

# Preserving Privacy in Cloud-based Data-Driven Stabilization

Teimour Hosseinalizadeh, Nima Monshizadeh

**Abstract**—In the recent years, we have observed three significant trends in control systems: a renewed interest in data-driven control design, the abundance of cloud computational services and the importance of preserving privacy for the system under control. Motivated by these factors, this work investigates privacy-preserving outsourcing for the design of a stabilizing controller for unknown linear time-invariant systems. The main objective of this research is to preserve the privacy for the system dynamics by designing an outsourcing mechanism. To achieve this goal, we propose a scheme that combines transformation-based techniques and robust data-driven control design methods. The scheme preserves the privacy of both the open-loop and closed-loop system matrices while stabilizing the system under control. The scheme is applicable to both data with and without disturbance and is lightweight in terms of computational overhead. Numerical investigations for a case study demonstrate the impacts of our mechanism and its role in hindering malicious adversaries from achieving their goals.

**Index Terms**—Privacy, Cloud-based Control, Data-driven control

## I. INTRODUCTION

Cloud-based services enable access to computing resources such as networks, servers, storage and applications that can be rapidly provisioned and released with minimal management effort or service provider interactions [1]. Researchers in control systems have documented the enhancement of conventional control technologies by leveraging cloud-based services across numerous industries. For instance, cloud-based control offers a 53% energy saving and a 36% improvement in thermal comfort for an office building [2], reduces electrical energy consumption in geothermal fields [3] and lowers peak demand during the cooling season in public schools [4]. Nonetheless, numerous security issue arises in cloud-based control due to the nature of cloud computing, one of which is the unauthorized access of could to privacy-sensitive parameters of the system and controller [5].

*Related studies:* Since the advent of privacy concerns in control systems [6], preserving privacy has become the focus of many studies using a wide range of methods and for a wide range of applications. For instance, [7] proposes a cloud-based load frequency control in power systems using homomorphic encryption, while [8] employs encryption to preserve privacy in platooning control of vehicular systems. Additionally, [9] addresses the problem of distributed economic dispatch in microgrids using edge-based additive

perturbations, and [10] explores outsourcing controllers for switched LPV systems using differential privacy. For a review of privacy-preserving methods in control systems, we refer to the surveys in [11] and [12].

In the literature on privacy for control systems there have been numerous studies with focus on preserving the privacy for the *system model or parameters* against adversaries. For instance, [13] considers the problem of privacy-preserving releasing of a dynamic model describing the aggregate input-output dynamics of subsystems, [14] motivated by the model of the system as a trade secret designs optimal filters for constructing additive noise, [15] considers preserving privacy for the state matrix in a linear quadratic problem, [16] studies the problem of securely outsourcing the solution of algebraic Riccati equations while [17] considers designing synthetic noise for a multiagent systems monitored by a control center and in the presence of an intruder. The main difference between these studies and the current work is that in these papers, the system model is known when designing a privacy-preserving mechanism. Furthermore, with the exception of [16], these studies utilize noise which its amount is adjusted based on differential privacy or Fisher information matrix [15] to guarantee privacy against adversaries. This introduces the well-known privacy-performance trade-off.

With the ever-increasing complexities of dynamic systems, the controller or privacy-preserving mechanism designer may not have the accurate system model to accomplish their tasks. This has been a key motivation (among others) for the recent renewed interest in data-driven control, which uses input and output trajectories of a system rooted in behavioral framework [18] (see [19] and [20]). The literature on secure control has also adopted this framework for which we refer to [21]–[23].

This brings us to the second class of studies with the focus on preserving privacy for the system model, which this research also belongs to, and that is the case where the designer of the privacy-persevering mechanism *does not know* the model of the system. For instance, [24] considers a cloud-based reinforcement learning (RL) where updating the value function is outsourced to the cloud, [25] studies cloud-based data-driven model predictive control inspired by the behavioral framework, and [26] presents a secure RL-based control method for unknown linear time-invariant (LTI) systems where a dynamic camouflaging technique is used to misguide the eavesdropper. The studies [24] and [25] rely on CKKS as a Fully Homomorphic Encryption (FHE) to prevent the cloud from inferring sensitive information. While FHE provides strong privacy guarantees it can introduce additional computational overhead and possibly delays as they report in [24]. The paper [26] draws on dynamical

The authors are with the Engineering and Technology Institute, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands. Email: {t.hosseinalizadeh, n.monshizadeh}@rug.nl. This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

systems theory to hide sensitive information, however it only considers an eavesdropper in the learning phase of the algorithm and permits the cloud to access privacy-sensitive data in the design phase. This approach differs significantly from our problem structure, as well as from the studies in [24] and [25], where the cloud is not trusted

This research aims to design a data-driven stabilizing controller for an unknown LTI system by following the paradigm presented in [19]. The additional constraint we impose is the preservation of privacy for both open-loop and closed-loop system matrices when the controller design is performed by the cloud. To achieve this goal, we propose a scheme that combines transformation-based methods and robust controllers design approaches. The scheme provides a privacy budget for the closed-loop system allowing the system designer to conceal the closed-loop system, even in the presence of unknown disturbances in the system's dynamics. Furthermore, through extensive numerical simulations we demonstrate the strong effects of the proposed scheme in preventing active adversaries from performing bias injection attacks on the system. To summarize, the contributions of this research are as follows:

- 1) Preserving privacy for both open-loop and closed-loop system matrices while designing a stabilizing controller
- 2) Providing a privacy budget for the closed-loop system
- 3) Guaranteeing privacy for systems in the presence of unknown disturbances

Additionally, the scheme does not degrade the controller's performance, unlike noise-based methods, and is lightweight in terms of computational complexity.

*Notation:* We denote the identity matrix of size  $n$  by  $I_n$ , the zero matrix of size  $n \times m$  by  $0_{n \times m}$  and drop the subscript whenever the dimension is clear from the context. For a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , we denote its induced 2-norm, and Moore-Penrose inverse by  $\|A\|$ , and  $A^\dagger$ , respectively. By  $A \succ 0$  ( $\succeq 0$ ), we mean  $A$  is a positive (semi-) definite matrix and by  $A^{1/2}$  we denote its unique positive (semi-) definite square root. We also denote  $\begin{bmatrix} A & B^\top \\ B & C \end{bmatrix}$  by  $\begin{bmatrix} A & \star \\ B & C \end{bmatrix}$ .

*Organization:* The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section II presents preliminaries and problem formulation, Section III provides a privacy-preserving scheme for systems without disturbance while Section IV extends the scheme to systems with disturbance. Numerical simulations and concluding remarks are provided in Sections V and VI, respectively.

## II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM SETUP

In this section we present the preliminaries and problem setup.

### A. Preliminaries

We frequently encounter a set  $\Sigma$  of systems parameterized through a quadratic matrix inequality (QMI) as

$$\Sigma := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid C + B^\top Z + Z^\top B + Z^\top A Z \preceq 0\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $A \succ 0$  and  $B^\top A^{-1} B - C \succeq 0$ . The matrices  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  are generally known and dependent on the data collected from a system.

We are particularly interested in a controller  $K$  that render all matrices  $A + BK$ , with  $[A \ B]^\top \in \Sigma$ , Schur stable. A necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence and design (in case of existence) of such a stabilizing controller is provided by the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\Sigma$  determine the set of linear systems given by the pair  $(A, B)$ . Then there exist the matrices  $K$  and  $P \succ 0$  such that*

$$(A + BK)P(A + BK)^\top - P \prec 0 \quad \text{for all } [A \ B]^\top \in \Sigma$$

*if and only if there exist  $Y$  and  $P \succ 0$  such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -P - C & \star & \star \\ 0 & -P & \star \\ B & \begin{bmatrix} P \\ Y \end{bmatrix} & -A \end{bmatrix} \prec 0. \quad (2)$$

*If (2) is feasible, then  $K = YP^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is given in [27, Thm.1].  $\square$

In this manuscript, we ask for solving LMIs in the form of (2) by specifying the matrices  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  in the set  $\Sigma$ .

### B. Problem setup

We consider a linear system described by equations of the form

$$x(t+1) = A_\star x(t) + B_\star u(t), \quad (3)$$

with state  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and input  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . In this study, the matrices  $A_\star$  and  $B_\star$  are real, constant and *unknown*. Furthermore, we assume that  $B_\star$  has full column rank.

We collect data from the system (3) by applying the input sequence  $u(0), u(1), \dots, u(T-1)$  and measuring the states  $x(0), x(1), \dots, x(T)$ . The collected data is organized into the matrices  $(X_0, X_1, U_0)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &:= [x(0) \ x(1) \ \cdots \ x(T-1)] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}, \\ X_1 &:= [x(1) \ x(2) \ \cdots \ x(T)] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}, \\ U_0 &:= [u(0) \ u(1) \ \cdots \ u(T-1)] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times T}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that that these data matrices satisfy

$$X_1 = A_\star X_0 + B_\star U_0. \quad (5)$$

We aim to have a controller  $u(t) = K_\star x(t)$  with  $K_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  to stabilize system (3) by using data (4). To achieve this, we outsource the computation of this controller to a cloud computing service which we refer to as Cloud.

Additionally, we want to preserve the privacy of the open-loop  $(A_\star, B_\star)$  and closed-loop matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  against Cloud. The main reason for this privacy constraint is that these matrices typically contain sensitive information about the process under control. Such information can be leaked to curious adversaries as a result of outsourcing the control problem to Cloud. Moreover, knowledge of these matrices can be leveraged to design additional and potentially more powerful cyber-attacks. We refer the reader to Figure 1 in




Fig. 1. A framework for preserving privacy in Cloud-based direct data-driven control. The pre-processing mechanism  $f_0(\cdot)$  is applied to the data collected from system then the results are transmitted to Cloud where it executes a predefined algorithm  $f_1(\cdot)$  for obtaining the controller  $\bar{K}$ . The post-processing mechanism  $f_2(\cdot)$  modifies the obtained controller to the final controller  $K_*$  which is applied to the system.

[28] for the role that model knowledge plays in designing zero dynamics, covert and bias injection attacks. Later, in Section V, we demonstrate that how a successful bias injection attack relies on the accuracy of model knowledge.

Our target applications are dynamical systems with low computational capabilities or in extreme cases without any computational resources, meaning we only have access to the system's sensors and actuators. For complex systems (high dimensions in states and inputs) designing a data-driven controller can be computationally intensive. This challenge is further compounded in unstable systems, where large value measurements must be stored and processed. Additionally, in switched dynamical systems, frequent data measurements and controller updates may be required which introduces significant computational overhead (see [29] for data-driven control of switched systems).

We have the following assumption with regard to the collected data in this manuscript:

**Assumption 1.** The matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ U_0 \end{bmatrix}$  in (4) has full row rank.

The assumption can be checked directly from the data, and it is satisfied under persistently exciting inputs of sufficiently high order [18].

*Remark 1.* Assumption 1 is aligned with the general assumption in the privacy literature that without any privacy-preserving mechanism an adversary should be considered capable of finding privacy-sensitive information (see, e.g., maxim number one in [30, p.371]). In particular, without any privacy-preserving mechanism in place, Cloud can identify the system matrices  $(A_*, B_*)$  from data in (4) under Assumption 1.

Figure 1 shows the sketch for the privacy-preserving scheme in this study. The functions  $f_0$  (pre-processing mechanism) and  $f_2$  (post-processing mechanism) and the algorithm  $f_1$  (outsourced mechanism) are our design tools. Data collected from the system undergoes pre-processing via  $f_0(\cdot)$  and is then transmitted to Cloud, where the predefined algorithm  $f_1(\cdot)$  computes the controller  $\bar{K}$ . The post-processing mechanism  $f_2(\cdot)$  then adjusts  $\bar{K}$  to the final controller  $K_*$  which is applied to the system. We further determine the general properties of these tools in the following assumption:

**Assumption 2.** The followings are assumed:

A2.1. We design  $f_0$ ,  $f_1$ , and  $f_2$  and Cloud executes  $f_1$

honestly.

A2.2. The function  $f_0$  and  $f_2$  are publicly known except for their secret parameters that are randomly chosen.

Assumption A2.1. determines Cloud model in our setup. We further point out that while Cloud in this study is a passive adversary, it can share its obtained information with active adversaries or it can be compromised by these adversaries. Assumption A2.2. is aligned with Kirchhoff's principle which requires that an encryption scheme must be designed to be secure even if the adversary knows all the details of the scheme except for the key (see, e.g. [31, p.7]).

It should be noted that the functions  $f_0$  and  $f_2$  should impose less computational burden compared to  $f_1$ , as the former ones will be locally executed.

In this work, we say that privacy for the matrices  $A_*$ ,  $B_*$  and  $A_* + B_*K_*$  is preserved if Cloud cannot uniquely identify their values based on the available information. Next, we formally present the problem of interest:

**Problem 1.** Let the data (4) be available from the system (3) and suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Design pre- and post-processing mechanisms  $f_0$  and  $f_2$  and the algorithm  $f_1$  such that:

- P1. The closed-loop system  $A_* + B_*K_*$  is stable.
- P2. The open-loop system matrices  $A_*$  and  $B_*$  remain private against Cloud.
- P3. The closed-loop system  $A_* + B_*K_*$  remains private against Cloud.

Next, we present our privacy-preserving scheme for the system (3) solving Problem 1. Subsequently, in Section IV, we discuss how the proposed scheme can be modified to cope with the scenario where the input-state data is corrupted by disturbances.

### III. PRESERVING PRIVACY FOR SYSTEMS WITHOUT DISTURBANCE

In this section, we first provide a stabilizing controller while preserving privacy for the open-loop system. Subsequently, we preserve privacy for the closed-loop system.

### A. Preserving privacy for the open-loop system

Recall that the data set (4) has been collected from system (3). We apply a transformation given by

$$V_0 := \begin{bmatrix} -(I + G_1)^{-1}F_1 & (I + G_1)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ U_0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where  $F_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $G_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  are randomly selected matrices such that  $I + G_1$  is invertible. Noting (5), applying the transformation (6) yields

$$X_1 = (A_\star + B_\star F_1)X_0 + (B_\star + B_\star G_1)V_0. \quad (7)$$

While the transformation (6) is performed on the collected data, which can be considered as the cyber part of a cyber-physical system, we explain in the remark below how it can also be regarded as a primary feedback for the system under control.

*Remark 2.* The transformation (6) can be considered equivalently as first applying a primary feedback

$$u(t) = F_1 x(t) + (I_m + G_1)v(t),$$

to the system (3) and then collecting data from the system

$$x(t+1) = (A_\star + B_\star F_1)x(t) + (B_\star + B_\star G_1)v(t),$$

by treating  $v(t)$  as the independent input. The collected data satisfies (7) as desired. This observation obviates the need to perform inversion for the matrix  $(I + G_1)$ , which incurs the cost of  $\mathcal{O}(m^3)$ , and is imposed on either the pre- or post-processing mechanism.

The transformation (6) constitutes the pre-processing mechanism, i.e.  $f_0$ , of the proposed privacy scheme. Next, we ask Cloud to solve the data-driven stabilization problem, but using the transformed data  $(X_1, X_0, V_0)$ . This brings us to the following result.

**Proposition 1.** *Let Cloud receive the data matrices  $(X_1, X_0, V_0)$  given in (4) and (6). Furthermore, let Cloud solve the LMI (2) with matrices  $(A, B, C)$  given by*

$$A = I_{n+m}, \quad B^\top = -X_1 \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ V_0 \end{bmatrix}^\dagger, \quad C = B^\top B. \quad (8)$$

*Assuming that this LMI is feasible, denote its solution by  $(\bar{Y}, \bar{P})$  and set  $\bar{K} := \bar{Y}\bar{P}^{-1}$ . Then the following holds:*

- (i) *Stability: The matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  is stable where  $K_\star = F_1 + (I + G_1)\bar{K}$ .*
- (ii) *Open-loop privacy: The matrices  $A_\star$  and  $B_\star$  remain private against Cloud.*

*Proof of (i):* By Lemma 1, the matrix  $A + BK$  is stable for any  $(A, B)$  belonging to the set

$$\mathcal{C} := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid C + B^\top Z + Z^\top B + Z^\top A Z \preceq 0\},$$

with  $A, B, C$  given by (8). It is easy to see that above set is a singleton and equals to  $\mathcal{C} = \{-(A^{-1}B)\}$ . By (7), it follows that

$$\underline{Z} := [A_\star + B_\star F_1 \quad B_\star + B_\star G_1]^\top \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Since the program (2) is feasible with  $\bar{K} = \bar{Y}\bar{P}^{-1}$ , we conclude that  $A_\star + B_\star(F_1 + (I + G_1)\bar{K})$  is stable.

*Proof of (ii):* The set of matrices that Cloud receives from us is

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{Cloud}} := \{X_1, X_0, V_0\}. \quad (9)$$

By Assumption 1, the only pair that is consistent with the received data is

$$\bar{A} = A_\star + B_\star F_1, \quad \bar{B} = B_\star + B_\star G_1, \quad (10)$$

where  $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$  is the unique solution to  $X_1 = \bar{A}X_0 + \bar{B}V_0$ . Note that  $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$  can be computed by Cloud from the data  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{Cloud}}$ . Denote  $G := I + G_1$  and consider the set

$$\mathcal{Q}(\tilde{F}_1, \tilde{G}) := \{(\tilde{G}^{-1}\tilde{F}_1, \tilde{G}^{-1}G)\}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\tilde{F}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $\tilde{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  are random matrices. It can be verified that for any arbitrary pair  $(\tilde{F}_1, \tilde{G})$ , the system matrices  $(\hat{A}_\star, \hat{B}_\star) = (\bar{A} - B_\star \tilde{F}_1, B_\star \tilde{G})$  together with the matrices  $(\hat{F}_1, \hat{G}) \in \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{F}_1, \tilde{G})$  satisfy the equalities

$$\bar{A} = \hat{A}_\star + \hat{B}_\star \hat{F}_1, \quad \bar{B} = \hat{B}_\star + B_\star G_1,$$

and thus are consistent with (10). Therefore, the true  $A_\star$  and  $B_\star$  remain unknown to Cloud. This completes the proof.  $\square$

In the following remark, we establish the relation of the transformation to secure computation literature.

*Remark 3.* It can be observed from Proposition 1 that what Cloud identifies by receiving  $(X_0, X_1, V_0)$  depends on  $\text{im } B_\star$ . In other words,  $A_\star$  and  $B_\star$  are unknown up to  $\text{im } B_\star$  for Cloud. In fully actuated systems, we have  $m = n$  and  $\text{im } B_\star = \mathbb{R}^n$ , and thus Cloud can only identify the matrices  $\tilde{A} := A_\star + \Delta A_\star$  and  $\tilde{B} := B_\star + \Delta B_\star$  where  $\Delta A_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $\Delta B_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  are arbitrary. In this case, the scheme becomes the one-time pad encryption scheme in cryptography [31, Thm.2.9] where it is perfectly secret. We refer the reader to [31, Def.2.3] for the exact definition of a perfectly secret encryption scheme, but generally speaking in this kind of schemes it is impossible to distinguish an encryption of a message  $m$  (matrices  $A_\star$  and  $B_\star$ ) from an encryption of  $\hat{m}$  (matrices  $\hat{A}_\star$  and  $\hat{B}_\star$ ).

Bearing in mind the definition of  $K_\star$ , we have  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star = \bar{A} + \bar{B}\bar{K}$  with  $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$  being the unique solution to

$$X_1 = \bar{A}X_0 + \bar{B}V_0. \quad (12)$$

As Cloud knows the matrices  $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$  together with the controller  $\bar{K}$ , it retrieves the closed-loop matrix, which is a breach of privacy with regard to P3 in Problem 1. Hence, Proposition 1, by itself, does not provide a solution to Problem 1 and it requires modification. In the next subsection, we change the algorithm  $f_1$  executed by Cloud and propose a suitable post-processing  $f_2$  of the matrix  $\bar{K}$  to patch this privacy hole.

### B. Preserving privacy for the closed-loop system

Let  $\bar{Z} := [\bar{A} \ \bar{B}]^\top$ , where  $\bar{A}$  and  $\bar{B}$  are uniquely obtained from (12). For a given  $\gamma \geq 0$ , define

$$\mathcal{C}(\gamma) := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid \|Z - \bar{Z}\| \leq \gamma\}. \quad (13)$$

The set  $C(\gamma)$  can be written in the form of  $\Sigma$  given in (1) as

$$C(\gamma) = \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid C + B^\top Z + Z^\top B + Z^\top A Z \preceq 0\},$$

with

$$A = I_{n+m}, \quad B^\top = -X_1 \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ V_0 \end{bmatrix}^\dagger, \quad C = B^\top B - \gamma^2 I_n. \quad (14)$$

Based on the set  $C(\gamma)$ , we define the following semi-definite program (SDP):

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{P, Y, \gamma \geq 0} \quad & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (2) \text{ with } (A, B, C) \text{ in } (14). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Note that the program (15) is feasible with  $\gamma > 0$  as long as the system (3) is stabilizable. In the following result, we show how solving (15) by Cloud and suitably modifying its solution provides us with the desired results.

**Proposition 2.** *Let Cloud receive the data matrices  $(X_1, X_0, V_0)$  given in (4) and (6). Furthermore, let Cloud solve the SDP (15) with the solution  $(\bar{P}, \bar{Y}, \bar{\gamma})$  and  $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ . Let  $\bar{K} := \bar{Y}\bar{P}^{-1}$ , and select  $F_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $G_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  such that*

$$\|[F_2 - F_1 \quad G_2 - G_1]\| \leq \frac{\bar{\gamma}}{\|B_\star\|}, \quad (16)$$

and

$$[F_2 - F_1 \quad G_2 - G_1] \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \bar{K} \end{bmatrix} \neq 0. \quad (17)$$

Choose

$$K_\star = F_2 + (I + G_2)\bar{K}. \quad (18)$$

Then the following statements hold:

- (i) *Stability:* The matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  is stable.
- (ii) *Open-loop privacy:* The matrices  $A_\star$  and  $B_\star$  remain private against Cloud.
- (iii) *Closed-loop privacy:* The matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  remains private against Cloud.

*Proof of (i):* It follows from (16) that

$$\|[B_\star(F_2 - F_1) \quad B_\star(G_2 - G_1)]\| \leq \bar{\gamma},$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \|[A_\star + B_\star F_2 \quad B_\star + B_\star G_2] - \\ & [A_\star + B_\star F_1 \quad B_\star + B_\star G_1]\| \leq \bar{\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, bearing in mind (7), (12), and (13), the pair  $[A_\star + B_\star F_2 \quad B_\star + B_\star G_2] \in C(\gamma)$  and hence the controller  $\bar{K}$  stabilizes it, i.e., the matrix

$$A_\star + B_\star F_2 + (B_\star + B_\star G_2)\bar{K}$$

is stable. By (18), we conclude that the matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  is stable.

*Proof of (ii):* By noticing that Cloud receives the same data matrices as in (9) the proof reduces to the proof of Proposition 1.(ii)

*Proof of (iii):* To prove this statement, first recall that the matrices  $F_1$  and  $G_1$  are randomly selected in (6). Define the matrices

$$\bar{A}_{cl} := A_\star + B_\star F_1 + (B_\star + B_\star G_1)\bar{K} \quad (19a)$$

$$\Delta := B_\star(F_2 - F_1) + B_\star(G_2 - G_1)\bar{K}. \quad (19b)$$

By (17), it follows that  $\Delta \neq 0$ . In addition, note that

$$\bar{A}_{cl} + \Delta = A_\star + B_\star K_\star. \quad (20)$$

Note that  $\bar{A}_{cl}$  is revealed to Cloud (see (12) and the subsequent discussion) and that  $\bar{K}$  is known to Cloud. Nevertheless, since  $\Delta \neq 0$  and unknown to Cloud then the closed-loop system  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  remains private against Cloud.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** By working with the SDP (15), rather than simply stabilizing the pair  $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$  as in Proposition 1, we create an additional uncertainty layer. The extent of this uncertainty is proportional to  $\bar{\gamma}$  returned by Cloud. A higher value provides a larger set for the designer to pick the second pair of random matrices  $F_2$  and  $G_2$  in (16). The additional constraint in (17) is to ensure that the designer does not pick a pair that results in the same closed-loop system as before, i.e.  $\bar{A} + \bar{B}\bar{K}$ .

**Remark 5.** While selecting  $F_2$  and  $G_2$  in (16) requires the value of  $\|B_\star\|$ , the results remain to hold if any known upper bound of  $\|B_\star\|$  is used in (16). Nevertheless, the accuracy of this upper bound will affect the size of uncertainty set mentioned in Remark 4.

We summarize the results to provide a solution to Problem 1.

**Theorem 1.** *Let the data set (4) be collected from the system (3). Then the pre-processing mechanism  $f_0$  given in (6), the algorithm  $f_1$  given in (15) and the post-processing mechanism  $f_2$  given in (16)-(18) provide a solution to Problem 1.*

*Proof.* The proof follows from the proof of Propositions 1 and 2.  $\square$

#### IV. PRESERVING PRIVACY FOR SYSTEMS WITH DISTURBANCE

In the previous section, we assumed the data was “clean”. However, in practice, data is often subject to disturbances. To address this, we now consider a scenario where the data is collected from the following system (see also [27] and [32]):

$$x(t+1) = A_\star x(t) + B_\star u(t) + d(t), \quad (21)$$

where  $d(t)$  is an unknown disturbance. The presence of the disturbance per se in the system dynamics requires a redesign of the algorithm  $f_1$  executed by Cloud to obtain a stabilizing controller. In terms of privacy, while the disturbance  $d(\cdot)$  in (21) can potentially create uncertainties for Cloud regarding the open-loop and closed-loop matrices, we do not consider  $d(\cdot)$  as an enhancing factor in the privacy-preserving scheme. One of the reasons is that de-noising techniques have been adopted in the literature on data driven control to decrease the

effects of the disturbance on the collected data (see, e.g., [33, Sec.6]). Furthermore, as studied in [34], the identification of a system through data can result in a consistency set which can be substantially smaller than the set on which the control design is based (see the case study in [34, Sec.5]). Therefore, as a privacy-aware approach, we ensure that privacy guarantees required by Problem 1 are independent of both the presence of disturbance and Cloud's strategy in estimating privacy-sensitive parameters.

Due to presence of disturbance, the equation (5) modifies to

$$X_1 = A_* X_0 + B_* U_0 + D_0, \quad (22)$$

where

$$D_0 := [d(0) \ d(1) \ \dots \ d(T-1)] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}.$$

We consider the disturbance class

$$\mathcal{D} := \{D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T} \mid DD^\top \preceq \Delta \Delta^\top\}, \quad (23)$$

for some known  $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}$ . The matrix  $\Delta$  is based on prior information that we have over  $d(\cdot)$ . While the matrix  $D_0$  is unknown, we assume that it belongs to the set in (23) as formally stated next:

**Assumption 3.**  $D_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ .

The disturbance set (23) captures notable classes of  $d(\cdot)$  in system and control as has been studied in the data-driven control literature; see e.g. [27], [32], and [35]. By applying the transformation (6) to the data in (22), we have that

$$X_1 = \underbrace{(A_* + B_* F_1)}_{=:A} X_0 + \underbrace{(B_* + B_* G_1)}_{=:B} V_0 + D_0. \quad (24)$$

By isolating  $D_0$  and substituting it in (23), we can write the consistency set for  $(A, B)$  as

$$\mathcal{C} := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid C + B^\top Z + Z^\top B + Z^\top A Z \preceq 0\}, \quad (25)$$

with the matrices obtained from transformed data

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ V_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ V_0 \end{bmatrix}^\top, \quad B = - \begin{bmatrix} X_0 \\ V_0 \end{bmatrix} X_1^\top, \quad (26)$$

$$C = X_1 X_1^\top - \Delta \Delta^\top.$$

We note that the set  $\mathcal{C}$  differs from the actual data consistency set of the system corresponding to (22), thanks to the presence of the random matrices  $F_1$  and  $G_1$ . Subsequently, we ask Cloud to solve the LMI (2) with the matrices  $A, B, C$  given above. An analogous statement to Proposition 1 can be stated for stability of the closed-loop matrix  $A_* + B_* K_*$  and the privacy of  $(A_*, B_*)$ . Nevertheless, preserving privacy of the closed-loop remains to be an issue, following a similar discussion as in Subsection III-B and noting that Cloud could potentially identify the matrix  $Z_* := (A_* + B_* F_1, B_* + B_* G_1)$  by removing the effect of  $D_0$  in (24). Next, building on the idea in (15), we propose a mechanism that preserves privacy of the closed-loop.

#### A. Preserving privacy for the closed-loop system with disturbance

For a given  $\gamma \geq 0$ , define

$$C(\gamma) := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid \|Z - \bar{Z}\| \leq \gamma, \text{ for some } \bar{Z} \in \mathcal{C}\}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is given by (25). This set serves as an extension of (13) to the case where disturbance is present in the data, which, with a slight abuse of notation, is denoted again by  $C(\gamma)$ . Loosely speaking, the set  $C(\gamma)$  enlarges the data consistency set (25) by  $\gamma$  in every direction; see Figure 2. Now, we can form a similar SDP as in (15) to stabilize the pair  $[A \ B]^\top \in C(\gamma)$ . However, the main challenge in designing such an algorithm is that  $C(\gamma)$  cannot in general be written in the form of a QMI and thus we cannot readily apply Lemma 1. To tackle this challenge, we provide an over-approximation for  $C(\gamma)$  in the form of a QMI in Proposition 3. As the derivation of this over-approximation relies on rewriting the set (25), we present its proof along a required lemma in the Appendix.




Fig. 2. The pair  $Z_* = (A_* + B_* F_1, B_* + B_* G_1)$  (bullet point), its  $\gamma$ -neighborhood systems (green), the consistency set  $\mathcal{C}$  (blue) and the set  $C(\gamma)$  (red) for a system with  $n = m = 1$ . Note the red surface covers the blue surface.

**Proposition 3.** Let  $C(\gamma)$  be the set defined in (27). Define the set  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  as

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}} := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid \bar{C} + B^\top Z + Z^\top B + Z^\top A Z \preceq 0\},$$

with

$$\bar{C} := C - (2\gamma \left\| A^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left\| (B^\top A^{-1} B - C)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| + \gamma^2 \|A\|) I_n. \quad (28)$$

Then, it holds that  $C(\gamma) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ .

By having an over-approximation for the set (27), we define the optimization program

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{P, Y, \gamma > 0} \quad & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (2) \text{ with } (A, B, \bar{C}) \text{ in } (26), (28). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Next, we present the main result of this section:

**Theorem 2.** Let the data  $(X_0, X_1, U_0)$  be collected from the system (21). Suppose that (29) be feasible with the solution

$(\bar{P}, \bar{Y}, \bar{\gamma})$ . Consider the pre-processing mechanism  $f_0$  given in (6), the algorithm  $f_1$  given in (29) and the post-processing mechanism  $f_2$  given in (16)-(18).

Then:

- (i) *Stability: The matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  is stable.*
- (ii) *Open-loop privacy: The matrices  $A_\star$  and  $B_\star$  remain private against Cloud.*
- (iii) *Closed-loop privacy: The matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  remains private against Cloud.*

*Proof of (i):* Analogous to the proof of Proposition 2.(i), the pair  $[A_\star + B_\star F_2 \quad B_\star + B_\star G_2] \in C(\gamma)$  in (27). By Proposition 3, we have that  $C(\gamma) \subseteq \bar{C}$  and therefore the aforementioned pair belongs to  $\bar{C}$ . By feasibility of the optimization (29) and bearing in mind (18), it follows that the matrix  $A_\star + B_\star K_\star$  is stable.

*Proof of (ii):* It is sufficient to prove the statement for the case where Cloud knows the disturbance matrix  $D_0$ . This assumption reduces the proof to the proof of Proposition 1.(ii) with the only difference that  $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$  in (10) is now the unique solution to  $X_1 - D_0 = \bar{A}X_0 + \bar{B}V_0$ .

*Proof of (iii):* Again, it is sufficient to prove the statement for the case where Cloud knows  $D_0$ . Under this assumption, Cloud infers the value of  $\bar{A}_{cl}$  in (19a), but not the nonzero matrix  $\Delta$  in (19b). This completes the proof (see also the proof of Proposition 2.(iii)).  $\square$

## V. CASE STUDY

In order to examine the proposed privacy-preserving scheme, we consider a batch reactor system which its discrete linearized model is given by [19]

$$[A_\star \mid B_\star] = 10^{-3} \begin{bmatrix} 1178 & 1 & 511 & -403 & 4 & -87 \\ -51 & 661 & -11 & 61 & 467 & 1 \\ 76 & 335 & 560 & 382 & 213 & -235 \\ 0 & 335 & 89 & 849 & 213 & -16 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

Note that the system is open-loop unstable and the true model is only used for collecting data.

For generating the data set (4)<sup>1</sup>, we apply to each input channel a random input sequence from the uniform distribution  $u \sim U(-5, 5)$  with length  $T = 20$  and we set  $x_0 \sim U(-2.5, 2.5)$ . For the privacy mechanism in Theorem 1 ( $f_0$  mechanism), we randomly select entries of  $F_1$  and  $G_1$  from uniform distribution  $U(-1, 1)$  and then ask Cloud to solve the optimization (15). The program is feasible and returns the solution

$$\bar{K} = 10^{-3} \begin{bmatrix} 1907 & -1439 & 1372 & -2721 \\ 3798 & 69 & 2305 & -2663 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\gamma} = 0.054 \quad (31)$$

Then from Theorem 1 and assuming that  $\|B_\star\|$  is known, we select  $F_2$  and  $G_2$  such that (16) and (17) hold and apply  $K_\star = F_2 + (I + G_2)\bar{K}$  to the system. The controller  $K_\star$  stabilizes system (30) as shown in Figure 3 (blue line).

<sup>1</sup>Simulation files are available at [https://github.com/teimour-halizadeh/privacy\\_data\\_driven\\_control](https://github.com/teimour-halizadeh/privacy_data_driven_control)

### A. Preventing bias injection attack

As we argued in Subsection II-B, an accurate model knowledge plays a crucial role in designing stronger attacks against a system. We consider a scenario where either Cloud shares the information that it has obtained with an active adversary denoted as  $\mathcal{A}$  or Cloud has been compromised by  $\mathcal{A}$ . The set of parameters that  $\mathcal{A}$  receives from Cloud is

$$\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{A} := \{X_1, X_0, V_0, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{K}\}.$$

Furthermore, based on Assumption 2,  $\mathcal{A}$  knows the mechanisms  $f_0$ ,  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ .

The goal of  $\mathcal{A}$  is to inject a bias with high impact into steady-state trajectory of the system while remaining undetected. For reaching this goal, we assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  follows the procedure in [28, Sec. 4.6]. In terms of disruption resources,  $\mathcal{A}$  has access to the actuator data of the system and injects (adds) a signal  $a(t)$  to  $u(t)$  at time  $t = T_{inj}$  and thus allows  $u(t) + a(t)$  be applied to system (30). The form of the attack signal [28, Eq. 19] for  $t \geq T_{inj}$  is given by

$$a(t+1) = \beta I_2 a(t) + (1-\beta)I_2 a_\infty,$$

where  $a(T_{inj}) = 0$  and  $0 < \beta < 1$ . The main parameter that  $\mathcal{A}$  should design is  $a_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for which it needs to consider two factors: First how to maximize its impact on the states of the system and second how to do so while remaining undetected.

The steady-state impact of  $a(t)$  on the states of the closed-loop system is given by

$$x_\infty^a := (I - \hat{A}_{cl})^{-1} \hat{B}_{cl} a_\infty, \quad (32)$$

where  $\hat{A}_{cl} = A_\star + B_\star F_2 + (B_\star + B_\star G_2)\bar{K}$  and  $\hat{B}_{cl} = B_\star$  are the true values of the closed-loop state matrix and the input matrix, respectively.

On the system side we assume that the system is equipped with an anomaly detection given by

$$r(t) = x(t), \quad t \geq T_a, \quad (33)$$

where  $r(t)$  is the residual at time  $t$  and  $T_a$  is a sufficiently large time constant. We also consider the set

$$\mathcal{U} := \{\|r(t)\| \leq \delta_\alpha, \forall t \geq T_a\}, \quad (34)$$

where  $\delta_\alpha \geq 0$ . Note that we assume  $\delta_\alpha$  is known to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

For injecting a maximum-energy bias while remaining unnoticed (stealthy) the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  thus needs to solve the optimization [28, Eq.21]

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{a_\infty} \quad & \|x_\infty^a\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & r(t) \in \mathcal{U}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Note that the constraint at steady-state is equivalent to  $\|x_\infty^a\| \leq \delta_\alpha$ .

We set  $\delta_\alpha = 0.2$  in set (34) and assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  starts injecting  $a(t)$  with  $\beta = 0.5$  at  $T_{inj} = 10$  by first attempting to solve the optimization (35).

In Table I, we have specified knowledge levels for  $\mathcal{A}$  and different bias injection policies that it adopts for solving (35).



TABLE I  
KNOWLEDGE OF  $\mathcal{A}$  AND ITS POLICIES FOR BIAS INJECTION

True values	$B_{cl} = B_*$ $A_{cl} = A_* + B_*F_2 + (B_* + B_*G_2)\bar{K}$
Knowledge of $\mathcal{A}$	$\hat{A} = A_* + B_*F_1$ $\hat{B} = B_* + B_*G_1$ $\bar{K}, \bar{\gamma}, \delta_\alpha$
Policy of $\mathcal{A}$	(I): exact knowledge $\hat{B}_{cl} = B_*$ $\hat{A}_{cl} = A_* + B_*F_2 + (B_* + B_*G_2)\bar{K}$ (II): uses its estimation $\hat{B}_{cl} = B_* + B_*G_1$ $\hat{A}_{cl} = A_* + B_*F_1 + (B_* + B_*G_1)\bar{K}$ (III): knows $\ B_*\ $ $\hat{B}_{cl} = (\ B_*\ /\ B_* + B_*G_1\ )(B_* + B_*G_1)$ $\hat{A}_{cl} = A_* + B_*F_1 + (B_* + B_*G_1)\bar{K}$ (IV): knows $B_*$ $\hat{B}_{cl} = B_*$ $\hat{A}_{cl} = A_* + B_*F_1 + (B_* + B_*G_1)\bar{K}$




Fig. 3. Bias injection results by the active adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  using different system's model knowledge and policies.

We have shown the results of this simulation at Figure 3. As it can be seen from this figure,  $\mathcal{A}$  injects successfully the maximum impact bias (dashed line) when there is no privacy mechanism, i.e., when it knows  $\hat{A}_{cl}$  and  $\hat{B}_{cl}$  in (32).

The dash-dotted line shows the response to  $a_\infty$  when  $\mathcal{A}$  uses its estimation in Policy (II) for solving (35). It is clear that the steady-state value of  $\|r(t)\|$  remains substantially below threshold level  $\delta_\alpha$  and thus does not have much impact on the system. In the next two scenarios, we suppose a situation when  $\mathcal{A}$  has obtained extra-information (side-knowledge) about the system (30). First we consider the case when  $\mathcal{A}$  knows  $\|B_*\|$ . By using this information,  $\mathcal{A}$  modifies its estimation of  $B_{cl}$  to  $\hat{B}_{cl} = (\|B_*\|/\|B_* + B_*G_1\|)(B_* + B_*G_1)$ ; see Policy (III) in Table I. The dotted line shows the response for this case. As it can be seen, while the steady-state value of  $\|r(t)\|$  now has a higher value compared to previous case, it does not reach the maximum impact.

The next case that we consider is when  $\mathcal{A}$  knows the exact value of  $B_*$ . As it can be seen from the figure (crossed line), the steady-state value of  $\|r(t)\|$  exceeds the threshold  $\delta_\alpha$ . The reason that even by knowing  $B_*$ , Cloud still is unable

to have the best possible attack is that the closed-loop system is unknown to it, which also emphasizes the importance of preserving privacy for the closed-loop system. These observations are in accordance with [28, Sec.4.6] which argues that for implementing a successful bias injection the adversary needs to know the true steady-state dynamics of closed-loop system and detector.

#### B. The effects of disturbance $d(t)$ on $\bar{\gamma}$

As we observed in Proposition 2, the value  $\bar{\gamma}$  allowed the system designer to preserve privacy for the closed-loop system, and hence acted as a privacy budget. This motivates us to study the relationship of  $\bar{\gamma}$  and the disturbance magnitude. To accomplish this, we consider the disturbance  $d(\cdot)$  in (21) to have a uniform distribution  $d(t) \sim U(-d_{\max}, d_{\max})$  where  $d_{\max} \in \{0, 0.02, \dots, 0.16\}$  for each experiment. For each  $d_{\max}$ , we collect  $10^3$  data sets with the same parameters that we obtained (31), and compute  $\bar{\gamma}$  by solving (29). We set  $\Delta\Delta^\top = (nd_{\max}^2T)I_n$  as it satisfies Assumption 3.




Fig. 4. Results for the optimization (29) with different values of  $d_{\max}$  (the upper-bound for the disturbance) and their corresponding  $\bar{\gamma}$  (the privacy budget for the closed-loop system). The results should be read as, e.g., we have obtained the  $\bar{\gamma}$  as  $0.02 < \bar{\gamma} \leq 0.03$  by solving (29) for 18% of the collected data sets when a uniform disturbance with  $d_{\max} = 0.04$  was present in the system's dynamic.

The results are shown in Figure 4. The value inside each square shows the fraction of the number of data sets to which  $\bar{\gamma}$  returned from (29) belongs. We can see from this figure that  $\bar{\gamma}$  decreases as  $d_{\max}$  increases. This means that the privacy budget is conversely related to the noise magnitude.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We have presented a scheme for outsourcing the computation of a data-driven stabilizing controller to a cloud computing service for an LTI system. The scheme preserves privacy for the open-loop and closed-loop system matrices, can be adopted for both data without disturbance and with disturbance, is lightweight in computational over-head and does not degrade the performance of a system. We have demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed scheme in



a numerical case study of a batch reactor system. Future research directions for this study include extension of the results to signal tracking and optimal control problems and considering other models for Cloud.

## VII. APPENDIX: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

To present the proof of Proposition 3, we recall another form for the set  $\mathcal{C}$  given in (25) as (see [27, Lem.2])

$$\mathcal{C} = \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid (Z - \zeta)^\top A(Z - \zeta) \preceq Q\}, \quad (36)$$

where

$$\zeta := -A^{-1}B, \quad Q := B^\top A^{-1}B - C. \quad (37)$$

In the next lemma, we remove the shift  $\zeta$  from the set  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $C(\gamma)$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $C(\gamma)$  be the sets given in (36) and (27), respectively. Define the sets*

$$\mathcal{C}_o := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid Z^\top A Z \preceq Q\}, \quad (38)$$

and

$$C_o(\gamma) := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid \|Z - \underline{Z}\| \leq \gamma, \text{ for some } \underline{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_o\}. \quad (39)$$

Then the following statements hold:

- (i)  $\bar{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_o$  if and only if  $\bar{Z} + \zeta \in \mathcal{C}$ .
- (ii)  $\bar{Z} \in C_o(\gamma)$  if and only if  $\bar{Z} + \zeta \in C(\gamma)$ .

*Proof.* The proof for statement (i) is trivial. For statement (ii), note that if  $\bar{Z} \in C_o(\gamma)$  we have

$$\|\bar{Z} - \underline{Z}\| = \|\bar{Z} + \zeta - (\underline{Z} + \zeta)\| \leq \gamma.$$

Since  $(\underline{Z} + \zeta) \in \mathcal{C}$  by statement (i), then  $\bar{Z} + \zeta \in C(\gamma)$ . The converse is analogous.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3:* We rewrite the set  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  as

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid (Z - \zeta)^\top A(Z - \zeta) \preceq \bar{Q}\}, \quad (40)$$

with the matrices

$$\bar{Q} := Q + 2\gamma \left\| A^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left\| Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| I_n + \gamma^2 \|A\| I_n,$$

$A$  in (26) and  $\zeta$  and  $Q$  given in (37). We also remove the shift  $\zeta$  and define the set

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}_o := \{[A \ B]^\top := Z \mid Z^\top A Z \preceq \bar{Q}\}.$$

From Lemma 2, it follows that for proving  $C(\gamma) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  we equivalently can prove  $C_o(\gamma) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_o$ .

For any  $\bar{Z} \in C_o(\gamma)$  there exists  $\underline{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_o$  such that  $\|\bar{Z} - \underline{Z}\| \leq \gamma$ . Thus to prove  $C_o(\gamma) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_o$ , we consider the set

$$\mathcal{S} = \{Z + \lambda \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|} \mid Z \in \mathcal{C}_o, 0 \leq \lambda \leq \gamma, \text{ and } \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times n}\}, \quad (41)$$

and prove  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_o$  noting that  $C_o(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ . Consider an arbitrary  $\bar{Z} \in \mathcal{S}$  as

$$\bar{Z} = Z + \lambda \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|}, \quad (42)$$

with  $Z \in \mathcal{C}_o$  in (38). We rewrite (42) as

$$\bar{Z} = A^{-1/2} \Upsilon Q^{1/2} + \lambda \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|}, \quad (43)$$

for some matrix  $\Upsilon$  with  $\Upsilon^\top \Upsilon \preceq I$ . By denoting  $W_1 := Q^{1/2} \Upsilon^\top A^{1/2}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Z}^\top A \bar{Z} &= (A^{-1} W_1^\top + \lambda \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|})^\top A (A^{-1} W_1^\top + \lambda \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|}) \\ &= Q^{1/2} \Upsilon^\top \Upsilon Q^{1/2} + \lambda \frac{W_1 \Delta}{\|\Delta\|} + \lambda \frac{(W_1 \Delta)^\top}{\|\Delta\|} + \lambda^2 \frac{\Delta^\top A \Delta}{\|\Delta\|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \lambda \frac{W_1 \Delta}{\|\Delta\|} + \lambda \frac{(W_1 \Delta)^\top}{\|\Delta\|} \right\| &\leq 2\lambda \|W_1\| \\ \|W_1\| &\leq \|Q\|^{1/2} \|A\|^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows since  $\left\| \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|} \right\| \leq 1$  and the second one since  $\|\Upsilon\| \leq 1$ . Hence,

$$\lambda \frac{W_1 \Delta}{\|\Delta\|} + \lambda \frac{(W_1 \Delta)^\top}{\|\Delta\|} \preceq 2\lambda \|Q\|^{1/2} \|A\|^{1/2} I_n. \quad (45)$$

Additionally, we have

$$\lambda^2 \frac{\Delta^\top A \Delta}{\|\Delta\|^2} \preceq \lambda^2 \|A\| \frac{\Delta^\top \Delta}{\|\Delta\|^2} \preceq \lambda^2 \|A\| I_n. \quad (46)$$

Therefore, it follows from (44)-(46) and  $0 \leq \lambda \leq \gamma$  that

$$\bar{Z}^\top A \bar{Z} \preceq Q + 2\gamma \left\| A^{1/2} \right\| \left\| Q^{1/2} \right\| I_n + \gamma^2 \|A\| I_n = \bar{Q}.$$

Thus  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_o$  and  $C_o(\gamma) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_o$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Mell, T. Grance *et al.*, “The nist definition of cloud computing,” 2011.
- [2] J. Dragoña, D. Picard, and L. Helsen, “Cloud-based implementation of white-box model predictive control for a geotabs office building: A field test demonstration,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 88, pp. 63–77, 2020.
- [3] P. Stoffel, A. Kümpel, and D. Müller, “Cloud-based optimal control of individual borehole heat exchangers in a geothermal field,” *Journal of Thermal Science*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 1253–1265, 2022.
- [4] S. woo Ham, D. Kim, T. Barham, and K. Ramseyer, “The first field application of a low-cost mpc for grid-interactive k-12 schools: Lessons-learned and savings assessment,” *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 296, p. 113351, 2023.
- [5] Y. Xia, Y. Zhang, L. Dai, Y. Zhan, and Z. Guo, “A brief survey on recent advances in cloud control systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 69, no. 7, pp. 3108–3114, 2022.
- [6] J. Le Ny and G. J. Pappas, “Differentially private filtering,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 341–354, 2013.
- [7] K. Xu, Y. Niu, and Z. Zhang, “Cloud-based frequency control for multiarea power systems: Privacy preserving via homomorphic encryption,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 2024.
- [8] D. Pan, D. Ding, X. Ge, Q.-L. Han, and X.-M. Zhang, “Privacy-preserving platooning control of vehicular cyber-physical systems with saturated inputs,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 2083–2097, 2022.
- [9] W. Chen, Z. Wang, J. Hu, Q.-L. Han, and G.-P. Liu, “Privacy-preserving distributed economic dispatch of microgrids using edge-based additive perturbations: An accelerated consensus algorithm,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 2024.

- [10] Y. Qi, Y. Tang, and Y. Kawano, "Full differential privacy preserving for switched lpv systems," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 2024.
- [11] N. Schlüter, P. Binfet, and M. S. Darup, "A brief survey on encrypted control: From the first to the second generation and beyond," *Annual Reviews in Control*, p. 100913, 2023.
- [12] S. Han and G. J. Pappas, "Privacy in control and dynamical systems," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 309–332, 2018.
- [13] J. Le Ny and G. J. Pappas, "Privacy-preserving release of aggregate dynamic models," in *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM international conference on High confidence networked systems*, 2013, pp. 49–56.
- [14] G. Bottegal, F. Farokhi, and I. Shames, "Preserving privacy of finite impulse response systems," *IEEE control systems letters*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 128–133, 2017.
- [15] I. Ziemann and H. Sandberg, "Parameter privacy versus control performance: Fisher information regularized control," in *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1259–1265.
- [16] S. Malladi and N. Monshizadeh, "Privacy-preserving cloud computation of algebraic riccati equations," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 8, pp. 223–228, 2024.
- [17] V. Katewa, A. Chakraborty, and V. Gupta, "Differential privacy for network identification," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 266–277, 2019.
- [18] J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovsky, and B. L. De Moor, "A note on persistency of excitation," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 325–329, 2005.
- [19] C. De Persis and P. Tesi, "Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 909–924, 2019.
- [20] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, "Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the deepc," in *18th European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 307–312.
- [21] A. Russo and A. Proutiere, "Poisoning attacks against data-driven control methods," in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 3234–3241.
- [22] R. Alisic, J. Kim, and H. Sandberg, "Model-free undetectable attacks on linear systems using lwe-based encryption," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 1249–1254, 2023.
- [23] S. C. Anand, M. S. Chong, and A. M. Teixeira, "Data-driven identification of attack-free sensors in networked control systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04845*, 2023.
- [24] J. Suh and T. Tanaka, "Sarsa (0) reinforcement learning over fully homomorphic encryption," in *2021 SICE International Symposium on Control Systems (SICE ISCS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [25] A. B. Alexandru, A. Tsiamis, and G. J. Pappas, "Towards private data-driven control," in *59th IEEE conference on decision and control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 5449–5456.
- [26] S. Mukherjee and V. Adetola, "A secure learning control strategy via dynamic camouflaging for unknown dynamical systems under attacks," in *2021 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 905–910.
- [27] A. Bisoffi, C. De Persis, and P. Tesi, "Data-driven control via petersen's lemma," *Automatica*, vol. 145, p. 110537, 2022.
- [28] A. Teixeira, I. Shames, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "A secure control framework for resource-limited adversaries," *Automatica*, vol. 51, pp. 135–148, 2015.
- [29] M. Rotulo, C. De Persis, and P. Tesi, "Online learning of data-driven controllers for unknown switched linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 145, p. 110519, 2022.
- [30] H. C. Van Tilborg and S. Jajodia, *Encyclopedia of cryptography and security*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2014.
- [31] J. Katz and Y. Lindell, *Introduction to modern cryptography*. CRC press, 2015.
- [32] H. J. van Waarde, M. K. Camlibel, and M. Mesbahi, "From noisy data to feedback controllers: Nonconservative design via a matrix s-lemma," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 162–175, 2020.
- [33] C. De Persis and P. Tesi, "Low-complexity learning of linear quadratic regulators from noisy data," *Automatica*, vol. 128, p. 109548, 2021.
- [34] A. Bisoffi, C. De Persis, and P. Tesi, "Trade-offs in learning controllers from noisy data," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 154, p. 104985, 2021.
- [35] J. Berberich, A. Koch, C. W. Scherer, and F. Allgöwer, "Robust data-driven state-feedback design," in *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1532–1538.