

LABELED RANDOM FINITE SETS VS. TRAJECTORY RANDOM FINITE SETS

Ronald Mahler, Eagan MN, USA, EML: mahlerronald@comcast.net

ABSTRACT

The paper [12] discussed two approaches for multitarget tracking (MTT): the generalized labeled multi-Bernoulli (GLMB) filter and three Poisson multi-Bernoulli mixture (PMBM) filters. The paper [13] discussed two frameworks for multitarget trajectory representation—labeled random finite set (LRFS) and set of trajectories (SoT)—and the merging of SoT and PMBM into trajectory PMBM (TPMBM) theory. This paper summarizes and augments the main findings of [12], [13]—specifically, why SoT, PMBM, and TPMBM are physically and mathematically erroneous.

1. INTRODUCTION

In what follows, “p.”, “c.”, “l.”, “S.” abbreviate “pages”, “column”, “lines”, “Section,” respectively.

1.1 *LRFS*. The RFS IDs/labels model appeared in 1997 in [7, p. 135, 196-197] and subsequently in [14, S. 14.5.6]; was systematically expanded into LRFS theory in the 2011 conference paper [21] and 2013 paper [22]; which has since been widely adopted. The first general exact closed-form (ECF) approximation¹ of any version of the multitarget Bayes recursive filter (MTBRF)—the GLMB filter—also appeared in [21], a surprising discovery that has been widely adopted or emulated. The first PMBM (PMBM-1) filter followed in the 2012 conference paper [23].² The first use of Gibbs sampling in RFS (and probably in MTT) was the 2015 GLMB paper [8], which is being increasingly adopted or emulated (including in PMBM in 2017 [2]).

The latest Gibbs-based GLMB filter implementations can simultaneously track over a million 3D targets in real time in significant clutter using off-the-shelf computing equipment [1], another surprising development. Also, GLMB-type filters have: quantifiable approximation errors [22]; linear complexity in the number of measurements [22]; log-linear complexity in the number of hypothesized tracks [17]; and linear complexity in the number of scans in the multi-scan case [20].

1.2 *SoT*. SoT was, nevertheless, specifically devised to supplant LRFS. It was proposed in 2014 in [18] and elaborated in 2020 in [4], to wit: “the main purpose of this paper is to establish the theoretical foundations to perform MTT using sets of trajectories” (p. 1687, c. 1), subject to the proviso

that “a full Bayesian methodology to MTT should not rely on pragmatic fixes” (p. 1689, c. 1). Implementations of an approximate TPMBM filter were reported in 2020 in [5].

In [18], [4], SoT was claimed to be necessary because LRFS is supposedly fundamentally erroneous: target labels are “artificial” and “do not represent an underlying physical reality” [18, p. 3, c. 1]. It was further claimed that SoT, unlike LRFS, provides physically correct and comprehensive modeling of multitarget trajectories. However, the 2022 paper [13] has demonstrated that SoT is based on fundamental mathematical and physical errors, compounded by multiple ad hoc fixes—see Sections 4-6, 15-17.

1.3 *PMBM*. There are, as demonstrated in 2019 in [12] (which has been viewed 2500+ times), actually three successive versions, all of them theoretically erroneous. PMBM-3 was promoted as state-of-the-art in 2018 in [9, p. 222, c.2], as was PMBM-2 in 2018 in [6, p. 1883, c. 1]. Yet in [18], [4], and [5], PMBM-1 and not PMBM-2,3 was, without explanation, chosen for use in TPMBM. This is presumably because SoT and PMBM-2,3 are mutually contradictory—see Sections 8-14.

What follows are concise summaries of LRFS, SoT, Poisson RFSs (PRFSs), PMBM-1,2,3, and TPMBM.

2. LABELED RANDOM FINITE SETS

LRFS was introduced in [21], [22]. The state of a multitarget population at time t is modeled as a *labeled finite set* (LFS)

$$X = \{(x_1, l_1), \dots, (x_n, l_n)\} \subseteq \mathbb{X}_0 \times \mathbb{L} \quad (1)$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{X}_0$ are the targets’ kinematic states and the *distinct* labels $l_1, \dots, l_n \in \mathbb{L}$ *uniquely identify* them. Denote the class of LFSs as \mathbb{F}_0 . A label is a symbol for a discrete state variable: target identity (ID) [13, p. 2, S. II-B]. If $X \notin \mathbb{F}_0$ then X is physically impossible—e.g., $\{(x_1, l), (x_2, l)\}$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$. An LRFS is a random variable (RV) on \mathbb{F}_0 (and thus labels are unknown random state variables). The GLMB filter is an ECF approximation of the MTBRF on \mathbb{F}_0 .³

A time-evolving multitarget population is a time sequence $X_{1:i} : X_1, \dots, X_i \in \mathbb{F}_0$ at the measurement-collection times t_1, \dots, t_i . The “ l -trajectory” of a target with label l is

³The Bernoulli filter [19], [14, S. 14.7], [16] and “dyadic filter” [11] are non-approximate special cases of the MTBRF on \mathbb{F}_0 when, respectively, target number cannot exceed 1 or 2.

¹In the sense of [12].

²It was actually a PMB filter and thus not ECF, see S. 8.

the time-sequence $X_l^k = X_k \cap (\mathbb{X}_0 \times \{l\})$ for $1 \leq k \leq i$, where $|X_l^k| \leq 1$ since $X_k \in \mathbb{F}_0$ [13, Eq. 4]. Note that if $X_l^i \neq \emptyset$ then $X_l^i = \{(x, l)\}$ for some $x \in \mathbb{X}_0$. The time-consecutive nonempty subsequences of an l -trajectory are its “track segments.”

Let $X_l^k, \dots, X_l^{k+i-1}$ be an l -segment of length i with start and stop times t_k, t_{k+i-1} . If we concatenate t_{k+i-1} to each element of $X_l^{k+i-1} = \{(x^i, l)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ then an l -segment can be re-notated as a vector:

$$T_l = ((x^1, l, t_k), (x^2, l, t_{k+1}), \dots, (x^i, l, t_{k+i-1})). \quad (2)$$

Let “ $A \approx B$ ” abbreviate the phrase “ A is notationally equivalent to B ” (in the sense that A and B are characterized by the same parameters). Then the l -segment can be successively re-notated as follows:

$$T_l \approx (l, t_k, x^1, \dots, x^i) \approx (l, t_k, x^{1:i}) \quad (3)$$

$$\approx (l, k, x^{1:i}) \approx (l, k_l, x_l^{1:i_i}) \quad (4)$$

where $(l, k_l, x_l^{1:i_i})$ (redundantly) emphasizes the fact that k_l, i_l , and $x_l^1, \dots, x_l^{i_i}$ define the particular trajectory segment T_l of the particular target l .

3. SETS OF TRAJECTORIES

SoT was introduced in [18] and elaborated in [4]. The sequence $X_{1:i} : X_1, \dots, X_i$ is replaced by a SoT $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ with distinct elements T_1, \dots, T_n , where a “trajectory” T is a vector:

$$T = (k, x^{1:i}) = ((t_k, x^1), (t_{k+1}, x^2), \dots, (t_{k+i-1}, x^i)). \quad (5)$$

Here, t_k and t_{k+i-1} are the trajectory’s beginning and end times and $x^{1:i} : x^1, x^2, \dots, x^i \in \mathbb{X}_0$ are its kinematic states at times $t_k, t_{k+1}, \dots, t_{k+i-1}$. A “trajectory RFS” (TRFS) is an RV whose realizations are SoTs.

4. THE MATHEMATICAL FUNDAMENTAL SoT ERROR

Because T_1, \dots, T_n are distinct, $T_j = (k_j, x_j^{1:i_j})$ for some k_j, i_j , and $x_j^1, \dots, x_j^{i_j}$ that are *uniquely associated* with $j = 1, \dots, n$. That is: T_j has been implicitly assigned a unique integer LRFS label $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Notational precision thus requires that $T_j = (j, k_j, x_j^{1:i_j})$. Comparing this with Eq. (4) we immediately see that SoT arises from (a) a failure to realize that the j are mathematically obligatory, and (b) a resulting decision to ignore (strip) them. It follows that SoT is mathematically fundamentally erroneous.

Moreover, suppose that the j are not stripped (resulting in “labeled SoT” or “LSoT”). Then it is clear from Eqs. 4,5) that LRFS trajectory segments and LSoT trajectories mathematically differ only by a change of notation [13, p. 4, S. III-A]. It follows that LSoT is just LRFS expressed in different notation.

5. SoT TRAJECTORY MODELING ERRORS

The simple counterexamples (CE’s) in [13, S. III-D] show that this “ j -error” results in seriously erroneous modeling of multitarget systems. Specifically, SoT allows impossible SoTs (CE-3) and cannot model two common trajectory types: spawned targets (CE-3) and reappearing targets/tracks (CE-4). Thus SoT is, contrary to claim, neither a physically correct nor a physical comprehensive trajectory model.

1. *CE-4*: Targets can reappear in a scene. Moreover, the output of MTTs and tracker-classifiers often includes tracks that are dropped and reacquired. Since ground truth trajectories must be compared to estimated trajectories, any comprehensive trajectory model must encompass such tracks. LRFS does but SoT cannot. Consider $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, T_2\}$ where $T_1 = (k, x^{1:5})$ and $T_2 = (k+10, y^{1:5})$. There is serious “tracking uncertainty” because \mathbf{T} could be a single reappearing target but SoT forces it to be two consecutive targets. Despite the contrary claim in [18, p. 3, c. 1], tracking uncertainty is eliminated (not increased) by restoring stripped LRFS labels: either $T_1 = (1, k, x^{1:5})$ and $T_2 = (1, k+10, y^{1:5})$ (single target) or $T_1 = (1, k, x^{1:5})$ and $T_2 = (2, k+10, y^{1:5})$ (two targets).

2. *CE-1*: Point targets have no physical extent and thus can simultaneously have identical kinematical states. Let n such targets with labels $1, \dots, n$ evolve identically during times t_1, \dots, t_i . Then the evolving system is $X_{1:i} : X_1, \dots, X_i$ with LFSS $X_k = \{(x_k, 1), \dots, (x_k, n)\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, i$ and $x_k \in \mathbb{X}_0$. When rewritten in SoT notation with unstripped labels, $X_{1:i}$ is the same as $\mathbf{T} = \{(1, 1, x^{1:i}), \dots, (n, 1, x^{1:i})\}$. If SoT is valid then labels can be stripped and so $\mathbf{T} = \{(1, x^{1:i})\}$: a single trajectory rather than n of them, a contradiction.

3. *CE-3*: Consider $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, T_2\}$ where $T_1 = (k, x, x^1)$ and $T_2 = (k, x, x^2)$ with x, x^1, x^2 distinct. Then \mathbf{T} is a physically impossible SoT since a single target x at time t_k cannot evolve to two different states x^1, x^2 at time t_{k+1} .⁴ Now restore the stripped labels: $T_1 = (1, k, x, x^1)$ and $T_2 = (2, k, x, x^2)$. Then \mathbf{T} represents a target-spawning event. That is, targets 1,2 had the identical state x at time t_k , at which point they separated and evolved respectively to x^1 and x^2 .

⁴Note that it would be specious to argue that erroneous SoTs can be ignored because they are zero-probability events: *every* SoT is a zero-probability event. It would be equally problematic to try to “repair” SoT by excluding erroneous SoTs from the definition of a SoT. This would require the (likely impossible) identification of all possible anomalies, followed by a complete revamping of SoT densities and integrals and any results based on them. Irregardless, this would not alter the fact that SoT as defined in [5] is seriously erroneous.

6. THE PHYSICAL FUNDAMENTAL SOT ERROR

See [13, S. II-B] for greater detail. The j -error seems to have arisen from the following fundamental physical misconceptions (all drawn from [4]):

1. (p. 1678, c. 2) “with the sequence of sets of labeled targets, there are infinite representations, as the labeling of the targets is arbitrary”: This is immaterial, because *all state variables have an infinite number of arbitrary representations!* For example: a position requires the following arbitrary and infinite representation scheme: specification of a number base, measurement unit, coordinate system origin, and coordinate system type.
2. (p. 1687, c. 2) “labels do not represent any physically meaningful property”: This is fundamentally false. The arbitrary symbols (labels) for a position can be assigned in a unique and “physically meaningful” manner once these specifications have been chosen. Similarly for target IDs and target labels (which are provisional IDs).
3. (p. 1689, c. 1) “In practice one can employ pragmatic fixes... to estimate sensible trajectories... For example, one can use the dynamic model”: This is obviously false. A “dynamic model” (Markov density a.k.a. dynamic prior) is a crucial theoretical feature of Bayesian MTT, not a “pragmatic fix” [14, S. 3.5.2]. Most obviously, it allows a tracker to infer that airplanes cannot execute instantaneous sharp-angle turns.
4. (p. 1686, c. 1) “...[target] labels are unobservable”: This is mistaken. Suppose that target states (p, v, l) consist of position p , velocity v , and *unique* label l , and that the sensor observes only position and is clutter-free with probability of detection $p_D = 1$. Then velocity is also “unobservable” in this sense. Yet velocity is routinely estimated (inferred). To a lesser extent the same is true of ID. An airplane can be inferred to be a jet fighter purely from kinematics. Moreover, labels are usually partially observable. When this sensor observes a set X of separated targets, its “measurement” is a set of separated positions. The positions and thus the labels must be distinct and therefore the latter are not “arbitrary” because X is an LFS. If otherwise, X would be a physically impossible multitarget state.

7. POISSON RANDOM FINITE SETS

A PRFS on \mathbb{X}_0 has multitarget probability density $f(X) \propto \prod_{x \in X} D(x)$ where $D(x) \geq 0$ is a density function on \mathbb{X}_0 [14, p. 366], [10, p. 98]. Likewise for a PRFS on $\mathbb{X}_0 \times \mathbb{L}$: $f(X) \propto \prod_{(x,l) \in X} D(x,l)$. The latter is physically nonviable since its realizations can be physically impossible, e.g., $\{(x_1, l), (x_2, l)\}$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$. Such realizations can be avoided only if $|\mathbb{L}| = 1$ (the unlabeled case), which results in a physically erroneous state representation: distinct targets

have distinct labels, *independently* of the limitations of the sensors that observe them.⁵ Thus *PRFSs on both $\mathbb{X}_0 \times \mathbb{L}$ and \mathbb{X}_0 do not represent underlying physical reality.*⁶

8. PMBM, VERSION 1

This 2012 “unlabeled” (PMBM-1) version [23] is actually PMB.⁷ Any multitarget population is modeled as a PMB RFS on \mathbb{X}_0 [23, Eqs. 2,12]. This models “undetected targets” (the “P” or PRFS part) and “detected targets” (the “MB” or MB RFS part). At each time-step t_k , the collected measurements in the measurement-set Z_k are assumed to be from newly-detected targets, and thus each measurement is used to construct a new Bernoulli (“B”) component—i.e., a new target—of an MBM RFS. The MBM RFS is then [23, p. 1105, c. 1, l. 16-23] approximated as an MB RFS.

9. PMBM-1 THEORETICAL ERRORS

1. The PMBMB-1 (but not PMB) filter is an ECF approximation of the MTBRF on \mathbb{X}_0 [12, S. 4.1]. It is not a theoretically rigorous MTT since it cannot inherently maintain trajectories.
2. The assumption that all measurements arise from newly-detected targets is a physically erroneous, ad hoc fix.
3. This assumption also implies a non-Bayesian multitarget dynamic prior $f_{k|k-1}(X|X_{k-1}, Z_k)$ rather than the usual $f_{k|k-1}(X|X_{k-1})$ or the general $f_{k|k-1}(X|X_{k-1}, Z_{1:k-1})$ [14, Eq. 3.54].⁸
4. This prior is also logically impossible: how can predicted targets X arise from a measurement-set Z_k not yet collected?
5. PMBM distributions grow in size with time and thus must be pruned. This is theoretically impossible because pruned PMBM distributions are not valid multitarget (let alone PMBM) distributions. [12, Eq. 46].

10. PMBM, VERSION 2

The “label-augmented” (PMBM-2) filter appeared in 2015 in [24] to address the fact that the PMBM-1 filter is not a true

⁵Thus refuting [6, p. 1884, c. 1, l. 14-15]: “...the usual radar tracking case, in which targets do not have a unique ID...” This is a category error: targets’ *distinctness* (which is innate) is confused with their *distinguishability* (which requires an observer/sensor).

⁶Prior to the 2011 LRFS innovations in [21], heuristically labeled RFS filters on \mathbb{X}_0 were necessary as a stopgap to avoid computational intractability, see [13, p. 3, S. III-A].

⁷The actual PBMB-1 filter apparently appeared in 2015 in [24].

⁸A closely related issue: the transition of “undetected targets” to “detected targets” [12, p. 13, Item 3]. This should be governed by the general Markov density $f_{k|k-1}(X|X_{k-1}, Z_{1:k-1})$. This is impossible because target detection is governed by the general measurement density $f_k(Z|X_k, Z_{1:k-1})$ [14, Eq. 3.56], where $X_k \sim f_{k|k-1}(X|X_{k-1}, Z_{1:k-1})$ and $Z_k \sim f_k(Z|X_k, Z_{1:k-1})$ (and “ \sim ” means “random sample drawn from”).

MTT. It is a PMBM-1 filter defined on $\mathbb{X}_0 \times \mathbb{L}$ rather than \mathbb{X}_0 , where “...track continuity is implicitly maintained in the same way as in JPDA [Joint Probabilistic Data Association] and related methods. This can be made explicit by incorporating a label element into the underlying state space...” [24, p. 1672, c. 2, l. 7-15]. Hence the (erroneous) claim that the LRFS paper [22] “...shows that the labelled case can be handled within the unlabeled framework by incorporating a label element in to the underlying state space” [24, p. 1675, c. 2, l. 16-19]. This labeling scheme was carried over into the 2018 sequel paper [6, p. 1886, c. 1, l. 26-29].

11. PMBM-2 THEORETICAL ERRORS

See [12, S. 4.3] for greater detail.

1. Targets are created from measurements [6, Eq. 11], so the dynamic prior is $f_{k|k-1}(X|X_{k-1}, Z_k)$.
2. PRFSs are implicitly defined on $\mathbb{X}_0 \times \mathbb{L}$ and thus are physically nonviable.
3. How can the labeled framework logically be “within” (i.e., a special case of) the unlabeled framework? The contrary is true: the unlabeled case is $|\mathbb{L}| = 1$.

12. PMBM, VERSION 3

This “hybrid labeled-unlabeled” version (PMBM-3) was introduced in the 2018 paper [9]. It is a modification of the PMBM-2 filter that appears intended to repair the fact that PRFS’s on $\mathbb{X}_0 \times \mathbb{L}$ are not LRFSs and thus cannot model any targets (let alone “undetected” ones). So, detected targets are created from collected measurements and modeled as labeled MBM (LMBM) distributions, but now with measurements used as de facto target labels [9, p. 249, c. 1, l. 8-11]. Moreover, undetected targets are assumed to have the same label and thus can be modeled as a PRFS on \mathbb{X}_0 .

13. PMBM-3 THEORETICAL ERRORS

See [12, S. 4.4, p. 13] for greater detail.

1. It still uses $f_{k|k-1}(X|X_{k-1}, Z_k)$.
2. The ad hoc assumption that measurements are de facto target labels leads to a mathematical contradiction.
3. The assumption that undetected targets have the same label is an ad hoc fix. Its consequence is that such targets can be in multiple locations simultaneously, a physical impossibility.
4. The PMBM-3 filter does not (as claimed in [9]) exactly solve the hybrid labeled-unlabeled MTBRF.

14. SoT CONTRADICTS PMBM-2,3

1. Labels are employed in PMBM-2,3 but forbidden in SoT.

15. TPMBM THEORETICAL ERRORS

1. The TPMBM filter appears to try to repair the errors in the PMBM-2,3 filters by reverting to the PMBM-1 filter and using SoT to enable it to maintain tracks. But this does not alter the fact that PMBM-1 and SoT are themselves erroneous.
2. Like the PMBM-1 filter, the TPMBM filter presumes that measurements initiate new targets, to wit: “For a new Bernoulli component i ...which is initiated by measurement z_k^j ...” [5, p. 4937, c. 2].
3. TPMBM requires “trajectory Poisson RFSs” (TPRFSs): that is, PRFSs whose realizations are SoTs. But these are physically nonviable for the same reason that PRFSs on $\mathbb{X}_0 \times \mathbb{L}$ are physically nonviable: they (and indeed SoT itself) allow physically impossible realizations (see [13, p. 6, S. III-E(5)] and Counterexample CE-3).

16. TPMBM NUMERICAL ERRORS: GTMPB FILTER

The 2020 paper [5] describes the GTPMB filter. This is a Gaussian mixture (GM) numerical implementation of the TPMB filter, which in turn is an approximation of the TPMBM filter. It requires Eq. 64, a GM of the form

$$p(T) = \sum_{q=t}^k w_q N(T; (t, x_q), P_q). \quad (6)$$

Here, $p(T)$ is a “single-trajectory density”; $w_q \geq 0$ and $\sum_{q=t}^k w_q = 1$; (t, x_q) with $x_q \in \mathbb{R}^{(q-t+1)n}$ is a trajectory; P_q is a $(q-t+1)n$ -by- $(q-t+1)n$ covariance matrix; and $N(\cdot; \cdot, \cdot)$ is a Gaussian distribution. If the unit of measurement (UoM) of \mathbb{R}^n is u then the UoMs of x_q and $N(T, (t, x_q), P_q)$ are u^{q-t+1} and $u^{-(q-t+1)}$, which vary with q . The summation is therefore mathematically undefined since its terms are numerically incommensurable.

If Eq. 64 is mathematically undefined then so is the GTPMB filter. The GTPMB prediction step (Lemma 6, p. 4939, c. 2) is undefined because, according to lines 1-3 of Lemma 6, Eq. 64 is inserted into Eq. 28 of the TPMB filter’s prediction step (Lemma 2, p. 4937, c. 2). The GTPMB filter update step (Lemma 7, p. 4939, c. 2) is thus also mathematically undefined since it depends on the prediction step.

Given this serious numerical error, the favorable simulation results reported in [5] require substantive explanation.

17. TPMBM NUMERICAL ERRORS: TPHD FILTER

See [13, p. 7, S. III-E(4)] for greater detail. The 2019 paper [3] describes the “trajectory probability hypothesis density” (TPHD) filter: a first-order approximation of the TPMBM filter. Like the TPMBM filter, it requires erroneous TPRFSs. It also employs a direct generalization of the conventional (unlabeled) PHD filter’s multitarget state estimator (which is summarized in [13, S. III-E(2)]). The first step is to find $\arg \sup_T D(T)$ where $D(T) \geq 0$ is a TPHD with $T =$

$(k, x^{1:i})$. If u is the UoM of \mathbb{X}_0 then the UoMs of T and $D(T)$ are u^i and u^{-i} , which vary with i . The arg sup is therefore mathematically undefined since the values of $D(T)$ are numerically incommensurable.⁹

Given this serious numerical error, the favorable simulation results reported in [3] require substantive explanation.

REFERENCES

- 1 M. Beard, B.-T. Vo, and B.-N. Vo, "A solution for large-scale multi-object tracking," *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 68: 2754-2769, 2020.
- 2 M. Fatimi, K. Granström, L. Svensson, F. Ruiz, and L. Hammarstrand, "Poisson multi-Bernoulli mapping using Gibbs sampling," *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 65(11): 2814-2827, 2017.
- 3 Á. García-Fernández and L. Svensson, "Trajectory PHD and CPHD filters," *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 67(22): 5702-5714, 2019.
- 4 Á. García-Fernández, L. Svensson, and M. Moreland, "Multiple target tracking based on sets of trajectories," *IEEE Trans. Aerospace & Electr. Sys.*, 56(3): 1685-1707, 2020.
- 5 Á. García-Fernández, L. Svensson, J. Williams, Yuxuan Xia, and K. Granström, "Trajectory Poisson multi-Bernoulli filters," *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 68: 4933-4945, 2020.
- 6 Á. García-Fernández, J. Williams, K. Granström, and L. Svensson, "Poisson multi-Bernoulli mixture filter: Direct derivation and implementation," *IEEE Trans. Aerospace & Electr. Sys.*, 54(4): 1883-1901, 2018.
- 7 I. Goodman, R. Mahler, and H. Nguyen, *Mathematics of Data Fusion*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York, 1997.
- 8 Hung Gia Hoang, B.-T. Vo, and B.-N. Vo, "A generalized labeled multi-Bernoulli filter implemented using Gibbs sampling," 2015, open source: <https://www.arxiv.org/abs/1506.00821/>.
- 9 F. Meyer, T. Kropfreiter, J. Williams, R. Lau, F. Hlawatsch, P. Braca, and M. Win, "Message passing algorithms for scalable multitarget tracking," *Proc. IEEE*, 106(2): 221-259, 2018.
- 10 R. Mahler, *Advances in Statistical Multisource-Multitarget Information Fusion*, Artech House, Norwood, MA, 2014.
- 11 R. Mahler, "Bayes-optimal tracking of two statistically correlated targets in general clutter," *IET Sign. Proc.*, 2022, open source: <https://doi.org/10.1049/sil2.12150>.
- 12 R. Mahler, "Exact closed-form multitarget Bayes filters," *Sensors*, 19(12), 2019, open source: <https://doi.org/10.3390/s19122818>.
- 13 R. Mahler, "Mathematical representation of multitarget systems," 15 Mar 2022, open source: <https://www.arxiv.org/abs/2203.10972/>.
- 14 R. Mahler, *Statistical Multisource-Multitarget Information Fusion*, Artech House, Norwood, MA, 2007.
- 15 R. Mahler, "'Statistics 101' for multisensor, multitarget data fusion," *IEEE Aerospace & Electronics Sys. Mag., Part 2: Tutorials*, 19(1): 53-64, 2004.
- 16 B. Ristic, B.-T. Vo, B.-N. Vo, and A. Farina, "A tutorial on Bernoulli filters: Theory, implementation, and applications," *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 61(13): 3406 - 3430, 2012.
- 17 Changbeom Shim, B.-T. Vo, B.-N. Vo, J. Ong, and D. Moratuwage, "Linear complexity Gibbs sampling for generalized labeled multi-Bernoulli filtering", *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 71: 1981-1994, 2023.
- 18 L. Svensson and M. Moreland, "Target tracking based on estimation of sets of trajectories," *Proc. 17th Int'l Conf. on Information Fusion*, Salamanca, Spain, July 7-10, 2014.
- 19 B.-T. Vo, "Random Finite Sets in Multi-Object Filtering," Ph.D. Dissertation, School of Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering, The University of Western Australia, 254 pages, October 2008.
- 20 B.-N. Vo and B.-T. Vo, "A multi-scan labeled random finite set model for multi-object state estimation," *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 67(9): 4948-4963, 2019.
- 21 B.-T. Vo and B.-N. Vo, "A random finite set conjugate prior and application to multi-target tracking," *Proc. 2011 Int'l Conf. on Intelligent Sensors, Sensor Networks, and Information Processing (ISSNIP2011)*, Adelaide, Australia, Dec. 6-9, 2011.
- 22 B.-T. Vo and V.-N. Vo, "Labeled random finite sets and multi-object conjugate priors," *IEEE Trans. Sign. Proc.*, 61(13): 3460-3475, 2013.
- 23 J. Williams, "Hybrid Poisson and multi-Bernoulli filters," *Proc. 15th Int'l Conf. on Information Fusion*, Singapore, July 9-12, 2012.
- 24 J. Williams, "Marginal multi-Bernoulli filters: RFS derivation of MHT, JIPDA, and association-based MeMber," *IEEE Trans. Aerospace & Electr. Sys.*, 51(3): 1664-1687, 2015.

⁹This should have been obvious, since one of the earliest RFS insights was that the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimator is mathematically undefined in multitarget problems and thus must be replaced by alternatives such as "JoM" or "MaM" [15, p. 59, c. 2], [14, S. 14.5], [10, S. 5.3].

