitimate users or potential eavesdroppers, inherently possess the possibility for packet dropping. In most case, the related methods set and optimize the expected targets to enable the design of effective scheduling methods. These methods are customized to function within certain predefined constraints, ensuring a balance between utility and privacy indexes. Furthermore, it can be beneficial to introduce artificial factors to manipulate the communication channels or scheduling strategy. Such operations can significantly increase the data complexity and ambiguity for unauthorized parties, thereby enhancing the privacy level.

A. Random Packet Drop

In the context of this approach, packet drop is an inevitable phenomenon in the networked transmission due to some inherent characteristics of communication systems such as buffer overflow and routing issues. Particularly, there is a probability that the local information transmitted between the sensor and the remote estimator may experience dropout [72]. Let $\gamma_u(t)$ be the random variable such that $\gamma_u(t) = 1$ when the transmitted package is successfully received by the remote estimator at time t , and otherwise $\gamma_u(t) = 0$. The subscript "u" represents the parameters of legitimate users. Similar definitions are given for $\gamma_e(t)$, where the subscript "e" stands for the parameters of eavesdroppers. The variables $\gamma_u(t)$ and $\gamma_e(t)$ are respectively assumed to be independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Bernoulli such that [167]:

$$\mathbb{P}(\gamma_u(t) = 1) = \lambda_u, \quad \mathbb{P}(\gamma_e(t) = 1) = \lambda_e. \quad (12)$$

The above packet drop structure for estimation systems in the presence of eavesdroppers is demonstrated in Fig. 5.




Fig. 5. The packet drop structure for estimation systems in the presence of eavesdroppers.

Notice that under the above assumption, the estimation performances of legitimate users and eavesdroppers will both degrade. Hence, the optimization target should be designed to consider the performance evaluation of both these parties.

Specifically, the optimization objective can be determined through minimizing the average mean squared error (MSE) of legitimate users, while simultaneously ensuring that the MSE of eavesdroppers remains above a certain threshold. This delicate balance can be achieved by employing approaches, including stochastic bit flipping [168] and transmit filter design [169].

Yuan et al. [170] firstly applied control feedback to enhance security, ingeniously using a malicious jammer to interfere with a malicious eavesdropper, essentially pitting attackers against each other. Considering the constraints of limited power and data utility, they framed the problem of energy distribution as an optimization problem. The Stackelberg game was employed to model it to effectively manage power allocation while ensuring optimal security against potential eavesdroppers. Then, Leong et al. [72] proposed the structural results on optimal transmission scheduling, revealing a threshold behavior in the estimation error covariance. This thresholding behavior indicates that the transmission scheduling strategy changes when the estimation error covariance crosses a certain threshold. In addition, Leong et al. [171] also applied mutual information as a measure to depict the performance, and then determined the upper and lower bounds on the revealed data. Extensions to the basic framework were explored in the literature, including alternative measures of security [172] and Markovian packet drops [173].

Moreover, Tsiamis et al. [174] considered a random transmission strategy with process noise and channel randomness. When the packet reception rate of the user was larger than that of the eavesdropper, the perfect secrecy was claimed to be achieved, where the estimation error covariance of the user is bounded while that of the eavesdropper grows unbounded, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}(P_e(t))) < \infty, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}(P_u(t))) = \infty, \quad (13)$$

where $P_e(t)$ is the estimation error covariance matrix of the eavesdropper and $P_u(t)$ is the that of the user. Wang et al. [175] discussed the sensor scheduling problem under energy constraints, which maximized the estimation error covariance of the eavesdropper while maintaining that of the remote estimator at a certain level. The above scheduling problem was further transformed into three optimal problems and one energy allocation problem under arbitrary fixed transmission times. Besides, the adversary in [176] was assumed to overhear the transmissions and proactively hijack the sensor to reprogram its transmission policy. The trade-off between eavesdropping performance and detection risk was constructed by a constrained Markov decision process [177], and then it was changed into an unconstrained problem by resorting to a Lagrange multiplier. Also, under the energy constraint, the cost combining the estimation and privacy performances was minimized over the infinite time horizon in [178].

B. Other Scheduling Methods

Recently, an effective encryption method called the state-secrecy code was proposed by Tsiamis [179]–[181]. The reference time is denoted as t_k , and it represents the time slot at which the most recent successful reception occurred

for the legitimate user. Then, the state-secrecy coding scheme at time t can be described as follows:

$$z(t) = x(t) - A^{t-t_k}x(t_k). \quad (14)$$

where $z(t)$ is the coding output utilized for transmission. The essence of this method hinges on a critical event, in which the legitimate user successfully acquires the transmitted package while the eavesdropper does not, i.e.,

$$\gamma_u(t) = 1, \quad \gamma_e(t) = 0. \quad (15)$$

If this event occurs for any time $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the perfect secrecy can be achieved [181]. The state-secrecy code for stable systems was proposed in [180], which imposed extra unstable dynamics on the recursive estimator of the eavesdropper. On the other hand, for unstable systems, the state transition matrix whose own dynamic was unstable was introduced to amplify the initial errors caused by the critical event [181]. Meanwhile, the perfect secrecy defined in (13) was achieved, and the divergence rate of the eavesdropper's estimator approached that of the open loop. Besides, the coding scheme was also studied for distributed estimation [182], where the communications in the wireless sensor networks were protected.

Nevertheless, the transmission of ACKs cannot be completely safe and it is also susceptible to cyberattacks [183], [184]. In the event that the sensor does not receive the ACK, the coding scheme depended on the most recent time when the legitimate user successfully received the package and the sensor also received the ACK [181]. Moreover, Lücke et al. [185] introduced a dynamic switching strategy designed to uphold resilience against flipped ACKs, which encompassed situations sending the ciphertexts and sending the plaintexts. In recent work, Kennedy et al. [186] proposed a state-secrecy coding scheme for remote state estimation without requiring ACKs. The method is based on randomly alternating between transmission of system state values and random noise with similar statistical properties as the system state. Through use of a pseudo-random sequence for pre-arranging the scheduling of the random noise, the legitimate user can discard noisy data, whereas the eavesdropper is deceived.

Artificial noise is a typical physical-layer method about encrypting communication signals. The complex noise signals are injected into the modulated signals of original data to decrease the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of transmitted signals in the channels. The degradation on SNR poses a challenge for the eavesdroppers to successfully demodulate the information, thus preventing them from acquiring any valid data. Since the general complex noises simultaneously affected the legitimate channels, a complex noise method based on null space design was proposed by Goel and Negi [187]. According to this approach, the noise lies in the null space of the channel gain of the legitimate user, ensuring that the user can completely eliminate the extra inserted artificial noises. In this case, the finally transmitted signal $x(t)$ can be expressed by the following form [187]:

$$x(t) = s(t) + w(t), \quad H(t)w(t) = 0. \quad (16)$$

$s(t)$ is signal vector of valid information and $H(t)$ is the legitimate channel gain. $w(t) = Z(t)v(t)$, where $Z(t)$ is an orthonormal basis for the null space of $H(t)$ satisfying $Z^\dagger(t)Z(t) = I$ and $v(t)$ is the complex Gaussian noise.

Denote the channel gain of the eavesdropper as $G(t)$. Then, on the basis of the above mechanism (16), the respective signals obtained for the legitimate user and that for the eavesdropper can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} z_u(t) &= H(t)s(t) \\ z_e(t) &= G(t)s(t) + G(t)w(t). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The result demonstrates that the legitimate user can effectively eliminate the added noises and extract the desired information, while the eavesdropper is unable to do so. Accordingly, when the noise is large enough, the eavesdropper cannot successfully demodulate the received signals because of the low SNR, which guarantees the perfect data privacy.

Through adding noises to the transmitted information from sensors, Leong et al. [188] realized the perfect secrecy and proposed the sufficient conditions for energy allocation. Xu et al. [189] designed a secure DFE with complex noises and simultaneously applied a dimensionality reduction method to reduce energy consumption. A prediction-based compensation method was considered to mitigate the adverse impact generated by the dimensionality reduction. Subsequently, by resorting to the event-trigger approach, the energy consumption of complex noises was significantly reduced, and the stability of the DFE was also guaranteed in [190]. Furthermore, Xu et al. [191] discussed a similar DFE problem under energy constraints, where an optimization problem was established based on the terminal fusion covariance and the energy cost of artificial noises in the finite time horizon. The optimal scheduling sequence was proposed, which tried to encrypt the LSEs only during the last time period.

Moreover, Guo et al. [192] constructed the power allocation problems to minimize the distortion outage probability for the FC, subject to a entire energy constraint and a secrecy outage constraint for the eavesdropper. They also studied two different scenarios [193], including the single sensor case with multiple antennas and the multiple sensors case in which each sensor has a single antenna. The similar power allocation problems were solved, while the performances were compared varying from the number of sensors and antennas. Besides, Yang et al. [194] applied the invertible linear transformation to encode the measurements with artificial noise, and then derived the lower bound of the such noise under a SNR threshold.

C. Discussion

When compared with the system constructions of other methods, the assumption about random packet drop link is more practical because of the channel modeling. The trade-off optimization methods based on the performances of both user and eavesdropper can be applicable for most systems, since there is no strong hypothesis for the eavesdropper. By contrast, artificial noise is quite effective on protecting high transmission privacy without considering the system stability. When the noise is large enough, the eavesdropper cannot acquire any valid information, because it cannot successfully demodulate the perturbed signals, whose form is similar to the unsuccessful decryption with cryptography.

Since the eavesdropping attack is a kind of passive and covert attack, we cannot accurately speculate the position or other information of the potential eavesdroppers. This means that the stealthily established communication channels of eavesdroppers are random in a certain range and

unknown to legitimate systems. Therefore, the packet drop link assumption for eavesdroppers may be impractical sometimes, because it is challenging to determine the packet drop probabilities of the eavesdroppers' channels. In this case, the construction of null space-based artificial noise may not be successful, and thus its effectiveness cannot be guaranteed.

On the other hand, the artificially complex noises will consume a lot of energy, because the energy should be large such that the SNR is low enough to ensure the sufficient confidentiality. However, a practical consideration is that in many systems, sensors are powered by the batteries that have a limited energy supply. In this case, the employment of artificial noise may decrease the normal working hours of the sensors. Besides, the state-secrecy code approach just realizes the divergence of the eavesdroppers' estimators for unstable state components, while the eavesdropper can still obtain the information about bounded ones.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper offers a comprehensive overview of privacy-preserving approaches in the context of state estimation systems. It specifically focuses on three main encryption methods, including cryptography, data perturbation, and transmission scheduling. We extensively discuss the fundamental models, classical applications, and recent developments related to these encryption approaches. Especially, we explore various privacy-preserving estimators while thoroughly evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. Every method has its benefits and drawbacks. It is inappropriate to say for sure which method is better or worse without knowing the specific scenario. The comparison of some typical methods is given in Table IV.

In what follows, we give some recommendations for future research based on this survey:

- 1) *Computational-Efficient Cryptography*: Most cryptographic methods such as Homomorphic encryption require high computation amounts. They may affect normal operations, while the real-time performance is quite important for estimation systems. Thus, the encryption structure can be simplified to reduce extra computation, for example, using partial encryption to process distributed state estimation.
- 2) *Energy-Efficient Noise Injection*: The generation of artificial noises requires a great deal of power, while the total energy of the system is always finite. Meanwhile, the channels are time-varying in many scenarios such as maneuvering vehicles, which renders the method unsuitable or ineffective. Hence, constructing some optimization problems to reduce the influence of such unexpected terms is quite valuable.
- 3) *Low-impact Perturbation*: The general perturbation processes always affect the legitimate performance while protecting privacy, and there exist some tradeoffs [195]. Some approaches such as null space [152] and coding [181] can be utilized to eliminate the adverse impact. However, the necessary conditions of system parameters may be difficult, and thus some relaxation or suboptimal cases can be further studied.
- 4) *Multiple Attacks*: In practical applications, it is common for systems to be subject to multiple attacks simultaneously [196]. The direct combination of various individual defense approaches will increase the

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF TYPICAL METHODS FOR PRIVACY-PRESERVING STATE ESTIMATION.

Method	Some references	Advantages	Disadvantages
Homomorphic encryption, Secure multi-party computation	[98]–[106]	1) The data accuracy can be maintained with secret keys; 2) Certain operations can be done on ciphertexts.	1) The computation amount is high; 2) The distribution of secret keys needs to be completely safe.
Watermarking, pseudo-random samples	[115]–[117]	1) The original data can be completely recovered; 2) The computation amount is relatively low.	1) The distribution of watermark should be entirely secure; 2) The performance of the eavesdropper may not be thoroughly destroyed.
Differential privacy	[132]–[141]	1) The encryption procedure is simple; 2) The mathematical model is rigorous, and the privacy level can be adjusted varying from the practical demands.	1) The information is still leaked on a certain level; 2) The assumption on adjacent relation is not practical enough.
Null space perturbation	[140], [152]	1) Some components are stealthily eliminated while requiring a few computations; 2) The performance of the eavesdropper can be damaged even for stable systems.	1) The sensors need to communicate with each other; 2) The assumption for the eavesdropper is too strong and not practical.
Optimal scheduling	[168]–[178]	1) The assumption for the eavesdropper is weak, and it can be applied to most systems; 2) Optimal expected target can be achieved.	1) The estimation error of the eavesdropper cannot diverge. 2) The assumption on random packet drop link may be outdated due to the development of communication technology.
State-secrecy code	[179]–[181], [185], [186]	1) The legitimate user can decode to acquire the original data; 2) The performance of the eavesdropper approaches the open loop.	1) The MSE of the eavesdropper cannot diverge for stable systems. 2) The time of successful packet reception should be known.
Artificial noise	[187]–[194]	1) The eavesdropper will lose most packets; 2) The legitimate user can get all the information.	1) Extra energy will be consumed; 2) It is unsuitable for time-varying channels.

complexity and cost of legitimate systems. Alternatively, countering multiple attacks with only one single scheme must be more efficient. Furthermore, it is also valuable to apply the effect of one attack to impact another [170].

- 5) *Physical Layer-Based Approach*: The information obtained from the physical layer plays a crucial role and carries unique significance. It can be utilized to add in the encryption [189], and can even be regarded as the secret keys that are difficult for eavesdroppers to acquire. In this case, appropriate usage of the physical-layer data can enhance the effectiveness of the methods [197].
- 6) *Artificial Intelligence-Based Approach*: Artificial intelligence approaches such as neural networks have been utilized for defending cyberattacks [198], while there is few related study on confidential estimation method. According to the ideas in [198], artificial intelligence methods show promise in the development of efficient encryption or compensation techniques.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Bar-Shalom, X. R. Li, T. Kirubarajan, *Estimation with applications to tracking and navigation*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 2001.
- [2] A. Paul, I. Kamwa, and G. Jóos, “Centralized dynamic state estimation using a federation of extended Kalman filters with intermittent PMU data from generator terminals,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 6109-6119, 2018.
- [3] A. Tsiamis and G. J. Pappas, “Online learning of the Kalman filter with logarithmic regret,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 2774-2789, 2023.
- [4] F. F. Rego, A. M. Pascoal, A. P. Aguiar, and C. N. Jones, “Distributed state estimation for discrete-time linear time invariant systems: A survey,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 48, pp. 36-56, 2019.
- [5] A. Primadianto and C. N. Lu, “A review on distribution system state estimation,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 3875-3883, 2017.
- [6] X. Ge, Q. Han, X. Zhang, L. Ding, and F. Yang, “Distributed event-triggered estimation over sensor networks: A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 1306-1320, 2020.
- [7] D. An, F. Zhang, F. Cui, and Q. Yang, “Toward data integrity attacks against distributed dynamic state estimation in smart grid,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 881-894, Jan. 2024.
- [8] H. Wu, B. Zhou, and C. Zhang, “Secure distributed estimation against data integrity attacks in Internet-of-Things systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 2552-2565, July 2022.
- [9] M. Doostmohammadian, A. Taghieh, and H. Zarrabi, “Distributed estimation approach for tracking a mobile target via formation of UAVs,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 3765-3776, Oct. 2022.
- [10] D. Liu, D. Ye, and X. -G. Zhao, “Fully distributed secure state estimation for nonlinear multi-agent systems against DoS attacks: An edge-pinning-based method,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3293844.
- [11] X. R. Li and V. P. Jilkov, “Survey of maneuvering target tracking. Part I. Dynamic models,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1333-1364, 2003.
- [12] D. Smith and S. Singh, “Approaches to multisensor data fusion in target tracking: A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 1696-1710, 2006.
- [13] W. Li, Z. Wang, G. Wei, L. Ma, J. Hu, and D. Ding, “A survey on multisensor fusion and consensus filtering for sensor networks,” *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, 2015.
- [14] J. Qian, Z. Duan, P. Duan, and Z. Li, “Observation of periodic systems: Bridge centralized Kalman filtering and consensus-based distributed filtering,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2023.3290105.
- [15] J. Zhou, W. Ding and W. Yang, “A secure encoding mechanism against deception attacks on multisensor remote state estimation,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 1959-1969, 2022.
- [16] M. Pham, D. Yang, and W. Sheng, “A sensor fusion approach to indoor human localization based on environmental and wearable sensors,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 339-350, Jan. 2019.
- [17] S. Sun, “Distributed optimal linear fusion predictors and filters for systems with random parameter matrices and correlated noises,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 1064-1074, 2020.
- [18] S. Sun, H. Lin, J. Ma, and X. Li, “Multi-sensor distributed fusion estimation with applications in networked systems: A review paper,” *Information Fusion*, vol. 38, pp. 122-134, 2017.
- [19] S. Sun and Z. Deng, “Multi-sensor optimal information fusion Kalman filter,” *Automatica*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1017-1023, 2004.
- [20] L. Li, M. Niu, Y. Xia, and H. Yang, “Stochastic event-triggered distributed fusion estimation under jamming attacks,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 7, pp. 309-321, 2021.

- [21] B. Chen, G. Hu, D. W. C. Ho, and L. Yu, "A new approach to linear/nonlinear distributed fusion estimation problem," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1301-1308, 2019.
- [22] G. Michieletto, F. Formaggio, A. Cenedese, and S. Tomasin, "Robust localization for secure navigation of UAV formations under GNSS spoofing attack," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 2383-2396, Oct. 2023.
- [23] B. Chen, W. Zhang, G. Hu, and L. Yu, "Networked fusion kalman filtering with multiple uncertainties," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 2232-2249, 2015.
- [24] D. Ding, Q. Han, Y. Xiang, X. Ge, and X. Zhang, "A survey on security control and attack detection for industrial cyber-physical systems," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 275, pp. 1674-1683, 2018.
- [25] D. Ding, Q. Han, X. Ge, and J. Wang, "Secure state estimation and control of cyber-physical systems: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 176-190, 2021.
- [26] M. Pajic, J. Weimer, N. Bezzo, O. Sokolsky, G. J. Pappas, and I. Lee, "Design and implementation of attack-resilient cyberphysical systems: With a focus on attack-resilient state estimators," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 66-81, 2017.
- [27] H. Sedjelmaci, M. Hadji, and N. Ansari, "Cyber security game for intelligent transportation systems," *IEEE Network*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 216-222, 2019.
- [28] H. Pirayesh and H. Zeng, "Jamming attacks and anti-jamming strategies in wireless networks: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 767-809, 2022.
- [29] N. Agrawal and S. Tapaswi, "Defense mechanisms against DDoS attacks in a cloud computing environment: State-of-the-art and research challenges," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 3769-3795, 2019.
- [30] X. Zhang, X. Liu, T. Ding, and P. Wang, "On resilience and distributed fixed-time control of MTDC systems under DoS attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 2569-2580, Oct. 2023.
- [31] X. Wang, J. Na, B. Niu, X. Zhao, T. Cheng, and W. Zhou, "Event-triggered adaptive bipartite secure consensus asymptotic tracking control for nonlinear MASs subject to DoS attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3286794.
- [32] X. Qi, L. Zhu, X. Li, and R. Gong, "Observer-based event-triggered sliding mode security control for nonlinear cyber-physical systems under DoS attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3343752.
- [33] W. Wang, Y. Yi, Q. Wang, M. Shen, G. Zhu, and J. Yang, "Limited information based emergency response control for underwater vehicle systems with disturbances and DoS attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2024, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2024.3352071.
- [34] F. Yang, S. Hu, X. Xie, D. Yue, and J. Sun, "Resilient fuzzy control synthesis of nonlinear DC microgrid via a time-constrained DoS attack model," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3309983.
- [35] Y. Jiang, B. Niu, T. Zhao, X. Zhao, X. Wang, and H. Wang, "Intelligent consensus asymptotic tracking control for nonlinear multiagent systems under denial-of-service attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2024, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2024.3354047.
- [36] T. Shi, P. Shi, and J. Chambers, "Dynamic event-triggered model predictive control under channel fading and denial-of-service attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3325534.
- [37] M. Zhu, A. H. Anwar, Z. Wan, J. -H. Cho, C. A. Kamhoua, and M. P. Singh, "A survey of defensive deception: Approaches using game theory and machine learning," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 2460-2493, 2021.
- [38] Y. Li, Y. Yang, Z. Zhao, J. Zhou, and D. E. Quevedo, "Deception attacks on remote estimation With disclosure and disruption resources," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 4096-4112, 2023.
- [39] T. Li, Z. Wang, L. Zou, B. Chen, and L. Yu, "A dynamic encryption-decryption scheme for replay attack detection in cyber-physical systems," *Automatica*, vol. 151, 110926, 2023.
- [40] H. Liu, Y. Mo, and K. H. Johansson, "Active detection against replay attack: A survey on watermark design for cyber-physical systems," *Safety, Security, and Privacy for Cyber-Physical Systems*, vol. 486, pp. 145-171, 2021.
- [41] R. Deng, G. Xiao, R. Lu, H. Liang, and A. V. Vasilakos, "False data injection on state estimation in power systems — Attacks, impacts, and defense: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 411-423, 2017.
- [42] F. Miao, Q. Zhu, M. Pajic, and G. J. Pappas, "Coding schemes for securing cyber-physical systems against stealthy data injection attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 106-117, 2017.
- [43] S. Gao, H. Zhang, C. Huang, Z. Wang and H. Yan, "Optimal injection attack strategy for nonlinear cyber-physical systems based on iterative learning," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 56-68, Jan. 2024.
- [44] D. An, F. Zhang, Q. Yang, and C. Zhang, "Data integrity attack in dynamic state estimation of smart grid: Attack model and countermeasures," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 1631-1644, July 2022.
- [45] P. Zhu, S. Jin, X. Bu, and Z. Hou, "Distributed data-driven control for a connected autonomous vehicle platoon subjected to false data injection attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3345369.
- [46] Z. Hu, R. Su, K. -V. Ling, Y. Guo, and R. Ma, "Resilient event-triggered MPC for load frequency regulation with wind turbines under false data injection attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3337006.
- [47] Y. -M. Wang, Y. -X. Li, S. Tong, and Z. Hou, "Data-driven-based event-triggered prescribed performance tracking of nonlinear system with FDI attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3310621.
- [48] D. Kapetanovic, G. Zheng and F. Rusek, "Physical layer security for massive MIMO: An overview on passive eavesdropping and active attacks," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 21-27, 2015.
- [49] K. Wang, L. Yuan, T. Miyazaki, Y. Chen, and Y. Zhang, "Jamming and eavesdropping defense in green cyber-physical transportation systems using a Stackelberg game," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 14, no. 9, pp. 4232-4242, 2018.
- [50] M. Conti, L. V. Mancini, R. Spolaor, and N. V. Verde, "Analyzing Android encrypted network traffic to identify user actions," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 114-125, 2016.
- [51] H. Zheng and H. Hu, "MISSILE: A system of mobile inertial sensor-based sensitive indoor location eavesdropping," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 3137-3151, 2020.
- [52] X. Yuan, Z. Feng, W. Ni, R. P. Liu, J. A. Zhang, and W. Xu, "Secrecy performance of terrestrial radio links under collaborative aerial eavesdropping," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 604-619, 2020.
- [53] N. Aldaghri and H. Mahdavi, "Physical layer secret key generation in static environments," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 2692-2705, 2020.
- [54] P. Xu, J. Yang, G. Chen, Z. Yang, Y. Li, and M. Z. Win, "Physical-layer secret and private key generation in wireless relay networks with correlated eavesdropping channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 19, pp. 985-1000, 2024.
- [55] M. Zhang, J. Zhou, P. Cong, G. Zhang, C. Zhuo, and S. Hu, "LIAS: A lightweight incentive authentication scheme for forensic services in IoV," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 805-820, April 2023.
- [56] O. Goldreich, *Foundations of cryptography: volume 1, basic tools*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [57] O. Goldreich, *Foundations of cryptography: volume 2, basic applications*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [58] D. K. Sharma, N. C. Singh, D. A. Noola, A. N. Doss, and J. ivakumar, "A review on various cryptographic techniques & algorithms," *Materials Today: Proceedings*, vol. 51, pp. 104-109, 2022.
- [59] K. A. Shim, "A survey of public-key cryptographic primitives in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 577-601, 2016.
- [60] K. A. Shim, "A survey on post-quantum public-key signature schemes for secure vehicular communications," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 14025-14042, 2022.
- [61] A. B. Alexandru and G. J. Pappas, "Private Weighted Sum Aggregation," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 219-230, 2022.
- [62] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," *Proc. 3rd Theory Cryptogr. Conf.*, 2006, pp. 265-284.
- [63] C. Dwork, K. Kenthapadi, F. McSherry, I. Mironov, and M. Naor, "Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation," *Adv. Cryptol.-EUROCRYPT '06*, 2006, pp. 486-503.
- [64] C. Dwork and A. Roth, *The Algorithmic Foundations of Differential Privacy*, now, 2014.
- [65] B. Kaikkhura, V. S. Siddharth Nadendla, and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed inference in the presence of eavesdroppers: a survey," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 40-46, 2015.
- [66] M. U. Hassan, M. H. Rehmani, and J. Chen, "Differential Privacy Techniques for Cyber Physical Systems: A Survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 746-789, 2020.

- [67] J. Soria-Comas, J. Domingo-Ferrer, D. Sánchez, and D. Megías, "Individual differential privacy: A utility-preserving formulation of differential privacy guarantees," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1418-1429, 2017.
- [68] L. Wu, C. Qin, Z. Xu, Y. Guan, and R. Lu, "TCPP: Achieving privacy-preserving trajectory correlation with differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 18, pp. 4006-4020, 2023.
- [69] D. Ye, S. Shen, T. Zhu, B. Liu, and W. Zhou, "One parameter defense—defending against data inference attacks via differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 1466-1480, 2022.
- [70] E. Ekenstedt, L. Ong, Y. Liu, S. Johnson, P. L. Yeoh, and J. Klierer, "When differential privacy implies syntactic privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 2110-2124, 2022.
- [71] D. E. Quevedo, A. Ahlén, A. S. Leong, and S. Dey, "On Kalman filtering over fading wireless channels with controlled transmission powers," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 1306-1316, 2012.
- [72] A. S. Leong, D. E. Quevedo, D. Dolz, and S. Dey, "Transmission scheduling for remote state estimation over packet dropping links in the presence of an eavesdropper," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 9, pp. 3732-3739, 2019.
- [73] M. A. Abbas, H. Song, and J. P. Hong, "Opportunistic scheduling for average secrecy rate enhancement in fading downlink channel With potential eavesdroppers," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 969-980, 2019.
- [74] C. Murguia, I. Shames, F. Farokhi, D. Nescic, and V. Poor, "On Privacy of Dynamical Systems: An Optimal Probabilistic Mapping Approach," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 16, pp. 2608-2620, 2021.
- [75] J. M. Kennedy, J. Heinovski, D. E. Quevedo, and F. Dressler, "Centralized model predictive control with human-driver interaction for platooning," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 72, no. 10, pp. 12664-12680, 2023.
- [76] B. Chen, G. Hu, D. W. C. Ho, and L. Yu, "Distributed estimation and control for discrete time-varying interconnected Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2192-2207, 2022.
- [77] Y. Zhang, B. Chen, L. Yu, and D. W. C. Ho, "Distributed Kalman filtering for interconnected dynamic systems," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 11571-11580, 2022.
- [78] R. E. Kalman, "A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems," *J. Basic Eng.*, vol. 82, pp. 35-45, 1960.
- [79] K. Dehghanpour, Z. Wang, J. Wang, Y. Yuan, and F. Bu, "A survey on state estimation techniques and challenges in smart distribution systems," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 2312-2322, 2019.
- [80] J. Wang, D. Shi, J. Chen, and C. -C. Liu, "Privacy-preserving hierarchical state estimation in untrustworthy cloud environments," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 1541-1551, 2021.
- [81] H. Huang, Z. Shen, C. Huang, Y. Wang, and F. Y. Wang, "Intelligent vehicle carriers to support general civilian purposes," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 4292-4295, 2023.
- [82] R. L. Rivest, L. Adleman, and M. L. Dertouzos, "On data banks and privacy homomorphisms," *Foundations of Secure Computation*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 169-180, 1978.
- [83] R. Geva et al, "Collaborative privacy-preserving analysis of oncological data using multiparty homomorphic encryption," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 120, no. 33, e2304415120, 2023.
- [84] C. Gentry, *A Fully Homomorphic Encryption Scheme*, vol. 20. Stanford, CA, USA: Stanford Univ., 2009.
- [85] P. Paillier, "Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes," *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques*, 1999, pp.223-238.
- [86] R. L. Rivest, A. Shamir, and L. Adleman, "A method for obtaining digital signatures and public-key cryptosystems," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 21, no.2, 120-126, 1978.
- [87] T. Elgamal, "A public key cryptosystem and a signature scheme based on discrete logarithms," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 469-472, 1985.
- [88] Z. Zhang, P. Cheng, J. Wu, and J. Chen, "Secure state estimation using hybrid homomorphic encryption scheme," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1704-1720, 2021.
- [89] A. A. M. A. Abdelhafez, *Localization of cyber-physical systems: Privacy, security and efficiency*, Technische Universität München, München, 2020.
- [90] M. S. Darup, A. B. Alexandru, D. E. Quevedo, and G. J. Pappas, "Encrypted control for networked systems: An illustrative introduction and current challenges," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 58-78, 2021.
- [91] A. B. Alexandru, K. Gatsis, Y. Shoukry, S. A. Seshia, P. Tabuada, and G. J. Pappas, "Cloud-Based quadratic optimization With partially homomorphic encryption," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 2357-2364, 2021.
- [92] A. B. Alexandru and George J. Pappas, "Encrypted LQG using labeled homomorphic encryption," *Proceedings of the 10th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPs '19)*, New York, NY, USA, pp. 129-140, 2019.
- [93] N. M. Hijazi, M. Aloqaily, M. Guizani, B. Ouni and F. Kar-ray, "Secure federated learning with fully homomorphic encryption for IoT communications," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2023.3302065, 2023.
- [94] A. Sultan, S. Tahir, H. Tahir, T. Anwer, F. Khan, M. Rajarajan, and Omer Rana, "A novel image-based homomorphic approach for preserving the privacy of autonomous vehicles connected to the cloud," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 1936-1948, 2023.
- [95] R. Zhu, M. Li, J. Yin, L. Sun, and H. Liu, "Enhanced federated learning for edge data security in intelligent transportation systems," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 13396-13408, 2023.
- [96] C. Marcolla, V. Sucasas, M. Manzano, R. Bassoli, F. H. P. Fitzek, and N. Aaraj, "Survey on fully homomorphic encryption, theory, and applications," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 110, no. 10, pp. 1572-1609, 2022.
- [97] A. Acar, H. Aksu, A. S. Uluagac, and M. Conti, "A survey on homomorphic encryption schemes: Theory and implementation," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 51, no. 79, pp 1-35, 2019.
- [98] F. J. Gonzalez-Serrano, A. Amor-Martín, and J. Casamayon-Anton, "State estimation using an extended Kalman filter with privacy-protected observed inputs," *2014 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS)*, Atlanta, GA, USA, 2014, pp. 54-59.
- [99] S. Ladan and S. Ali Akbar, "Secure centralized Kalman filter for network environments by homomorphic encryption," *2021 7th International Conference on Control, Instrumentation and Automation (ICCIA)*, Tabriz, Iran, 2021, pp. 1-5.
- [100] M. Aristov, B. Noack, U. D. Hanebeck, and J. Müller-Quade, "Encrypted Multisensor Information Filtering," *2018 21st International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*, Cambridge, UK, 2018, pp. 1631-1637.
- [101] Y. Ni, J. Wu, L. Li, and L. Shi, "Multi-party dynamic state estimation that preserves data and model privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 16, pp. 2288-2299, 2021.
- [102] S. Emad, A. Alanwar, Y. Alkabani, M. W. El-Kharashi, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "Privacy guarantees for cloud-based state estimation using partially homomorphic encryption," *2022 European Control Conference (ECC)*, London, United Kingdom, 2022, pp. 98-105.
- [103] M. Ristic, B. Noack, and U. D. Hanebeck, "Secure fast covariance interterference using partially homomorphic and order revealing encryption schemes," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 217-222, 2021.
- [104] Z. Mohsen, S. Ladan, A. S. Ali, and F. Farhad, "Private state estimation for cyber-physical systems using semi-homomorphic encryption", *23rd International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, July 16-20, 2018.
- [105] J. Kim and H. Shim, "Encrypted state estimation in networked control systems," *emph2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 7190-7195.
- [106] A. Alanwar, V. Gaßmann, X. He, H. Said, H. Sandberg, K. H. Johansson, and Matthias Althoff, "Privacy-preserving set-based estimation using partially homomorphic encryption," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 71, 100786, 2023.
- [107] M. T. I. Ziad, A. Alanwar, M. Alzantot, and M. Srivastava, "CryptoImg: Privacy preserving processing over encrypted images" *2016 IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2016, pp. 570-575.
- [108] A. C. Yao, "Protocols for secure computations," *23rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1982)*, Chicago, IL, USA, pp. 160-164, 1982.
- [109] R. Cramer, I.B. Damgård, and J. B.Nielsen, *Secure Multiparty Computation*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [110] T. P. Pedersen, "Non-interactive and information-theoretic secure verifiable secret sharing," *Annual International Cryptology Conference*, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, pp. 129-140, 1991.
- [111] T. Hofmeister, M. Krause, and H. U.Simon, "Contrast-optimal k out of n secret sharing schemes in visual cryptography," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 240, no. 2, pp. 471-485, 2000.
- [112] A. Iacovazzi and Y. Elovici, "Network flow watermarking: A survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 512-530, 2017.

- [113] Z. Song, A. Skuric, and K. Ji, "A recursive watermark method for hard real-time industrial control system cyber-resilience enhancement," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 1030-1043, April 2020.
- [114] H. Niederreiter, *Random number generation and quasi-Monte Carlo methods*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1992.
- [115] M. Ristic, B. Noack, and U. D. Hanebeck, "Cryptographically privileged state estimation with Gaussian keystreams," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 602-607, 2022.
- [116] J. Huang, D. W. Ho, F. Li, W. Yang, Y. Tang, "Secure remote state estimation against linear man-in-the-middle attacks using watermarking," *Automatica*, vol. 121, 109182, 2020.
- [117] J. Zhou, W. Yang, W. Ding, W. X. Zheng, and Y. Xu, "Watermarking-based protection strategy against stealthy integrity attack on distributed state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 628-635, 2023.
- [118] Q. Geng and P. Viswanath, "Optimal noise adding mechanisms for approximate differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 952-969, Feb. 2016.
- [119] F. McSherry and K. Talwar, "Mechanism design via differential privacy," *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*, Providence, RI, USA, 2007, pp. 94-103.
- [120] P. Sadeghi and M. Korki, "Offset-symmetric Gaussians for differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 2394-2409, 2022.
- [121] W. Alghamdi, S. Asodeh, F. P. Calmon, O. Kosut, L. Sankar, and F. Wei, "Cactus mechanisms: Optimal differential privacy mechanisms in the large-composition regime," *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Espoo, Finland, 2022, pp. 1838-1843.
- [122] B. Balle and Y. Wang, "Improving the Gaussian mechanism for differential privacy: Analytical calibration and optimal denoising," *arXiv*, 2018, DOI:10.48550/arXiv.1805.06530.
- [123] G. Muthukrishnan and S. Kalyani, "Grafting Laplace and Gaussian distributions: A new noise mechanism for differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 18, pp. 5359-5374, 2023.
- [124] S. Kadam, A. Scaglione, N. Ravi, S. Peisert, B. Lunghino, and A. Shumavon, "Optimum noise mechanism for probabilistic differentially private queries in discrete finite sets," *2023 International Conference on Smart Applications, Communications and Networking (SmartNets)*, Istanbul, Turkiye, 2023, pp. 1-6.
- [125] D. Han, K. Liu, Y. Lin, and Y. Xia, "Differentially private distributed online learning over time-varying digraphs via dual averaging," *International Journal of Robust Nonlinear Control*, pp.1-15, 2021.
- [126] S. Han, U. Topcu, and G. J. Pappas, "Differentially private distributed constrained optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 50-64, 2017.
- [127] X. Liu, J. Zhang, and J. Wang, "Differentially private consensus algorithm for continuous-time heterogeneous multi-agent systems," *Automatica*, vol. 122, 109283, 2020.
- [128] M. Ye, G. Hu, L. Xie, and S. Xu, "Differentially private distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2451-2458, 2022.
- [129] Y. Wang, Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and G. E. Dullerud, "Differential privacy in linear distributed control systems: Entropy minimizing mechanisms and performance tradeoffs," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 118-130, March 2017.
- [130] Y. Kawano and M. Cao, "Design of privacy-preserving dynamic controllers," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 3863-3878, 2020.
- [131] K. H. Degue and J. Le Ny, "Cooperative differentially private LQG control with measurement aggregation," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 1093-1098, 2023.
- [132] J. Le Ny and G. J. Pappas, "Differentially private Kalman filtering," *Proc. 50th Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control, Comput.*, Oct. 2012, pp. 1618-1625.
- [133] J. Le Ny and G. J. Pappas, "Differentially private filtering," *Proc. Conf. Decision Control*, Maui, HI, USA, 2012.
- [134] J. Le Ny and G. J. Pappas, "Differentially private filtering," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 341-354, 2014.
- [135] J. Le Ny, *Differential Privacy for Dynamic Data*, Springer, 2020.
- [136] X. Yan, B. Chen, Y. Zhang, and L. Yu, "Guaranteeing differential privacy in distributed fusion estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 3416-3423, 2023.
- [137] K. Yazdani and M. Hale, "Error bounds and guidelines for privacy calibration in differentially private Kalman filtering," *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*, Denver, CO, USA, 2020, pp. 4423-4428.
- [138] K. H. Degue and J. Le Ny, "On differentially private Kalman filtering," *2017 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP)*, Montreal, QC, Canada, 2017, pp. 487-491.
- [139] K. H. Degue and J. L. Ny, "Differentially private Kalman filtering with signal aggregation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2022.3230735.
- [140] X. Yan, B. Chen, Y. Zhang, and L. Yu, "Distributed encryption fusion estimation against full eavesdropping," *Automatica*, vol. 153, 111025, 2023.
- [141] X. Yan and C. Yang, "State estimation with differential privacy under scale enlargement of the sensor network," *2022 13th Asian Control Conference (ASCC)*, Jeju, Korea, Republic of, 2022, pp. 971-978.
- [142] J. Le Ny and M. Mohammady, "Differentially private MIMO filtering for event streams," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 145-157, Jan. 2018.
- [143] K. H. Degue and J. Le Ny, "Differentially private interval observer design with bounded input perturbation," *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*, Denver, CO, USA, 2020, pp. 1465-1470.
- [144] M. M. Dawoud, C. Liu, A. Alanwar, and K. H. Johansson, "Differentially private set-based estimation using zonotopes," *2023 European Control Conference (ECC)*, Bucharest, Romania, 2023, pp. 1-8.
- [145] J. Wang, R. Zhu, and S. Liu, "A differentially private unscented Kalman filter for streaming data in IoT," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 6487-6495, 2018.
- [146] H. Andre and J. Le Ny, "A differentially private ensemble Kalman filter for road traffic estimation," *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, New Orleans, LA, USA, pp. 6409-6413, 2017.
- [147] J. Le Ny, "Differentially private nonlinear observer design using contraction analysis," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 30, pp. 4225-4243, 2020.
- [148] S. C. Vishnoi, A. F. Taha, S. A. Nugroho, and C. G. Claudel, "On differential privacy and traffic state estimation problem for connected vehicles," *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Cancun, Mexico, 2022, pp. 1162-1167.
- [149] N. Das and R. Bhattacharya, "Privacy and utility aware data sharing for space situational awareness from ensemble and unscented Kalman filtering perspective," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 1162-1176, 2021.
- [150] G. Chen, L. Sun, and Y. Zhang, "A stealthy artificial noise strategy against eavesdropping for remote estimation sensor networks," *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, vol. 359, no. 18, pp. 10726-10740, 2022.
- [151] A. Moradi, N. K. D. Venkatesh, S. P. Talebi, and S. Werner, "Privacy-preserving distributed Kalman filtering," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 3074-3089, 2022.
- [152] X. Yan, Y. Zhang, D. Xu, and B. Chen, "Distributed confidentiality fusion estimation against eavesdroppers," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 3633-3642, 2022.
- [153] S. Y. Kung, "Compressive privacy: From information estimation theory to machine learning," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 94-112, 2017.
- [154] Y. Song, C. X. Wang, and W. P. Tay, "Compressive privacy for a linear dynamical system," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 895-910, 2020.
- [155] J. Shang, M. Chen, and T. Chen, "Optimal linear encryption against stealthy attacks on remote state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 3592-3607, 2021.
- [156] Z. Guo, D. Shi, K. H. Johansson, and L. Shi, "Optimal linear cyberattack on remote state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 4-13, 2017.
- [157] J. Shang and T. Chen, "Linear encryption against eavesdropping on remote state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 4413-4419, 2023.
- [158] E. Nekouei, T. Tanaka, M. Skoglund, and K. H. Johansson, "Information-theoretic approaches to privacy in estimation and control," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 47, pp. 412-422, 2019.
- [159] E. Nekouei, M. Skoglund, and K. H. Johansson, "Privacy of information sharing schemes in a cloud-based multi-sensor estimation problem," *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*, Milwaukee, WI, USA, pp. 998-1002, 2018.
- [160] E. Nekouei, H. Sandberg, M. Skoglund, and K. H. Johansson, "Optimal privacy-aware estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2253-2266, 2022.
- [161] T. Tanaka, M. Skoglund, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "Directed information and privacy loss in cloud-based control," *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*, Seattle, WA, USA, 2017, pp. 1666-1672.
- [162] H. Liu, J. Zou, X. Ren, and X. Wang, "A privacy-preserving approach against eavesdropping attacks on remote state estimation for cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TCSII.2023.3326734.
- [163] E. Nekouei, H. Sandberg, M. Skoglund, and K. H. Johansson, "A model randomization approach to statistical parameter privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 839-850, 2023.
- [164] H. Hayati, N. van de Wouw, and C. Murguia, "Immersion and Invariance-based Coding for Privacy in Remote Anomaly Detection," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, *22nd IFAC World Congress*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 11191-11196, 2023.

- [165] H. Hayati, N. van de Wouw, and C. Murguia, "Privacy-Preserving Anomaly Detection in Stochastic Dynamical Systems: Synthesis of Optimal Gaussian Mechanisms," *arXiv:2211.03698v2*, 2023.
- [166] H. Hayati, N. van de Wouw, and C. Murguia, "Infinite Horizon Privacy in Networked Control Systems: Utility/Privacy Tradeoffs and Design Tools," *arXiv:2303.17519v2*, 2023.
- [167] L. Schenato, B. Sinopoli, M. Franceschetti, K. Poolla, and S. S. Sastry, "Foundations of control and estimation over lossy networks," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 163–187, 2007.
- [168] T. C. Aysal and K. E. Barner, "Sensor data cryptography in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 273–289, 2008.
- [169] H. Reberedo, J. Xavier, and M. R. D. Rodrigues, "Filter design with secrecy constraints: The MIMO Gaussian wiretap channel," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 15, pp. 3799–3814, 2013.
- [170] L. Yuan, K. Wang, T. Miyazaki, S. Guo, and M. Wu, "Optimal transmission strategy for sensors to defend against eavesdropping and jamming attacks," *2017 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, Paris, France, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [171] A. S. Leong, D. E. Quevedo, D. Dolz, and S. Dey, "Information bounds for state estimation in the presence of an eavesdropper," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 547–552, 2019.
- [172] A. S. Leong, D. E. Quevedo, D. Dolz, and S. Dey, "Remote state estimation over packet dropping links in the presence of an eavesdropper," *arXiv*, 2017, arXiv:1702.02785.
- [173] A. S. Leong, D. E. Quevedo, and S. Dey, "State estimation over Markovian packet dropping links in the presence of an eavesdropper," *Proc. 56th Annu. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*, Melbourne, Australia, Dec. 2017, pp. 6616–6621.
- [174] A. Tsiamis, K. Gatsis, and G. J. Pappas, "State estimation with secrecy against eavesdroppers," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 8385–8392, 2017.
- [175] L. Wang, X. Cao, H. Zhang, C. Sun, W. X. Zheng, "Transmission scheduling for privacy-optimal encryption against eavesdropping attacks on remote state estimation," *Automatica*, 137, 110145, 2022.
- [176] J. Lu, D. E. Quevedo, V. Gupta, and S. Dey, "Stealthy hacking and secrecy of controlled state estimation systems With random dropouts," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 31–46, 2023.
- [177] K. Ding, X. Ren, A. S. Leong, D. E. Quevedo, and L. Shi, "Remote state estimation in the presence of an active eavesdropper," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 229–244, 2021.
- [178] L. Huang, K. Ding, A. S. Leong, D. E. Quevedo, and L. Shi, "Encryption scheduling for remote state estimation under an operation constraint," *Automatica*, vol. 127, 109537, 2021.
- [179] A. Tsiamis, K. Gatsis, and G. J. Pappas, "State estimation codes for perfect secrecy," *Proc. IEEE 56th Conf. Decis. Control*, 2017, pp. 176–181.
- [180] A. Tsiamis, K. Gatsis, and G. J. Pappas, "State-secrecy codes for stable systems," *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2018, pp. 171–177.
- [181] A. Tsiamis, K. Gatsis, and G. J. Pappas, "State-secrecy codes for networked linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2001–2015, 2020.
- [182] P. Chen, W. Yang, Y. Liu, H. Zhang, and Z. Zhao, "Dynamic encoding scheme for state estimation over wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 70, no. 11, pp. 4098–4102, 2023.
- [183] S. Knorn and S. Dey, "Optimal energy allocation for linear control with packet loss under energy harvesting constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 77, pp. 259–267, 2017.
- [184] Y. Li, D. E. Quevedo, S. Dey, and L. Shi, "A game-theoretic approach to fake-acknowledgment attack on cyber-physical systems," *Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2017.
- [185] M. Lücke, J. Lu, and D. E. Quevedo, "Coding for secrecy in remote state estimation with an adversary," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 4955–4962, Sept. 2022.
- [186] J. M. Kennedy, J. J. Ford, D. E. Quevedo, and F. Dressler, "Innovation-based remote state estimation secrecy with no acknowledgments," *ArXiv*, 2212.08234, 2022.
- [187] S. Goel and R. Negi, "Guaranteeing secrecy using artificial noise," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 7, pp. 2180–2189, 2008.
- [188] A. Leong, A. Redder, E. Danie, and S. Dey, "On the use of artificial noise for secure state estimation in the presence of eavesdroppers," *Proc. Eur. Control Conf.*, 2018, pp. 325–330.
- [189] D. Xu, B. Chen, L. Yu, and W. Zhang, "Secure dimensionality reduction fusion estimation against eavesdroppers in cyber-physical systems," *ISA Transactions*, vol. 104, pp. 154–161, 2020.
- [190] D. Xu, X. Yan, B. Chen, and L. Yu, "Energy-constrained confidentiality fusion estimation against eavesdroppers," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 624–628, 2022.
- [191] D. Xu, B. Chen, Y. Zhang, and L. Yu, "Distributed anti-eavesdropping fusion estimation under energy constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2023.3250094.
- [192] X. Guo, A. S. Leong, and S. Dey, "Distortion outage minimization in distributed estimation with estimation secrecy outage constraints," *IEEE Trans. Signal Inf. Process. Netw.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 12–28, 2017.
- [193] X. Guo, A. S. Leong, and S. Dey, "Estimation in wireless sensor networks with security constraints," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 544–561, 2017.
- [194] W. Yang, D. Li, H. Zhang, Y. Tang, and W. X. Zheng, "An encoding mechanism for secrecy of remote state estimation," *Automatica*, vol. 120, 109116, 2020.
- [195] D. Li, Q. Yang, F. Zhang, Y. Wang, Y. Qian, and D. An, "Research on privacy issues in smart metering system: An improved TCN-based NILM attack method and practical DRL-based rechargeable battery assisted privacy preserving method," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3270543.
- [196] L. Yao, X. Huang, Z. Wang, and H. Shen, "Memory-based event-triggered control of Markov jump systems under hybrid cyber attacks: A switching-like adaptive law," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/TASE.2023.3324649.
- [197] X. Zhou, L. Song, and Y. Zhang, *Physical Layer Security in Wireless Communications*, Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2014.
- [198] F. Farivar, M. S. Haghghi, A. Jolfaei and M. Alazab, "Artificial intelligence for detection, estimation, and compensation of malicious attacks in nonlinear cyber-physical systems and industrial IoT," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 2716–2725, 2020.