

Localization Accuracy Improvement in Multistatic ISAC with LoS/NLoS Condition using 5G NR Signals

Keivan Khosroshahi^{*†}, Philippe Sehier[†], Sami Mekki[†], and Michael Suppa[‡]

^{*} Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, CentraleSupélec, Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

[†] Nokia Standards, Massy, France

[‡] Roboception, Munich, Germany

keivan.khosroshahi@centralesupelec.fr, {philippe.sehier, sami.mekki}@nokia.com, michael.suppa@roboception.de

Abstract—Integrated sensing and communication (ISAC) is anticipated to play a crucial role in sixth-generation (6G) mobile communication networks. A significant challenge in ISAC systems is the degradation of localization accuracy due to poor propagation conditions, such as multipath effects and non-line-of-sight (NLoS) scenarios. These conditions result in outlier measurements that can severely impact localization performance. This paper investigates the enhancement of target localization accuracy in multistatic ISAC systems under both line-of-sight (LoS) and NLoS conditions. We leverage positioning reference signal (PRS), which is currently employed in fifth-generation (5G) new radio (NR) for user equipment (UE) positioning, as the sensing signal. We introduce a novel algorithm to improve localization accuracy by mitigating the impact of outliers in range measurements, while also accounting for errors due to PRS range resolution. Eventually, through simulation results, we demonstrate the superiority of the proposed method over previous approaches. Indeed, we achieve up to 28% and 20% improvements in average localization error over least squares (LS) and iteratively reweighted least squares (IRLS) methods, respectively. Additionally, we observe up to 16% and 13% enhancements in the 90th percentile of localization error compared to LS and IRLS, respectively. Our simulation is based on 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) standards, ensuring the applicability of our results across diverse environments, including urban and indoor areas.

Index Terms—Multistatic ISAC, 6G, PRS, LS, IRLS, localization, 3GPP

I. INTRODUCTION

Sensing using radio signals has gained significant interest in beyond fifth-generation (B5G) and sixth-generation (6G). Integrated sensing and communication (ISAC) is anticipated to emerge as a promising technology in future wireless systems. The emergence of ISAC offers numerous sensing applications, ranging from remote healthcare and weather monitoring to target tracking, gesture recognition, autonomous vehicles, and augmented reality (AR) [1]. Reference signals in wireless communication systems are known for their excellent passive detection performance and strong resistance to noise [2]. This has led to increased interest in developing sensing signals based on reference signals. Among the various reference

signals in fifth-generation (5G) networks, the positioning reference signals (PRS) is particularly notable for sensing applications because of its abundant time-frequency resources and flexible configuration. The PRS was introduced in 3rd generation partnership project (3GPP) release 16 of the 5G specification to improve the positioning accuracy of connected user equipment (UEs) [3].

On the other hand, research on ISAC has mostly concentrated on waveform design and signal processing, especially in monostatic systems where the transmitter and receiver are collocated. In contrast, bistatic ISAC, where the transmitter and receiver are not collocated, offers the advantage of eliminating the need for full-duplex capability. Multistatic ISAC, which employs multiple dispersed transmitters and receivers, offers advantages such as diversity gain from independent sensing at each receiver [4]. However, non-line-of-sight (NLoS) paths between the transmitter, receiver, and target can lead to measurement errors, known as outliers. Since localization accuracy is highly sensitive to the outliers, it is crucial to take them into account. Therefore, one of the main challenges in localization and sensing is to efficiently mitigate the impact of outliers [5].

The research community has proposed several methods to identify and reject outliers from time of arrival (ToA), or equivalently, range measurements. However, the method explained in [5] suffers from a drawback as it requires a priori information regarding the status of the transmission path i.e., line-of-sight (LoS) or NLoS, and the transmission time of the signal which might not be available. Authors in [6] employ a recursive weighted least squares method, which requires a single reference base station (BS) to compute the time difference of arrival (TDoA) that leads to an inaccurate position estimation if the reference BS is identified as an outlier. Similarly, in [7], a reference BS is defined, which introduces the drawback that the reference itself may contain an outlier. Authors in [8] introduce a reference-free TDoA-based positioning method but does not address the issue of outlier rejection. To overcome this issue, authors in [9], implement the iteratively reweighted least square (IRLS) technique, which is robust to the outliers.

The problem with IRLS algorithm is that it might diverge

This work was funded by the European Commission through the H2020 MSCA 5GSmartFact project under grant agreement number 956670.

in some cases, depending on initial values and the presence of outliers. Moreover, the previously cited works focused on the positioning of the connected devices. The problem of outliers also exists in sensing for passive targets, which degrades the accuracy of location estimation. To the best of the authors' knowledge, passive target localization under LoS/NLoS conditions in a multistatic ISAC scenario using 5G new radio (NR) reference signal, while considering 3GPP standard constraints, has not yet been investigated.

In this work, we focus on the localization accuracy enhancement of an unconnected target in multistatic ISAC under both LoS and NLoS conditions. We utilize PRS, currently employed in 5G NR for UEs positioning, as the sensing signal. We introduce a novel algorithm that improves the localization accuracy of the target by accounting for the effects of both outliers and range estimation error caused by PRS range resolution. Simulation results demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method compared to least square (LS) and IRLS approaches. We achieve significant improvement in average localization error compared to LS and IRLS methods. Additionally, our results show considerable enhancement in 90th percentile of the localization error compared to LS and IRLS. This study provides the first proof of concept of using PRS in localizing a target in LoS and NLoS scenarios, taking 3GPP standard constraints into account.

II. PRS AS REFERENCE SIGNALS FOR SENSING

The allocation of physical resource blocks (PRBs) in 5G NR is defined in the technical specification (TS) 38.214 [10]. PRB consists of 12 consecutive subcarriers in the frequency domain and 14 symbols in the time domain. According to TS 38.211 [11], the generation of the PRS sequences is performed using the following equation:

$$\kappa(m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - 2c(2m)) + j\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - 2c(2m+1)) \quad (1)$$

where $c(i)$ denotes the Gold sequence of length 31. The starting value of $c(i)$ for the PRS is provided in [11].

PRS allocation consists of a minimum of 24 PRBs and a maximum of 272 PRBs, illustrating the flexible transmission parameters supported in 5G NR. This flexibility allows PRS to adapt its time-frequency resource configuration to meet sensing accuracy requirements for diverse applications. As per the PRS resource mapping guidelines indicated in TS 38.211 [11], four comb structures—Comb 2, 4, 6, 12—in the frequency domain and five symbol configurations—Symbol 1, 2, 4, 6, 12—in the time domain are supported. Further details on PRS configuration and resource allocation in ISAC scenarios can be found in [12].

III. MULTISTATIC ISAC SYSTEM MODEL

We consider a multistatic ISAC scenario comprising S transmitters, K receivers, and one passive point-like target. Figure 1 shows the considered setup where the UEs are configured to receive the downlink information from gNodeBs (gNBs) in LoS or NLoS. The locations of the gNBs and




Fig. 1: Multistatic ISAC scenario in which the red dashed lines indicate blocked LoS links, green dashed lines indicate LoS links, and the yellow dashed lines indicate the NLoS links between gNBs, UEs, and the target.

UEs are assumed to be known. The location of the UEs can be determined by the positioning service provided by gNBs [3]. The location of the k -th UE is denoted as $\mathbf{u}_k = (x_{k,u}, y_{k,u})$, $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. The point-like target is placed at $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, y_0)$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and s -th gNB is located at $\mathbf{g}_s = (x_{s,g}, y_{s,g})$, $\mathbf{g}_s \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}$. We assume that the clocks of the gNBs could be synchronized by global positioning system (GPS) clock module [13].

The transmitted signal from s -th gNB in the continuous time domain can be expressed as [12]:

$$\mathcal{Q}_s(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \text{rect}\left(\frac{t - nT_0}{T_0}\right) \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} v_s(m, n) e^{j2\pi m \Delta f (t - nT_0)} \quad (2)$$

where M represents the number of subcarriers, and N is the number of symbols in the time domain in an orthogonal frequency-division multiplexing (OFDM) resource grid. The function $\text{rect}(t/T_0)$ denotes a rectangular pulse, Δf is the subcarrier spacing, and $T_0 = T_{CP} + T_s$ is the total duration of an OFDM symbol, where $T_s = \frac{1}{\Delta f}$ is the symbol duration and T_{CP} is the cyclic prefix (CP) length. $v_s(m, n)$ denotes the complex symbol transmitted by s -th gNBs at the m -th subcarrier and n -th symbol, where $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$ and $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$ within an $M \times N$ OFDM resource grid. We assume that UEs receive the echoes from the target and estimate the time of flights (ToFs). The reflected signals from the target, received by the k -th UE, can be expressed as [14]:

$$\mathcal{Y}_k(t) = \sum_{s=1}^S \beta_{s,k} \mathcal{Q}_s(t - \tau_{s,k}) e^{j2\pi f_d t} + e(t) \quad (3)$$

where $\beta_{s,k}$ represents the attenuation factor of PRS signal sent from s -th gNB and received by k -th UE, f_d is the Doppler frequency shift, $\tau_{s,k}$ denotes the delay of received PRS signal

by k -th UE from the s -th gNB, and $e(t) \in \mathbb{C}$ is the complex additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) with zero mean and variance of $2\sigma^2$. The extracted received symbols after fast Fourier transform (FFT) for k -th UE can be written as:

$$\tilde{v}_k(m, n) = \sum_{s=1}^S \beta_{s,k} e^{j2\pi n T_0 f_d} e^{-j2\pi m \Delta f \tau_{s,k}} v_s(m, n) + p(m, n) \quad (4)$$

where $p(m, n) \in \mathbb{C}$ is the AWGN noise with zero mean and variance of $2\sigma^2$ on the n -th OFDM symbol and the m -th subcarrier obtained from sampling and FFT over $\mathcal{Y}_k(t)$. The UE can estimate the bistatic distance $\hat{r}_{s,k}$, i.e., the distance from the gNB to the target and from the target to the UE, using the periodogram-based method without encountering range ambiguity [15]. To accomplish this, we first extract the received PRS symbols by UE k in (4), sent from gNB s denoted, as $\tilde{v}_{s,k}(m, n) = \beta_{s,k} e^{j2\pi n T_0 f_d} e^{-j2\pi m \Delta f \tau_{s,k}} v_s(m, n)$, $\forall s \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}$. This extraction is feasible due to the distinct PRS offset in the time or frequency domain for each gNB. Then, we remove the transmitted PRS symbols of gNB s from the received echoes by performing point-wise division as:

$$g_{s,k}(m, n) = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{v}_{s,k}(m, n)}{v_s(m, n)} & , \text{ if } v_s(m, n) \neq 0 \\ 0 & , \text{ if } v_s(m, n) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Then, we perform an M -point inverse fast Fourier transform (IFFT) on the n -th column of $g_{s,k}(m, n)$ as:

$$r_{s,k}^n(\ell) = |\text{IFFT}(g_{s,k}(m, n))| = \left| \beta_{s,k} e^{j2\pi n T_0 f_d} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} e^{-j2\pi m \Delta f \frac{\hat{r}_{s,k}}{c_0}} e^{j2\pi \frac{m\ell}{M}} + \frac{p(m, n)}{v_s(m, n)} e^{j2\pi \frac{m\ell}{M}} \right| \quad (6)$$

where $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$, $|\cdot|$ denotes the absolute value, and we have replaced $\tau_{s,k}$ with $\frac{\hat{r}_{s,k}}{c_0}$ where c_0 is the light speed. The maximum value in (6) is achieved when the argument of $e^{-j2\pi m \Delta f \frac{\hat{r}_{s,k}}{c_0}} e^{j2\pi \frac{m\ell}{M}}$ cancel each other out. The next step is to perform an IFFT over all columns of $g_{s,k}(m, n)$ and average the results to enhance the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR):

$$\bar{r}_{s,k}(\ell) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} r_{s,k}^n(\ell) \quad (7)$$

Next, we identify the index of the maximum value, denoted as $\hat{\ell}_{s,k}$, in (7). Using this index, the bistatic distance of the target between UE k and gNB s can then be estimated as:

$$\hat{r}_{s,k} = \frac{\hat{\ell}_{s,k} c_0}{\Delta f M} \quad (8)$$

Additionally, the PRS range resolution is defined as:

$$\Delta r = \frac{c_0}{\Delta f M} \quad (9)$$

If the target is in LoS of both gNB s and UE k , then the correct bistatic distance of the target between UE k and gNB s , denoted as $r_{s,k}$, can be expressed geometrically as:

$$r_{s,k} = \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| + \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\| \quad (10)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ represents the Euclidean norm. In the next section, we discuss how to adapt existing methods for positioning connected devices to localize a passive target. We also introduce our novel method to reduce the target localization error using $\hat{r}_{s,k}$, $\forall s \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}$, and $\forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ from (8).

IV. TARGET'S LOCATION ESTIMATION

Equation (10) is written assuming the target is in LoS of both the UE and the gNB. However, if the target is in NLoS with either the UE, the gNB, or both, the resulting error in location estimation can be significant. Additionally, the PRS range resolution defined in (9) introduces further error in localization estimation. In this section, we will first explain and adapt the LS and IRLS methods for estimating the target's location, taking into account the outliers and PRS range resolution. We will then present our proposed method to further improve localization accuracy.

A. LS and IRLS Method in Sensing

Considering the outlier and PRS range estimation error, we can express the bistatic distance of the target between UE k and gNB s as:

$$\hat{r}_{s,k} = r_{s,k} + \delta_{s,k} \quad (11)$$

where $\delta_{s,k}$ represents the outlier and PRS range estimation error between gNB s and UE k . One conventional approach to estimate \mathbf{x}_0 is to solve the following LS optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}_0} \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{r}_{s,k} - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\|)^2 \quad (12)$$

We can solve (12) using the gradient descent method. Since the optimization problem in (12) is non-convex, the gradient descent method converges to a local minimum.

To improve localization accuracy by rejecting outliers, the IRLS method can be used [9]. This alters the optimization problem to:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}_0} \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \sum_{s=1}^S (\hat{r}_{s,k} - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\|)^2 \quad (13)$$

where w_k is the weight assigned to the range estimation of UE k . We name the objective function in (13) as $f_{\text{IRLS}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$. To solve this problem, we use the gradient descent method. Therefore, we calculate the gradient of $f_{\text{IRLS}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f_{\text{IRLS}}(\mathbf{x}_0) = & -2 \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \sum_{s=1}^S (\hat{r}_{s,k} - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| \\ & - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\|) \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s}{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\|} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k}{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\|} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We consider an initial value for $\mathbf{x}_0^{(0)}$ and set $w_k^{(0)} = \frac{1}{K}$, $\forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. We then iteratively update $\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_0^{(i+1)} = \mathbf{x}_0^{(i)} - \eta \nabla f_{\text{IRLS}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)}) \quad (15)$$

where η is the step size.

Algorithm 1 The algorithm for location estimation using IRLS

Input: Bistatic distances $\hat{r}_{s,k}$, location of the gNBs $\mathbf{g}_s, \forall s \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}$, location of the UEs $\mathbf{u}_k, \forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, maximum residual error e_{\max} , threshold ϵ^{IRLS} , maximum number of iteration I_{\max}

Output: Position estimation $\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)}$, weights of the UEs $\mathbf{w}^{(i)}$
 $i \leftarrow 1$

Initial estimate of the target location $\mathbf{x}_0^{(0)}$

$w_k^{(0)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{K}, \forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$

while $i \leq I_{\max}$ and $\Delta^{\text{IRLS}} > \epsilon^{\text{IRLS}}$ **do**

$i \leftarrow i + 1$

Update $\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)}$ using (15)

Compute residual error using (16)

Update $w_k^{(i)}$ with (17)

Normalize $\mathbf{w}^{(i)}$ as in (18)

Compute Δ^{IRLS} using (19)

end while

return $\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)}, \mathbf{w}^{(i)}$

To detect inaccurate measurements, we define the residual error e_k for k -th UE as a measure of reliability:

$$e_k^{(i+1)} = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \left| \hat{r}_{s,k} - (\|\mathbf{x}_0^{(i+1)} - \mathbf{g}_s\| + \|\mathbf{x}_0^{(i+1)} - \mathbf{u}_k\|) \right| \quad (16)$$

After calculating the residual errors for all UEs, the weights for the next iteration are determined using the Andrews sine function, known for its robustness in statistics and outlier rejection [16]. The weights are computed as:

$$\begin{cases} w_k^{(i+1)} = \frac{e_{\max}}{e_k^{(i+1)}} \sin\left(\frac{e_k^{(i+1)}}{e_{\max}}\right) & , \text{ if } e_k^{(i+1)} \leq e_{\max} \\ w_k^{(i+1)} = 0 & , \text{ if } e_k^{(i+1)} > e_{\max} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where e_{\max} is the maximum value of the residual error. The weights are then normalized as:

$$w_k^{(i+1)} = \frac{w_k^{(i+1)}}{\sum_{k=1}^K w_k^{(i+1)}} \quad (18)$$

The convergence check is done after each iteration as:

$$\Delta^{\text{IRLS}} = \|\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)} - \mathbf{x}_0^{(i-1)}\| \quad (19)$$

We define ϵ^{IRLS} as a threshold. If $\Delta^{\text{IRLS}} > \epsilon^{\text{IRLS}}$, the algorithm starts repeating the process or until a maximum number of iterations I_{\max} is reached. The summary of the IRLS algorithm can be seen in Algorithm 1 where $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K]$ is the vector of the UE's weights.

B. Proposed Method for Localization Accuracy Improvement

Outliers can arise in three different scenarios: 1) The target is in NLoS of the UEs. 2) The target is in NLoS of the gNBs. 3) The target is in NLoS of both the gNBs and the UEs. Since we lack priori knowledge about the occurrence of these scenarios, we account for all of them in the optimization that will be introduced later in this section.

1) *The target is in NLoS of the UEs:* In the case that the target is in NLoS with some UEs, we remove all paths between the target and all the UEs to mitigate the influence of the potentially erroneous measurements that could cause outliers, as we do not know which UEs are in NLoS with the target. This can be done as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}_{s,s',k} &= \hat{r}_{s',k} - \hat{r}_{s,k} = \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| + \zeta_{0,k} + \gamma_{s',k} \\ &\quad - (\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_{s'}\| + \zeta_{0,k} + \gamma_{s,k}) \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_{s'}\| + \gamma_{s',k} - \gamma_{s,k} \\ \forall s, s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}, s \neq s', \forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\zeta_{0,k}$ represents the NLoS distance that the signal travels to reach UE k from the target, and $\gamma_{s,k} \sim U(-\frac{c_0}{2\Delta fM}, \frac{c_0}{2\Delta fM}), \forall s \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}, \forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ denotes the range estimation error caused by the PRS range resolution defined in (9) between k -th UE and s -th gNB. By removing the paths between the target and the UEs, we alleviate the potential error from PRS range estimation.

2) *The target is in NLoS of the gNBs:* When the target is in NLoS of some gNBs, to remove the potential error from the range estimation using PRS, we need to remove all the paths between the target and the gNBs since we are not aware which gNBs are in NLoS with the target. This can be achieved by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}_{s,k,k'} &= \hat{r}_{s,k} - \hat{r}_{s,k'} = \zeta_{s,0} + \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\| + \gamma_{s,k} \\ &\quad - (\zeta_{s,0} + \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_{k'}\| + \gamma_{s,k'}) \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\| - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_{k'}\| + \gamma_{s,k} - \gamma_{s,k'} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\forall s \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}, \forall k, k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}, k \neq k' \quad (23)$$

where $\zeta_{s,0}$ denotes the NLoS distance that the signal travels from gNB s to the target. It is important to note that while removing the paths as described in IV-B1 and IV-B2 reduces error in PRS range estimation by eliminating NLoS paths, it maintains the correctness of the range measurements when the target is in LoS with the gNBs or UEs. Considering the calculated $\hat{r}_{s,s',k}$ and $\hat{r}_{s,k,k'}$ as (21) and (23), respectively, we solve the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}_0} & \left[\sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{k'=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{s,k,k'} - (\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\| - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_{k'}\|))^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{s=1}^{S-1} \sum_{s'=s+1}^S (\hat{r}_{s,s',k} - (\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_{s'}\|))^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

To solve (24) using the gradient descent method, we denote the objective function as $f(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and drive its gradient as:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0) &= -2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{s=1}^{S-1} \sum_{s'=s+1}^S (\hat{r}_{s,s',k} - (\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\| \\ &\quad - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_{s'}\|)) \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s}{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_s\|} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_{s'}}{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{g}_{s'}\|} \right) \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{k'=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{s,k,k'} - (\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\| - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_{k'}\|)) \\ &\quad \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k}{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_k\|} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_{k'}}{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{u}_{k'}\|} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Using the gradient in (25), we can iteratively update \mathbf{x}_0 as:

$$\mathbf{x}_0^{(i+1)} = \mathbf{x}_0^{(i)} - \alpha \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)}) \quad (26)$$

where α is the step size. The iterations proceed until $\|\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)} - \mathbf{x}_0^{(i-1)}\| \leq \epsilon^*$ is satisfied. Since the optimization problem in (24) is non-convex, this method converges to a local minimum.

3) *The target is in NLoS of both gNBs and UEs:* If the target is in NLoS of all gNBs and UEs, the range measurements are subject to significant errors. However, applying the methods described in Sections IV-B1 and IV-B2 can improve accuracy.

Our simulations indicate that our proposed algorithm outperforms the IRLS when the target is in the LoS of at least one transmitter and receiver. While it is unlikely that the target is in the NLoS of all transmitters and receivers in most scenarios, we propose the joint use of our method and IRLS to further enhance localization accuracy in all environments. To that end, if we denote the estimated location of the target using IRLS algorithm as $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{IRLS}}$ and the introduced algorithm as \mathbf{x}_0^* , the ultimate estimated location can be defined as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \begin{cases} \nu^{\text{IRLS}} \mathbf{x}_0^{\text{IRLS}} + \nu^* \mathbf{x}_0^* & , \text{ if IRLS converges} \\ \mathbf{x}_0^* & , \text{ if IRLS diverges} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

where ν^{IRLS} and ν^* are positive weights assigned to the location estimates of the IRLS and the proposed method, respectively, where $\nu^{\text{IRLS}} + \nu^* = 1$. ν^{IRLS} and ν^* can be chosen based on the considered environment. In dense environments, such as factories, where the target is most likely in NLoS of all transmitters and receivers, we increase the weight of $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{IRLS}}$ by raising ν^{IRLS} . Conversely, in the areas where the target is likely in LoS of at least one transmitter and receiver such as rural environments, we assign more weight to \mathbf{x}_0^* by increasing ν^* . This adaptive strategy allows us to mitigate the limitations of each method, as different scenarios can occur unpredictably. Additionally, the method in (27) is robust against divergence, unlike IRLS. In the next section, we compare the simulation results of LS, IRLS, and the proposed method in (27).

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

To validate the introduced approach, we use Matlab 5G toolboxes to make this work 3GPP standards compliant. We simulate a scenario where multiple gNBs, UEs and a target are randomly distributed in $400\text{m} \times 400\text{m}$, $200\text{m} \times 200\text{m}$ and $150\text{m} \times 150\text{m}$ area, respectively, and $\nu^{\text{IRLS}} = \nu^* = \frac{1}{2}$. The carrier frequency is set to 28GHz, subcarrier spacing is 120kHz and PRB of PRS is equal to 66 which corresponds to 100MHz in frequency range 2 (FR2) transmission bandwidth configurations defined in TS 38.104 [17]. The PRS comb size is set to 12, allowing up to 12 gNBs to participate in sensing. Given such configuration, Δr is 3.15m based on (9), which means that besides outliers, we have taken the 3.15m error caused by PRS range resolution into account as well in the simulations. We also set e_{\max} to 7, α to 0.001, η to 0.01, and ϵ^{IRLS} and ϵ^* to 0.01. In the simulations, the number of outliers is uniformly distributed between zero and $S + K$.

In Figure 2, we present the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of different methods while the number of gNBs and




Fig. 2: CDFs of different methods.

TABLE I: Localization error comparison.

| | Average localization error (m) | 90th percentile (m) |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| LS | 1.28 | 2.08 |
| IRLS | 1.19 | 2.01 |
| Proposed method | 0.96 | 1.74 |

UEs is 6. To simulate the effect of outliers, we randomly add outliers in the range estimations, with values up to 10m using uniform distribution. The results demonstrate that the proposed method outperforms the other methods. Table I provides a numerical analysis of different methods with the mentioned configuration. The introduced algorithm in this work shows almost 20% improvement in average localization error compared to the IRLS and 25% improvement compared to the LS. Additionally, we achieve 13% and 16% improvement in 90th percentile of localization error compared to IRLS and LS, respectively. Figure 3 illustrates the impact of the number of gNBs and UEs on average localization error while the outliers are randomly added up to 14m to the different paths between different gNBs and UEs. As shown in Figure 3, when the number of gNBs and UEs is sufficient (e.g., 4 gNBs and 4 UEs in this simulation), the proposed method outperforms both IRLS and LS. Additionally, the results indicate that increasing the number of gNBs and UEs leads to a notable improvement in localization accuracy using our proposed method. In contrast, the gains from adding more gNBs and UEs become marginal when using the LS method or IRLS beyond a certain point.

Figure 4 provides useful insight on the sensitivity of the different algorithms based on the maximum added outlier. We randomly added outliers from 4m to 18m with uniform distribution to the random paths between the gNBs and the target and between target and UEs, with the number of gNBs and UEs fixed at 6. The results reveal that the proposed method significantly enhances target localization accuracy. Depending on the level of added outliers, the proposed method achieves




Fig. 3: Comparison of the localization error.

up to 28% accuracy enhancement compared to LS and up to 20% improvement compared to IRLS.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduced a novel method to improve the accuracy of target localization in multistatic ISAC scenario using PRS when the target is in LoS or NLoS of the UEs and gNBs. We used PRS as the sensing signal, which is currently used in 5G NR UE positioning, and we validated our methods using the MATLAB 5G toolbox, ensuring compliance with 3GPP standards. To the best of our knowledge, this study presents the first proof of concept for using PRS to localize a target under LoS/NLoS conditions, taking into account both 3GPP standard constraints and the range estimation error caused by PRS range resolution. The results show up to 28% and 20% improvement in average localization error compared to the LS and IRLS, respectively. Additionally, the results show that we can reach up to 16% enhancement in 90th percentile compared to LS and 13% compared to IRLS. Our findings demonstrated that with a sufficient number of UEs and gNBs, the proposed method is robust to outliers as it outperforms IRLS and LS in various scenarios with different outlier conditions.

For future works, evaluating the proposed algorithm with different subcarrier spacings, as well as examining the effect of imperfect synchronization between the clocks of the gNBs, will be of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Behravan, V. Yajnanarayana, M. F. Keskin, H. Chen, D. Shrestha, T. E. Abrudan, T. Svensson, K. Schindhelm, A. Wolfgang, S. Lindberg *et al.*, "Positioning and sensing in 6G: Gaps, challenges, and opportunities," *IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 40–48, 2022.
- [2] Z. Wei, Y. Wang, L. Ma, S. Yang, Z. Feng, C. Pan, Q. Zhang, Y. Wang, H. Wu, and P. Zhang, "5G PRS-based sensing: A sensing reference signal approach for joint sensing and communication system," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 3250–3263, 2022.




Fig. 4: Outlier sensitivity of each method.

- [3] 3GPP, "Study on NR positioning support," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Specification (TS) 38.855, 2019, v16.0.0.
- [4] Z. Behdad, Ö. T. Demir, K. W. Sung, E. Björnson, and C. Cavdar, "Multi-static target detection and power allocation for integrated sensing and communication in cell-free massive MIMO," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2024.
- [5] W. Wang, G. Wang, J. Zhang, and Y. Li, "Robust weighted least squares method for TOA-based localization under mixed LOS/NLOS conditions," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 2226–2229, 2017.
- [6] K. Lee, S. Kim, and K. You, "Iterative regression based hybrid localization for wireless sensor networks," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 257, 2021.
- [7] M. Rosić, M. Simić, and P. Lukić, "TDOA approach for target localization based on improved genetic algorithm," in *24th Telecommunications Forum (TELFOR)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–4.
- [8] A. Amar and G. Leus, "A reference-free time difference of arrival source localization using a passive sensor array," in *IEEE Sensor Array and Multichannel Signal Processing Workshop*, 2010, pp. 157–160.
- [9] M. Henninger, T. E. Abrudan, S. Mandelli, M. Arnold, S. Saur, V.-M. Kolmonen, S. Klein, T. Schlitter, and S. Ten Brink, "Probabilistic 5G indoor positioning proof of concept with outlier rejection," in *Joint European Conference on Networks and Communications & 6G Summit (EuCNC/6G Summit)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 249–254.
- [10] 3GPP, "NR; physical layer procedures for data," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Specification (TS) 38.214, 2024, v18.2.0.
- [11] —, "NR; physical channels and modulation," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Specification (TS) 38.211, 2024, v18.2.0.
- [12] K. Khosroshahi, P. Sehier, and S. Mekki, "Doppler ambiguity elimination using 5G signals in integrated sensing and communication," 2024, accepted in IEEE 100th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2024-Fall). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00679>
- [13] P. Vyskocil and J. Sebesta, "Relative timing characteristics of GPS timing modules for time synchronization application," in *IEEE International workshop on satellite and space communications*, 2009, pp. 230–234.
- [14] K. M. Braun, "OFDM radar algorithms in mobile communication networks," Ph.D. dissertation, Karlsruhe, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie (KIT), 2014.
- [15] K. Khosroshahi, P. Sehier, and S. Mekki, "Leveraging PRS and PDSCH for integrated sensing and communication systems," 2024, accepted in IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00667>
- [16] D. F. Andrews and F. R. Hampel, *Robust estimates of location*. Princeton University Press, 2015.
- [17] 3GPP, "NR; base station (BS) radio transmission and reception," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Specification (TS) 38.104, 2024, v18.6.0.