

Two-Way Coding in Control Systems Under Injection Attacks: From Attack Detection to Attack Correction

Song Fang
School of Electrical Engineering
and Computer Science, KTH Royal
Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden
sonf@kth.se

Karl Henrik Johansson
School of Electrical Engineering
and Computer Science, KTH Royal
Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden
kallej@kth.se

Mikael Skoglund
School of Electrical Engineering
and Computer Science, KTH Royal
Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden
skoglund@kth.se

Henrik Sandberg
School of Electrical Engineering
and Computer Science, KTH Royal
Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden
hsan@kth.se

Hideaki Ishii
Department of Computer Science,
Tokyo Institute of Technology
Yokohama, Japan
ishii@c.titech.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we introduce the method of two-way coding, a concept originating in communication theory characterizing coding schemes for two-way channels, into (networked) feedback control systems under injection attacks. We first show that the presence of two-way coding can distort the perspective of the attacker on the control system. In general, the distorted viewpoint on the attacker side as a consequence of two-way coding will facilitate detecting the attacks, or restricting what the attacker can do, or even correcting the attack effect. In the particular case of zero-dynamics attacks, if the attacks are to be designed according to the original plant, then they will be easily detected; while if the attacks are designed with respect to the equivalent plant as viewed by the attacker, then under the additional assumption that the plant is stabilizable by static output feedback, the attack effect may be corrected in steady state.

KEYWORDS

Cyber-physical system, networked control system, cyber-physical security, two-way channel, two-way coding, zero-dynamics attack

1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of two-way communication channels dates back to Shannon [26]. As its name indicates, in two-way channels, signals are transmitted simultaneously in both directions between the two terminals of communication. Accordingly, coding for two-way channels should make use of the information contained in the data transmitted in both directions; in other words, the coding schemes are also two-way, and thus are referred to as two-way coding [3, 5, 18].

Inherently, the communication channels in networked feedback control systems are two-way channels, with the controller side and the plant side being viewed as the two terminals of communication, respectively. Nevertheless, approaches based on two-way coding for the two-way channels in networked feedback systems are rarely seen in the literature. One exception is the so-called scattering transformation utilized in the tele-operation of robotics [2, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22]; in a broad sense, scattering transformation can be viewed as a special class of two-way coding to resolve the issue of two-way time delays, the most essential characterization and the main issue of the two-way channels modeled on the input-output level in the problem of tele-operation. Other related applications of the scattering transformation include [9, 16, 17].

Particularly in the cyber-physical security problems (see, e.g., [1, 4, 8, 15, 20, 23–25, 27, 29, 32] and the references therein) of networked control systems, to the best of our knowledge, only one-way coding has been employed. The authors of [31] introduced (one-way) encryption matrices into control systems to achieve confidentiality and integrity. In [19], the authors considered a method of coding (using one-way coding matrices) the sensor outputs in order to detect stealthy false data injection attacks in cyber-physical systems. Modulation matrices, which are one-way, were inserted into cyber-physical systems in [12] to detect covert attacks and zero-dynamics attacks. Dynamic one-way coding was applied to detect and isolate routing attacks [7] and replay attacks [6]. For remote state estimation in the presence of eavesdroppers, the so-called state-secrecy codes were introduced [30], which are also inherently one-way coding schemes. On the other hand, as will be discussed in Section 4 of this paper, one-way coding has its inherent limitations;




Figure 3: A feedback system with two-way coding.

where $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{d} \in \mathbb{R}$. As illustrated on the plant side in Fig. 1, the inverse of two-way coding M denotes another two-way coding.

At this point, we do not impose any assumptions on the controller K and plant P except that the closed-loop system is stable; we now prove the following result for this generic setting.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *If $\bar{q}(t) = q(t)$ and $v(t) = \bar{v}(t)$, then $\bar{u}(t) = u(t)$ and $y(t) = \bar{y}(t)$.*

PROOF. Since

$$\begin{bmatrix} q(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(t) \\ v(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

we have

$$u(t) = a^{-1}q(t) - a^{-1}bv(t),$$

and

$$y(t) = cu(t) + dv(t) = ca^{-1}q(t) + (d - ca^{-1}b)v(t).$$

Similarly, since

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}(t) \\ \bar{v}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{a} & \bar{b} \\ \bar{c} & \bar{d} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{q}(t) \\ \bar{y}(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

and noting (4), we have

$$\bar{y}(t) = -\bar{d}^{-1}\bar{c}\bar{q}(t) + \bar{d}^{-1}\bar{v}(t) = ca^{-1}\bar{q}(t) + (d - ca^{-1}b)\bar{v}(t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(t) &= \bar{a}\bar{q}(t) + \bar{b}\bar{y}(t) = \left(\bar{a} - \bar{b}\bar{d}^{-1}\bar{c}\right)\bar{q}(t) + \bar{b}\bar{d}^{-1}\bar{v}(t) \\ &= a^{-1}\bar{q}(t) - a^{-1}b\bar{v}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, when $\bar{q}(t) = q(t)$ and $v(t) = \bar{v}(t)$, it follows that $\bar{u}(t) = u(t)$ and $y(t) = \bar{y}(t)$. \square

In other words, if $\bar{q}(t) = q(t)$ and $v(t) = \bar{v}(t)$, the system in Fig. 1, now equivalent to that of Fig. 3, reduces to the system depicted in Fig. 4 as the “original” feedback system without two-way coding. As such, properties, including stability and performance, of the system in Fig. 1 when $\bar{q}(t) = q(t)$ and $v(t) = \bar{v}(t)$ are equivalent to those of the original system in Fig. 4.




Figure 4: The original feedback system without two-way coding.




Figure 5: A networked feedback system with two-way stretching matrix coding.

2.1 Special Cases of Two-Way Coding

We now consider some special cases of two-way coding matrices. In what follows, we will introduce the (two-way) stretching matrix, shearing matrix, rotation matrix, and so on that are adapted from 2D computer graphics [14], as well as the scattering transformation from tele-operation [2, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22].

2.1.1 Two-Way Stretching Matrix. Below we list three cases of the two-way stretching matrices.

Case 1:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad a \neq 0.$$

Case 2:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{bmatrix}, \quad d \neq 0.$$

Case 3:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{bmatrix}, \quad ad \neq 0.$$

In the case when $ad = 1$, M is also known as the two-way squeezing matrix.

The three cases of two-way stretching matrices are easy to understand; they are simply re-scalings of the signals. We now only illustrate case 3 in Fig. 5. Herein, it is easy to see that $\bar{a} = 1/a$ and $\bar{d} = 1/d$ since

$$M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{a} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{d} \end{bmatrix}.$$

As a matter of fact, the two-way stretching matrices reduce to two one-way re-scaling transformations as one-way




Figure 6: A networked feedback system with two-way shearing matrix coding: case 1.




Figure 7: A networked feedback system with two-way shearing matrix coding: case 2.

coding schemes (cf. Fig. 2); we will discuss the differences between two-way coding and one-way coding in more details in the subsequent sections.

2.1.2 Two-Way Shearing Matrix. Three cases of the two-way shearing matrices are given below.

Case 1:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c & 1 \end{bmatrix}, M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -c & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this case, we have the illustration given in Fig. 6, where $\bar{c} = -c$. Simply speaking, the idea is to create a “parallel system” on the plant side, and compensate for it on the controller side.

Case 2:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -b \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this case, we have the illustration given in Fig. 7, where $\bar{b} = -b$. The idea is to add a “local feedback controller” on the plant side, and compensate for it on the controller side.

Case 3:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & b \\ c & 1 \end{bmatrix}, M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -b \\ -c & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Herein, $bc \neq 1$. In this case, we have the illustration given in Fig. 8, where $\bar{b} = -b$ and $\bar{c} = -c$.

2.1.3 Two-Way Rotation Matrix. The two-way rotation matrix and its inverse are given by

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}, M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}.$$




Figure 8: A networked feedback system with two-way shearing matrix coding: case 3.

Herein, $\theta \neq k\pi/2, k = 2m + 1, m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

2.1.4 Scattering Transformation. The scattering transformation is given by [2, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22]

$$\begin{bmatrix} q(t) \\ v(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2\gamma}}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2\sqrt{\gamma}} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2\gamma}}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2\sqrt{\gamma}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Herein, $0 < \gamma < \infty$. As a consequence,

$$\begin{bmatrix} q(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2\gamma} & 1 \\ \gamma & \sqrt{2\gamma} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(t) \\ v(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Correspondingly,

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2\gamma} & 1 \\ \gamma & \sqrt{2\gamma} \end{bmatrix}, M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\gamma}} \\ -1 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \end{bmatrix}.$$

More generally, the scattering transformation can be extended as [2, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22]

$$\begin{bmatrix} q(t) \\ v(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma} \cos \theta & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \sin \theta \\ -\sqrt{\gamma} \sin \theta & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Herein, $0 < \gamma < \infty$ and $\theta \neq k\pi/2, k = 2m + 1, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. As a result,

$$\begin{bmatrix} q(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\cos \theta} & \tan \theta \\ \gamma \tan \theta & \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\cos \theta} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(t) \\ v(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\cos \theta} & \tan \theta \\ \gamma \tan \theta & \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\cos \theta} \end{bmatrix}, M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma} \cos \theta} & -\frac{\tan \theta}{\gamma} \\ -\tan \theta & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma} \cos \theta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

3 ANALYSIS OF LTI SYSTEMS WITH TWO-WAY CODING

In this section, we analyze in particular LTI feedback control systems. Consider the SISO feedback system with two-way




Figure 9: A feedback system with two-way coding under injection attacks.

coding depicted in Fig. 9. Assume that herein the controller K and plant P are LTI with transfer functions $K(s)$ and $P(s)$, respectively. In addition, let $r(t)$, $u(t)$, $\bar{u}(t)$, $y(t)$, $\bar{y}(t)$, $q(t)$, $\bar{q}(t)$, $v(t)$, $\bar{v}(t)$, $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}$. Meanwhile, suppose that injection (additive) attacks $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ exist in the forward path and feedback path of the control systems, respectively. Let $R(s)$, $U(s)$, $\bar{U}(s)$, $Y(s)$, $\bar{Y}(s)$, $Q(s)$, $\bar{Q}(s)$, $V(s)$, $\bar{V}(s)$, $W(s)$, $Z(s)$ represent the Laplace transforms, assuming that they exist, of the signals $r(t)$, $u(t)$, $\bar{u}(t)$, $y(t)$, $\bar{y}(t)$, $q(t)$, $\bar{q}(t)$, $v(t)$, $\bar{v}(t)$, $w(t)$, $z(t)$. From now on, we assume that all the transfer functions of the systems are with zero initial conditions, unless otherwise specified.

We first provide expressions for the Laplace transforms of the real plant output $\bar{y}(t)$ and the plant output $y(t)$ as seen on the controller side, given reference $r(t)$ and under injection attacks $w(t)$ and $z(t)$.

THEOREM 3.1. *Consider the SISO feedback system with two-way coding under injection attacks depicted in Fig. 9. Assume that controller K and plant P are LTI with transfer functions $K(s)$ and $P(s)$, respectively, and that the closed-loop system is stable. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}(s) &= \frac{K(s)P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}R(s) + \frac{a^{-1}[1+cK(s)]P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}W(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}[b-(ad-bc)K(s)]P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}Z(s), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= \frac{K(s)P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}R(s) + \frac{a^{-1}[P(s)-c]}{1+K(s)P(s)}W(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}[ad-bc+bP(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

PROOF. Since

$$\bar{Y}(s) = P(s)\bar{U}(s),$$

and

$$\bar{U}(s) = \bar{b}\bar{Y}(s) + \bar{a}\bar{Q}(s),$$

we have

$$\bar{U}(s) = \bar{b}P(s)\bar{U}(s) + \bar{a}\bar{Q}(s),$$

and thus

$$\bar{U}(s) = \frac{\bar{a}\bar{Q}(s)}{1-\bar{b}P(s)}.$$

Correspondingly,

$$\bar{Y}(s) = P(s)\bar{U}(s) = \frac{\bar{a}P(s)\bar{Q}(s)}{1-\bar{b}P(s)}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}(s) &= \bar{d}\bar{Y}(s) + \bar{c}\bar{Q}(s) = \frac{\bar{a}\bar{d}P(s)\bar{Q}(s)}{1-\bar{b}P(s)} + \bar{c}\bar{Q}(s) \\ &= \left[\frac{\bar{a}\bar{d}P(s)}{1-\bar{b}P(s)} + \bar{c} \right] \bar{Q}(s) = \frac{(\bar{a}\bar{d} - \bar{b}\bar{c})P(s) + \bar{c}}{1-\bar{b}P(s)}\bar{Q}(s) \\ &= \frac{P(s) - c}{ad - bc + bP(s)}\bar{Q}(s). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Similarly, since

$$U(s) = K(s)[R(s) - Y(s)],$$

and

$$Y(s) = cU(s) + dV(s),$$

we have

$$Y(s) = cK(s)[R(s) - Y(s)] + dV(s),$$

and hence

$$Y(s) = \frac{cK(s)R(s) + dV(s)}{1+cK(s)}.$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} U(s) &= K(s)[R(s) - Y(s)] \\ &= K(s)R(s) - \frac{K(s)[cK(s)R(s) + dV(s)]}{1+cK(s)} \\ &= \frac{K(s)[R(s) - dV(s)]}{1+cK(s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(s) &= aU(s) + bV(s) \\ &= \frac{aK(s)}{1+cK(s)}R(s) - \frac{adK(s)}{1+cK(s)}V(s) + bV(s) \\ &= \frac{aK(s)}{1+cK(s)}R(s) + \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}V(s) \\ &= \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)} \left[\frac{aK(s)}{b-(ad-bc)K(s)} \right] R(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}V(s). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Using (7) and (8), while noting that

$$\bar{Q}(s) = Q(s) + W(s),$$

and

$$V(s) = \bar{V}(s) + Z(s),$$

we may then obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}(s) &= Q(s) + W(s) \\ &= W(s) + \frac{aK(s)}{1+cK(s)}R(s) + \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}V(s) \\ &= W(s) + \frac{aK(s)}{1+cK(s)}R(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}\left[\bar{V}(s) + Z(s)\right] \\ &= W(s) + \frac{aK(s)}{1+cK(s)}R(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}\left[\frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}\right]\bar{Q}(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{1 - \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}\left[\frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}\right]\right\}\bar{Q}(s) \\ = W(s) + \frac{aK(s)}{1+cK(s)}R(s) + \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}\left[\frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}\right] \\ = \frac{[1+cK(s)][ad-bc+bP(s)]}{[1+cK(s)][ad-bc+bP(s)]} \\ - \frac{[b-(ad-bc)K(s)][P(s)-c]}{[1+cK(s)][ad-bc+bP(s)]} \\ = \frac{ad[1+K(s)P(s)]}{[1+cK(s)][ad-bc+bP(s)]}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}(s) &= \frac{d^{-1}K(s)[ad-bc+bP(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}R(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}d^{-1}[1+cK(s)][ad-bc+bP(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}W(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}d^{-1}[b-(ad-bc)K(s)][ad-bc+bP(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}(s) &= \frac{\bar{a}P(s)\bar{Q}(s)}{1-\bar{b}P(s)} = \frac{dP(s)\bar{Q}(s)}{ad-bc+bP(s)} \\ &= \frac{K(s)P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}R(s) + \frac{a^{-1}[1+cK(s)]P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}W(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}[b-(ad-bc)K(s)]P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(s) &= \bar{V}(s) + Z(s) = \frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}\bar{Q}(s) + Z(s) \\ &= \frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}[Q(s) + W(s)] + Z(s) \\ &= \frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}\left[\frac{aK(s)}{1+cK(s)}\right]R(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}\left[\frac{b-(ad-bc)K(s)}{1+cK(s)}\right]V(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{P(s)-c}{ad-bc+bP(s)}W(s) + Z(s), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V(s) &= \frac{d^{-1}K(s)[P(s)-c]}{1+K(s)P(s)}R(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}d^{-1}[1+cK(s)][P(s)-c]}{1+K(s)P(s)}W(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}d^{-1}[1+cK(s)][ad-bc+bP(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= \frac{cK(s)R(s) + dV(s)}{1+cK(s)} \\ &= \frac{K(s)P(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}R(s) + \frac{a^{-1}[P(s)-c]}{1+K(s)P(s)}W(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}[ad-bc+bP(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Note that based on Theorem 3.1, Laplace transforms of all the signals flowing in the feedback system can be obtained. For instance, since $\bar{Y}(s) = P(s)\bar{U}(s)$, it follows from (5) that plant input $\bar{U}(s)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}(s) &= \frac{K(s)}{1+K(s)P(s)}R(s) + \frac{a^{-1}[1+cK(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}W(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{a^{-1}[b-(ad-bc)K(s)]}{1+K(s)P(s)}Z(s). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We now investigate the implications of Theorem 3.1. It is clear that from the perspective of the reference, the transfer




Figure 10: A feedback system with two-way coding: from the viewpoint of the attacker.




Figure 11: A feedback system with two-way coding: the equivalent system from the attacker's viewpoint.




Figure 12: The original feedback system without two-way coding.

function from reference $R(s)$ to plant output $\bar{Y}(s)$, found as

$$\frac{K(s)P(s)}{1 + K(s)P(s)}, \quad (10)$$

stays exactly the same as in the original system depicted in Fig. 12 where two-way coding does not exist; therein, the transfer function from reference $R(s)$ to plant output $\bar{Y}(s)$ is also given by (10). As such, the controller $K(s)$ may be designed regardless of two-way coding. Meanwhile, to the attacker, the feedback system behaves differently from the original system because of the presence of two-way coding, as will be shown in the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3.2. *From the viewpoint of the attacker (see Fig. 10), the feedback system is equivalent to that of Fig. 11, where the transfer function of the equivalent plant \bar{P} is given*

by

$$\bar{P}(s) = \frac{P(s) - c}{ad - bc + bP(s)}, \quad (11)$$

while that of the equivalent controller \bar{K} is found as

$$\bar{K}(s) = \frac{b - (ad - bc)K(s)}{1 + cK(s)}. \quad (12)$$

In addition, the Laplace transform of the equivalent reference signal \bar{r} is

$$\bar{R}(s) = \frac{aK(s)}{b - (ad - bc)K(s)}R(s). \quad (13)$$

PROOF. Equations (11), (12), and (13) follow directly from (7) and (8). \square

Clearly, the presence of two-way coding will distort the attacker's view of the control system, making the properties of the plant, controller, and reference all seemingly different from those of the original system. This distorted perspective will assist in defending the system against attacks that are designed based on the system models, as will be seen shortly in the next section.

4 ATTACK DETECTION AND CORRECTION

In this section, we examine how the presence of two-way coding can play a critical role in the defense against injection attacks in LTI systems. In general, the distorted perspective on the attacker side as a result of two-way coding will enable detecting the attacks or restricting what the attacker can do or even correcting the attack effect, depending on the attacker's knowledge of the system. In the particular case of zero-dynamics attacks, it is seen that the attacks will be detected if designed according to the original plant, while the attack effect will be corrected in steady state if the attacks are to be designed with respect to the equivalent plant as seen by the attacker.

Before we proceed, we first prove the following result. Consider still the SISO feedback system depicted in Fig. 9. Without physically changing $P(s)$, we can use two-way coding to make the zeros and/or poles of the equivalent plant $\bar{P}(s)$, as seen by the attacker, all different from those of the original plant $P(s)$.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let*

$$P(s) = \frac{m_P(s)}{n_P(s)}, \quad (14)$$

where $m_P(s)$ and $n_P(s)$ denote the numerator and denominator polynomials of $P(s)$, respectively. Suppose that $m_P(s)$ and $n_P(s)$ are coprime.

- The zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ are given by the roots of

$$m_P(s) - cn_P(s) = 0. \quad (15)$$

In addition, if $c \neq 0$, then the zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ are all different from those of $P(s)$.

- The poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ are given by the roots of

$$(ad - bc)n_P(s) + bm_P(s) = 0. \quad (16)$$

In addition, if $b \neq 0$, then the poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ are all different from those of $P(s)$.

PROOF. It is clear that

$$\bar{P}(s) = \frac{P(s) - c}{ad - bc + bP(s)} = \frac{m_P(s) - cn_P(s)}{(ad - bc)n_P(s) + bm_P(s)}.$$

Note that the zeros of $P(s)$ are given by the roots of $m_P(s) = 0$. Let z_i be a zero of $P(s)$. Hence, $m_P(z_i) = 0$. Then, z_i cannot be a zero of $\bar{P}(s)$, otherwise this will lead to $n_P(z_i) = m_P(z_i)/c = 0$ and thus z_i will be a pole of $P(s)$, which contradicts the fact that $m_P(s)$ and $n_P(s)$ are coprime.

Similarly, note that the poles of $P(s)$ are given by the roots of $n_P(s) = 0$. Let p_i be a pole of $P(s)$. Therefore, $n_P(p_i) = 0$. Then, p_i cannot be a pole of $\bar{P}(s)$, otherwise this will lead to $m_P(p_i) = (ad - bc)n_P(p_i)/b = 0$ and thus p_i will be a zero of $P(s)$, which contradicts the fact that $m_P(s)$ and $n_P(s)$ are coprime. \square

Note that herein the conditions $c \neq 0$ and/or $b \neq 0$ are essential. Similarly to Theorem 4.1, it can also be shown that the zeros of $\bar{K}(s)$ are all different from those of $K(s)$ when $b \neq 0$, while the poles of $\bar{K}(s)$ are all different from those of $K(s)$ when $c \neq 0$.

We now remark on some fundamental differences between two-way coding and one-way coding. It is clear that two-way coding reduces to two one-way coding schemes when $b = c = 0$ (as in the case of two-way stretching matrix; see Section 2.1.1), and correspondingly,

$$\bar{P}(s) = \frac{P(s)}{ad}, \quad \bar{K}(s) = adK(s). \quad (17)$$

It is clear that the zeros and poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ and $\bar{K}(s)$ are exactly the same as those of $P(s)$ and $K(s)$. In other words, one-way coding will not change the zeros nor poles of the plant nor the controller. Indeed, similar results hold for multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems as well. It is also worth mentioning that even with dynamic one-way coding schemes, since cancellations between unstable poles and nonminimum-phase zeros should always be avoided to prevent possible internal instability, the nonminimum-phase zeros and unstable poles of the original plant and controller cannot be eliminated.

We next show that the presence of two-way coding not only can make the zeros and/or poles of the equivalent plant $\bar{P}(s)$ all different from those of the original plant $P(s)$, but

also, under some additional conditions, may render $\bar{P}(s)$ stable and/or minimum-phase. In fact, similar results hold for the pair of the equivalent controller $\bar{K}(s)$ and the original controller $K(s)$ as well.

THEOREM 4.2. Suppose that a minimal realization of the plant $P(s)$ is given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + B\bar{u}(t), \\ \bar{y}(t) &= Cx(t) + D\bar{u}(t). \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

If the plant is stabilizable by static output feedback [28] described as

$$\bar{u}(t) = F\bar{y}(t), \quad (19)$$

where $F \in \mathbb{R}$, then all the poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ can be made stable, while all the zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ can be made minimum-phase.

PROOF. Since (18) is a minimal realization of $P(s)$, we have

$$P(s) = \frac{m_P(s)}{n_P(s)} = C(sI - A)^{-1}B + D.$$

Meanwhile, since P is stabilizable by static output feedback, there exists a non-zero constant F_1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 + F_1 [C(sI - A)^{-1}B + D]} &= \frac{1}{1 + F_1 \left[\frac{m_P(s)}{n_P(s)} \right]} \\ &= \frac{n_P(s)}{n_P(s) + F_1 m_P(s)} \end{aligned}$$

is stable, i.e., all its poles are stable. In other words, all the roots of $n_P(s) + F_1 m_P(s)$ are with negative real parts. Meanwhile, note that

$$\bar{P}(s) = \frac{P(s) - c}{ad - bc + bP(s)} = \frac{m_P(s) - cn_P(s)}{(ad - bc)n_P(s) + bm_P(s)}.$$

As such, when $b/(ad - bc) = F_1$,

$$(ad - bc)n_P(s) + bm_P(s) = (ad - bc)[n_P(s) + F_1 m_P(s)],$$

and hence all its roots are with negative real parts, i.e., all the poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ are stable. Similarly, when $c = -1/F_2$, where F_2 is a stabilizing, non-zero static output feedback control gain, we have

$$m_P(s) - cn_P(s) = -c[n_P(s) + F_2 m_P(s)],$$

and thus all its roots are with negative real parts, i.e., all the zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ are minimum-phase. \square

From the proof, it can be seen that it is possible to make all the poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ stable and all the zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ minimum-phase simultaneously, as long as $F_1 \neq F_2$.

It is also worth mentioning that herein we only require the plant to be stabilizable by static output feedback F , which is used merely for the purpose of deciding the parameters of two-way coding, but the controller $K(s)$ is not necessarily chosen among such static controllers; stated alternatively, the controller $K(s)$ are not further restricted.

4.1 Zero-Dynamics Attacks

We next examine the implications of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 in the attack detection and correction of zero-dynamics attacks [29]. Consider first the original system in Fig. 12. For zero-dynamics attacks, the typical attack design is to let $Z(s) = 0$ and

$$W(s) = \frac{w_0}{s - \zeta}, \quad (20)$$

where ζ is a zero of $P(s)$. It is known that if w_0 is chosen correspondingly, then the attack cannot be detected, as a consequence of the blocking property of zeros.

Consider next the system with two-way coding in Fig. 9 where the equivalent plant from the perspective of the attacker is given by $\bar{P}(s)$. If the zero-dynamics attacks are still designed in terms of the zeros of $P(s)$, then they will easily be detected as long as $c \neq 0$, since the zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ are all different from those of $P(s)$.

On the other hand, if the attacker somehow knows $\bar{P}(s)$ (e.g., by carrying out system identification based on $\bar{q}(t)$ and $\bar{v}(t)$, or by knowing a, b, c, d as well as $P(s)$) and designs the zero-dynamics attacks accordingly, then the attacks cannot be detected. In this case, note that if the plant P is stabilizable by static output feedback, then all the zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ can be made minimum-phase. As a result, only stable zero-dynamics attacks are possible, meaning that the attack signal and hence the attack response will be zero in steady state; in such a case, we say that the attack effect can be corrected.

We summarize the above discussions in the following corollary.

COROLLARY 4.3. *Consider the system with two-way coding in Fig. 9 under zero-dynamics attack given by (20).*

- *If the zero-dynamics attack is designed according to $P(s)$, then it can always be detected with $c \neq 0$.*
- *If the zero-dynamics attack is designed with respect to $\bar{P}(s)$, then, supposing that the plant P is stabilizable by static output feedback, all the zeros of $\bar{P}(s)$ can be made minimum-phase, in which case the attack effect will be corrected in steady state.*

Note also that for zero-dynamics attacks, the attacker may instead choose to let $W(s) = 0$ and

$$Z(s) = \frac{z_0}{s - \lambda}, \quad (21)$$

where λ is a pole of $P(s)$ (and hence a zero of the closed-loop system from $z(t)$ to plant output $\bar{y}(t)$). If z_0 is chosen correspondingly, then the attack cannot be detected. Similarly, in the system with two-way coding in Fig. 9, if the zero-dynamics attacks are still designed in terms of the poles of $P(s)$, they will easily be detected as long as $b \neq 0$, since the poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ are all different from those of $P(s)$. On the

other hand, if the attacker knows $\bar{P}(s)$ and designs the zero-dynamics attacks accordingly, then the attacks cannot be detected. In this case, note that if the plant P is stabilizable by static output feedback, then all the poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ can be made stable. As a consequence, only stable zero-dynamics attacks are possible, meaning that the attack effect will be zero in steady state; in such a situation, the attack effect is said to be corrected.

Similarly, we summarize the previous discussions in the corollary below.

COROLLARY 4.4. *Consider the system with two-way coding in Fig. 9 under zero-dynamics attack given by (21).*

- *If the zero-dynamics attack is designed according to $P(s)$, then it can always be detected with $b \neq 0$.*
- *If the zero-dynamics attack is designed with respect to $\bar{P}(s)$, then, supposing that the plant P is stabilizable by static output feedback, all the poles of $\bar{P}(s)$ can be made stable, in which case the attack effect will be corrected in steady state.*

When the zero-dynamics attacks (20) and (21) happen simultaneously, it is clear that Corollary 4.3 and Corollary 4.4 apply respectively to the two attacks.

It might also be interesting to examine what changes two-way coding can bring to the detection and correction of other classes of injection attacks; see, e.g., [23]. We will, however, leave those investigations to future research.

5 CONCLUSIONS

We have introduced the method of two-way coding into feedback control systems under injection attacks. We have shown that the presence of two-way coding can distort the perspective of the attacker on the control system; this distorted view on the attacker side was demonstrated to facilitate detecting the attacks, or restricting what the attacker can do, or even correcting the attack effect in steady state. Future research directions include the analysis of MIMO systems, discrete-time systems, as well as other classes of attacks in the presence of two-way coding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, the Swedish Strategic Research Foundation, the Swedish Research Council, the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (CERCES project), the JSPS under Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Grant No.: 15H04020, and the JST CREST under Grant No.: JPMJCR15K3.

REFERENCES

- [1] Saurabh Amin, Galina A. Schwartz, Alvaro A. Cárdenas, and S. Shankar Sastry. 2015. Game-theoretic models of electricity theft detection in

- smart utility networks: Providing new capabilities with advanced metering infrastructure. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 35, 1 (2015), 66–81.
- [2] Robert J. Anderson and Mark W. Spong. 1989. Bilateral control of teleoperators with time delay. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 34, 5 (1989), 494–501.
- [3] Anas Chaaban and Aydin Sezgin. 2015. Multi-way communications: An information theoretic perspective. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory* 12, 3–4 (2015), 185–371.
- [4] Peng Cheng, Ling Shi, and Bruno Sinopoli. 2017. Guest editorial special issue on secure control of cyber-physical systems. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems* 4, 1 (2017), 1–3.
- [5] Edward C. Van der Meulen. 1977. A survey of multi-way channels in information theory: 1961–1976. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 23, 1 (1977), 1–37.
- [6] Riccardo M.G. Ferrari and André M.H. Teixeira. 2017. Detection and isolation of replay attacks through sensor watermarking. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 50, 1 (2017), 7363–7368.
- [7] Riccardo M.G. Ferrari and André M.H. Teixeira. 2017. Detection and isolation of routing attacks through sensor watermarking. In *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*. 5436–5442.
- [8] Jairo Giraldo, David Urbina, Alvaro Cardenas, Junia Valente, Mustafa Faisal, Justin Ruths, Nils Ole Tippenhauer, Henrik Sandberg, and Richard Candell. 2018. A Survey of Physics-Based Attack Detection in Cyber-Physical Systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 51, 4 (2018), 76.
- [9] Guoxiang Gu and Li Qiu. 2011. A two-port approach to networked feedback stabilization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference*. 2387–2392.
- [10] Takeshi Hatanaka, Nikhil Chopra, Masayuki Fujita, and Mark W. Spong. 2015. *Passivity-based control and estimation in networked robotics*. Springer.
- [11] Sandra Hirche and Martin Buss. 2012. Human-oriented control for haptic teleoperation. *Proc. IEEE* (2012).
- [12] Andreas Hoehn and Ping Zhang. 2016. Detection of covert attacks and zero dynamics attacks in cyber-physical systems. In *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*. 302–307.
- [13] Peter F. Hokayem and Mark W. Spong. 2006. Bilateral teleoperation: An historical survey. *Automatica* 42, 12 (2006), 2035–2057.
- [14] John F. Hughes, Andries Van Dam, James D. Foley, Morgan McGuire, Steven K. Feiner, David F. Sklar, and Kurt Akeley. 2014. *Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice*. Pearson.
- [15] Karl H. Johansson, George J. Pappas, Paulo Tabuada, and Claire J. Tomlin. 2014. Guest editorial special issue on control of cyber-physical systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 59, 12 (2014), 3120–3121.
- [16] Thomas Kailath, Ali H. Sayed, and Babak Hassibi. 2000. *Linear Estimation*. Prentice Hall.
- [17] Hidenori Kimura. 1996. *Chain-scattering approach to H_∞ control*. Springer.
- [18] Hendrik B. Meeuwissen. 1998. *Information theoretical aspects of two-way communication*. Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.
- [19] Fei Miao, Quanyan Zhu, Miroslav Pajic, and George J. Pappas. 2017. Coding schemes for securing cyber-physical systems against stealthy data injection attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems* 4, 1 (2017), 106–117.
- [20] Yilin Mo, Sean Weerakkody, and Bruno Sinopoli. 2015. Physical authentication of control systems: Designing watermarked control inputs to detect counterfeit sensor outputs. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 35, 1 (2015), 93–109.
- [21] Günter Niemeyer and Jean-Jacques E. Slotine. 1991. Stable adaptive teleoperation. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering* 16, 1 (1991), 152–162.
- [22] Emmanuel Nuño, Luis Basañez, and Romeo Ortega. 2011. Passivity-based control for bilateral teleoperation: A tutorial. *Automatica* 47, 3 (2011), 485–495.
- [23] Fabio Pasqualetti, Florian Dorfler, and Francesco Bullo. 2015. Control-theoretic methods for cyberphysical security: Geometric principles for optimal cross-layer resilient control systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 35, 1 (2015), 110–127.
- [24] Radha Poovendran, Krishna Sampigethaya, Sandeep Kumar S. Gupta, Insup Lee, K. Venkatesh Prasad, David Corman, and James L. Paunicka. 2012. Special issue on cyber-physical systems [scanning the issue]. *Proc. IEEE* 100, 1 (2012), 6–12.
- [25] Henrik Sandberg, Saurabh Amin, and Karl H. Johansson. 2015. Cyber-physical security in networked control systems: An introduction to the issue. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 35, 1 (2015), 20–23.
- [26] Claude E. Shannon. 1961. Two-way communication channels. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*.
- [27] Roy S. Smith. 2015. Covert misappropriation of networked control systems: Presenting a feedback structure. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 35, 1 (2015), 82–92.
- [28] Vassilis L. Syrmos, Chaouki T. Abdallah, Peter Dorato, and Karolos Grigoriadis. 1997. Static output feedback: A survey. *Automatica* 33, 2 (1997), 125–137.
- [29] Andre Teixeira, Kin C. Sou, Henrik Sandberg, and Karl H. Johansson. 2015. Secure control systems: A quantitative risk management approach. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 35, 1 (2015), 24–45.
- [30] Anastasios Tsiamis, Konstantinos Gatsis, and George J. Pappas. 2017. State estimation codes for perfect secrecy. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. 176–181.
- [31] Zhiheng Xu and Quanyan Zhu. 2015. Secure and resilient control design for cloud enabled networked control systems. In *Proceedings of the First ACM Workshop on Cyber-Physical Systems-Security and/or Privacy*. 31–42.
- [32] Quanyan Zhu and Tamer Basar. 2015. Game-theoretic methods for robustness, security, and resilience of cyberphysical control systems: Games-in-games principle for optimal cross-layer resilient control systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 35, 1 (2015), 46–65.