

Egoistic MDS-based Rigid Body Localization

Niclas Führling^{*✉}, Giuseppe Abreu^{*✉}, David González G.^{†✉} and Osvaldo Gonsa^{†✉}

^{*}*School of Computer Science and Engineering, Constructor University, Bremen, Germany*

[†]*Wireless Communications Technologies Group, Continental AG, Frankfurt, Germany*

(nfuehrling,gabreu)@constructor.university, david.gonzalez.g@ieee.org, osvaldo.gonsa@continental-corporation.com

Abstract—We consider a novel anchorless rigid body localization (RBL) suitable for application in autonomous driving (AD), in so far as the algorithm enables a rigid body to egoistically detect the location (relative translation) and orientation (relative rotation) of another body, without knowledge of the shape of the latter, based only on a set of measurements of the distances between sensors of one vehicle to the other. A key point of the proposed method is that the translation vector between the two-bodies is modeled using the double-centering operator from multidimensional scaling (MDS) theory, enabling the method to be used between rigid bodies regardless of their shapes, in contrast to conventional approaches which require both bodies to have the same shape. Simulation results illustrate the good performance of the proposed technique in terms of root mean square error (RMSE) of the estimates in different setups.

Index Terms—Rigid Body Localization, Convex Optimization, Multidimensional Scaling, Nyström Approximation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Wireless localization [1] can be seen as a precursor of joint communication and sensing (JCAS), demonstrating how communication signals can also be used for sensing an environment, including localization of users. There are many types of information that can be extracted from radio signals for the purpose of localization, including finger-prints [2], received signal strength indicator (RSSI) [3], angle of arrival (AoA) [4], or delay-based estimates of radio range [5]. Conventionally, such information needed for localization was generally assumed to be obtained by specialized equipment and protocols, requiring the transmission of dedicated signals, implicating in costs and other constraints which in turn explains the predominance in related literature [1], [6] of methods to find the position of individual points.

Recently, however, advances in JCAS technology [7] has demonstrated that radar parameters (*i.e.*, range, bearing and velocity) can be acquired by conventional communications signals [8], [9], not only actively, *i.e.*, using signals transmitted by the target to the sensors, but also passively, *i.e.*, using round-trip reflections of signals transmitted by the sensors themselves, which in turn implies a more abundant and richer availability of positioning information. A consequence of this development is an increasing interest in the rigid body localization (RBL) problem [10], [11], whose objective is to determine not only the average location of targets, but their shape and orientation, based on a collection of points sufficient to define the object. This feature of rigid body localization (RBL) is particularly attractive to vehicle-to-everything (V2X) networks, where – unlike earlier applications of positioning technology such as asset management in industrial settings [12] and people tracking in indoor settings

– information on the size, shape, and orientation of vehicles are crucial to ensure the efficacy and safety of autonomous driving (AD) applications such as collision detection [13], navigation [14], and vehicle path prediction [15], to name only a few examples.

It is important also to distinguish between the type of RBL system here addressed, which is based on radio signals, possibly under a JCAS paradigm [10], [16], and conventional simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) technologies [17]–[19] relying on dedicated equipment and massive amounts of data [20] to function, which makes the latter less likely to be useful in the day-to-day AD applications envisioned for a future where autonomous vehicles (AVs) will be widely deployed.

An example of the radio-based RBL approach which is the subject of this article is the method in [21], where the pose, angular velocity and trajectory of a rigid body is estimated using Lyapunov functions of Doppler measurements, obtained by a nonlinear observer. Another example is [16], in which a two-stage approach was used to estimate rotation, translation, angular velocity and translational velocity by range and Doppler measurements, making use of various weighted least square (WLS) minimization methods. And going beyond the problem of RBL involving a single object, the scheme in [22] which proposes a new relative multi-object RBL method¹ in an anchorless scenario, whereby the relative translation and rotation between two rigid bodies is estimated by measuring the cross-body line-of-sight (LOS) distances between the points defining the two bodies.

The latter case relates to a common scenario in AD where a vehicle is able to measure the distance between itself and vehicles in its surroundings, such that the corresponding RBL solution would find a large a direct and crucial application. Unfortunately, however, most state-of-the-art (SotA) RBL methods assume that the shape of the target rigid body is known [16], [22], [23], which is unrealistic in real life applications since vehicles vary greatly in shape and size.

In view of the above, we propose in this article an anchorless and MDS-based egoistic approach for RBL, in which a rigid body (*e.g.* vehicle) can estimate not only the distance, but also the shape and orientation of another (*e.g.* another vehicle, possibly of different size and shape), based only on cross-body sensor-to-sensor range measurements.

The structure of the remainder of article is as follows. First, a description of the system and measurement model is offered in Section II. Then, in Section III, the proposed method in-

¹An anchor-based version of the method had been proposed earlier in [23].

cluding the convex optimization problem for the estimation of the translation, shape and orientation of the target rigid body is introduced, after a brief introduction of the SotA MDS-based RBL approach. Finally, a comparison of the proposed scheme with the conventional least square-based RBL technique of [16], adjusted to an egoistic setting, is offered in Section IV, followed by further performance evaluation in terms of RMSE results with different parameters.

II. RIGID BODY LOCALIZATION SYSTEM MODEL

A. System Model

Referring to the illustration in Figure 1, let a given rigid body be represented by a collection of N landmark points $\mathbf{c}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ in the three-dimensional (3D) space, with $n = \{1, \dots, N\}$, such that the shape of said body is well described by the corresponding conformation matrix \mathbf{C} constructed by the column-wise collection of the vectors \mathbf{c}_n . Then, consider the representation of the location $\mathbf{S}^{(1)}$ of said rigid body relative to another location (*e.g.*, earlier location in case the body is in motion) $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$, which without loss of generality can be set to be a “canonical” reference (centered at the absolute origin), such that $\mathbf{S}^{(0)} = \mathbf{C}$ and thus one can write²

$$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{t} \cdot \mathbf{1}_N^T = [\mathbf{Q} | \mathbf{t}] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{1}_N^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ is a translation vector given by the difference of the geometric centers of the body at the two locations, $\mathbf{1}_N$ is a column vector with N entries all equal to 1, and $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is a rotation matrix³ determined by corresponding yaw, pitch and roll angles α, β and γ , respectively, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q} &\triangleq \mathbf{Q}_z(\gamma) \mathbf{Q}_y(\beta) \mathbf{Q}_x(\alpha) & (2) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \gamma & -\sin \gamma & 0 \\ \sin \gamma & \cos \gamma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & 0 & \sin \beta \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin \beta & 0 & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ 0 & \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta \cos \gamma \sin \alpha \sin \beta \cos \gamma - \cos \alpha \sin \gamma \cos \alpha \sin \beta \cos \gamma + \sin \alpha \sin \gamma \\ \cos \beta \sin \gamma \sin \alpha \sin \beta \sin \gamma + \cos \alpha \cos \gamma \cos \alpha \sin \beta \sin \gamma - \sin \alpha \cos \gamma \\ -\sin \beta & \sin \alpha \cos \beta & \cos \alpha \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} q_{1,1} & q_{1,2} & q_{1,3} \\ q_{2,1} & q_{2,2} & q_{2,3} \\ q_{3,1} & q_{3,2} & q_{3,3} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider a scenario as illustrated in Figure 2, in which two rigid bodies, hereafter referred to by their indices $i = \{1, 2\}$, have generally different shapes and/or are characterized by generally distinct numbers N_1 and N_2 of landmark points, respectively, such that under a common absolute reference, the bodies are represented by the corresponding distinct conformation matrices $\mathbf{C}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times N_1}$ and $\mathbf{C}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times N_2}$.

²Hereafter we drop super-scripts, which are no longer necessary.

³For the sake of simplicity, in this article, detecting the orientation of a rigid body will be interpreted as estimating of the 9 elements of the corresponding rotation matrix \mathbf{Q} as a whole. In a follow up work, however, this will be extended by replacing the estimation of \mathbf{Q} with the estimation of the associated and fundamental yaw, pitch and roll angles (α, β, γ) .




Fig. 1. Illustration of a rigid body at two distinct locations $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{S}^{(1)}$. Without loss of generality, we set the initial to be identical to the matrix \mathbf{C} , which defines the shape and orientation of the rigid body. The second location $\mathbf{S}^{(1)}$ of the body relative to its initial location $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$ is then determined according to equation (1), and is obtained by the transformation of $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$ via a rotation matrix \mathbf{Q} and a translation vector \mathbf{t} .




Fig. 2. Illustration of two-body egoistic RBL scenario. Each rigid body has a different shape, defined by distinct conformation matrices \mathbf{C}_1 and \mathbf{C}_2 , respectively. The translation vector \mathbf{t} between the bodies, depicted in yellow, is defined by the difference between the geometric centers of the two bodies.

Since $\mathbf{C}_1 \neq \mathbf{C}_2$, it is obvious that in such a scenario the location of one body relative to the other cannot be described in terms of equation (1). A common problem in V2X systems with relevance to AD applications is, however, that one rigid body – say, the truck in Figure 2 – is able to estimate not only its distance to the other – in this case, the car in Figure 2 – but also its shape and orientation, based on a set of measurements of the distances between their corresponding landmark points.

It will be considered, in what follows, that such measurements can be obtained by deploying to the landmark points of each rigid body, a set of wireless transceivers, hereafter referred to as “sensors”, capable of performing such mutual distance estimates⁴. It will, furthermore, be assumed that each body is only aware of its own shape, described by corresponding conformation matrices $\mathbf{C}_i = [\mathbf{c}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{i,N_i}] \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times N_i}$, where $\mathbf{c}_{i,n}$, is the location of the n -th point of the i -th body, with respect to its geometric center.

⁴As discussed in the introduction, the setup with sensors deployed in each rigid body can be replaced by one in which each rigid body is equipped with radar or JCAS technology capable of measuring distances from a set of points in one body to another set of points in the other. Mathematically, however, both approaches to the techniques utilized and proposed in this article.

B. Measurement Model

When subject to unbiased estimation errors, the estimates of the distance between a pair of sensors $s_{1,n}$ on the first body, and $s_{2,m}$ on the second⁵, can be described by

$$\tilde{d}_{n,m} = d_{n,m} + v_{n,m}, \quad (3)$$

where $d_{n,m} \triangleq \|s_{1,n} - s_{2,m}\|_2$ is the true pairwise distance between the sensors, while $v_{n,m}$ denotes noise modeled as i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random variables with variance σ^2 .

In order to avoid negative numbers and linearize the relationship between the acquired squared distances and corresponding measurement errors, we shall also consider the equivalent model

$$\tilde{d}_{n,m}^2 = d_{n,m}^2 + \omega_{n,m}, \quad (4)$$

where the mean and variance of the measurement error $\omega_{n,m}$ are respectively given by $\mathbb{E}[\omega_{n,m}] = \sigma^2$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\omega_{n,m} - \mathbb{E}[\omega_{n,m}])^2] = 4d_{n,m}^2\sigma^2 + 2\sigma^4$, as described in [23].

It proves convenient, to collect the true distances $d_{n,m}$ from above into the euclidean distance matrix (EDM)

$$D = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} D_1 & D_{12} \\ \hline D_{12}^\top & D_2 \end{array} \right] \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_1+N_2) \times (N_1+N_2)}. \quad (5)$$

C. Problem Statement

With the system and measurement model, we are ready to clearly define the problem we seek to solve and, for the sake of context, discuss a particularly relevant SotA method. To that end, let us first observe that assuming, without loss of generality, that the rigid body 1 (*i.e.*, the truck) attempts to egoistically locate body 2 (*i.e.*, the car), the system model conditions described earlier translate to the assumption that the self intra-distance matrix D_1 is known exactly, the target intra-distance matrix D_2 is unknown, and the squared cross-distance matrix D_{12} can be written as

$$D_{12}^{\odot 2} = D_{12} \odot D_{12} = \psi_1 \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top + \mathbf{1}_{N_1} \psi_2^\top - 2S_1^\top S_2, \quad (6)$$

where S_1 and S_2 are matrices containing the locations of the sensors in bodies 1 and 2, respectively, the auxiliary vectors $\psi_i \triangleq S_i^\top S_i$ carry the squared norms of the corresponding individual sensor locations, and the symbol \odot indicates an element-wise matrix operation (*e.g.*, multiplication or exponentiation).

Next, consider an augmented sensor location matrix carrying the positions of all landmark points in both bodies, such that we may write, in similarity to equation (1)

$$S = [S_1 | S_2] = [Q_1 | Q_2] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} C_1 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_2} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_1} & C_2 \end{array} \right] + [t_1 | t_2] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{0}_{N_2}^\top \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top \end{array} \right], \quad (7)$$

where Q_i and t_i respectively denote the rotation matrix and translation vector of the i -th body, while $\mathbf{0}_{3 \times N}$, $\mathbf{0}_N$ and $\mathbf{1}_N$ denote an all-zero matrix and an all-zero/all-one column vector, respectively.

Under the egoistic assumptions that $S_1 = C_1$, and $t_1 = \mathbf{0}_3$, however, equation (7) reduces to

⁵Without lack of clarity, we abuse the notation slightly by using $s_{i,n}$ in reference both to a sensor and its location.

$$S = [S_1 | S_2] = [I | Q] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} C_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & C_2 \end{array} \right] + [\mathbf{0} | t] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{0}_{N_2}^\top \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top \end{array} \right], \quad (8)$$

where we have simplified the notation by omitting subscripts that can be inferred from context, which includes relabeling $Q = Q_2$ and $t = t_2$.

The problem addressed in this article is therefore to estimate, with basis on equations (6) and (8), the rotation matrix Q and translation vector t , given perfect knowledge of the conformation matrix C_1 – which implies exact knowledge of D_1 – and possession of an estimate of the matrix D_{12} subject to noise, under the egoistic condition that C_2 is unknown and for a general case where $N_1 \neq N_2$.

D. A Note on Related SotA

To the best of our knowledge, the egoistic and generalized variation of the RBL problem described above is original, but a related problem was considered in [22], however with the assumptions that $N_1 = N_2$ and C_2 is also known. Unfortunately, a critical error⁶ was made in [22, Subsec. 3.2], which makes the approach thereby ineffective for the estimation of the translation vector t . In spite of the aforementioned error, the method in [22] partially inspired the contribution of our article to be introduced subsequently, such that it is useful to briefly revise in the sequel the portion of the method regarding the estimation of the rotation matrix Q .

First, consider the $N \times N$ classic Schönberg double-centering matrix (DCM), defined by [25]

$$J = I - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^\top. \quad (9)$$

Left- and right-multiplying a measured distance matrix by the DCM J , and scaling the result by $-\frac{1}{2}$, yields

$$\bar{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} = -\frac{1}{2} J D_{12}^{\odot 2} J = J S_1^\top S_2 J = C_1^\top Q C_2. \quad (10)$$

In order to facilitate the formulation of a problem to estimate Q , it proves convenient to apply an orthogonal Procrustes problem (OPP) onto equation (10), which under the assumption of perfect knowledge of C_2 can be achieved by defining [26]

$$\check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} \triangleq \bar{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} C_2^\dagger = C_1^\top Q, \quad (11a)$$

where

$$C_2^\dagger \triangleq C_2^\top (C_2 C_2^\top)^{-1}. \quad (11b)$$

Then, the relative rotation Q of body 2 with respect to the orientation of body 1 can be estimated by solving the problem

$$\hat{Q}_{OPP} = \arg \min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \|\check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} - C_1^\top Q\|_F^2, \quad (12)$$

which can be obtained in closed form via singular value decomposition (SVD) of the matrix $C_1 \check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2}$.

In particular, the solution of problem (12) is given by [22]

$$\hat{Q}_{OPP} = UV^\top, \quad (13a)$$

⁶For the sake of completeness, a proof of incorrectness of the material in [22, Subsec. 3.2] can be found in the journal version of this work [24].

with U and V such that

$$C_1 \tilde{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} = U \Sigma V^\top. \quad (13b)$$

We emphasize that although it was assumed in [22] that both rigid bodies have the same number of landmark points (e.g., $N_1 = N_2$), the notion of a relative rotation (8) between two bodies of different shapes and number of landmark points is geometrically well defined, as can be inferred from equation (8). In particular, by aligning the rotation matrix of the first rigid body with the cartesian coordinates, such that $Q_1 = I$, the orientation Q_2 of the second body with respect to the first, becomes simply the relative rotation itself. In other words, $Q_1 = I \implies Q_2 = Q$, or more generally, $Q = Q_1^\top \cdot Q_2$.

III. PROPOSED METHOD

The assumption of pre-existing knowledge of the conformation matrix C_2 , which is typical the SotA RBL methods [16], [22] is hard to meet in practical conditions. In AD-related V2X applications, for instance, that would require that a vehicle attempting to locate other vehicles in its vicinity is aware of their shapes, an obviously impractical requirement given the enormous diversity in vehicle models, which are also constantly updated. In order to mitigate this problem, we propose in this section methods to estimate t and Q , respectively, without the requirement that C_2 is known.

A. Translation Estimation

Let us start by pointing out that not knowing C_2 implicates not knowing the intra-distances matrix D_2 . And while the reverse implication is not logically true – i.e., in principle one could have knowledge of D_2 but nor C_2 – the assumption that D_2 is also not available to the rigid body 1 is consistent with egoistic principle followed in this article, as indeed, an assumption of knowledge of D_2 would require that the target vehicle broadcasts such information⁷. In what follows, we therefore assume no knowledge of D_2 .

Under such conditions, the first problem at hand is one of matrix completion, and although several methods to solve such a problem exist [27]–[29], a number of which could be used, we here consider the simple and well-known Nyström approximation method [30], which applied to the EDM D from equation (5) yields⁸ the following estimate of D_2

$$\hat{D}_2 \approx \mathbb{H}[D_{12}^\top D_1^{-1} D_{12}], \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbb{H}[\cdot]$ denotes a hollowing operator that enforces all elements of the diagonal matrix to be zero.

With possession of the intra-distances matrix of the first body D_1 , the measurements \tilde{D}_{12} corresponding the distances

⁷Notice that an N -point 3D conformation matrix contains $3N$ entries, while the corresponding intra-distance matrix contains $N(N-1)/2$ distinct entries, such that the intra-distances data is larger than the conformation data for $N > 7$, which is a small number of points to define a rigid body in 3D.

⁸Note that the Nyström approximation in general only works if the rank(D_1) \geq rank(D_2), which means that the first body must have at least the same amount of sensors as the second body. If that condition is not satisfied, alternative matrix completion methods, e.g. [27]–[29], may yield better results.

between the two bodies, and the latter estimate \hat{D}_2 of the intra-distances matrix corresponding to the second rigid body, the full sample EDM corresponding to all distances within and between the two rigid bodies can be reconstructed as

$$\hat{D} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} D_1 & \tilde{D}_{12} \\ \hline \tilde{D}_{12}^\top & \mathbb{H}[\tilde{D}_{12}^\top D_1^{-1} \tilde{D}_{12}] \end{array} \right], \quad (15)$$

such that an MDS-based first estimate of the position of all sensors from both rigid bodies can be obtained as [25]

$$[\hat{S}_1^*, \hat{S}_2^*] = V \Lambda^{1/2}, \quad (16)$$

where V and Λ are the eigenvector and eigenvalue pairs of the corresponding double-centered EDM, that is

$$\bar{D} = V \Lambda V^\top, \quad (17)$$

with

$$\bar{D} = -\frac{1}{2} J_{N_1+N_2} \hat{D}^{\odot 2} J_{N_1+N_2}, \quad (18)$$

where $J_{N_1+N_2}$ is a $(N_1 + N_2)$ -point Schönberg DCM build as per equation (9).

The initial MDS solution given by equation (16) can then be brought to the reference frame of the first rigid body via a Procrustes transformation by solving

$$(Q^*, t^*) = \arg \min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, t \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}} \|C_1 - (Q \hat{S}_1^* + t \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top)\|_F, \quad (19)$$

from which we then obtain

$$\hat{S} = [C_1, \hat{S}_2] = [C_1, Q^* \hat{S}_2^* + t^* \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top], \quad (20)$$

or, more explicitly

$$\hat{S}_2 = Q^* \hat{S}_2^* + t^* \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top. \quad (21)$$

Substituting the latter result into equation (8) and using the relation $Q_2 C_2 = \hat{S}_2 J_{N_2}$, we obtain

$$\hat{S} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} C_1 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_2}^\top \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_1}^\top & (Q^* \hat{S}_2^* + t^* \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top) J_{N_2} \end{array} \right] + [\mathbf{0} | t] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{0}_{N_2}^\top \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top \end{array} \right], \quad (22)$$

Utilizing the latter expression, we can finally formulate a quadratic program to find the translation vector t , namely

$$\hat{t} = \arg \min_t \|J_{N_1+N_2} (\hat{S}^\top \hat{S} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{D}^{\odot 2}) J_{N_1+N_2}\|_F^2, \quad (23)$$

which can easily be solved by common optimization tools, such as gradient descent or interior point methods [31], [32].

B. Rotation Matrix Estimation

With the estimate \hat{S}_2 obtained via equation (21) in hands, a robust estimate of the rotation matrix Q corresponding to the second rigid body can be obtained via a procedure similar to that described in Subsection II-D.

Before we proceed, let us emphasize that, in principle, \hat{Q} can be extracted by

$$(\hat{S}_2 J_{N_2})(\hat{S}_2 J_{N_2})^\top = Q \Lambda Q^\top = Q C_2 C_2^\top Q^\top, \quad (24)$$

where we used $Q_2 C_2 = \hat{S}_2 J_{N_2}$ in the last equality.

Notice, however, that the eigenvalue decomposition in equation (24) is such that the eigenvectors are ordered according to their corresponding eigenvalues, which in turn relate to the largest orthogonal dimensions of the body [33], [34]. It follows that the columns of the estimate obtained via equation (24) may be swapped for rigid bodies with approximately spherical shapes, leading to large estimation errors.

We therefore propose instead the following method. First, let us return to equation (10), but this time accounting for the fact that S_1 and S_2 have different numbers N_1 and N_2 of landmark points, such that

$$\bar{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} = -\frac{1}{2} J_{N_1} D_{12}^{\odot 2} J_{N_2} = C_1^T Q C_2, \quad (25)$$

which if left-multiplied by the pseudo-inverse of C_1^T yields

$$\check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} \triangleq C_1^\dagger \bar{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} = Q C_2, \quad (26a)$$

where

$$C_1^\dagger \triangleq (C_1 C_1^T)^{-1} C_1. \quad (26b)$$

Then, squaring equation (26) yields

$$\check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} \check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2T} = Q C_2 C_2^T Q^T = Q \Lambda Q^T, \quad (27)$$

from which the following optimization problem can be constructed

$$\hat{Q} = \arg \min_Q \|\check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} \check{D}_{12}^{\odot 2T} - Q \Lambda Q^T\|_F^2. \quad (28)$$

We emphasize that although the solution of problem (28) can be easily obtained via common optimization theory tools [31], [32], the result can also be severely degraded by the order of the eigenvalues in Λ . Fortunately, however, in 3D there are only 6 distinct permutations of Λ , such that the solution with the permutation that yields the smallest objective can be estimated as the correct one.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section we provide simulation results illustrating the performance of the contributed egoistic MDS-based RBL technique. Since, to the best of our knowledge, no equivalent SotA method exists for the egoistic set-up here considered in which C_2 is unknown, we first compare in Figure 3 only results on translation vector estimation via the non-egoistic method of [16], against proposed technique of Subsection III-A, but using the estimate of Q from [16] in equation (22). For the sake of disambiguation, the corresponding results of the proposed method with an externally fed rotation matrix is referred to as the ‘‘Genie-Aided’’ scheme.

The performance metric of choice is the RMSE, as a function of the ranging error⁹ σ , namely

$$\varepsilon = \sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K |\hat{t}^{(k)} - t|_2^2}, \quad (29)$$

where $\hat{t}^{(k)}$ denotes an estimate obtained at a k -th realization, and we emphasize that the dependence of ε on σ is due to the errors $\hat{t}^{(k)}$, not included explicit in the notation for simplicity.

⁹Note that the ranging error is not equivalent to the exact error in meters but rather the error used in the noise calculations given in (4).




Fig. 3. RMSE of the translation estimate of the genie-aided (GA) proposed method and the SotA, over the range error σ .




Fig. 4. RMSE of the translation estimate of the proposed method compared to the GA variation, over the range error σ .

Each point in the figure is obtained by averaging $K = 10^3$ Monte-Carlo realizations, using the system parameters described in Table I. The algorithms are implemented in MATLAB, with the minimization problems solved using the CVX optimization package.

The results in Figure 3 show that in a non-egoistic scenario, the proposed method outperforms the SotA alternative if ranging errors are below 20 cm, which is well within the typical values of sensing technology used in the Automotive Industry [35].

Finally, a comparison between the latter Genie-Aided method and the actually proposed egoistic scheme is offered in Figure 4, which confirms that the contributed (egoistic) method maintains a performance close to that of the Genie-Aided (non-egoistic) alternative.

TABLE I
SIMULATION PARAMETERS

Reference frames	$C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 \\ -4 & -4 & -4 & -4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 0.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$ $C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 1 & 1 & 0.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$
Translations	$\mathbf{t}_1 = [0, 0, 0]^T$ $\mathbf{t}_2 = \mathbf{t} = [7, 3, 0.5]^T$
Rotations	$[\psi_1, \theta_1, \phi_1] = [0^\circ, 0^\circ, 0^\circ]$ $[\psi_2, \theta_2, \phi_2] = [10^\circ, 20^\circ, 45^\circ]$

V. CONCLUSION

We proposed a novel anchorless RBL algorithm suitable for application in AD, which enables a rigid body to egoistically detect the relative translation (effective distance) and orientation (relative rotation) of another body, based only on a set of measurements of the distances between sensors of one vehicle to the other and without knowledge of the shape of the latter. A key point of the proposed method is that the translation vector between the two-bodies is modeled using the MDS double-centering operator, enabling its applicability between rigid bodies of different shapes, in contrast to conventional approaches which require both bodies to have the same shape. Simulation results illustrate the good performance of the proposed technique in terms of RMSE as a function of the ranging error, in the desired (and typical) moderate to low ranging errors regime.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Yassin *et al.*, "Recent advances in indoor localization: A survey on theoretical approaches and applications," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2017.
- [2] Q. D. Vo and P. De, "A survey of fingerprint-based outdoor localization," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2016.
- [3] N. Führling *et al.*, "Robust received signal strength indicator (RSSI)-based multitarget localization via gaussian process regression," *IEEE J. Indoor Seamless Position. Navig.*, vol. 1, 2023.
- [4] M. Al-Sadoon *et al.*, "AOA localization for vehicle-tracking systems using a dual-band sensor array," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 68, no. 8, 2020.
- [5] G. Zeng *et al.*, "Global and asymptotically efficient localization from range measurements," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, 2022.
- [6] D. Burghal *et al.*, "A comprehensive survey of machine learning based localization with wireless signals," 2020.
- [7] J. A. Zhang *et al.*, "An overview of signal processing techniques for joint communication and radar sensing," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 15, no. 6, 2021.
- [8] K. R. R. Ranasinghe *et al.*, "Fast and efficient sequential radar parameter estimation in MIMO-OTFS systems," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2024.
- [9] K. R. R. Ranasinghe *et al.*, "Joint channel, data and radar parameter estimation for AFDM systems in doubly-dispersive channels," 2024.
- [10] Y. Wang *et al.*, "An investigation and solution of angle based rigid body localization," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, 2020.
- [11] N. Führling *et al.*, "Enabling Next-Generation V2X Perception: Wireless Rigid Body Localization and Tracking," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00349*, 2024.
- [12] F. Ahmed *et al.*, "Comparative study of seamless asset location and tracking technologies," *Procedia Manuf.*, International Conference on Flexible Automation and Intelligent Manufacturing, vol. 51, 2020.
- [13] B. Gebregziabher, "Multi object tracking for predictive collision avoidance," 2023.
- [14] K. Eickenhoff, Y. Yang, P. Geneva, and G. Huang, "Tightly-coupled visual-inertial localization and 3-D rigid-body target tracking," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2019.
- [15] Y. Huang, J. Du, Z. Yang, Z. Zhou, L. Zhang, and H. Chen, "A survey on trajectory-prediction methods for autonomous driving," *IEEE Trans. on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 7, no. 3, 2022.
- [16] S. Chen and K. C. Ho, "Accurate localization of a rigid body using multiple sensors and landmarks," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 24, 2015.
- [17] J. Huang *et al.*, "ClusterSLAM: A SLAM backend for simultaneous rigid body clustering and motion estimation," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019.
- [18] A. Macario Barros *et al.*, "A comprehensive survey of visual SLAM algorithms," *Robotics*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2022.
- [19] H. Bayle *et al.*, "From SLAM to situational awareness: Challenges and survey," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 10, 2023.
- [20] S. Sagirolglu and D. Sinanc, "Big data: A review," in *International Conference on Collaboration Technologies and Systems (CTS)*, 2013.
- [21] S. Brás *et al.*, "Nonlinear observer for 3D rigid body motion estimation using doppler measurements," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 11, 2016.
- [22] A. Pizzo, S. P. Chepuri, and G. Leus, "Towards multi-rigid body localization," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2016.
- [23] S. P. Chepuri *et al.*, "Tracking position and orientation of a mobile rigid body," in *5th IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP)*, 2013.
- [24] N. Führling *et al.*, "Robust Egoistic Rigid Body Localization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.10219*, 2025.
- [25] W. S. Torgerson, "Multidimensional scaling: I. theory and method," *Psychometrika*, vol. 17, no. 4, Dec. 1952.
- [26] P. Schönemann, "A generalized solution of the orthogonal procrustes problem," *Psychometrika*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1966.
- [27] H. Fang and D. P. O'Leary, "Euclidean distance matrix completion problems," *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 27, no. 4-5, 2012.
- [28] L. T. Nguyen, J. Kim, and B. Shim, "Low-rank matrix completion: A contemporary survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, 2019.
- [29] Y. Fan and M. Pesavento, "Localization in sensor networks using distributed low-rank matrix completion," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2024.
- [30] C. K. I. Williams and M. Seeger, "Using the Nyström method to speed up kernel machines," in *Proc. of the 13th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'00. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2000.
- [31] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, ser. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer New York, NY, 1999.
- [32] S. Ruder, "An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747*, 2016.
- [33] I. T. Jolliffe, *Principal component analysis for special types of data*. Springer, 2002.
- [34] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, J. H. Friedman, and J. H. Friedman, *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*. Springer, 2009, vol. 2.
- [35] R. Malekian, K. Curran, C. F. Pedersen, B. Cao, and X. Qi, "Guest editorial special issue on sensor technologies for connected cars: Devices, systems and modeling," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 18, no. 12, 2018.