

CalTag: Robust calibration of mmWave Radar and LiDAR using backscatter tags

Junyi Xu¹, Kshitiz Bansal², and Dinesh Bharadia³

University of California San Diego

jux006@ucsd.edu, ksbansal@ucsd.edu, dineshb@ucsd.edu

Abstract—The rise of automation in robotics necessitates the use of high-quality perception systems, often through the use of multiple sensors. A crucial aspect of a successfully deployed multi-sensor systems is the calibration with a known object typically named fiducial. In this work, we propose a novel fiducial system for millimeter wave radars, termed as CalTag. CalTag addresses the limitations of traditional corner reflector-based calibration methods in extremely cluttered environments. CalTag leverages millimeter wave backscatter technology to achieve more reliable calibration than corner reflectors, enhancing the overall performance of multi-sensor perception systems. We compare the performance in several real-world environments and show the improvement achieved by using CalTag as the radar fiducial over a corner reflector.

I. INTRODUCTION

Robotic automation is advancing rapidly, prompting the demand for high-quality perception systems. This evolution has made multi-modal sensing a standard in perception technology. Robots are typically equipped with sensors that offer complementary information, but they also introduce redundancy to a system essential for maintaining safety in life-critical applications, like autonomous driving. In a multi-modal sensing system, the most common sensors are LiDARs, cameras, and radars. Their data is integrated using sensor fusion techniques [19], [20], [23], [29].

Each sensor provides an independent view of the world in its coordinate system. To align data from different sensors, a transformation process, known as extrinsic calibration, is required. Extrinsic calibration uses the measurements from multiple sensors of a set of targets to compute a transformation matrix that maps each sensor’s coordinate system to a common reference system. Extrinsic calibration methods are categorized into two types— target-based methods [7], [9], [22], [27] and targetless methods [5], [11], [24]. Target-based methods use specific fiducial marker for each sensor to achieve high measurement precision. Whereas targetless methods rely on existing objects in the environment that are sensitive to all sensors. While targetless methods offer convenience and lower cost, they typically have lower calibration accuracy than target-based methods [17].

Incorporating multiple sensors benefits from selecting the most appropriate sensor for the encountered environment [18]. Due to its robustness against severe weather conditions and the efficiency in measuring object velocity [3], [20], radar has become increasingly important in sensor fusion,

particularly in the field of autonomous driving [2], [4], [29] to achieve all-weather perception. This drives the demand for a more reliable and convenient extrinsic calibration strategy between the radar and other sensors.

Calibration techniques with LiDAR and camera have been developed more extensively than with the radar, largely due to the simplicity of the fiducial marker principle and clear direction for amendment. Various LiDAR fiducial markers and associated techniques were proposed in [1], [27]. The high sensitivity of LiDAR to sharp depth changes makes edges the primary choice for LiDAR fiducial designs. [16] and [27] explore different edge shapes to enhance LiDAR calibration techniques. Camera fiducial designs often focus on corners, whose small sizes make them less affected by perspective and lens distortion. Built on top of this principle, the checkerboard method [27] and the circular fiducial markers [6] manipulate with the shape of black and white regions to accommodate different conditions.

In contrast, research on fiducial design for radar calibration has been limited. Existing methods predominantly use the corner reflector as the fiducial marker [9], [14], [16], [22], [25]. The reliance on corner reflectors restricts advancements in accuracy, convenience, and effectiveness of radar calibration. Moreover, current radar calibration methods typically assume a clutter-free environment. Due to low radar signal resolution and lack of semantic information, clutters can heavily interfere with the fiducial’s reflected signal, compromising the measurement accuracy or even leading to false detection. Solving this issue requires manual intervention to perform coarse calibration [22], but it does not guarantee success. These constraints limit the applicability and flexibility of radar calibration techniques.

In this paper, we propose an altogether different radar fiducial design, CalTag, that uses millimeter-wave backscatter technology presented in [10] and optimize it to fit in radar calibration. CalTag completely removes the influence of clutters and background noise while maintaining the recognizable peak at the position of the fiducial. Through artificial frequency shift of the reflected wave, CalTag creates the effect that only a single object is detected in the predefined area, which makes it suitable for heavily cluttered environment and eliminates the need for coarse calibration.

We conduct extensive experiments that compare the performance of calibration using CalTag to using the corner

reflector under different environments. The results prove that using CalTag can maintain a high calibration accuracy even in highly cluttered conditions that using a corner reflector fails. This observation opens new opportunities of deployment for radar systems. CalTag also provides more consistent calibration performance across different degrees of sensor rotation than the corner reflector. In either perspective, CalTag is more robust and reliable for radar calibration.

II. RELATED WORK

Extrinsic calibration computes the necessary spatial transformation to align coordinate systems of multiple sensors such that they accurately represent the same positional information about an object. Fiducial design in target-based methods aims at maximizing the sensor’s sensitivity to the marker. The corner reflector, known for its high Radar Cross-Section (RCS), compact size, and simple structure, is the most common radar fiducial [14], [16], [22]. In open, low-clutter environments, the backscatter signal from a corner reflector is easily detectable, but multiple objects may be detected in cluttered environments. Missing semantic information, radar measurements alone cannot differentiate between the target and clutters.

Peršić et al. [22] proposed an initial coarse calibration method to address false detection. They first estimate the rough position of the corner reflector in the radar’s coordinate system based on measurements from another sensor and the relative position between two sensors. Then, the correspondence between the radar and the LiDAR detection is accepted if only a single object is detected within the predefined area around the estimated position. This method is also used in [16]. However, the manual measurements of relative sensor position are prone to error, especially when two sensors face different directions. Pairwise coarse calibration for all sensors is also impractical in large-scale radar calibration.

Besides coarse calibration, Sugimoto et al. [25] adopted a dynamic approach by moving the corner reflector vertically across the radar plane several times to create a series of changes in intensity at the position of the corner reflector. However, this method requires a complicated mechanical design for the vertical movement.

Targetless calibration methods deploy more complicated techniques that can be classified into three categories [28]: edge registration, mutual information, and segmentation. The weak semantic information in the radar signal makes edge registration and mutual information difficult to apply to radar calibration. Izquierdo et al. [13] leveraged segmentation-type radar calibration by using high-definition (HD) maps. This method selects static and high radar-sensitive structural objects as targets and estimates the transformation matrix using a DGNS with real-time kinematic accuracy.

Due to the variability of environmental features, an increasing number of targetless calibration methods rely on the deep learning. Generally, the model incorporate both feature extraction and calibration into the end-to-end optimization. For instance, Schöller et al. [24] used two convolutional neural networks. The first network estimate the extrinsic

matrix from the combined latent space information. The second network refines the estimation by minimizing residual errors of the first network. Cheng et al. [5] employed the YOLO model on radar feature extraction to combat low resolution and high noise in radar data. Deep learning-based targetless methods have apparent limitations in scalability and flexibility due to their fixed neural network structures and sensor configurations. Additionally, the performance of these models depends on the quality and variability of the training data, making it challenging to maintain high-quality feature detection in diverse and cluttered environments.

III. BACKGROUND

A. Radar Primer

Range estimation: A frequency-modulated continuous wave (FMCW) radar uses frequency-modulated signals, often called chirp signals, to measure the round-trip time of reflected signals from the environment. Each chirp signal is a sinusoidal tone, whose frequency increases linearly with time. Within a chirp period, let’s say T , the signal sweeps a fixed bandwidth BW . The reflected chirp signal from the environment is received by the radar and conjugate multiplied by the transmitted chirp, which results in a constant tone signal per reflection. The tone frequency is dependent on the round trip time of each reflection. The conjugated signal is sampled at N samples per chirp, resulting in a fixed sampling rate of $f_s = \frac{N}{T}$.

Range information is directly embedded in the tone frequency. The distance d between the Radar and the object can be calculated using the following equation

$$d = \frac{c\Delta f}{2\frac{BW}{T}} = \frac{ckf_s}{2\frac{BW}{T}} = \frac{ck\frac{N}{T}}{2\frac{BW}{T}} = \frac{ckN}{2BW}, \quad (1)$$

where c is the speed of light, Δf is the frequency of tone signal, and $k \in [0, 1]$. We calculate k by applying Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) over all samples in a chirp. $\frac{c}{2BW}$ is the range resolution, which determines the closest distance between two distinguishable objects by the radar.

Angle estimation: The angle of arrival θ is calculated using spatial Fourier Transform. The radar receiver consists of a linear antenna array. When a reflected wave reaches the radar’s antenna array at a certain angle, it creates a linearly varying phase across the antenna array. With a carrier wavelength of λ for the given radar, the distance between adjacent antennas is $\frac{\lambda}{2}$, so the path length difference between two adjacent antennas is $\frac{\lambda}{2} \sin(\theta)$. It gives a phase difference of $\sin(\theta)/2$. We can calculate the angle of arrival using $\theta = \sin^{-1}(2k)$, where k is obtained by taking FFT over the readings from all antennas at one sample of signal and $k \in [0, 1]$. This allows us to detect objects with a Field of View (FOV) from -90° to 90° . Please refer to [8] for more details on angle estimation using a linear antenna array.

Doppler estimation: When the object is moving relative to the radar at a velocity v , the Doppler effect creates a change in the frequency of the reflected wave that is proportional to the velocity of the object. This frequency change is calculated by $\frac{v}{c}f_c$, where c is the speed of light

and f_c is the center frequency of the chirp. The frequency change is embodied as a phase change between consecutive chirps. We take FFT along multiple chirps to measure the frequency change encoded in the reflected wave and use it to calculate the relative velocity of the object.

Range-Doppler FFT plot: As shown in the lower part of Figure 1, the Range-Doppler FFT plot consists of Doppler FFT profiles at each range FFT bin. As an essential tool in our calibration method, it provides velocity information at different distances from the radar. The high intensity central line represents stationary objects at different distances. Peaks with positive Doppler frequencies represent objects approaching the radar. Peaks with negative Doppler frequencies represent objects moving away from the radar. CalTag leverages artificial Doppler generation to stand out from the heavy clutter at the zero Doppler region. Note that only the positive range axis is meaningful and participates in the further calculation, as shown in Figure 2.

B. Backscatter Tag design principles

The millimeter wave backscatter tags perform ON-OFF modulation with multiple cycles within a single chirp to create a certain frequency shift of the backscatter signal in the range domain [10]. When the CalTag's reflected signal appears at Δf , as shown in Figure 1, the in-chirp ON-OFF modulation creates harmonics at $\Delta f + n \times f_m$ using a modulation frequency of f_m . The first harmonics of the positive frequency component at Δf appear at $\Delta f \pm f_m$, as indicated by blue arrows at two sides. Similarly, the negative frequency component at $-\Delta f$ creates first harmonics at $-\Delta f \pm f_m$, as indicated by orange arrows at two sides. The two high-intensity peaks at the positive range domain of the Range-Doppler FFT plot correspond to the two positive frequency components. By changing f_m , we can easily control the frequency of the first harmonics. Note that the Doppler shift of frequency can also be precisely controlled [26]. When the on-off period of the modulation is not a multiple of the chirp duration, we will get a Doppler shift towards the non-zero Doppler regions. Therefore, we can shift the CalTag's signal to a static clutter-free region.

IV. CALTAG DESIGN

In this section, we will go over how CalTag performs LiDAR and radar calibration.

A. Detection

The procedures for detecting the range and the angle of arrival associated with the CalTag are shown in Figure 2. We detect the frequency bin with the maximum power on the range-doppler FFT plot within a predefined region. Given that there is a harmonic at $\Delta f + f_m$, we set the predefined frequency range to be $[f_m, f_m + \Delta f_{max} + \alpha]$, where Δf_{max} is the frequency associated with the maximum distance from the radar that we place the CalTag and α is a constant frequency offset for the tolerance of detection error. We also set the predefined frequency range in the velocity domain from β to maximum Doppler frequency, where β is a customized frequency that prevents the region from including




Fig. 1: The upper plot shows the first harmonics. The lower plot shows the Range-Doppler FFT with modulated backscatter signals. High-intensity peaks inside red boxes are the modulated frequencies corresponding to harmonics at positive and negative frequency axes.

the zero frequency line. The red rectangular box in Figure 2 represents the Range-Doppler FFT section for detecting the shifted frequency. A zoomed-in version of the segmented region is presented in the flowchart as well. As expected, within the segmented area, the bin with the highest power corresponds to the shifted frequency component.

Subsequently, we take the Fourier transform along the samples from multiple antennas at the detected range frequency bin to obtain the angle FFT profile. The angle frequency bin with the highest power gives the angle of arrival of the backscatter signal. The original range frequency bin, which reflects the CalTag's actual range, is calculated by subtracting the modulation frequency from the detected frequency. Since both the positive and negative frequency components associated with the backscatter signal are shifted by f_m , as shown in Figure 1. An alternative way of calculating the actual range is by detecting both peaks at two sides of the modulation frequency and compute the distance corresponding to half of the frequency difference:

$$\frac{(f_m + \Delta f) - (f_m - \Delta f)}{2} = \frac{\Delta f - (-\Delta f)}{2} = \Delta f.$$

B. Improving range accuracy through super resolution

Calibration with CalTag needs a high enough radar sampling frequency to create a clutter-free frequency range. Meanwhile, we need to estimate the range with millimeter level precision. In the Fourier transform, the FFT bin width represents the frequency resolution and is determined by the sampling frequency f_s and the number of FFT points.

However, using a very large number of FFT points requires extensive computational resources. To tackle this issue, we use a combination of FFT and super-resolution method Multiple Signal Classification (MUSIC). Since the shifted frequencies will fall inside a known range of frequencies. Instead of searching from $-\frac{f_s}{2}$ to $+\frac{f_s}{2}$, we use MUSIC to search only within the frequency range that the shifted frequencies may occur. Due to the narrower frequency spectrum to focus on, this method also allows us to search frequencies




Fig. 2: Flowchart for tag detection

using a finer resolution. The 2D FFT with small number of FFT points is first used to determine the rough Range-Doppler frequency bin where the shifted peaks appear. Then, a 1D MUSIC is applied to the selected Doppler bin to search frequencies only in the predefined range of frequencies along the range axis with a much higher resolution. Finally, the angle of arrival is calculated by applying 1D MUSIC over samples of multiple antennas at the identified range.

C. Fiducial detection using LiDAR

We set the LiDAR as the reference sensor and look for the transformation matrix of the radar's point cloud to best match the LiDAR's point cloud. Since Radar gives range and angle information (r, θ) in 2D, we discard the height information in LiDAR's point cloud, projecting the 3D point cloud into a 2D Bird Eye View (BEV). Since the fiducial appears as a dense set of points in the BEV when the fiducial is put in an empty space, we use Density-based spatial clustering of applications with noise (DBSCAN) to capture the fiducial by finding the cluster with the smallest standard deviation in the x and y direction. The center of the cluster is a close estimate of the center position of the fiducial.

D. Calibration Procedure

CalTag is placed at multiple locations to obtain point clouds in the radar and LiDAR coordinate systems respectively. An example is given in Figure 5.

The extrinsic matrix consists of a 2×2 rotation matrix R and a 2×1 translation matrix t .

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} R & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The known correspondence between points in the source point cloud (radar) and points in the reference point cloud (LiDAR) allows us to use the Kabsch algorithm [15] for calibration. We first translate the centroid of the radar point cloud matrix μ_R and LiDAR point cloud matrix μ_L to the origin in their respective coordinate system and recalculate translated point clouds,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_R &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N q_i & \mu_L &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^N p_j \\ q'_i &= q_i - \mu_R & p'_j &= p_j - \mu_L \end{aligned}$$

where q_i is the position of i th point in the radar point cloud, and p_j is the position of the j th point in the LiDAR point cloud, N is the total number of valid CalTag position. q' and p' denote the translated radar and LiDAR point clouds.

The cross-covariance matrix is calculated from the pairwise product of the translated point clouds and then decomposed using the Singular Vector Decomposition (SVD):


$$W = \sum_{(i,j) \in N} q_i^T p'_j = UDV^T.$$

The rotational matrix is computed as $R = UV$. The translation matrix is computed as $t = \mu_L - R\mu_R$.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

A. Experiment setup

In our experiments, we use an INRAS 24-GHz FMCW Radar [12], an OS1 Ouster LiDAR [21], a corner reflector, and a CalTag. The CalTag is placed on top of a 3D printed base and mounted on a tripod, as shown in Figure 3a and 3b. The whole structure is kept in front of the LiDAR-Radar system, as shown in Figure 4. We manually adjust the height of the fiducial to align with the height of the Radar.



(a) CalTag on a 3D printed base

(b) Complete fiducial structure

Fig. 3: CalTag mounting structure

B. Radar parameters

We operate the radar with 250MHz bandwidth, achieving a range resolution of 0.6m. Since the tag's modulation frequency is set to 500KHz, we use 2MHz sampling frequency, which is four times the modulation frequency, to position




Fig. 4: Comparison of three clutter levels. The top images show the environments, in which regions within the red polygons are clutter sources. The orange box marks the position of the CalTag. Bottom radar plots show the clutter sources and other background noise in polar coordinates. The red fan-shaped boundary marks the data collection region. The blue arrow maps the position of the clutter source from the image to the radar plot.

the shifted peaks around half of the maximum detectable range. This is achieved by using 992 samples per chirp and a chirp duration of 496ms. With 250 MHz bandwidth and 992 samples per chirp, the Radar’s maximum detectable range is 297.6m. This means the CalTag’s distance is shifted by 148.8m, effectively isolated from potential clutters.

C. Radar signal processing parameters

For the rough peak detection, we use 1024-point 2D FFT along the range and the Doppler axis to locate the shifted frequency. Subsequently, in the refined range measurement, we use 1D MUSIC with 2cm resolution along the range axis at the identified Doppler frequency of the peaks. 1D MUSIC with 0.25° degree resolution along the angle axis is then used to measure the angle of arrival at the identified range.

D. Calibration error measurements

The transformation error is measured through the root mean square error of the transformation outcome for all fiducial positions as follows,

$$\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^N \|p(y_k^L) - Tg(y_k^R)\|^2,$$

where N is the total number of tag position, $g(y_k^R)$ converts the detected polar coordinates of the fiducial (r_k, θ_k) to 2D Euclidean coordinates (x, y) and $p(y_k^L)$ projects the 3D LiDAR point cloud into point cloud in 2D BEV.

VI. EVALUATION

In this section, we will present a comprehensive evaluation of our proposed calibration with CalTag. We conduct experiments in different levels of cluttered environments and with different relative positions of Radar and LiDAR. In each

scenario, we compare the results from the CalTag with those from a corner reflector. Since LiDAR serves as the reference sensor, we treat the tag positions detected by LiDAR as the ground truth. For each experiment, data is collected with multiple fiducial positions and divided into training and testing sets. Calibration is performed on the training set and then evaluated on the testing set.

Corner reflector baseline: For the detection of corner reflectors, we followed the method in [22] to perform coarse calibration with a window size of 5° in angle and 10cm in range and selected the peak in the window as the target.

Experiment procedure: We collect 9 valid positions for each fiducial (correctly detected by both sensors). Among the 9 positions, we randomly select 6 positions to calculate the extrinsic matrix that matches the radar point cloud to the LiDAR point cloud and assess the calibration accuracy on the remaining 3 positions. This process is repeated 50 times.

A. Calibration under different clutter levels

Robotic environments with LiDAR-Radar setups can be highly complex and cluttered. To evaluate our method’s reliability, we conducted calibration experiments across three clutter levels, comparing the performance of using CalTag to using a corner reflector. Given that angle measurement errors in coarse calibration heavily impact calibration accuracy with the corner reflector, we kept the radar and LiDAR face roughly the same direction throughout the experiment.

Description of clutter levels: Figure 4 illustrates three clutter levels using both real-world images and radar range-angle FFT plots. The red fan-shaped boundary marks the region in which we put the fiducial and collect data, namely the region of interest. Figure 4a shows the outdoor case




Fig. 5: Comparison of the calibration results between using corner reflector and using CalTag in an environment with and without strong clutters. Red points are radar point clouds. Blue points are LiDAR point clouds.




Fig. 6: Training and testing calibration error with CalTag and corner reflector as the fiducial under different clutter levels

where no prominent source of clutter is close to the data collection area. The bottom radar plot demonstrates that only weak environmental noise exists. Figure 4b shows an indoor environment with open space. There are some clutter sources near the edge of the data collection area, such as the wall to the left of the fiducial. The wall appears in the radar plot as the vertical high-intensity section at the left boundary of the region of interest, so its impact is insufficient to affect fiducials placed in the middle of the region. Figure 4c shows another indoor case with strong sources of clutter. The metallic elevator gates to the right of the fiducial reflect much more electromagnetic waves, resulting in a larger impact. In the bottom radar plot, we observe both peaks corresponding to two clutter sources and strong side lobes.

Qualitative result: Figure 5 displays calibration outputs using two fiducials across different clutter levels. The pre-

calibration point clouds represent fiducial positions in radar and LiDAR coordinates. The post-calibration point clouds show radar data transformed into the LiDAR coordinate system using the estimated extrinsic matrix. The extent of overlapping between two post-calibration point clouds indicates the calibration performance. There is little difference between the performance under low clutter level. However, strong clutters have a huge impact on the performance when the corner reflector is used but still have little influence on the performance when the CalTag is used.

Quantitative result: Figure 6 compares the RMSE while using CalTag as the fiducial to the RMSE while using the corner reflector as the fiducial, for both training and testing sets. With CalTag, calibration RMSE is below 0.03m for the training set and below 0.05m for the testing set across all clutter levels. This demonstrates the robustness of CalTag against clutters. As expected, the RMSE of calibration using the corner reflector is highly dependent on the clutter level. It reaches the same accuracy as using CalTag only in clutter-free conditions. As the clutter level increases, the RMSE rises, but the performance is still acceptable when the clutter has limited influence on the region of interest. However, calibration using the corner reflector completely fails in a heavily cluttered environment. The RMSE shoots beyond 0.15m for both training and testing sets. Huge variation in RMSE conveys unreliability of using a corner reflector as a fiducial when the environment for calibration is unknown. Extra work to exclude false detection would also complicate the calibration procedure.

B. Corner reflector coarse calibration

The corner reflector-based calibration needs a coarse calibration step [22] that estimates the rotation and translation of sensors to create a window in the Range-Angle FFT profile.




Fig. 7: Potential scenarios when initial coarse calibration is used in the process of calibration with corner reflector





Fig. 8: Relationship between calibration RMSE and coarse calibration angle error under two different window sizes. The small window size is 10° by $20cm$. The large window size is 60° by $2m$.


In this evaluation, we will show how this requirement can cause problems for calibration.

Effect of window size on peak detection: Accurately measuring the relative position and angular difference between two sensors is challenging, especially with sensor rotation. A large window size have better tolerance to coarse calibration errors, but it enhances the risk of capturing multiple peaks in cluttered environments. Figure 7 depicts the trade-off between reducing manual measurement errors and minimizing false detection. 7a shows the ideal case where an appropriately sized window captures the peak accurately. However, if the coarse calibration error exceeds the tolerance, the target will fall outside of the window, as shown in Figure 7b. Directly widening the window may result in capturing additional peaks from surrounding objects, leading to false detection when clutter sources have higher backscatter power than the target. Figure 7c elaborates this scenario.

Subsequent effect on calibration error: To better evaluate the uncertainty in the selection of window size, we conducted a calibration experiment at a medium clutter level, as depicted in 4b, using a corner reflector and two different coarse calibration window sizes. Figure 8 shows the calibration errors against different manual angle measurement errors. The small window is 10° in angle by $20cm$ in range. The large window is 60° in angle by $2m$ in range. We intentionally add angle errors to the coarse calibration matrix to simulate manual measurement flaws. The RMSE begins to increase when the angle error rises beyond 20° . The small window size results in an earlier start of increment,



(a) RMSE with varying range resolution, angle resolution = 0.001°



(b) RMSE with varying angle resolution, range resolution = $0.005m$

Fig. 9: Calibration accuracy of testing set under different range and angle MUSIC resolution

confirming the lower tolerance of a small window to angle errors than a large window. However, using a large window suffers from steeper increase in RMSE when false detection occurs. Even under the same environment, changes in the radar's position and direction alter the angle and the range of clutters, complicating window size selection.

C. CalTag Detection micro-benchmarks

Role of precision: The precision of fiducial detection heavily influences the calibration quality. While shrinking bin width improves calibration accuracy, it requires more computational resources. In this section, we evaluate the CalTag detection quality by changing the signal processing resolution and find the optimal MUSIC bin size. Figure 9a and 9b show the average calibration accuracy across different clutter levels under various MUSIC resolutions. RMSE is kept under $0.03m$ when the range bin width is below $0.04m$. There is no visible trend when the range bin width increases. Angle resolution has a greater impact on calibration accuracy. The calibration error increases steadily with the angle bin width by roughly $0.01m$ from 0.001° to 2° . The optimal range resolution is $0.02m$, and the optimal angle resolution

is 0.25°.

Performance under large rotations: Two sensors strictly facing the same direction is rare in a real-world deployment. To test CalTag’s robustness against radar rotation, we collected data with the radar facing angles from 0° to 30° in 10° steps relative to the LiDAR. Table I shows that the calibration error remains consistent across all angles. The training RMSE is around 2 ± 0.5 cm. The testing RMSE is around 3 ± 1 cm. The results demonstrate CalTag’s reliability in autonomous calibration.

TABLE I: CalTag calibration error under different Radar rotation angle

Rotation angle (degree)	train RMSE (m)	test RMSE (m)
10	0.0207 ± 0.0053	0.0276 ± 0.0115
10	0.0203 ± 0.0053	0.0288 ± 0.0111
20	0.0216 ± 0.0048	0.0268 ± 0.0099
30	0.0201 ± 0.0055	0.0288 ± 0.0177

VII. CONCLUSION

Apart from traditional methods, CalTag and its detection method changes the backscatter signal to enhance its sensitivity to the radar. Experiments across three levels of clutter demonstrate CalTag’s reliability. On the other hand, tests with the corner reflector under different coarse calibration angle errors show the uncertainties from potential human measurement errors, which is perfectly solved by CalTag. Future work can explore real-time and autonomous calibration using CalTag, integrate it with other sensor fiducials for more effective multi-sensor calibration, and extend the 2D calibration to 3D calibration with 6 Degrees of Freedom using radars that provide elevation data.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zixuan Bai, Guang Jiang, and Ailing Xu. Lidar-camera calibration using line correspondences. *Sensors*, 20(21):6319, 2020.
- [2] Kshitiz Bansal, Gautham Reddy, and Dinesh Bharadia. Shenron-scalable, high fidelity and efficient radar simulation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- [3] Kshitiz Bansal, Keshav Rungta, and Dinesh Bharadia. Radsegnet: A reliable approach to radar camera fusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.03849*, 2022.
- [4] Kshitiz Bansal, Keshav Rungta, Siyuan Zhu, and Dinesh Bharadia. Pointillism: Accurate 3d bounding box estimation with multi-radars. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*, pages 340–353, 2020.
- [5] Lei Cheng and Siyang Cao. Online targetless radar-camera extrinsic calibration based on the common features of radar and camera. In *NAECON 2023-IEEE National Aerospace and Electronics Conference*, pages 294–299. IEEE, 2023.
- [6] Shreyansh Daftry, Michael Maurer, Andreas Wendel, and Horst Bischof. Flexible and user-centric camera calibration using planar fiducial markers. In *BMVC*. Citeseer, 2013.
- [7] Ankit Dhall, Kunal Chelani, Vishnu Radhakrishnan, and K Madhava Krishna. Lidar-camera calibration using 3d-3d point correspondences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.09785*, 2017.
- [8] Vivek Dham. Programming chirp parameters in ti radar devices. *Application Report SWRA553*, Texas Instruments, 1457, 2017.
- [9] Joris Domhof, Julian FP Kooij, and Dariu M Gavrilă. An extrinsic calibration tool for radar, camera and lidar. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 8107–8113. IEEE, 2019.
- [10] Manideep Dunna, Kshitiz Bansal, Sanjeev Anthia Ganesh, Eamon Patamasing, and Dinesh Bharadia. R-fiducial: Millimeter wave radar

fiducials for sensing traffic infrastructure. In *2023 IEEE 97th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2023-Spring)*, pages 1–7, 2023.

- [11] Lionel Heng. Automatic targetless extrinsic calibration of multiple 3d lidars and radars. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 10669–10675. IEEE, 2020.
- [12] INRAS. Radarbook2. <https://inras.at/en/radarbook2/>.
- [13] Rubén Izquierdo, Ignacio Parra, D Fernández-Llorca, and MA Sotelo. Multi-radar self-calibration method using high-definition digital maps for autonomous driving. In *2018 21st International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 2197–2202. IEEE, 2018.
- [14] Peng Jiang and Srikanth Saripalli. Improving extrinsics between radar and lidar using learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10594*, 2023.
- [15] Wolfgang Kabsch. A solution for the best rotation to relate two sets of vectors. *Acta Crystallographica Section A: Crystal Physics, Diffraction, Theoretical and General Crystallography*, 32(5):922–923, 1976.
- [16] Chia-Le Lee, Yu-Han Hsueh, Chieh-Chih Wang, and Wen-Chieh Lin. Extrinsic and temporal calibration of automotive radar and 3d lidar. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 9976–9983. IEEE, 2020.
- [17] Liang Li, Haotian Li, Xiyuan Liu, Dongjiao He, Ziliang Miao, Fanze Kong, Rundong Li, Zheng Liu, and Fu Zhang. Joint intrinsic and extrinsic lidar-camera calibration in targetless environments using plane-constrained bundle adjustment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12629*, 2023.
- [18] Abdul Sajeed Mohammed, Ali Amamou, Follivi Kloutse Ayevide, Souso Kelouwani, Kodjo Agbossou, and Nadjet Zioui. The perception system of intelligent ground vehicles in all weather conditions: A systematic literature review. *Sensors*, 20(22):6532, 2020.
- [19] Ramin Nabati and Hairong Qi. Radar-camera sensor fusion for joint object detection and distance estimation in autonomous vehicles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08428*, 2020.
- [20] Ramin Nabati and Hairong Qi. Centerfusion: Center-based radar and camera fusion for 3d object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1527–1536, 2021.
- [21] Ouster. High-resolution os1 lidar sensor: Robotics, trucking, mapping, security. <https://ouster.com/products/hardware/os1-lidar-sensor>.
- [22] Juraj Peršič, Ivan Marković, and Ivan Petrović. Extrinsic 6dof calibration of 3d lidar and radar. In *2017 European Conference on Mobile Robots (ECMR)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- [23] Ratheesh Ravindran, Michael J Santora, and Mohsin M Jamali. Camera, lidar, and radar sensor fusion based on bayesian neural network (clr-bnn). *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 22(7):6964–6974, 2022.
- [24] Christoph Schöller, Maximilian Schnettler, Annkathrin Krämmer, Gereon Hinz, Maida Bakovic, Müge Güzet, and Alois Knoll. Targetless rotational auto-calibration of radar and camera for intelligent transportation systems. In *2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, pages 3934–3941. IEEE, 2019.
- [25] Shigeki Sugimoto, Hayato Tateda, Hidekazu Takahashi, and Masatoshi Okutomi. Obstacle detection using millimeter-wave radar and its visualization on image sequence. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Pattern Recognition, 2004. ICPR 2004.*, volume 3, pages 342–345. IEEE, 2004.
- [26] Rohith Reddy Vennam, Ish Kumar Jain, Kshitiz Bansal, Joshua Orozco, Puja Shukla, Aanjhan Ranganathan, and Dinesh Bharadia. mmspoof: Resilient spoofing of automotive millimeter-wave radars using reflect array. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1807–1821. IEEE, 2023.
- [27] Guohang Yan, Feiyu He, Chunlei Shi, Pengjin Wei, Xinyu Cai, and Yikang Li. Joint camera intrinsic and lidar-camera extrinsic calibration. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 11446–11452. IEEE, 2023.
- [28] Guohang Yan, Zhuochun Liu, Chengjie Wang, Chunlei Shi, Pengjin Wei, Xinyu Cai, Tao Ma, Zhizheng Liu, Zebin Zhong, Yuqian Liu, et al. Opencalib: A multi-sensor calibration toolbox for autonomous driving. *Software Impacts*, 14:100393, 2022.
- [29] Shanliang Yao, Runwei Guan, Xiaoyu Huang, Zhuoxiao Li, Xiangyu Sha, Yong Yue, Eng Gee Lim, Hyungjoon Seo, Ka Lok Man, Xiaohui Zhu, et al. Radar-camera fusion for object detection and semantic segmentation in autonomous driving: A comprehensive review. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.