

# UNSUPERVISED UAV 3D TRAJECTORIES ESTIMATION WITH SPARSE POINT CLOUDS

Hanfang Liang<sup>1</sup>, Yizhuo Yang<sup>2</sup>, Jinming Hu<sup>1</sup>, Jianfei Yang<sup>2</sup>, Fen Liu<sup>2</sup>, Shenghai Yuan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jiangnan University <sup>2</sup> Nanyang Technological University

## ABSTRACT


Compact UAV systems, while advancing delivery and surveillance, pose significant security challenges due to their small size, which hinders detection by traditional methods. This paper presents a cost-effective, unsupervised UAV detection method using spatial-temporal sequence processing to fuse multiple LiDAR scans for accurate UAV tracking in real-world scenarios. Our approach segments point clouds into foreground and background, analyzes spatial-temporal data, and employs a scoring mechanism to enhance detection accuracy. Tested on a public dataset, our solution placed 4th in the CVPR 2024 UG2+ Challenge, demonstrating its practical effectiveness. We plan to open-source all designs, code, and sample data for the research community @ [github.com/lianghanfang/UnLiDAR-UAV-Est](https://github.com/lianghanfang/UnLiDAR-UAV-Est).

**Index Terms**— Trajectory Estimation, UAV detection, Point Clouds, Unsupervised

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Drones have revolutionized various industries by enabling precise fertilizing in agriculture and allowing detailed inspection for hard-to-reach structures [1, 2]. However, the potential for malicious drone use is a significant concern. They can be exploited for unauthorized surveillance, drug trafficking, smuggling, and even deploying grenades in war zones. This threat highlights the urgent need for advanced detection systems to detect hostile drones effectively.

Detecting compact UAVs is challenging. Existing solutions rely on **UAV control signals** [3, 4] to detect, but can be bypassed easily by changing frequencies, using 5G networks, or fully autonomous drones [5, 6]. **Visual**-based methods [7, 8, 9] struggle with small objects at high altitudes. Narrow field-of-view cameras mounted on buildings can be manually operated to see the drone [10, 11, 12], but this is impractical for field operations. Wide field-of-view cameras can monitor a larger area but often only capture a few pixels of the drone as shown in Fig. 1. **Radar** can detect drones effectively, but cheaper models are noisy [13] and expensive ones are costly and power-demanding [14]. **Audio**-based detection [15, 16, 17] are intuitive but often less effective, with most commercial drones being very quiet at a distance. **LiDAR** can detect drones, but its data is sparse at long ranges [18].



**Fig. 1.** Illustration of detecting and tracking compact drones using a single low-cost sparse LiDAR to identify threats.


Overall, there is no perfect solution for drone detection.

This work aims to accurately detect drones regardless of their control signal frequency or autonomy, including small drones at high altitudes, without manual operation. It ensures practicality for wide field operations and affordability for single-person or single-vehicle use, as shown in Fig. 1.

In this paper, We propose a concurrent clustering method for analyzing point clouds from a low-cost 3D LiDAR system. First, we perform global-local clustering to exclude large static objects. Then, we refine clustering using spatiotemporal density and voxel attributes to identify moving targets and isolate the UAV trajectory. Finally, we use spline fitting to reconstruct the UAV’s spatial trajectory, enhancing detection accuracy, reducing noise, and eliminating irrelevant data for clearer insights into drone movements.

The main **contributions** of our work are as follows:

- **Unsupervised Trajectory Estimation:** We propose a fast, unsupervised method for detecting drone trajectories and positions from LiDAR point cloud data without any labels for supervised learning.
- **Spatio-Temporal Analysis:** Our spatio-temporal voxel and density analysis method, with a scoring mechanism, isolates the correct trajectory point set.
- **Extensive Benchmarking:** We benchmarked and tested various modalities with different methods to validate system performance. To our best knowledge, this is the first benchmark of its kind for this application.



**Fig. 2.** System Overview: Our algorithm uses DBSCAN to cluster point clouds, compares spatial-temporal changes, filters non-UAV data, and estimates UAV trajectories with spline fitting, measuring error with MSE.

- **Open-Source for All:** We plan to open-source our design, codes, scripts and processed data for the benefit of the community and the general public [github.com/lianghanfang/UnLiDAR-UAV-Est](https://github.com/lianghanfang/UnLiDAR-UAV-Est).

**International Recognition:** The proposed method is an improved iteration of our award-winning solution from the CVPR 2024 UG2+ Challenge, enhancing its cost-effectiveness, robustness, and reliability for practical field applications.

## 2. RELATED WORKS

This section reviews the limited literature on UAV detection and tracking, focusing on a few key approaches.

Vision-based UAV detection has evolved through deep learning, addressing challenges highlighted in studies such as Det-Fly [19] and MAV-VID, Drone-vs-Bird, and Anti-UAV [20]. Methods have improved accuracy by augmenting data and optimizing YOLOv4 for small UAV detection [21], and through transfer learning and adaptive fusion using simulated data [22].

Motion-assisted MAV detection integrates motion and appearance features using fixed and mobile cameras. Fixed camera methods employ background subtraction and CNN-based classification [23], while mobile cameras utilize spatiotemporal characteristics [24]-[25], but can struggle in dynamic environments. Another approach combines appearance and motion-based classification to distinguish MAVs from distractors [26], albeit facing challenges with similar moving objects.

Detection from moving cameras is complex due to the background and target motion mixing together. Methods using UAV-to-UAV datasets and hybrid classifiers [27] contend with background interference. Two-stage segmentation and feature super-resolution [28, 29] offer advancements but grapple with issues like motion blur and occlusions in complex settings.

LiDAR systems, widely used for object detection and tracking, face unique challenges with UAVs due to their small size, shape variability, diverse materials, high speeds, and unpredictable movements. One method adjusts LiDAR frame integration time based on drone speed and distance to enhance point cloud density and size, but this approach is intricate and sensitive to parameter settings [30]. Another strategy reduces LiDAR beams with probabilistic analysis and repositions the sensor for wider coverage, yet it struggles with continuous tracking of small points [31].


Segmentation methods combined with object models and temporal information improve UAV detection and tracking effectiveness, though they are constrained by segmentation and object model accuracy [32]. Euclidean distance clustering and particle filtering algorithms offer accurate yet computationally efficient solutions, albeit sensitive to data noise and outliers [33]. In summary, while several methods address UAV detection and tracking challenges with LiDAR, each method presents distinct limitations and complexities, underscoring the need for ongoing research and development in this domain.

## 3. PROPOSED METHODS

This section outlines our clustering-based, unsupervised spatial-temporal approach for detecting MAVs under challenging conditions. An overview of the system is shown in Fig. 2.

### 3.1. Global-Local Point Set clusterings

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote a sequence of LiDAR scan frames, with  $f$  denoting the number of frames.  $\mathcal{P}$  represents a set of 3D points from a single scan in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The number of points in set  $\mathcal{P}$  is denoted  $card\mathcal{P}$ .  $\mathcal{C}$  denotes a cluster (subset) of points from  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\rho$  denotes the density of points,  $\mathcal{V}$  denotes the voxels of a set of points.



**Fig. 3.** This figure shows sampled points, ground truth, and our predicted trajectory, showing the accuracy of our solution.

For local representation,  $(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_i)$  represents the set of points  $\mathcal{P}$  within the  $i$ -th frame  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $\mathcal{C}_j(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_i)$  denotes the  $j$ -th cluster category of points from  $(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_i)$ . For global representation,  $\sum_i^j \mathcal{F}$  denotes frame sequences from frame  $i$  to frame  $j$ .  $\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\sum_i^j \mathcal{F})$  denotes the  $k$ -th category of the cluster after merging the points from  $\sum_i^j \mathcal{F}$ .

To distinguish between the results of global and local clustering,  $\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}_n | \sum_i^j \mathcal{F})$  represents the  $k$ -th cluster of points in the  $n$ -th frame, where the clustering is derived from the sequence of frames  $\sum_i^j \mathcal{F}$ .

And  $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{C})$  indicates the size of the voxel occupied by cluster  $\mathcal{C}$  in the space. Let  $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}$  be an operator that denotes the density of points in a cluster  $\mathcal{C}$  derived from a set of points  $\mathcal{P}$  in the context of a frame sequence  $\mathcal{F}$ .

We first superimpose the point cloud on the global time frames to obtain  $(\mathcal{P}|\sum_i^j \mathcal{F})$ , then use DBSCAN to perform clustering to obtain  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}|\sum_i^j \mathcal{F})$ .

We calculate the density  $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{P} | \mathcal{F})$  of the point cloud in global point set.

$$\rho_{\mathcal{C}_k}(\mathcal{P} | \mathcal{F}) = \frac{\text{card}\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P} | \mathcal{F})}{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P} | \mathcal{F}))} \quad (1)$$

For local point cluster, we first calculate the density  $\rho_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{P} | \sum_i^j \mathcal{F})$  of the point cloud in point set  $(\mathcal{P}|\sum_i^j \mathcal{F})$ . And simultaneously calculate the spatial Intersection over Union (IoU) of the overlapping areas of voxels. Define the IoU of voxels in category  $k$  of the cluster  $\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\sum_i^j \mathcal{F})$  between frame  $i$  and  $j$  as  $\text{IoU}_k^{i,j}$ .

$$\rho_{\mathcal{C}_k} \left( \mathcal{P} | \sum_i^j \mathcal{F} \right) = \frac{\text{card}\mathcal{C}_k \left( \mathcal{P} | \sum_i^j \mathcal{F} \right)}{\mathcal{V} \left( \mathcal{C}_k \left( \mathcal{P} | \sum_i^j \mathcal{F} \right) \right)} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{IoU}_k^{i,j} = \frac{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_i)) \cap \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_j))}{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_i)) \cup \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_j))} \quad (3)$$

And calculate the ratio of local density to global density as Relative density  $\mathcal{R}_k^{i,j}$ .

$$\mathcal{R}_k^{i,j} = \frac{\rho(\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\sum_i^j \mathcal{F}))}{\rho(\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}))} \quad (4)$$

At this point, through the global-local clusterer, the relative density of each cluster point set  $\mathcal{R}_k^{i,j}$  and the IoU of voxels  $\text{IoU}_k^{i,j}$  can be obtained.

### 3.2. Scoring Mechanism and Trajectory Prediction

For moving objects, voxel positions shift across time frames, causing lower alignment compared to stationary objects. Stationary surfaces show increased point cloud density over time, while moving objects maintain consistent density. We propose a scoring mechanism based on these density and voxel shifts, using a logarithmic function to stabilize and scale voxel IoU.

We define a voxel coincidence score for cluster  $k$  between local point set frame  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_i)$  and  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}_j)$  as  $\psi_{\text{IoU}}^k$ . Define the score of point set density matching between  $\rho(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{F}))$  and  $\rho(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}|\sum_i^j \mathcal{F}))$  as  $\psi_{\text{dens}}^k$ .

$$\psi_{\text{IoU}}^k = \sum_{k=1}^n \log \frac{1}{\text{IoU}_k^{i,j}}, \quad \psi_{\text{dens}}^k = \sum_{k=1}^n e^{\mathcal{R}_k^{i,j}} \quad (5)$$

$$\psi^k = \psi_{\text{dens}}^k + \lambda \times \psi_{\text{IoU}}^k \quad (6)$$

Based on the proposed scoring scheme, the category with the highest score  $\psi^k$  can be identified as the final target with the highest confidence.

For the final trajectory based on the time frame, we use spline fitting on the UAV point cloud and interpolate based on the time frame to determine the spatial position at the corresponding time points. Define the  $k$ -th point cloud frame after segmenting the background as  $P_s^k$ . Sort the point clouds of each time frame according to the timestamp and merge them into a point set  $\mathbb{P}_{uav} = \{P_s^0, P_s^1, \dots, P_s^k\}$ . Among them, the

**Table 1.** Benchmark for wide-area drone estimation of MMAUD V2 and V3 Challenging dataset

Methods	Modality	Training	Bandwidth	Day RMSE (m)			Night RMSE (m)			RMSE (m)		RMSE (m)
				Dx	Dy	Dz	Dx	Dy	Dz	Day	Night	
VisualNet	Visual	Supervised	73.7Mpt/s	<u>0.24</u>	<b>0.39</b>	<u>0.32</u>	1.98	6.10	8.13	<u>0.65</u>	11.45	6.05
DarkNet	Visual	Supervised	73.7Mpt/s	<b>0.23</b>	<u>0.46</u>	<b>0.23</b>	1.84	5.50	4.57	<b>0.63</b>	8.31	4.47
YOLOv5s	Visual	Supervised	73.7Mpt/s	0.46	0.57	1.04	<b>0.64</b>	1.76	1.59	1.27	4.71	2.99
AudioNet	Audio	Supervised	0.18MHz	0.60	1.76	1.59	0.60	1.76	1.59	2.80	2.80	2.80
VorasNet	Audio	Supervised	0.18MHz	0.54	1.59	1.51	0.54	<u>1.59</u>	<u>1.51</u>	2.64	<u>2.64</u>	<u>2.64</u>
VoxelNet	LiDAR	Supervised	0.20Mpt/s	6.37	7.75	5.89	6.37	7.75	5.89	11.63	11.63	11.63
PointNet	LiDAR	Supervised	0.20Mpt/s	/	/	/	/	/	/	76.47	76.47	76.47
PointPillars	LiDAR	Supervised	0.20Mpt/s	4.34	5.34	6.02	4.34	5.34	6.02	9.14	9.14	9.14
VoteNet	LiDAR	Supervised	0.20Mpt/s	/	/	/	/	/	/	104.38	104.38	104.38
SECOND	LiDAR	Supervised	0.20Mpt/s	5.05	6.04	5.71	5.05	6.04	5.71	9.73	9.73	9.73
SPVNAS	LiDAR	Supervised	0.20Mpt/s	2.24	4.99	3.84	2.24	4.99	3.84	6.69	6.69	6.69
Ours	LiDAR	Unsupervised	0.20Mpt/s	0.72	0.85	0.76	<u>0.72</u>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.76</b>	1.35	<b>1.35</b>	<b>1.35</b>

RMSE: Error between predicted and actual values. The smaller, the better the estimation. **RMSE** denotes average error between day and night. Mpt/s denotes Mega Sampling Points Per Second of input. “/” denotes fails to detect. Best results are **boldened**, and second-best results are underlined

points in the point set  $\mathbb{P}_{uav}$  are selected as control points, and the three-dimensional spline  $S(u)$  can be expressed as:

$$S(u) = \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^n P_s^j(i) B_i(u) \quad (7)$$

Where  $B_i$  is the basis function of the spline. The three-dimensional curve is interpolated and fitted in the order of time frames to obtain the UAV spatial coordinates of the required time nodes.

## 4. EXPERIMENT

### 4.1. Dataset

We evaluated our algorithm on the difficult part of the MMAUD [34], namely MMAUD\_v2 and MMAUD\_v3 sequences, featuring visual, LiDAR array, RADAR, and audio array sensors, with over 1700 seconds of multi-modal data in 50 sequences. Each sequence includes millions of sampling points of visual, LiDAR, audio, and radar data. For MMAUD\_V1 sequences, most detections are easy as UAVs typically fly within 40 meters. However, for MMAUD\_v2 and MMAUD\_v3 sequences, the 100-meter range makes smaller UAVs harder to detect with LIDAR.

### 4.2. Evaluation Metrics

We evaluate our algorithm using RMSE error, which directly evaluates system prediction accuracy in various conditions. By varying the lighting conditions, we can better understand the performance of each baseline method. The overall visual performance can be seen from Fig. 3, where green represents drone trajectories segmented via global and local clustering, red denotes actual drone positions, and blue indicates

predicted positions. Our approach excels in noise reduction and precise drone trajectory extraction from point cloud data.

### 4.3. Result and Discussion

The proposed solution demonstrates robust performance under various lighting conditions, as shown in table 1. Traditional supervised LiDAR-based methods often expect dense data with large object sizes and end up with some of the worst performance due to sparse LiDAR data reflected by compact UAVs. Visual-based approaches perform well during the day with denser sampling points but exhibit significant performance drops at night. Audio-based methods show consistent performance day and night, but the overall accuracy is low.

Our proposed solution manages to perform robust drone pose estimation for both day and night, even with very sparse point clouds. This demonstrates that it is a practical solution for UAV early warning applications.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

This paper introduces an unsupervised approach for robust ground-based UAV detection using spatial-temporal and global-local clustering of sparse point cloud sequences. Our method extracts precise UAV trajectories from sparse and noisy data. We plan to open-source our design, codes, scripts, and sampled data. In future work, we aim to integrate active countermeasures, leveraging UAVs or EMP devices, to effectively neutralize drone threats using proposed perception inputs.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Muqing Cao, Kun Cao, Xiuxian Li, Shenghai Yuan, Yang Lyu, Thien-Minh Nguyen, and Lihua Xie, “Distributed multi-robot sweep coverage

- for a region with unknown workload distribution,” *Autonomous Intelligent Systems*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 13, 2021.
- [2] Yang Lyu, Muqing Cao, Shenghai Yuan, and Lihua Xie, “Vision-based plane estimation and following for building inspection with autonomous uav,” *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man. Cybern. B*, 2023.
  - [3] Zheng Si, Chao Liu, Jianyu Liu, and Yinhao Zhou, “Application of snns model based on multi-dimensional attention in drone radio frequency signal classification,” in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2024.
  - [4] Ryan J Wallace, Kristy M Kiernan, Tom Haritos, John Robbins, and Jon M Loffi, “Evaluating small uas operations and national airspace system interference using aerospace,” *Journal of Aviation Technology and Engineering*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 24, 2019.
  - [5] Shenghai Yuan, Han Wang, and Lihua Xie, “Survey on localization systems and algorithms for unmanned systems,” *Unmanned Systems*, vol. 9, no. 02, pp. 129–163, 2021.
  - [6] Thien-Minh Nguyen, Muqing Cao, Shenghai Yuan, Yang Lyu, Thien Hoang Nguyen, and Lihua Xie, “Viral-fusion: A visual-inertial-ranging-lidar sensor fusion approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 958–977, 2021.
  - [7] Angelo Coluccia, Alessio Fascista, Lars Sommer, Arne Schumann, Anastasios Dimou, Dimitrios Zarpalas, and Nabin Sharma, “Drone-vs-bird detection grand challenge at icassp2023,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–2.
  - [8] Sahaj K Mistry, Shreyas Chatterjee, Ajeet K Verma, Vinit Jakhetiya, Badri N Subudhi, and Sunil Jaiswal, “Drone-vs-bird: Drone detection using yolov7 with csrt tracker,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–2.
  - [9] Pengcheng Dong, Chuntao Wang, Zhenyong Lu, Kai Zhang, Wenbo Wan, and Jiande Sun, “S-feature pyramid network and attention model for drone detection,” in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2023.
  - [10] Nan Jiang, Kuiran Wang, Xiaoke Peng, Xuehui Yu, Qiang Wang, Junliang Xing, Guorong Li, Jian Zhao, Guodong Guo, and Zhenjun Han, “Anti-uav: A large multi-modal benchmark for uav tracking,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.08466*, 2021.
  - [11] J Zhao, G Wang, J Li, L Jin, N Fan, M Wang, X Wang, T Yong, Y Deng, Y Guo, et al., “The 2nd anti-uav workshop & challenge: Methods and results,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.09909*, 2021.
  - [12] Jian Zhao, Jianan Li, Lei Jin, Jiaming Chu, Zhihao Zhang, Jun Wang, Jiangqiang Xia, Kai Wang, Yang Liu, Sadaf Gulshad, et al., “The 3rd anti-uav workshop & challenge: Methods and results,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07290*, 2023.
  - [13] Yuan He, Jia Zhang, Rui Xi, Xin Na, Yimiao Sun, and Beibei Li, “Detection and identification of non-cooperative uav using a cots mmwave radar,” *ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks*, 2024.
  - [14] Chenxing Wang, Jiangmin Tian, Jiuwen Cao, and Xiaohong Wang, “Deep learning-based uav detection in pulse-doppler radar,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2021.
  - [15] Sara Al-Emadi, Abdulla Al-Ali, Amr Mohammad, and Abdulaziz Al-Ali, “Audio based drone detection and identification using deep learning,” in *2019 15th International Wireless Communications & Mobile Computing Conference (IWCMC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 459–464.
  - [16] Allen Lei, Tianchen Deng, Han Wang, Jianfei Yang, and Shenghai Yuan, “Audio array-based 3d uav trajectory estimation with lidar pseudo-labeling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.12698*, 2024.
  - [17] Zhenyuan Xiao, Huanran Hu, Guili Xu, and Junwei He, “Tame: Temporal audio-based mamba for enhanced drone trajectory estimation and classification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13037*, 2024.
  - [18] Matouš Vrba, Viktor Walter, Václav Pritzl, Michal Pliska, Tomáš Báča, Vojtěch Spurný, Daniel Heřt, and Martin Saska, “On onboard lidar-based flying object detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05404*, 2023.
  - [19] Ye Zheng, Zhang Chen, Dailin Lv, Zhixing Li, Zhenzhong Lan, and Shiyu Zhao, “Air-to-air visual detection of micro-uavs: An experimental evaluation of deep learning,” *IEEE Robotics and automation letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1020–1027, 2021.
  - [20] Brian KS Isaac-Medina, Matt Poyser, Daniel Organisciak, Chris G Willcocks, Toby P Breckon, and Hubert PH Shum, “Unmanned aerial vehicle visual detection and tracking using deep neural networks: A performance benchmark,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 1223–1232.
  - [21] Hansen Liu, Kuangang Fan, Qinghua Ouyang, and Na Li, “Real-time small drones detection based on pruned yolov4,” *Sensors*, 2021.
  - [22] Chen Rui, Guo Youwei, Zheng Huafei, and Jiang Hongyu, “A comprehensive approach for uav small object detection with simulation-based transfer learning and adaptive fusion,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01800*, 2021.
  - [23] Ulzhalgas Seidaliyeva, Daryn Akhmetov, Lyazzat Iipbayeva, and Eric T Matson, “Real-time and accurate drone detection in a video with a static background,” *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 14, pp. 3856, 2020.
  - [24] Jiayang Xie, Chengxing Gao, Junfeng Wu, Zhiguo Shi, and Jiming Chen, “Small low-contrast target detection: Data-driven spatiotemporal feature fusion and implementation,” *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 11847–11858, 2021.
  - [25] Jiayang Xie, Jin Yu, Junfeng Wu, Zhiguo Shi, and Jiming Chen, “Adaptive switching spatial-temporal fusion detection for remote flying drones,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 2020.
  - [26] Ye Zheng, Canlun Zheng, Xiaoyu Zhang, Fei Chen, Zhang Chen, and Shiyu Zhao, “Detection, localization, and tracking of multiple mavs with panoramic stereo camera networks,” *IEEE transactions on automation science and engineering*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 1226–1243, 2022.
  - [27] Jing Li, Dong Hye Ye, Mathias Kolsch, Juan P Wachs, and Charles A Bouman, “Fast and robust uav to uav detection and tracking from video,” *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computing*, 2021.
  - [28] Muhammad Waseem Ashraf, Waqas Sultani, and Mubarak Shah, “Dogfight: Detecting drones from drones videos,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 7067–7076.
  - [29] Hanzhuo Wang, Xingjian Wang, Chengwei Zhou, Wenchao Meng, and Zhiguo Shi, “Low in resolution, high in precision: Uav detection with super-resolution and motion information extraction,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
  - [30] Li Qingqing, Yu Xianjia, Jorge Peña Queralta, and Tomi Westerlund, “Adaptive lidar scan frame integration: Tracking known mavs in 3d point clouds,” in *2021 20th International Conference on Advanced Robotics (ICAR)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1079–1086.
  - [31] Sedat Dogru and Lino Marques, “Drone detection using sparse lidar measurements,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 3062–3069, 2022.
  - [32] Jan Razlaw, Jan Quenzel, and Sven Behnke, “Detection and tracking of small objects in sparse 3d laser range data,” in *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019.
  - [33] Hong Wang, Yu Peng, Liansheng Liu, and Jun Liang, “Study on target detection and tracking method of uav based on lidar,” in *2021 Global Reliability and Prognostics and Health Management*. IEEE, 2021.
  - [34] Shenghai Yuan, Yizhuo Yang, Thien Hoang Nguyen, Thien-Minh Nguyen, Jianfei Yang, Fen Liu, Jianping Li, Han Wang, and Lihua Xie, “Mmaud: A comprehensive multi-modal anti-uav dataset for modern miniature drone threats,” *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2024.