

# Analysis of indistinguishable trajectories of a nonholonomic vehicle subject to range measurements

Francesco Riz, Luigi Palopoli, Daniele Fontanelli

**Abstract**—In this paper we analyse the indistinguishability properties of the trajectory followed by a vehicle subject to ranging measurements that are intermittent, due to sampling or to finite sensing range. Considering the intermittent sensing and a particular class of robot dynamical models, whose trajectory has a shape uniquely defined by its control inputs, we can regard the trajectory as a rigid body, described by the polyline connecting the points where successive measurements occur. With this generalisation, we reduce the problem to finding the conditions on the shape of the trajectory, on the layout of the anchors and on the number of measurements and their distribution among the anchors, that allow us find a unique roto-translation of the trajectory, regarded as a rigid body, compliant with the collected measurements. Moreover, we show that the unicycle kinematic model falls in the class of dynamical systems whose trajectory can be represented as a rigid body, and we also propose a local constructibility analysis for this particular dynamics, by means of the Constructibility Gramian.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Mobile robots are facing an increasing use in real-life scenarios, where they are required to plan their trajectories, and move autonomously in order to accomplish the tasks they are required to execute. Inevitably, these operations require the robot to know its current position in the environment, known as the *localisation problem*, that the robot can execute by using the odometric information, i.e. the manoeuvres executed, and the measurements, i.e. the information collected through the interaction with the environment, such as with exteroceptive sensors. When the robot moves in an indoor environment, it can rely on different types of sensors, based on some features of the sensed signal (e.g. sensed power, or time of flight) based on technologies such as Wi-Fi [1], Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) [2], LiDAR [3], or Ultra Wide Band (UWB) [4] signals, which yield the distance between a fixed-frame point and the vehicle. Other types of sensors, which can be used in an indoor environment, are based mainly on visual information collected by cameras [5], thus yielding *bearing* measurements.

In this paper, we consider a nonholonomic vehicle moving in an environment, equipped with ranging sensors with bounded sensing range. In this setting, we analyse the properties of the environment, i.e. number and layout of the sensors,

and of the trajectory, i.e. the sequence of manoeuvres, allowing the vehicle to localise itself.

**Related work:** This problem has been deeply analysed in the technical literature in the so-called *observability analysis*, and often relies on the *Observability Rank Condition* (ORC), i.e. a system is observable only if the *Observability Matrix* is full rank. By means of the ORC, Belo et al. [5] carry out a complete observability analysis of a system composed of moving vehicles (targets) and moving cameras (sensors), collecting planar bearing measurements. With the same *rationale*, other research works extend this type of analysis to multiple fixed-frame landmarks in a 3D environment ([6]), use the same tools to dynamically find the optimal control strategy ([7]), or implement estimation filters, using cameras to collect visual information from the scene, extract features and localise the vehicle in the environment [8]. Delaune et al. [9] show that in some particular cases, relying only on bearing measurements is not sufficient to reconstruct the trajectory followed by the vehicle and thus they propose to use also range sensors. Based on the Observability Matrix, Martinelli et al. [10], analyse the observability of a vehicle subject to a single measurement, be it bearing or range. Single landmarks measuring their distance from the target vehicle have been considered in [11] and [12], where the authors build the Observability Matrix and the Observability Gramian, respectively, to quantify the observability of the system. Fernando et al. [13] analyse how the number of ranging sensors affects the observability of a Micro Aerial Vehicle and show that the observability properties of the system heavily depend on the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle. Magnago et al. [14] use RFID tags and show that a suitably designed Unscented Kalman Filter converges only in presence of at least 3 tags. With distance-only measurements, other works deal with the design of estimation filters estimating the state of the system ([15], [16]). The same tools have been used to quantify observability and to design control strategy aiming at maximising some observability metrics, known under the name of *active sensing*. This technique may be applied to a moving sensor, finding the trajectory that optimises the observability of a moving target ([17], [18], [19]), or to the moving vehicle itself which senses some fixed-frame sensors ([20], [21], [22]).

**Paper contributions:** The main part of the technical literature described so far uses the Observability Matrix or the Observability Gramian as tools to quantify the observability of a system. However, since these tools are based on the linearisation of the dynamics of the system or of the measure-

F. Riz and L. Palopoli are with the Department of Information Engineering and Computer Science, University of Trento, Italy, e-mail: {francesco.riz, luigi.palopoli}@unitn.it.

D. Fontanelli is with the Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Trento, Italy, e-mail: danielle.fontanelli@unitn.it

ments collected by the sensors, they yield only local results, associated with the concepts of *weak observability*. In our past work [23], we have analysed global observability properties, associated with the concepts of *indistinguishable* states, in presence of ranging sensors with unbounded sensing range. Then, in [24], we have proposed a sufficient condition for attaining global observability in the case of bounded sensing range. The aim of this paper is twofold: first we extend the global observability analysis with intermittent measurements, modelled through bounded sensing range sensors to simplify the geometrical interpretation of the results, and provide both sufficient and necessary conditions to achieve global observability. Secondly, we analyse local constructibility of a unicycle vehicle moving in the same scenario, by means of the Constructibility Gramian.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: in Section II we introduce the dynamic model and the measurement system, and an abstraction of the trajectory allowing us to interpret the constructibility properties from a geometric point of view. With this assumption, Section III and IV analyse the condition on the shape of the trajectory, on the layout of the sensors, and on the number of measurements and their distribution among the anchors ensuring indistinguishability. Section V presents the dual problem of mapping and discusses the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle allowing it to find the position of an anchor in its reference frame. In Section VI, we present a local constructibility analysis based on the Constructibility Gramian, and in Section VII, we draw the conclusions and claim some further research direction.

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

### A. Theoretical background

Let us consider a generic continuous-time nonlinear system in its state space representation

$$\dot{q} = f(q, u), \quad (1)$$

where  $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state of the system, while  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  collects its control inputs. We assume that the nonlinear system represents the dynamics of a generic vehicle, moving on a planar surface, and thus a part of the state vector  $q$  denotes the  $x, y$  position of the vehicle, denoted  $P(t)$ , on a  $\mathbb{R}^2$  plane. Moreover, we restrict our analysis to a particular class of systems such that the properties introduced in Property 1 hold true.

**Property 1.** *We analyse dynamical systems in the shape (1) such that, whenever the knowledge of the initial condition  $q(t_0)$  is not available, we can build a family of trajectories in the time interval  $[t_0, t_f]$ , by relying only on the control inputs  $u(t)$ ,  $t \in [t_0, t_f]$  on the given time interval. The trajectories of this family are rigid translations and rotations of the same trajectory.*

Therefore, by Property 1, given the control inputs on a time interval, we may disregard the dynamics (1) of the vehicle and consider the followed trajectory as a rigid body, which can undergo a rotation and/or a translation.

We consider the environment to be equipped with a set of ranging sensors, with coordinates  $B_i = [X_i, Y_i]^\top$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , collecting their distance  $\|B_i - P(t)\|$  from the vehicle. We assume that such ranging sensors are implemented with digital components, allowing them to collect the measurements only at some predefined sampling instants  $t_k$ , with  $t_{k+1} > t_k$ . Moreover, for sake of simplicity in the next sections, we consider the output  $z_k$  of the system the square of the collected distance, and thus the output equation of the system reads

$$z_{k,i} = \rho_{k,i}^2 = \|P_k - B_i\|^2 = (x_k - X_i)^2 + (y_k - Y_i)^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $P_k = [x_k, y_k]^\top$  is the  $x, y$  position  $P(t)$  of the vehicle at time  $t = t_k$ . The value of  $i$  is always univocally identified by the anchor collecting the measurement at the given time step  $k$ , and thus we will denote it as  $i_k$ , or simply drop it in the subscripts.

Since the measurements are collected only in some precise positions assumed by the vehicle on its trajectory, we may draw a further simplification of the system we want to analyse. Instead of disregarding the dynamics (1) of the system and consider a rigid body whose shape is given by the path followed by the vehicle, we can also disregard such a path and consider the rigid body to be a polyline connecting the consecutive points of the trajectory where the measurements occur, i.e. the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$ , representing the path followed by the vehicle, is formally defined as

$$\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{\kappa=0}^{K-1} \mathcal{S}_{\kappa, \kappa+1}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}_{k,l}$  is the closed convex hull of the set  $\{P_k, P_l\}$ , i.e. the segment connecting  $P_k$  and  $P_l$ ,  $\|\mathcal{S}_{k,l}\|$  is its length, while  $K$  is the total number of measurements collected by the anchors. For sake of clarity, we will denote by  $\mathcal{P}_k$  the  $k$ -th point of the rigid body, coinciding with the position  $P_k$  of the vehicle at time  $k$  only for some particular roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

With this definition of the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$ , and the assumptions on the measurement system, we analyse how the shape of  $\mathcal{T}$  and the layout of the anchors on the plane affect the ability to find a translation and rotation of  $\mathcal{T}$  itself, such that its vertices  $\mathcal{P}_k$  are compliant with the measurements collected by the anchors, i.e. they satisfy  $\|\mathcal{P}_k - B_{i_k}\| = \rho_k$ . To this aim, we need to introduce the concepts of *constructibility* and *backward indistinguishability* of the states of a nonlinear system. For sake of generality, in the following definitions, adapted from [25], we will consider a plant with a continuous-time dynamics (1) and the general version of the discrete-time output equation (2), in the shape

$$\begin{aligned} q(t) &= f(q(t), u(t)) \\ z_k &= h(q(t_k)) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We consider the dynamical system to evolve between an initial time instant  $t_0$  (i.e.  $k = 0$ ) and a final time  $t_f$ , with  $k = k_f$ . Given the hybrid nature of the system at hand, we will use both  $k$  and  $t$  to denote the time, with the understanding that by the time instant  $k$  we refer to time  $t_k$ . With this consideration in mind, we are now ready to introduce the concept of *constructibility*.

**Definition 1** (Constructibility). Given system (4), constructibility is the ability to reconstruct the final state  $q_f$  of the system at time  $k_f$ , given the outputs  $z_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_f$  and the control inputs  $u(t)$ ,  $t \in [t_0, t_f]$ . Intuitively, constructibility consists in reconstructing the current state  $q_k$  given the past history of inputs and outputs.

The concept of constructibility is therefore associated with the estimation of the final state  $q_f$  of the system but, by Property 1, the problem of estimating the final state is equivalent to estimating the initial state  $q_0$ , related to the well-known concept of *observability*. However, in the spirit of active sensing ([21]), analysing constructibility allows us to find trajectories optimising the performances of estimation filters. To analyse formally the concept of constructibility, both in a local and in a global perspective, we introduce the definition of *backward indistinguishability*.

**Definition 2.** Given the dynamical system (4), and a time interval  $T = [t_0, t_f]$ , two final states  $q_f$  and  $\bar{q}_f$  are said **backward indistinguishable** on  $T$ , if for all admissible control input histories  $u(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , the output histories  $z_k$  and  $\bar{z}_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_f$  of the trajectories satisfying the final conditions  $q_f$ ,  $\bar{q}_f$ , are identical. Moreover, we define  $\mathcal{I}_{(b)}(q_f)$  as the set of all the final conditions that are indistinguishable from  $q_f$  on  $T$ .

**Definition 3.** Given the dynamical system (4), a time interval  $T = [t_0, t_f]$ , and an admissible control input history  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , two final states  $q_f$  and  $\bar{q}_f$  are said  **$u^*$ -backward indistinguishable** on  $T$ , if for the input history  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , the output histories  $z_k$  and  $\bar{z}_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_f$  of the trajectories satisfying the final conditions  $q_f$ ,  $\bar{q}_f$ , are identical. Moreover, we define  $\mathcal{I}_{(b)}^{u^*}(q_f)$  as the set of all the final conditions that are  $u^*$ -backward indistinguishable from  $q_f$  on  $T$ .

For the system at hand (see Property 1), we will focus on the concept of  $u$ -backward indistinguishability, since we will consider the shape of trajectories that are generated by a known sequence of control inputs that are considered to be known upfront with no uncertainties. With a slight abuse of notation, in the rest of the paper we will refer to *indistinguishable* trajectories as trajectories generated by a known control input sequence and by two *backward indistinguishable* final conditions.

We now introduce further definitions on *constructibility* that will be useful for the local analysis carried out in Section VI.

**Definition 4.** Given a time interval  $T = [t_0, t_f]$ , and an admissible control input history  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , the system (4) is said  **$u^*$ -constructible at  $q_f$**  on  $T$ , if  $\mathcal{I}_{(b)}^{u^*}(q_f) = \{q_f\}$ , while it is said  **$u^*$ -weakly constructible at  $q_f$**  if  $q_f$  is an isolated point of  $\mathcal{I}_{(b)}^{u^*}(q_f)$ .

**Definition 5.** Given a time interval  $T = [t_0, t_f]$ , and an admissible control input history  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , the system (4) is said  **$u^*$ -(weakly) constructible**, if it is  $u^*$ -(weakly) constructible at every  $q_f$ .

**Definition 6.** Given a time interval  $T = [t_0, t_f]$ , the sys-

tem (4) is said **(weakly) constructible**, if it is  $u^*$ -(weakly) constructible, for all admissible input histories  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ .

In the local analysis, associated with the concept of *weak constructibility*, presented in Section VI, we will refer to a *weakly constructible trajectory* as a trajectory, defined by a control sequence  $u^*$ , such that the system is  $u^*$ -weakly constructible.

**Remark 1.** We may interpret the concept of constructibility as follows: the system is  $u^*$ -constructible if there exists a unique roto-translation of the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$  generated by  $u^*$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{P}_k - B_{i_k}\| = \rho_k, \quad \forall k = 0, \dots, k_f.$$

This paper aims at analysing the effect of the control inputs of a particular class of nonlinear systems on its constructibility properties. With the parallel we have drawn with a rigid body in Remark 1, analysing the constructibility of such a system is equivalent to finding the conditions on the shape of the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$ , arising from the control input history  $u$ , and on the layout of the anchors deployed on the plane, such that there exists a unique roto-translation of  $\mathcal{T}$  compliant with the measurements collected by the anchors.

## B. Unicycle kinematic model

In particular, we will discuss the example of the unicycle kinematic model. Its state is composed of its cartesian coordinates  $x, y$  and of its heading  $\theta$  with respect to a reference axis, and has the following dynamics:

$$\dot{q} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{\theta} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v \cos \theta \\ v \sin \theta \\ \omega \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where the forward velocity  $v$  and the angular velocity  $\omega$  of the vehicle are the control inputs  $u$ . We now show that a unicycle vehicle fulfills Property 1, i.e. the properties we require to the nonlinear system, showing that, given three points  $P(t_0)$ ,  $P(t_1)$ ,  $P(t_2)$  of its trajectory, the length of the segments  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$  as defined in (3), and their relative orientation only depend on the control inputs histories in the intervals  $[t_0, t_1]$  and  $[t_1, t_2]$ .

Let us consider two time instants  $t_0 > t_1$ , we want to find the state  $q_1$  as a function of the initial state  $q_0$ , given a generic, but known, control input history. We first compute the expression of  $\theta(t)$ , by integrating its dynamics, thus we get to

$$\theta(t) = \theta_0 + \int_{t_0}^t \omega(s) ds = \theta_0 + \Omega(t_0, t), \quad (6)$$

where we can compute explicitly the integral part for any  $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ , since  $\omega(t)$  is known over the time interval. We then compute  $x(t_1)$  by integrating its dynamics and by exploiting (6), hence getting to

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= x_0 + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} v(t) \cos(\theta(t)) dt \\ &= x_0 + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} v(t) \cos(\theta_0 + \Omega(t_0, t)) dt \\ &= x_0 + \Delta_{F,0} \cos \theta_0 - \Delta_{L,0} \sin \theta_0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta_F$  and  $\Delta_L$  denote the projections of the overall displacement of the vehicle on the longitudinal (forward) and on the lateral direction, respectively, and are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{F,0} &= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} v(t) \cos(\Omega(t_0, t)) dt, \\ \Delta_{L,0} &= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} v(t) \sin(\Omega(t_0, t)) dt.\end{aligned}$$

By following analogous arguments, we get to a similar expression for  $y_1$ ,

$$y_1 = y_0 + \Delta_{F,0} \sin \theta_0 + \Delta_{L,0} \cos \theta_0.$$

We compute the length of  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  as

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| &= \sqrt{(x_1 - x_0)^2 + (y_1 - y_0)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\Delta_{F,0}^2 + \Delta_{L,0}^2},\end{aligned}$$

which depends only on the control inputs  $v(t)$  and  $\omega(t)$  in  $[t_0, t_1]$ . With the same procedure we can compute  $\|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\|$ , which depends only on the controls over the time interval  $[t_1, t_2]$ . Moreover, we compute the angle  $\alpha_{0,1}$  described by the two segments as

$$\alpha_{0,1} = \arctan\left(\frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1}\right) - \arctan\left(\frac{y_1 - y_0}{x_1 - x_0}\right),$$

which does not depend on the initial state  $q_0$ . We can see the independence on  $q_0$  by exploiting the concept of rotation matrix  $R_{\theta_0} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta_0 & -\sin \theta_0 \\ \sin \theta_0 & \cos \theta_0 \end{bmatrix}$ , which is widely used in the analysis of the dynamics of rigid bodies. By simple computations, we get the following expressions

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} x_2 - x_1 \\ y_2 - y_1 \end{bmatrix} &= R_{\theta_0} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{F,1} \cos(\Omega(t_0, t_1)) - \Delta_{L,1} \sin(\Omega(t_0, t_1)) \\ \Delta_{F,1} \sin(\Omega(t_0, t_1)) + \Delta_{L,1} \cos(\Omega(t_0, t_1)) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} x_1 - x_0 \\ y_1 - y_0 \end{bmatrix} &= R_{\theta_0} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{F,0} \\ \Delta_{L,0} \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

where there is no dependence on  $x_0, y_0$ , while the dependence on  $\theta_0$  is entirely collected in the rotation matrix, which is common to the two segments. Therefore the angle  $\alpha_{0,1}$  only depends on the control inputs  $v(t), \omega(t), t \in [t_0, t_2]$ .

In the next sections we will analyse the constructibility properties, namely the indistinguishability properties of the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$ , defined in (3) and for instance obtained by a unicycle vehicle, as discussed in Remark 1.

### C. Problem statement

Given a rigid body (trajectory)  $\mathcal{T}$  and a reference frame  $\langle B \rangle$  attached to it, i.e. the coordinates of all the points of  $\mathcal{T}$  are known in  $\langle B \rangle$ , the world reference frame  $\langle W \rangle$  where the coordinates of the anchors are known, and the set of the collected measurements  $\rho_k$ , we seek for the conditions on the shape of  $\mathcal{T}$  and on the layout of the anchors in  $\langle W \rangle$  such that there exists a unique transformation (roto-translation) from  $\langle B \rangle$  to  $\langle W \rangle$  such that each point  $\mathcal{P}_k$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  is compliant with the collected measurements, i.e.  $\|\mathcal{P}_k - B_{i_k}\| = \rho_k, \forall k = 0, \dots, k_f$ . Formally, we are seeking for the conditions on  $\mathcal{T}$  and on the anchors such that the system is  $u^*$ -constructible as defined in Definition 5.

The second problem we address is the analysis of local constructibility of a unicycle-like vehicle subject to range measurement. In the same setting as before, we rely on an additional knowledge on the final state  $q_f$ , hence assessing the  $u^*$ -weak constructibility (see Definition 5).

### III. INDISTINGUISHABILITY WITH A SINGLE ANCHOR

We consider the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$  defined in (3), and discuss how the readings of a single anchor change depending on roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$ . In our past work [23], we have proved the following result for a unicycle-like vehicle subject to range measurements:

**Theorem 1** ([23]). *Consider a robot with kinematics (5), with output function (2) and one anchor, and moving with non-null forward velocity  $v(t) \neq 0$ . The system state is unobservable for any trajectory.*

In simple terms, we have proved that a unicycle vehicle sensed by a single anchor is never observable, and thus never constructible, as defined in Definition 6, independently on the manoeuvres executed, i.e. on the control input sequence. We now want to reformulate this result in terms of the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$  and generalise the analysis of the unconstructible spaces of the system, depending on the number and on the layout of the measurement points sensed by the anchor.

Without loss of generality, in the following analyses we will consider the measurements occurring at the first points  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  of the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ , and the anchor to lie in the origin of the reference frame, i.e.  $B = [0, 0]^\top$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Given an anchor  $B$  collecting  $N$  measurements  $\rho_k$  in the points  $\mathcal{P}_k, k = 0, \dots, N - 1$  of the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ ,*

- 1) *if  $N = 1$ , rotations about  $B$  and about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  do not change the sensor readings;*
- 2) *if  $N = 2$  (or  $N > 2$  with collinear measurement points), any rotation of  $\mathcal{T}$  about  $B$  and a unique rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  do not change the sensor readings;*
- 3) *if  $N \geq 3$ , provided that the points are not collinear, only rotations of  $\mathcal{T}$  about  $B$  do not change the sensor readings.*

For the proof of this theorem, we first show that any rotation of the trajectory about the anchor does not change the sensor readings, and then we analyse the case where an anchor collects 1, 2 or 3 measurements.

#### A. Rotations about the anchor

We first notice that rotating  $\mathcal{T}$  does not change its shape, by Property 1. The trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is identified by its measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_k = [x_k, y_k]^\top$ , such that  $x_k^2 + y_k^2 = \rho_k^2, k = 0, \dots, N - 1$ . After a rotation  $\phi$  about  $B = [0, 0]^\top$ , we obtain the rotated points

$$\mathcal{P}_k^* = \begin{bmatrix} x_k^* \\ y_k^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_k \cos \phi - y_k \sin \phi \\ x_k \sin \phi + y_k \cos \phi \end{bmatrix},$$

whose distance from the origin squared (i.e. the measurement  $z_k$  collected by the anchor) is

$$z_k = x_k^{*2} + y_k^{*2} = \rho_k^2,$$

and thus with an arbitrarily high number of measurements collected by an anchor, any rotations of the trajectory about the anchor itself yields the same exact readings.

### B. One measurement

With one measurement we identify a point  $\mathcal{P}_0$  that is sensed by the anchor, thus constraining the possible roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  that satisfy the sensor readings. The measurement point is compliant with the sensor reading only for a position  $\mathcal{P}_0 = [\rho_0 \cos \phi, \rho_0 \sin \phi]^\top$ , for any  $\phi \in [0, 2\pi]$ . The remaining part of the trajectory is univocally determined by the relative position of its second point with respect to the first, i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_0 = [\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \cos \psi, \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \sin \psi]^\top$ , where  $\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$  is known from the manoeuvres. Since the collected measurement affects only the first point and the associated constraint is satisfied by construction of  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , the trajectory is compliant with the measurement for any pair  $(\phi, \psi) \in [0, 2\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$ , describing a rotation of the trajectory about the anchor and a rotation about its initial point, respectively.

### C. Two measurements

By taking the second measurement from the anchor, provided that the two measurements are not taken in the same point, we are adding a further constraint on the position and orientation of the trajectory. Notice that, whenever the two measurement points coincide, we fall in the previous case of one single measurement, however no constraint is needed on the collected measurements, i.e.  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  may coincide.

In this case, we show that the rotation about the initial point of the trajectory is now constrained by the second measurement collected by the anchor, while the rotation about the anchor is still preserving the same readings. We define the two points in their general form through a rotation matrix, and we will impose a constraint on their distance  $\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$ .

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = R_\phi \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{P}_1 = R_\alpha \begin{bmatrix} \rho_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By imposing  $\|\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_0\|^2 = \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|^2$ , we get an explicit expression of  $\alpha$ , which reads

$$\alpha = \phi \pm \arccos \left( \frac{\rho_0^2 + \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|^2 - \rho_1^2}{2\rho_0 \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|} \right) := \phi \pm \delta. \quad (7)$$

This result shows that, for any rotation  $\phi$  about the anchor, there are two different points  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$ , that are compliant with the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle (i.e.  $\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$ ) and with the measurements collected by the anchor (i.e.  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$ ).

This result has a further geometric interpretation, where by properly combining the (fixed) rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and a rotation about  $B$ , we can obtain an axial symmetry with respect to an axis passing through the anchor itself. Without loss of generality, let us consider a symmetry axis  $y = 0$ , passing through the anchor  $B = [0, 0]^\top$ , with the measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_0 = [x_0, y_0]^\top$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1 = [x_1, y_1]^\top$ . The symmetric points with respect to the  $x$  axis are  $\mathcal{P}_0^* = [x_0, -y_0]^\top$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1^* = [x_1, -y_1]^\top$ , preserving both the measurements  $\rho_0 = \rho_0^*$  and  $\rho_1 = \rho_1^*$  of the anchor, and the geometry of the trajectory,

which is uniquely identified by the length of the segment connecting the two points, i.e.  $\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| = \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}^*\|$ .

**Remark 2.** In the particular case when  $\rho_1 = \rho_0 \pm \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$ , i.e. the vehicle moves on the diameter of the circle centered in the anchor, we get  $\delta = n\pi$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , i.e. a unique feasible value for  $\alpha$  in (7), hence avoiding the ambiguity associated with the rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$ .

### D. Three measurements

As discussed above, we consider the case of three measurements collected by the anchor in three noncollinear points  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$  of the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ . Should these three points lie on the same line, the same analysis as in the previous case, with 2 measurements, has to be considered, by substituting  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  with the segment  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,2}$ . We show that two values of the rotation  $\alpha$  about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  defined in (7) yield two different values of  $\rho_2$ . We define  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  as the points resulting from the two choices of  $\alpha$ , where we chose  $\phi = 0$  without loss of generality, and thus

$$\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 + \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \cos(\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \cos(\delta + \alpha_{0,1}) \\ \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \sin(\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \sin(\delta + \alpha_{0,1}) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 + \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \cos(-\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \cos(-\delta + \alpha_{0,1}) \\ \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \sin(-\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \sin(-\delta + \alpha_{0,1}) \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\alpha_{0,1}$  is the angle between the segments  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$ . This situation is depicted in Figure 3. We now compute the difference between the distances of  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  from the origin, getting

$$\|\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}\| - \|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}\| = 4\rho_0 \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \sin \alpha_{0,1} \sin \delta, \quad (8)$$

where we conclude the two distances are equal only when  $\alpha_{0,1} = k\pi$ , i.e. when  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  are collinear, or when  $\delta = k\pi$ , i.e. the situation described in Remark 2 occurs, and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  coincide.

### E. Indistinguishability with a single anchor

With three noncollinear measurement points, we reach the greatest amount of information that can be collected by a single anchor, and thus we conclude that any further measurement beyond the third is no more informative (unless all the preceding measurement points are collinear). Therefore, with the analysis of 1, 2 and 3 measurements, we have exhaustively addressed the analysis of a single anchor, whose results depend both on the number of collected measurements and on their layout on the plane. To simplify further investigations, we introduce the following notation.

**Notation.** By **1 measurement**, we denote any number of measurements collected by the same anchor in the same position  $\mathcal{P}$  on the plane;

By **2 measurements**, we denote any number of collinear measurements collected by the same anchor;

By **3 measurements** we denote any number of measurements collected by an anchor, not falling in one of the two cases above, i.e. distinct and noncollinear measurement points.

With this notation in mind, we summarise in Table I the results obtained in this section.

TABLE I  
REVIEW OF THE RESULTS OBTAINED WITH A SINGLE ANCHOR.

# Meas.	Unconstructible motions of $\mathcal{T}$
1	Rotation about the anchor and rotation about the initial point
2	Rotation about the anchor and axial symmetry
3	Rotation about the anchor




Fig. 1. Example 1. The same trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  rotated about the pivot anchor  $B_0$ . When  $\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4$  and  $B_0$  are collinear, we always have two roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  that are compliant with the measurements.

#### IV. INDISTINGUISHABILITY WITH MORE ANCHORS

In this section we analyse the relation between the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle, i.e. the shape of  $\mathcal{T}$  as defined in (3), the position of the anchors on the plane, and the measurements collected by them. We will leverage on the results of the previous section, where we have discussed the case of a single anchor, to analyse the indistinguishable trajectories arising in the case of multiple anchors.

##### A. Large number of anchors and measurements

Before analysing the scenarios with a small number of anchors and discussing the shape of the trajectories and the layout of the anchors, we present two particular situations, for a general number of anchors, where we can achieve indistinguishability.

**Example 1** (Rotation of the trajectory). With reference to Figure 1, let us consider a pivot anchor  $B_0$ , collecting an arbitrary number of measurements, we will show that a rotation  $2\gamma$  about this anchor, which does not affect the readings of  $B_0$  by Theorem 2, will generate no changes in the readings of the other anchors. We then consider a second anchor  $B_1$ , collecting 2 measurements (i.e. an arbitrary number of measurements, with collinear measurement points). We design the two measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_3$  and  $\mathcal{P}_4$  such that they are aligned with the pivot anchor  $B_0$  and such that the angle between  $\mathcal{S}_{3,4}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{0,1}$  is  $\gamma$ , where  $\mathcal{B}_{0,1}$  is the line connecting the two anchors. By this assumption, a rotation of  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  by  $2\gamma$  about  $B_0$  is equivalent to an axial symmetry of it with respect to  $\mathcal{B}_{0,1}$ , which passes through the anchor  $B_1$  and thus, by the analysis in Section III-C, generates no changes in the sensor readings. \*

**Example 2** (Translation of the trajectory). In the situation represented in Figure 2, let us consider an anchor  $B_0$  collecting two measurements in  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , where the distance between the anchor and the segment  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  is  $\Delta$ . We translate the




Fig. 2. Example 2. The same trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  translated by  $2\Delta$  orthogonally to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ . When  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}, \mathcal{S}_{2,3}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{4,5}$  are parallel and have the same distance  $\Delta$  from the anchor collecting the measurements, we always have two translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  that are compliant with the measurements.

whole trajectory by  $2\Delta$  in the direction orthogonal to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ , thus achieving an axial symmetry and, by the analysis in Section III-C, not changing the sensor readings. We then consider a second anchor  $B_1$  collecting two measurements in  $\mathcal{P}_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_3$ , where we design the two measurement points, i.e. the shape of  $\mathcal{T}$ , such that  $\mathcal{S}_{2,3}$  is parallel to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ , and its distance from  $B_1$  is exactly  $\Delta$ . By construction, the translation of the whole trajectory by  $2\Delta$  generates an axial symmetry on both the anchors, thus generating no changes in their readings. \*

By considering these two examples and by noting that the same procedure can be extended to an arbitrary number of anchors, we can introduce the following claim.

**Claim 1.** Given  $M$  anchors  $B_i = [X_i, Y_i]^T$  deployed on a plane, we can always design a shape of the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  that generates indistinguishability.

**Remark 3.** Notice that we have presented two examples where each anchor collects at least 2 measurements. If we consider one or more anchors collecting a single measurement, we do not need the demanding conditions on  $\mathcal{S}_{3,4}$  being aligned with  $B_0$  (Example 1) or on  $\mathcal{S}_{2,3}$  being parallel to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  (Example 2) to hold true in order to get to the same results.

##### B. Analysis of indistinguishability

In the previous section, we have discussed a method to plan the trajectory of the vehicle, when the position of the anchors in the world reference frame is known upfront, that generates indistinguishability, independently on the overall number of collected measurements. Now we move our focus to the analysis of generic trajectories that are characterised by the number of measurements that are collected and by their distribution among the anchors. To describe compactly the setting, we list the number of measurements collected by each anchor separated by a “+” sign, e.g.  $N + 1$  denotes  $N$  measurements collected by the first anchor and 1 by the second. First of all we show a sufficient condition for a trajectory to be indistinguishable, based on a “small” number of measurements.

**Theorem 3.** Given an anchor  $B_1$  collecting  $N$  measurements, and a second anchor  $B_2$  collecting 1 measurement from a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ , the trajectory is always indistinguishable.

*Proof.* In Theorem 2, we already proved that if an anchor collects  $N$  measurements, the trajectory is indistinguishable, and thus we focus on the case  $N + 1$ . Let us consider the most informative case in Theorem 2, i.e. when 3 non collinear points are sensed by the first anchor. In this setting, we can compute the distance  $d_3$  of the fourth point  $\mathcal{P}_3$  of the trajectory by leveraging on the known manoeuvres executed by the vehicle. The point  $\mathcal{P}_3$  lies on the intersection between the circle centered in  $B_1$  with radius  $d_3$  and the circle centered in  $B_2$  with radius  $\rho_3$ , hence yielding two distinct points.  $\square$

With this, we have shown that as long as only two anchors are involved and one of them collects only 1 measurements, the trajectory is indistinguishable, independently on its shape.

We now introduce the opposite results, keeping in mind the analysis in Section IV-A, where we stated that there exist no sufficiently high number of anchors and measurements that ensure indistinguishability.

**Theorem 4.** *Given an anchor  $B_1$  collecting 2 measurements from a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  and two further measurements collected by anchors other than  $B_1$ ,  $\mathcal{T}$  is not indistinguishable unless specific manoeuvres are executed.*

For the proof of Theorem 4, we consider an increasing number of measurements, starting from the considerations drawn in Theorem 2 on two measurements collected by the first anchor.

1) 2+1: We add a third measurement collected by a second anchor, and we show that in this setting there are at most 4 trajectories, i.e. 4 roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$ , that are indistinguishable. To show this result, we will exploit the definition of the angle  $\delta$  in (7). We build a new reference frame, centred in the first anchor  $B_1$  and with the first measurement point  $\mathcal{P}_0$  lying on the  $x$ -axis. Therefore we obtain the explicit expression of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  in the new reference frame as

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{P}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 + \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \cos \delta \\ \pm \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \sin \delta \end{bmatrix},$$

where the  $\pm$  sign accounts for the fixed rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and generates two distinct points  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$ . Given the two solutions obtained in Section III-C, there are two distinct rigid bodies  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$  that are compliant with the measurements, each of them yielding a possible next point  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$ , which has to satisfy the constraint given by the last measurement, i.e.  $\|B_2 - \mathcal{P}_2\| = \rho_2$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_2$  without the superscript denotes any of the two points. From a geometric point of view, we are seeking for the position of the second anchor  $B_2$ , with distance  $D$  from  $B_1$ , in this new reference frame, i.e. for each of the two rigid bodies, we are seeking for the intersections between a circle centered in the origin having radius  $D$  and a circle centered in  $\mathcal{P}_2$  with radius  $\|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\|$ , as depicted in Figure 3. For each point  $\mathcal{P}_2$ , the two circles have two intersections as long as  $\underline{d} < \|\mathcal{P}_2\| < \bar{d}$  holds true for both  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$ , where  $\underline{d} = |D - \rho_2|$  and  $\bar{d} = D + \rho_2$ . Hence, as far as this inequality condition holds true, there are four possible trajectories  $\mathcal{T}_1^{(a)}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_2^{(a)}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_1^{(b)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2^{(b)}$  that yield the same measurement outputs from the two anchors.




Fig. 3. Setting 2 + 1. The blue and red trajectories represent the two rigid bodies  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ , in the reference frame such that  $\mathcal{P}_0$  lies on the  $x$ -axis. Each of them has a circle centered in their last point  $\mathcal{P}_2$ , hence yielding an overall number of 4 intersections (i.e. possible positions of  $B_2$ ) with the circle centered in the first anchor with radius  $D$ .

**Remark 4.** *In the original reference frame  $B_2$  has known coordinates, and thus any position of  $B_2$  in the new reference frame corresponds to a different configuration of the rigid body  $\mathcal{T}$ , i.e. a different trajectory followed by the vehicle, in the original reference frame.*

This result is a particular case of the general setting in Theorem 3, and thus the indistinguishability was already proven. However, this scenario deserved more attention, since the following proofs are built upon this result.

**Remark 5.** *Should the distance  $\|\mathcal{P}_2\|$  given by one of the two feasible trajectories be out of the interval  $[\underline{d}, \bar{d}]$ , the two circles identified in the proof would have less than two intersections and thus the number of overall feasible trajectory would decrease, hence guaranteeing that the largest number of solutions be four.*

2) 2 + 2: In the same reference frame defined in the previous section, we start from the 4 possible positions of  $B_2$ . As first, we notice that ambiguities may arise between two trajectories rotated both about  $B_1$  and about  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ , or between two trajectories only rotated about the anchor  $B_1$ , and thus the analysis will be divided into two parts, one for each pair of trajectories.

**Rotation about anchor:** Given the two points  $\mathcal{P}_2 = [x_2, y_2]^\top$  and  $\mathcal{P}_3 = [x_3, y_3]^\top$ , we want to find the position of the anchor  $B_2$  satisfying the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} X_2^2 + Y_2^2 = D^2 \\ (X_2 - x_2)^2 + (Y_2 - y_2)^2 = \rho_2^2 \\ (X_2 - x_3)^2 + (Y_2 - y_3)^2 = \rho_3^2 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

We take the difference of the last two equations with respect to the first and get to these linear equations in the unknowns  $X_2, Y_2$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_2 & y_2 \\ x_3 & y_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_2 \\ Y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} D^2 - \rho_2^2 + x_2^2 + y_2^2 \\ D^2 - \rho_3^2 + x_3^2 + y_3^2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

To find a unique solution for  $B_2$ , we need a nonsingular matrix  $M$ , thus we compute its determinant to find the position  $\mathcal{P}_3$  such that  $\det M = 0$ .

$$\det M = x_3 y_2 - x_2 y_3, \quad (11)$$

thus  $B_2$  has a unique solution, i.e. the system is  $u$ -constructible, as soon as  $B_1, \mathcal{P}_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_3$  are not aligned, hence defining two lines (one for  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and one for  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ ) where  $\mathcal{P}_3$  cannot lie to guarantee  $u$ -constructibility. From a geometrical point of view, we are trying to reconstruct the position of  $B$  by using three range measurements, i.e. by using trilateration. To have a unique solution to the trilateration problem, the three anchors need to be noncollinear. Notice that this result is compliant with the scenario proposed in Example 1.

**Rotation about anchor and initial point:** Given two points  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$ , we build  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(b)}$  as  $\mathcal{P}^{(b)} = R_\zeta(\mathcal{P}^{(a)} - \mathcal{P}_0) + \mathcal{P}_0$ , where  $\zeta = -2\delta$  and  $\delta$  defined in (7). With these two pairs, we want to find the positions of two anchors  $B_2^{(a)}, B_2^{(b)}$  satisfying the set of equations (10), for both  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ . With the same *rationale* as before, we take the differences

$$\begin{aligned} (\|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)} - B_2^{(a)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(a)}\|^2) &= (\|\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)} - B_2^{(b)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(b)}\|^2) \\ (\|\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)} - B_2^{(a)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(a)}\|^2) &= (\|\mathcal{P}_3^{(b)} - B_2^{(b)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(b)}\|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

As in the previous case, we get to two linear equations in the shape  $M[X_2^{(a)}, Y_2^{(a)}]^\top = h$ , with the same  $M$  as in (11). With this result, given one of the two feasible  $B_2^{(b)}$  obtained in the case  $2+1$ , we find a unique anchor satisfying the differences of the distances, as far as  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  and  $B_1$  are not aligned (in compliance with the previous part of this proof). We now add the constraint  $\|B_2\| = D$ , by building the equation  $\|B_2^{(a)}\| - \|B_2^{(b)}\| = 0$ , with  $B_2^{(a)}$  obtained as the unique solution of (12). We get to a quadratic equation in the coordinates of  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  in the shape

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_3 & y_3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} Q \begin{bmatrix} x_3 \\ y_3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (13)$$

where the matrix of the quadratic equation  $Q$ , representing a conic section, has this shape

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} R & b \\ b^\top & c \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , and its invariants characterise the conic. In particular, by starting from  $Q$ , we find the center  $O$  of the conic

$$O = -R^{-1}b = \mathcal{P}_2^{(a)},$$

and we can check that  $\det Q = 0$ , and thus the conic is a degenerate conic with center  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$ . To identify the shape of the resulting conic, we analyse the determinant of the submatrix  $R$ , thus getting to

$$\det R = -\rho_0^2 (X_2^{(b)} - X_2^{(a)})^2 (\|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}\|^2 - \underline{d}^2) (\bar{d}^2 - \|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}\|^2),$$

where  $X_2^{(b)} = X_2^{(a)} \cos \zeta - \rho_0 (\cos \zeta - 1) + Y_2^{(b)} \sin \zeta$  is the  $x$  coordinate of the point obtained by rotating  $B_2^{(b)}$  about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  by  $-\zeta$ .

The condition  $\underline{d} < \|\mathcal{P}_2\| < \bar{d}$  guarantees that the product of the last two terms is always positive, while the intermediate term is always nonpositive, and it is 0 when the points  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$  and  $B_2^{(b)}$  are collinear. This situation is the mirrored version of the situation analysed above, where the two measurement

points collected by an anchor and the other anchor are aligned, and thus there exist no points  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  that can recover  $u$ -constructibility. By algebraic computations, matrix  $Q$  in this case is the 0 matrix, i.e. the conic described by it is the whole  $\mathbb{R}^2$  plane. When this unfortunate situation does not occur, the determinant is negative, hence the conic described by  $Q$  is a degenerate hyperbole, i.e. two lines intersecting in  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and thus, for each of the two anchors  $B_2^{(b)}$ , we find two lines where  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  cannot lie, to ensure  $u$ -constructibility.

In conclusion, we have two critical directions for  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  arising from the first situation and four directions arising from the second, and thus the overall number of lines where  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  cannot lie to ensure  $u$ -constructibility is 6.

3)  $2+1+1$ : With respect to the previous case, we here collect the same number of measurements, but we distribute them among 3 anchors. As in the previous case, we start from the measurement collected by the second anchor (i.e.  $2+1$ ) and, by the conclusions in the previous section, there are (at most) four possible trajectories that yield the same sensor readings. In the body reference frame  $\langle B \rangle$  (which is different from the reference frame the previous sections are built upon), we can determine one position of the third anchor for each of the indistinguishable trajectories arising in  $2+1$ . For each pair of anchors determined through this procedure, the fourth measurement point  $\mathcal{P}_3$  will have the same distance from the two selected anchors if and only if it lies on the axis of the segment having the two anchors as vertices. From this geometric consideration, for each pair of anchors we can build a line (the axis of the corresponding segment), where the point  $\mathcal{P}_3$  must not lie to avoid indistinguishability, hence yielding a maximum overall number of 6 critical lines. Notice that the setting  $2+2$  is a particular case of the scenario  $2+1+1$ , and thus to design the point  $\mathcal{P}_3$  avoiding indistinguishability, we may follow the same procedure described here, i.e. transforming the coordinates of the anchors  $B_2$  to the body reference frame  $\langle B \rangle$ .

### C. Summing up the results

In the analysis of indistinguishability of trajectories, we have presented two opposite results in Theorems 3 and 4, neglecting the case where each anchor collects only one measurement, i.e.  $1+1+1$ . No formal proof of indistinguishability can be given in this settings, but it will be discussed by leveraging on the closed-form results obtained in the local analysis at the end of Section VI. We anticipate here the main result:

**Claim 2.** *Given three anchors  $B_i = [X_i, Y_i]^\top$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , collecting one measurement  $\rho_k$  each in the point  $\mathcal{P}_k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2$ , there is a finite number of roto-translations of the trajectory followed by the vehicle that are compliant with the measurements collected by the anchors.*

Based on Claim 2, let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be the number of roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  compliant with the measurements obtained in the setting  $1+1+1$ . With the same procedure as in the case  $2+1+1$ , for each pair of indistinguishable trajectories after three measurements, we can find a line (axis of the segment






Fig. 4. Summing up all the results obtained in the analysis of indistinguishability of the trajectory followed by a vehicle, as a function of the overall number of measurements and of their distribution among the different anchors. The number in brackets under the combination denotes the number of trajectories that are indistinguishable in that setting. The red part is referred to Theorem 3, while the green part is associated with the results obtained in Theorem 4.

having two anchors as vertices in the local reference frame) where the fourth measurement does not resolve the ambiguity. Hence, the number of critical lines for the fourth measurement in the setting  $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$  is  $n(n - 1)/2$ .

Figure 4 shows an overview of the results obtained in this section. The part of the figure highlighted in red is associated with the results in Theorem 3, while the part highlighted in green is referred to Theorem 4.

## V. MAPPING

We now reverse the perspective, by considering the problem of mapping, the dual problem with respect to localisation. Starting from the (now known) trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  of the vehicle moving on the plane (and hence we know its measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_k$ ), we estimate the position of the fixed-frame anchors in the robot reference frame. The problems being dual, one may expect that the same algebraic relations and the same results pop out from this analysis, but we show here that this is not the case. In fact, in the localisation problem, we have used the shape of the trajectory, i.e. the distance between the measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_k$  and their layout, while here we have no information on the layout of the anchors on the plane, and thus the overall mapping problem boils down to an independent mapping problem for each anchor, which will be analysed separately.

Let us consider the mapping problem on a single anchor  $B$ , we are trying to find the minimum number of range measurements needed to univocally find the position of a point on the plane. This problem, which is known in the literature as the *trilateration problem*, has been solved as in the following Proposition.

**Proposition 1** (Trilateration problem). *Let  $B = [X, Y]^T$  be a point with unknown coordinates on the  $\mathbb{R}^2$  plane and let  $\mathcal{P}_k = [x_k, y_k]^T$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2$  be three points (of the trajectory of the vehicle) with known coordinates. Given the three range measurements  $\rho_k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2$ , we can reconstruct*

*the coordinates of  $B$  as long as the three measurement points are noncollinear.*

*Proof.* By taking the differences of the squared distances  $\rho_1^2 - \rho_0^2$  and  $\rho_2^2 - \rho_0^2$ , we get a set of linear equations in the coordinates of  $B$

$$M \begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix} = h, \quad \text{where } M = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 - x_1 & y_0 - y_1 \\ x_0 - x_2 & y_0 - y_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

thus yielding a unique solution if  $\det M \neq 0$ . By computing explicitly the determinant, we come up with

$$\det M = x_0 y_1 - x_0 y_2 + x_1 y_2 - x_1 y_0 + x_2 y_0 - x_2 y_1, \quad (15)$$

thus the matrix is singular only when the three points are collinear, hence concluding the proof.  $\square$

From a geometric point of view, we are looking for the intersections among three circles, if the centers are collinear, then the circles intersect in two distinct points, symmetric with respect to the axis passing through the centers, otherwise the intersection is unique.

To map all environment, i.e. to find the positions of all the anchors on the plane, the robot has to repeat the same procedure, i.e. collect at least three noncollinear measurements, for each anchor.

## VI. LOCAL CONSTRUCTIBILITY

In the previous sections, we have focused our analysis on a global perspective, associated with the concept of indistinguishability, i.e. the (non) existence of a unique roto-translation of  $\mathcal{T}$  that is compliant with the measurement collected by the anchors. We now move the analysis from global to local, associated with the concept of *weak* constructibility, as in Definition 5. To this aim, we consider a vehicle with unicycle dynamic model (5) subject to ranging measurement with output function (2), and build its Constructibility Gramian (CG). The CG is an  $n \times n$  matrix, where  $n$  is the size of the state of the system, that may be used as a tool to check for nonlinear constructibility, i.e. it describes how difficult it is to reconstruct the final state of the system given the control inputs and the measurement outputs over a time window  $[t_0, t_f]$ . In particular, the reciprocal of its smallest singular value (or equivalently of its smallest eigenvalue, since the CG is symmetric), measures how measurement noise affects the estimate of the final state and if it is equal to 0, i.e. if the CG is singular, then the system is locally unconstructible (see [26]). The CG is defined for continuous- or discrete-time system, and thus we have to extend its definition to a generic system with continuous-time dynamics and intermittent (discrete-time) measurement output (4). For a continuous-time system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= f(q, u) \\ z &= g(q) \end{aligned},$$

the Constructibility Gramian  $G_C(t_0, t_f)$  is defined as

$$G_C(t_0, t_f) = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \Phi^T(\tau, t_f) H^T(\tau) W_C(\tau) H(\tau) \Phi(\tau, t_f) d\tau, \quad (16)$$




Fig. 5. Representation of the quantities affecting the contribution of a single measurement  $g_k$  to the CG.

where  $H(t) = \left. \frac{\partial h}{\partial q} \right|_{q=q(t)}$  is the Jacobian of the measurement evaluated at the current time  $t$ , and  $W_C(t)$  is a weighing matrix, which accounts for heterogeneous measurement units, different uncertainties among sensors, or for nonlinear effects, such as bounded sensing range. The *sensitivity matrix*  $\Phi(t, t_f) = \frac{\partial q(t)}{\partial q_f}$  is the unique solution to the final value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Phi}(t, t_f) &= F(t)\Phi(t, t_f), \\ \Phi(t_f, t_f) &= \mathbf{I}_n \end{aligned}$$

where  $F(t) = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \right|_{q=q(t)}$  is the linearised dynamics of the system and  $\mathbf{I}_n$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. To cope with the discrete-time output  $z_k$  in (4), we design the weighing matrix  $W_C$  such that

$$W_C(t_k) = \begin{cases} \text{diag}(\underline{e}_i) & \text{if } B_i \text{ measures at } t_k, \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbf{0}$  denotes the null matrix, the operator  $\text{diag}(w)$  operator indicates a diagonal matrix having the entries of the vector  $w$  as diagonal entries, and  $\underline{e}_i$  is the unitary vector aligned with the  $i$ -th axis, thus assuming that the sensors have homogeneous uncertainty. In this way, with the same idea as in the previous section, we can disregard the dynamics of the system and the trajectory followed by the vehicle and focus on a finite number of points  $\mathcal{P}_k$  where the measurements occur. Therefore, the CG in (16) has the following simplified expression

$$G_C(t_0, t_f) = \sum_{k=0}^{k_f-1} g(t_k, t_f),$$

where the contribution  $g(t_k, t_f)$  of the  $k$ -th measurement is computed with its definition in (16)

$$g(t_k, t_f) = v_k v_k^\top, \quad v_k = [\cos \alpha_k, \sin \alpha_k, p_k]^\top, \quad (17)$$

with  $\alpha_k = \arctan2(y_k - Y_k, x_k - X_k)$  and  $p_k$  the distance of the final point from the line passing through the anchor  $B_k$  collecting the measurement having slope  $\alpha_k$ , computed as

$$p_k = \frac{(x_f - x_k)(Y_k - y_k) - (y_f - y_k)(X_k - x_k)}{\sqrt{(x_k - X_k)^2 + (y_k - Y_k)^2}},$$

which is not dependent on the collected measurement, i.e. the distance  $\rho_k$ . Figure 5 shows the relevant parameters defining  $g_k$ . By construction,  $g(t_k, t_f)$  (in the following it will be contracted to  $g_k$ ) is an  $n \times n$  matrix with rank 1, whose column space is  $v_k$ . We will leverage on considerations on the rank of sum of matrices, relying on alignment among null and column spaces of the different contributions  $g_k$ . As in the previous

section on the analysis of indistinguishable trajectories, we state here the main result of the local constructibility analysis.

**Theorem 5.** *Given at least three measurements, distributed among at least 2 anchors, the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is weakly constructible, unless some specific manoeuvres are executed by the vehicle.*

To prove Theorem 5, we follow the same procedure as in the previous sections, analysing an increasing number of anchors and measurements collected by them.

#### A. Single anchor

With a single anchor collecting measurements, the same conclusions drawn in Theorem 2 hold true, i.e. the trajectory can rotate about the anchor without modifying the readings of the sensor. The same considerations will be obtained by means of the CG.

a) *One measurement:* When a single measurement is collected, in  $\mathcal{P}_0 = [x_0, y_0]^\top$ , the Constructibility Gramian is simply computed as  $G = v_0 v_0^\top$ , where  $v_0$  is defined in (17) and thus, by construction, the CG has rank 1. Its null space, i.e. the unconstructible subspace, is a two-dimensional vector subspace whose basis contains the columns of the matrix  $\ker(G)$

$$\ker(G) = \begin{bmatrix} -(y_f - Y_1) & -(y_f - y_0) \\ x_f - X_1 & x_f - x_0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

as one may simply check with  $v_0^\top \ker(G) = \mathbf{0}$ . The two vectors defining the unconstructible subspace are tangent to the circle centered in  $B_1$  and passing through  $P_f$ , and to the circle centered in  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and passing through  $P_f$ , respectively. This result is compliant with Theorem 2, hence highlighting the same constructibility properties.

b) *Two measurements:* The second measurement collected by the anchor generates an overall Constructibility Gramian  $G = v_0 v_0^\top + v_1 v_1^\top$ , having at most rank 2, since it is the sum of two rank-1 matrices. Since the column space of  $g_0$  is  $v_0$  by construction, we can analytically derive the conditions on  $\mathcal{P}_1$  such that the Gramian has still rank 1, by solving  $v_1 = \ell v_0$ , with  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ , yielding

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \ell \mathcal{P}_0 + (1 - \ell) B_1,$$

i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $B_1$  are collinear, occurring whenever the vehicle is moving on the diameter of the circle centered in the anchor. This result may be interpreted by keeping in mind that we are dealing with local properties, i.e. we are regarding rotations as (small) translations along the tangent of the circle centered in the rotation pole. In this particular scenario, the rotation about  $B_1$  and about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  share the same tangent, orthogonal to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ , and thus, only in this setting, also a rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is allowed. The two situations with rank 2 and rank 1 are represented in Figure 6.

**Remark 6.** *This result has a strong connection with the scenario described in Remark 2, where indistinguishability was avoided, while preventing local constructibility. In this*




Fig. 6. A pair of measurements collected by anchor  $B_1$ . (a) The three points are not aligned, the rank of the CG is 2 and the two tangents of the circles passing through  $\mathcal{P}_1$  are not aligned. (b) The particular situation where  $B_1$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  are aligned occurs, the two circles passing through  $\mathcal{P}_1$  share the same tangent, hence making the CG rank deficient.

situation, the angle  $\delta$  defined in (7) is equal to 0 and the two points  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$  collapse on each other.

Any further measurement collected by the first anchor, beyond the second, is not informative from a local point of view (provided that the two measurement points are not collinear with the anchor itself). In fact, by the previous analysis, the vector  $[-(y_f - Y_1), x_f - X_1, 1]^T$ , associated with the rotation of the trajectory about the anchor, will always belong to the null space of any  $g_k$  whose measurement is collected by the first anchor, hence a single anchor always generates a singular Gramian, independently on the number of measurement collected.

### B. Two anchors

As in Section IV, we now consider a higher number of anchors and an increasing number of measurements distributed among them. Since the maximum number of informative measurements collected by an anchor is 2, we will analyse the cases 1 + 1, 2 + 1 and 2 + 2 hereafter.

a) 1 + 1: We follow here the same procedure as before, where the two measurements were collected by the same anchor. We look for the condition on  $\mathcal{P}_1$  where the Gramian has rank 1, i.e. when  $v_1 = \ell v_0$ , thus getting from the first two equations

$$x_1 = \ell(x_0 - X_1) + X_2, \quad y_1 = \ell(y_0 - Y_1) + Y_2. \quad (18)$$

By plugging this definition of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  into the third equation, reading  $p_1 = \ell p_0$ , we get a linear equation in  $y_0$ , yielding

$$y_0 = \frac{Y_1 - Y_2}{X_1 - X_2} x_0 + \frac{X_1 Y_2 - X_2 Y_1}{X_1 - X_2},$$

i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_0$  collinear with  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , and thus, by plugging this result in (18), we get that also  $\mathcal{P}_1$  lies on the same line. Thus, as soon as the four points are not collinear, the rank of the Gramian is 2.

**Remark 7.** From a geometric point of view, we can draw the same consideration as in Remark 6, where the tangent of the circles passing through  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and centered in  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, share the same tangent. Moreover, in this particular situation, indistinguishability is achieved.

b) 2 + 1: Without loss of generality, let us consider the anchor  $B_1$  collecting two measurements in  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , while the second anchor  $B_2$  collects its only measurement in  $\mathcal{P}_2$ . By the previous analyses, we know that

$$\ker(v_0 v_0^\top + v_1 v_1^\top) = \begin{bmatrix} -(y_f - Y_1) \\ x_f - X_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

while the column space of  $v_2^\top v_2$  is  $v_2$  itself. Whenever this two vectors are orthogonal, i.e. their inner product  $\langle \ker(v_0 v_0^\top + v_1 v_1^\top), v_2 \rangle$  is 0, the CG has rank 2. This condition holds true when

$$X_1 Y_2 - X_2 Y_1 - X_1 y_2 + Y_1 x_2 + X_2 y_2 - Y_2 x_2 = 0,$$

i.e. when  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  are aligned. To give a physical interpretation, we need to refer to the results obtained in the case 2 + 1 in Section IV (refer to Figure 3). From a local perspective we have some knowledge on the initial state of the system, i.e. we can distinguish *a priori* if the vehicle is travelling along the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  or  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$  in Figure 3, and thus we can compute the distance of  $\mathcal{P}_2$  from the anchor  $B_1$ . Therefore, we know that  $\mathcal{P}_2$  lies on the intersection between two circles centered in  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  respectively. Whenever  $\mathcal{P}_2$  lies on the line connecting the two anchors, these two circles intersect in a single point and therefore they share the same tangent direction, with the same conclusions as in the 1 + 1 setting, described in Figure 6.

c) 2 + 2: We consider two pairs of measurement points being not collinear with the anchor collecting their distance. In this scenario, the CG remains singular as long as the 1-dimensional null spaces of the Gramians  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , associated with each anchor, are aligned. We therefore write the condition  $\ker(G_2) = \ell \ker(G_1)$ , yielding

$$\begin{aligned} -y_f + Y_2 &= -\ell y_f + \ell Y_1 \\ x_f - X_2 &= \ell x_f - \ell X_1 \\ 1 &= \ell \end{aligned}$$

hence yielding  $B_1 = B_2$ , which is impossible by assumption of distinct anchors. Therefore, when a two anchors collect a pair of measurements each, the system is locally constructible as far as the pair of measurement points and the anchor collecting their distances are not collinear.

### C. Three anchors

With three anchors, we only consider the scenario 1 + 1 + 1, which is expected to yield results similar to the case 2 + 1. We build the column spaces  $v_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2$  of the three contributions to the CG. The overall Gramian will be full rank as soon as the three column spaces are linearly independent, and this conditions may be checked by computing the determinant of  $W = [v_0, v_1, v_2]$ , yielding

$$\det W = ax_2 + by_2 + c,$$

where  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$  are three parameters depending on the coordinates of the three anchors  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B_3$ , and of the two measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . Hence,  $\det W = 0$  describes a line, where the coefficients are such that this line passes

through the anchor  $B_3$  itself. Therefore, the Gramian is singular as soon as  $\mathcal{P}_2$  lies on a line whose analytical form is known, passing through  $B_3$ . From a geometrical point of view, this line has a similar interpretation to the one obtained in the scenario  $2 + 1$ . Indeed, by combining the rotation of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  about  $B_1$  and of  $\mathcal{P}_2$  about  $B_2$  such that  $S_{1,2}$  maintains the same length, the (tangent to the) resulting motion of the third point  $\mathcal{P}_3$  is tangent to the circle centred in  $B_3$  and passing through  $\mathcal{P}_3$  itself. From a global perspective, this particular situation makes two intersections between two 1D geometrical varieties coincide (see Remarks 2 and 6), but it provides no guarantees on the uniqueness of this intersections. Thus, we achieve local constructibility in any configuration, hence guaranteeing that the number of solutions (i.e. the number of roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  such that the trajectory is compliant with the measurements) is finite, as stated in Claim 2.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have proposed an analysis of indistinguishability by abstracting the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle and the measurements collected by the sensors, in order to have an easy geometrical interpretation of the results obtained in this analysis, both for the localisation and for the mapping problem. Then we have proposed a local constructibility analysis based on the CG, showing analysis and differences between the local and global analysis. In the near future, we plan to build control strategies for moving anchors or for multi-agent systems, ensuring both global constructibility and a certain level of constructibility that can be quantified through some norm of the Constructibility Gramian, in the spirit of the active sensing.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Chen, Y. B. Xu, L. Chen, and Z. A. Deng, "Survey of WLAN fingerprinting positioning system," *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, vol. 380, pp. 2499–2505, Aug. 2013.
- [2] P. Nazemzadeh, F. Moro, D. Fontanelli, D. Macii, and L. Palopoli, "Indoor Positioning of a Robotic Walking Assistant for Large Public Environments," *IEEE Trans. on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 2965–2976, Nov 2015.
- [3] M. J. Gallant and J. A. Marshall, "Two-dimensional axis mapping using LiDAR," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 150–160, Feb. 2016.
- [4] K. Cheok, M. Radovnikovich, P. Vempaty, G. Hudas, J. Overholt, and P. Fleck, "UWB tracking of mobile robots," in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*, Istanbul, Turkey, Sep. 2010, pp. 2615–2620.
- [5] F. A. Belo, P. Salaris, D. Fontanelli, and A. Bicchi, "A complete observability analysis of the planar bearing localization and mapping for visual servoing with known camera velocities," *International Journal of Advanced Robotic Systems*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 197, 2013.
- [6] H. Sert, W. Perruquetti, A. Kokosy, X. Jin, and J. Palos, "Localizability of unicycle mobiles robots: An algebraic point of view," in *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 223–228.
- [7] G. L. Mariottini, G. Pappas, D. Prattichizzo, and K. Daniilidis, "Vision-based localization of leader-follower formations," in *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 635–640.
- [8] Y. Wu, Y. Li, W. Li, H. Li, and R. Lu, "Robust lidar-based localization scheme for unmanned ground vehicle via multisensor fusion," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 32, no. 12, pp. 5633–5643, 2020.
- [9] J. Delaune, D. S. Bayard, and R. Brockers, "Range-visual-inertial odometry: Scale observability without excitation," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 2421–2428, 2021.
- [10] A. Martinelli, "The unicycle in presence of a single disturbance: Observability properties," in *2017 Proceedings of the Conference on Control and its Applications*. SIAM, 2017, pp. 62–69.
- [11] D. De Palma, F. Arrichiello, G. Parlangeli, and G. Indiveri, "Underwater localization using single beacon measurements: Observability analysis for a double integrator system," *Ocean Engineering*, vol. 142, pp. 650–665, 2017.
- [12] J. D. Quenzer and K. A. Morgansen, "Observability based control in range-only underwater vehicle localization," in *2014 American control conference*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 4702–4707.
- [13] E. Fernando, O. De Silva, G. K. Mann, and R. Gosine, "Toward developing an indoor localization system for mavs using two or three rf range anchors: An observability based approach," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 5173–5187, 2021.
- [14] V. Magnago, L. Palopoli, A. Motroni, P. Nepa, D. Fontanelli, D. Macii, A. Buffi, and B. Tellini, "Robot Localisation based on Phase Measures of backscattered UHF-RFID Signals," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference (I2MTC)*. Auckland, New Zealand: IEEE, May 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [15] D. Fontanelli, F. Shamsfakhr, D. Macii, and L. Palopoli, "An uncertainty-driven and observability-based state estimator for nonholonomic robots," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 70, pp. 1–12, 2021.
- [16] B. Araki, I. Gilitschenski, T. Ogata, A. Wallar, W. Schwarting, Z. Choudhury, S. Karaman, and D. Rus, "Range-based cooperative localization with nonlinear observability analysis," in *2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1864–1870.
- [17] N. T. Hung and A. M. Pascoal, "Range-based navigation and target localization: Observability analysis and guidelines for motion planning," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 14 620–14 627, 2020.
- [18] D. Coleman, S. D. Bopardikar, and X. Tan, "Observability-aware target tracking with range only measurement," in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 4217–4224.
- [19] F. Mandić, N. Mišković, N. Palomeras, M. Carreras, and G. Vallicrosa, "Mobile beacon control algorithm that ensures observability in single range navigation," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 49, no. 23, pp. 48–53, 2016.
- [20] S. Cedervall and X. Hu, "Nonlinear observers for unicycle robots with range sensors," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 1325–1329, 2007.
- [21] P. Salaris, M. Cognetti, R. Spica, and P. R. Giordano, "Online optimal perception-aware trajectory generation," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1307–1322, 2019.
- [22] O. Napolitano, D. Fontanelli, L. Pallottino, and P. Salaris, "Gramian-based optimal active sensing control under intermittent measurements," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 9680–9686.
- [23] L. Palopoli and D. Fontanelli, "Global observability analysis of a nonholonomic robot using range sensors," in *2020 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1300–1305.
- [24] F. Riz, L. Palopoli, and D. Fontanelli, "On local/global constructibility for mobile robots using bounded range measurements," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2022.
- [25] M. Bayat, N. Crasta, A. P. Aguiar, and A. M. Pascoal, "Range-based underwater vehicle localization in the presence of unknown ocean currents: Theory and experiments," *IEEE Transactions on control systems technology*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 122–139, 2015.
- [26] A. J. Krener and K. Ide, "Measures of unobservability," in *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) held jointly with 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 6401–6406.