

Robust Egoistic Rigid Body Localization

Niclas Führling[✉], *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Giuseppe Thadeu Freitas de Abreu[✉], *Senior Member, IEEE*
David González G.[✉], *Senior Member, IEEE* and Osvaldo Gonsa[✉]

Abstract—We consider a robust and self-reliant (or “egoistic”) variation of the rigid body localization (RBL) problem, in which a primary rigid body seeks to estimate the pose (*i.e.*, location and orientation) of another rigid body (or “target”), relative to its own, without the assistance of external infrastructure, without prior knowledge of the shape of the target, and taking into account the possibility that the available observations are incomplete. Three complementary contributions are then offered for such a scenario. The first is a method to estimate the translation vector between the center point of both rigid bodies, which unlike existing techniques does not require that both objects have the same shape or even the same number of landmark points. This technique is shown to significantly outperform the state-of-the-art (SotA) under complete information, but to be sensitive to data erasures, even when enhanced by matrix completion methods. The second contribution, designed to offer improved performance in the presence of incomplete information, offers a robust alternative to the latter, at the expense of a slight relative loss under complete information. Finally, the third contribution is a scheme for the estimation of the rotation matrix describing the relative orientation of the target rigid body with respect to the primary. Comparisons of the proposed schemes and SotA techniques demonstrate the advantage of the contributed methods in terms of root mean square error (RMSE) performance under fully complete information and incomplete conditions.

Index Terms—Rigid Body Localization, Convex Optimization, Multidimensional Scaling, Matrix Completion.

I. INTRODUCTION

WIRELESS localization [2]–[4] can be seen as a precursor of joint communication and sensing (JCAS), in so far as it demonstrates that communication signals can be used to locate users and acquire situation awareness, functionalities that have been identified as key drivers for beyond fifth-generation (B5G) [5] and sixth-generation (6G) [6] systems, as well as new applications such as the internet of vehicles (IoV) [7] and digital twins [8].

Indeed, there are several types of information – including finger-prints [9], received signal strength indicator (RSSI) [10], angle of arrival (AoA) [11], and delay-based estimates of radio range [12] – can be extracted from radio signals for the purpose of localization. In much of related literature it is considered that acquiring such information requires specialized equipment, dedicated protocols, and/or the transmission of purpose-designed signals, which explains the predominance of methods to find the position of individual points [2], [3], [13], given the additional overhead, costs and other constraints.

N. Führling and G. T. F. Abreu are with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, Constructor University, Campus Ring 1, 28759, Bremen, Germany (emails: [nfuehrling, gabreu]@constructor.university).

D. González G. and O. Gonsa are with the Wireless Communications Technologies Group, Continental AG, Wilhelm-Fay Strasse 30, 65936, Frankfurt am Main, Germany (e-mails: david.gonzalez.g@ieee.org, osvaldo.gonsa@continental-corporation.com).

Parts of this article have been accepted to the 2025 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC) [1] (Corresponding author: N. Führling)

Recently, however, advances in JCAS technology [14] has demonstrated that radar parameters (*i.e.*, range, bearing and velocity) can be acquired by conventional communications signals [15], [16], 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 recent development is an increasing interest in the rigid body localization (RBL) problem [17]–[19], whose objective is to determine not only the location of point targets, or their average, but the shape and orientation of objects, based on a collection of points sufficient to define the latter.

Rigid body localization is particularly attractive to vehicle-to-anything (V2X) networks and IoV applications which, unlike earlier applications of positioning technology such as people tracking in indoor settings [13] and asset management in industrial settings [20], crucially require information on the size, shape, and orientation of vehicles in order to ensure the efficacy and safety of autonomous driving (AD) applications such as collision detection [21], navigation [22], and vehicle path prediction [23], to name only a few examples.

Focusing on the V2X and IoV paradigm in particular, a scenario commonly encountered is such that a vehicle is able to obtain relative information between itself and surrounding vehicles, which if processed adequately can be utilized to enable RBL as a means to enrich applications such as advanced autonomous driving (AD), platooning and more.

We emphasize that for such a purpose conventional simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) technologies [24]–[26] are not suitable, as they require expensive dedicated equipment and massive amounts of data to function, implicating in high costs and latencies that limit their feasibility. In contrast to SLAM, the type of RBL problem here addressed is based on radio signals, preferably under (but not limited to) a JCAS paradigm [17], [27]. Examples of the latter are the method proposed in [28], where the pose, angular velocity and trajectory of a rigid body is estimated using Lyapunov functions of Doppler measurements, obtained by a nonlinear observer; the technique in [27], where a two-stage algorithm was used to estimate rotation, translation, angular velocity and translational velocity from range and Doppler measurements, making use of various weighted least square (WLS) minimization methods; and the scheme in [29], which proposes a solution to the relative multi-object RBL problem¹ 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.

¹An anchor-based version of the method also appeared earlier in [30].

Unfortunately, these and most other SotA RBL methods assume that the shape of the target rigid body is known [27], [29], [30], which is unrealistic in real life applications since vehicles vary greatly in shape and size. In addition, a recurrent problem in localization systems which is even more critical in the RBL scenario, is that measurements are often missing due to channel blockage, poor signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), packet losses or similar conditions.

In light of all the above, in this work, we consider robust and egoistic radio-based RBL schemes, capable of operating with incomplete information, without requiring infrastructure, and which offer a low cost alternative to SLAM. The contributions of the article can be summarized as follows:

- A scheme for the estimation of the translation vector between two rigid bodies of arbitrary shapes is described. In contrast to existing methods, the proposed technique does not require that both bodies have the same shape, and enables the first body to act in a self-reliant (“egoistic”) manner, in the sense that no knowledge of the shape of the second (“target”) body is needed by the primary rigid body. The proposed method is found to outperform the most closely related SotA alternative.
- A second egoistic translation vector estimation method is proposed, by extending² the technique in [29] from a translation distance estimator to a full translation vector estimator, robust to incomplete observations;
- A scheme for the estimation of the rotation matrix between two rigid bodies of arbitrary shapes is proposed that works in a egoistic manner, and is independent of translation vector estimates.

The structure of the remainder of the article is as follows. First, Section II describes the system model, concisely and clearly stating the problem mathematically, and briefly elaborating on limitations of related SotA approaches. The two proposed translation vector estimation methods are described and evaluated in Sections III and IV, respectively, while the rotation estimation method is described in Section V, along with a brief complexity analysis.

II. RIGID BODY LOCALIZATION: SYSTEM MODEL, PROBLEM FORMULATION AND STATE-OF-THE-ART

A. System Model

Consider a rigid body 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 described by the corresponding conformation matrix \mathbf{C} constructed by the column-wise collection of the vectors \mathbf{c}_n , such that $\mathbf{C} = [\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times N}$. Next, as illustrated in Figure 1, consider the representation of the location $\mathbf{S}^{(1)}$ of said rigid body relative to another (*e.g.*, previous) location $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$, which without loss of generality can be set as a “canonical” reference (centered at the absolute origin), such that $\mathbf{S}^{(0)} = \mathbf{C}$. Then, one can write³, without loss of generality

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

where $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ is a translation vector given by the distance between 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 matrix⁴ determined by the corresponding yaw, pitch and roll angles α, β and γ , respectively, namely

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




Fig. 1. Illustration of a rigid body transformation at two distinct locations $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{S}^{(1)}$. Without loss of generality, we set the initial position 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 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 a two-body egoistic RBL scenario. Each rigid body has a different shape and orientation, defined by distinct conformation matrices \mathbf{C}_1 and \mathbf{C}_2 , respectively. The translation vector \mathbf{t} between the bodies, highlighted in yellow, is defined by the difference between the geometric centers of the two rigid bodies.

²Besides the extension, we also correct an error made in [29, Subsec. 3.2], which renders that approach ineffective for the estimation of the translation vector \mathbf{t} . For details see Subsection II-C and Appendix A.

³For simplicity, we hereafter omit super-scripts (\cdot) whenever clarity is not compromised.

⁴For the sake of simplicity, in coherence with the SotA, detecting the orientation of a rigid body in this article will be interpreted as estimating of the 9 elements of the corresponding rotation matrix \mathbf{Q} as a whole. However, as shown in [31] this representation can 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) .

Next, consider a scenario as illustrated in Figure 2, in which two distinct 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 $\mathbf{C}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times N_2}$.

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 scenario in V2X systems with relevance to AD applications is, however, that one of the rigid bodies – say, the truck in Figure 2 – seeks to estimate not only its distance to the other body – in this case, the car in Figure 2 – but also the shape and orientation of the latter, based on a set of measurements of the distances between their corresponding landmark points.

It will be considered, in what follows, that the distance measurements among the landmark points, hereafter referred to as “sensors”, on both rigid bodies can be obtained either via point-to-point communications or other technologies such as radar, video or JCAS. It will, furthermore, be assumed that each body is only aware of its own shape, described by the 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.

When subjected to unbiased estimation errors, the estimates of the pairwise distance between sensors $\mathbf{s}_{1,n}$ on the first body, and $\mathbf{s}_{2,m}$ on the second⁵, can be described by

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

where $d_{n,m} \triangleq \|\mathbf{s}_{1,n} - \mathbf{s}_{2,m}\|_2$ is the true pairwise distance between the sensors, while $v_{n,m}$ denotes measurement 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, given by

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

where the mean and variance of the squared-distance estimation 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 [30].

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

$$\mathbf{D} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{D}_1 & \mathbf{D}_{12} \\ \hline \mathbf{D}_{12}^\top & \mathbf{D}_2 \end{array} \right] \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_1+N_2) \times (N_1+N_2)}, \quad (5)$$

which includes both the pairwise distances between the rigid bodies \mathbf{D}_{12} , as well as the intra-distances of the two individual rigid bodies \mathbf{D}_1 and \mathbf{D}_2 .

Without loss of generality, it can be assumed under the system model described above, that the self intra-distance matrix \mathbf{D}_1 is known exactly, the target intra-distance matrix \mathbf{D}_2 is unknown, and the squared cross-distance matrix \mathbf{D}_{12} can be written as [32]

$$\mathbf{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} = \mathbf{D}_{12} \odot \mathbf{D}_{12} = \boldsymbol{\psi}_1 \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top + \mathbf{1}_{N_1} \boldsymbol{\psi}_2^\top - 2\mathbf{S}_1^\top \mathbf{S}_2, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are matrices containing the locations of the sensors in bodies 1 and 2, respectively; the auxiliary vectors $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i \triangleq \mathbf{S}_i^\top \mathbf{S}_i$ 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).

Since the cross-body measurements typically can only be assured to be available under LOS conditions, it is possible that some distances between sensors on both bodies cannot be measured. To incorporate this into the given model the modified notation of the squared measurements is given by

$$\mathbf{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} \odot \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1) + \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_2) \mathbf{W} - 2(\mathbf{S}_1^\top \mathbf{S}_2) \odot \mathbf{W}, \quad (7)$$

where the so-called connectivity matrix \mathbf{W} , which captures the M available measurements, is defined as

$$\mathbf{W} = \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{1}_M \mathbf{1}_M^\top & \mathbf{1}_M \mathbf{1}_{N_2-M}^\top \\ \mathbf{1}_{N_1-M} \mathbf{1}_M^\top & \mathbf{0}_{N_1-M} \mathbf{0}_{N_2-M}^\top \end{array} \right]. \quad (8)$$

B. Problem Statement

With the aforementioned system model in hand, we are ready to define the problem we seek to solve and, for the sake of context, discuss a particularly relevant SotA method. To that end, 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)

$$\mathbf{S} = [\mathbf{S}_1 | \mathbf{S}_2] = [\mathbf{Q}_1 | \mathbf{Q}_2] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_2} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_1} & \mathbf{C}_2 \end{array} \right] + [\mathbf{t}_1 | \mathbf{t}_2] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{0}_{N_2}^\top \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top \end{array} \right], \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{Q}_i and \mathbf{t}_i denote the rotation matrix and translation vector of the i -th body respectively, 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 assumption, *i.e.* $\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{C}_1$ and $\mathbf{t}_1 = \mathbf{0}_3$, however, equation (9) reduces to

$$\mathbf{S} = [\mathbf{S}_1 | \mathbf{S}_2] = [\mathbf{I} | \mathbf{Q}] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_2 \end{array} \right] + [\mathbf{0} | \mathbf{t}] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{0}_{N_2}^\top \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top \end{array} \right], \quad (10)$$

where we have simplified the notation by omitting subscripts that can be inferred from context, which includes relabeling $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_2$ and $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}_2$.

The problem addressed in this article – namely, the attempt by rigid body 1 (*e.g.*, the truck in Fig. 2) to locate body 2 (*e.g.*, the car in Fig. 2) without support of infrastructure – translates therefore to estimating, with basis on equations (6) and (10), the rotation matrix \mathbf{Q} and the translation vector \mathbf{t} , given perfect knowledge of the conformation matrix \mathbf{C}_1 (which implies exact knowledge of \mathbf{D}_1), possession of an incomplete estimate of the matrix \mathbf{D}_{12} subject to noise, under the egoistic condition that \mathbf{C}_2 is unknown, and for a general case where $N_1 \neq N_2$.

⁵For simplicity, we slightly abuse the notation by using $\mathbf{s}_{i,n}$ to refer both to a sensor and its location.

C. A Note on Related SotA

To the best of our knowledge, the egoistic and generalized variation of the RBL problem described above is original. The closest related problem we are aware of is the one considered in [29], which cast onto the description offered above would amount to the particular case where $N_1 = N_2$, combined with an idealistic assumption that C_2 is perfectly and fully known. In addition to these crucial distinctions, however, a critical error was made in [29, Subsec. 3.2], as demonstrated in Appendix A, which renders the approach thereby ineffective for the estimation of the translation vector \mathbf{t} . In spite of the aforementioned error, the method in [29] 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 \mathbf{Q} .

First, consider the $N \times N$ classic Schönberg double-centering matrix (DCM), defined by [32]

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top. \quad (11)$$

Taking into account incomplete observation and making use of the Schönberg DCM, a projection matrix \mathbf{P} can be formulated, written as

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{J}_M & \mathbf{0}_M \mathbf{0}_{N-M}^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{N-M} \mathbf{0}_M^\top & \mathbf{J}_{N-M} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

Left- and right-multiplying a measured distance matrix by the projection matrix \mathbf{P} , and scaling the result by $-\frac{1}{2}$, as well as applying the connectivity matrix \mathbf{W} , yields

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\odot 2} &= -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} \odot \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{P} \mathbf{S}_1^\top \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{P}) \odot \mathbf{W} \\ &= (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C}_2) \odot \mathbf{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where it was shown in [29] that due to the missing measurements only the visible measurements $\mathbf{C}_{i,v}$, *i.e.*, the first M columns of the conformation matrix \mathbf{C}_i are required.

To facilitate the formulation of a problem to estimate \mathbf{Q} , it will prove convenient to apply an orthogonal Procrustes problem (OPP) onto equation (13), which under the assumption of perfect knowledge of \mathbf{C}_2 can be achieved by defining [33]

$$\check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\odot 2} \triangleq \bar{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\odot 2} \mathbf{C}_{2,v}^\dagger = \mathbf{C}_{1,v}^\top \mathbf{Q}, \quad (14a)$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_{2,v}^\dagger \triangleq \mathbf{C}_{2,v}^\top (\mathbf{C}_{2,v} \mathbf{C}_{2,v}^\top)^{-1}. \quad (14b)$$

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

$$\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{OPP} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \|\check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\odot 2} - \mathbf{C}_{1,v}^\top \mathbf{Q}\|_F^2, \quad (15)$$

which can be obtained in closed form via singular value decomposition (SVD) of the matrix $\mathbf{C}_1 \check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\odot 2}$.

In particular, the solution of problem (15) is given by [29]

$$\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{OPP} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{V}^\top, \quad (16a)$$

with \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} such that

$$\mathbf{C}_{1,v} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\odot 2} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^\top. \quad (16b)$$

While the solution to this problem is well known, it has to be noted that in order to use the orthogonal projection

specific rank restrictions have to be fulfilled. Specifically in our scenario we need to achieve $\text{rank}(\bar{\mathbf{C}}_{2,v}) = 3$, where the rank can be generalized by the projection in (13), leading to $\text{rank}(\check{\mathbf{C}}_{2,v}) = M - 1$. This means that we need at least 4 links in order to perform the estimation and avoid singularities.

We emphasize that although it was assumed in [29] that both rigid bodies have the same number of landmark points (*e.g.*, $N_1 = N_2$), the notion of a relative rotation (10) between two bodies is general, and therefore apply also to bodies of distinct shapes and/or different numbers of landmark points, as can be inferred from equation (10). In particular, by aligning the rotation matrix of the first rigid body with the cartesian coordinates, such that $\mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{I}$, the orientation \mathbf{Q}_2 of the second body with respect to the first, becomes simply the relative rotation itself. In other words, $\mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{I} \implies \mathbf{Q}_2 = \mathbf{Q}$, or more generally, $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \cdot \mathbf{Q}_2$.

III. EGOISTIC ESTIMATION OF TRANSLATION VECTORS BETWEEN ARBITRARILY-SHAPED RBLs

The assumption of pre-existing knowledge of the conformation matrix \mathbf{C}_2 , although typical of SotA RBL methods [27], [29], is hard to meet in practical conditions. In AD-related V2X applications, for instance, satisfying such assumption would require that a vehicle attempting to locate other vehicles in its vicinity is aware of their shapes, which is obviously impractical given the enormous diversity in vehicle models and their frequent updates. In order to mitigate this problem, we propose in the following sections methods to estimate \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{Q} , respectively, without the requirement that \mathbf{C}_2 is known.

In particular, in the following sections we first present the reconstruction of the EDM in an egoistic scenario, followed by an multidimensional scaling (MDS)-based egoistic translation estimation with corresponding performance evaluations. Furthermore, a second estimator extending and correcting the SotA method shown in [29] will be presented, which is shown to be more robust against incomplete observations.

A. MDS-based Egoistic Translation Estimation

Let us start by pointing out that not knowing the conformation matrix \mathbf{C}_2 implicates not knowing the intra-distances matrix \mathbf{D}_2 . And while the reverse implication is not always true – *i.e.*, in principle one could have knowledge of \mathbf{D}_2 but not \mathbf{C}_2 – the assumption that \mathbf{D}_2 is also not available is consistent with egoistic principle followed in this article⁶. In what follows, we therefore assume no knowledge of \mathbf{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 [34]–[36], a number of which could be used, we here consider the simple and well-known Nyström approximation method⁷ [37].

⁶Notice 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.

⁷Although more sophisticated matrix completion (MC) exist, which could yield better performance, it will later be shown in Section IV that our RBL scheme offers additional robustness to incompleteness, such that what is relevant to this article is the relative performances between the two proposed and the SotA under a given MC method.

Applying the Nyström approximation to the EDM D from equation (5) yields⁸ the following estimate of D_2

$$\hat{D}_2 \approx \mathbb{H}[D_{12}^\top D_1^{-1} D_{12}], \quad (17)$$

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

With the knowledge of the intra-distances matrix of the first body D_1 , calculated from the conformation matrix C_1 itself, the measurements \tilde{D}_{12} corresponding to the distances 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 constructed as

$$\hat{D} = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & \tilde{D}_{12} \\ \tilde{D}_{12}^\top & \mathbb{H}[\tilde{D}_{12}^\top D_1^{-1} \tilde{D}_{12}] \end{bmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

such that an MDS-based first estimate of the position of all sensors from both rigid bodies can be obtained as [32]

$$[\hat{S}_1^*, \hat{S}_2^*] = V \Lambda^{1/2}, \quad (19a)$$

where V and Λ are the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the corresponding double-centered EDM, given by

$$\bar{D} = V \Lambda V^\top, \quad (19b)$$

with

$$\bar{D} = -\frac{1}{2} J_{N_1+N_2} \hat{D}^{\odot 2} J_{N_1+N_2}, \quad (19c)$$

where $J_{N_1+N_2}$ is an $(N_1 + N_2)$ -point Schönberg DCM build as described in equation (11).

The initial MDS solution shown in equation (19a) can then be transformed to the reference frame of the first rigid body via a Procrustes transformation, namely

$$\hat{S}_2 = R^* \hat{S}_2^* + t^* \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top. \quad (20a)$$

where

$$(R^*, t^*) = \arg \min_{R \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, t \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}} \|C_1 - (R \hat{S}_1^* + t \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top)\|_F, \quad (20b)$$

from which we then obtain the estimate

$$\hat{S} = [C_1, \hat{S}_2], \quad (21a)$$

which substituted into equation (10) and using the relation $Q_2 C_2 = \hat{S}_2 J_{N_2}$, yields

$$\hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_2}^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{3 \times N_1}^\top & (R^* \hat{S}_2^* + t^* \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top) J_{N_2} \end{bmatrix} + [\mathbf{0} | t] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{0}_{N_2}^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{N_1}^\top & \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21b)$$

Utilizing the latter expression, the translation vector t can be found by solving the quadratic optimization program

$$\hat{t} = \arg \min_t \|J_{N_1+N_2} (\hat{S}^\top \hat{S} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{D}^{\odot 2} \odot \hat{W}) J_{N_1+N_2}\|_F^2, \quad (22a)$$

which can easily be solved by common optimization tools, such as gradient descent or interior point methods [38], [39].

⁸The Nyström approximation in general only works if the $\text{rank}(D_1) \geq \text{rank}(D_2)$, 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.* [34]–[36], may yield better results.

Algorithm 1 : MDS Estimation of RBL Translation Vectors

Input: Conformation matrix C_1 , measurements \tilde{D}_{12} .

Output: Translation vector estimate \hat{t} ;

- 1: Construct D_1 as the EDM of C_1 , and \hat{D} via eq. (18);
 - 2: Obtain an estimate \hat{S}_2^* via MDS as per equation (19);
 - 3: Refine the latter estimate into \hat{S}_2 via equation (20);
 - 4: Construct the stacked RBL estimate \hat{S} via equation (21);
 - 5: Solve eq. (22) to obtain the translation vector estimate \hat{t} ;
-

In the above, we have already integrated the notion of incomplete observations as described in Section II-B, by capturing incomplete observations via the erasure matrix

$$\hat{W} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{N_1} & W \\ W^\top & I_{N_2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22b)$$

The proposed method for the MDS-based egoistic translation estimation without rigid body conformation knowledge, based on the range information between the two rigid bodies is therefore summarized in Algorithm 1.

B. Performance Evaluation

In this section we offer simulation results illustrating the performance of the egoistic MDS-based RBL technique contributed above. Since, to the best of our knowledge, no equivalent SotA method exists for the egoistic set-up here considered, we first compare in Figure 3 only the results of the estimation of the translation vector t via the non-egoistic method of [27], against a variation of the proposed technique of Algorithm 1, in which an estimate of Q obtained from [27] is used with the knowledge of the conformation matrix C_2 , such that equation (21b) is effectively replaced by equation (10). For the sake of disambiguation, the proposed method will be dubbed Ego RBL, while the method modified by an externally fed conformation matrix is referred to as the ‘‘Genie-Aided’’ scheme.




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

TABLE I
SIMULATION PARAMETERS

Reference frames	Translations	Rotations
$C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 & -1.25 & 1.25 \\ -4 & -4 & -4 & -4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 0.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$ $C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 1 & 1 & 0.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$	$t_1 = [0, 0, 0]^T$ $t_2 = t = [7, 3, 0.5]^T$	$[\psi_1, \theta_1, \phi_1] = [0^\circ, 0^\circ, 0^\circ]$ $[\psi_2, \theta_2, \phi_2] = [10^\circ, 20^\circ, 45^\circ]$




Fig. 4. RMSE of the translation estimate of the proposed MDS-based method for different levels of available information, over the range error σ .

To analyze the behavior and performance of the two proposed methods, we choose the RMSE as our metric for comparison. Thus, we need to define the RMSE for the translation vector as

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K |\hat{t}^{(k)} - t|_2^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (23)$$

where \hat{t} is the estimated translation vector and $K = 10^3$ is the number of Monte-Carlo simulations⁹.

The considered scenario is represented by two rigid bodies as shown in Fig. 2, where the parameters, including translation, rotation, as well as the original reference frames of the rigid bodies, are summarized in Table I and will be consistently utilized hereafter, unless when otherwise stated. Our first results are given in Fig. 3 comparing the translation estimates in a non-egoistic scenario, between the proposed method and the SotA in [27] respectively in terms of RMSE in meter over the range error¹⁰ σ .

It can be observed in Figure 3 that the proposed MDS-based method outperforms the SotA of [27] for range errors below 20 cm, which is well within the typical accuracy of sensing technology used in Automotive Industry [42]. In turn, in Figure 4, it is found that the proposed egoistic scheme for a fully complete scenario achieves a performance very close to that of the Genie-Aided variation, confirming that the contributed (egoistic) MDS-based method is capable of

⁹The algorithms are implemented in MATLAB, with the minimization problems solved using the CVX optimization package [40], [41].

¹⁰Note that the range error is not equivalent to the exact error in meters but rather the error used in the noise calculations given in (4).

handling the practical condition that no prior knowledge on the shape of the target object is available.

Finally, further simulations are performed to evaluate the performance of Algorithm 1 in systems under different levels of incompleteness. The results, also shown in Figure 4, illustrate the impact of incomplete information on the accuracy RBL. In particular, it is seen that performance degrades quickly, leading to rather high error floors as the available information goes from fully complete to 80%, to 70% complete¹¹.

C. Matrix Completion aided Localization

As seen in Figure 4, incompleteness in the distance measurement matrix significantly harms the estimation performance. To counter this harming effect, matrix completion (MC) methods can be used. We emphasize, however, that performing MC directly over the entire EDM D , which is a hollow symmetric matrix, usually yields poor results. Instead, we apply MC to fill the missing elements of the partially observed measurement matrix \hat{D}_{12} , and then construct the estimate of \hat{D} via Nyström approximation, via equation (18).

Well known and high-performing matrix completion algorithms include the simple rank enforcing algorithm [43], the OptSpace algorithm [44], the soft-impute (SI) method [45], and the accelerated and inexact Soft-Impute (AIS-Impute) approach of [46]. Among these techniques, we select OptSpace [44] due to its trade-off between complexity and performance, but obviously any other suitable method can be used.




Fig. 5. RMSE of the translation estimate of the proposed method aided by matrix completion for different levels of available information, over the range error σ .

¹¹The percentage of completion is computed based on the number of zeros and non-zeros in the connectivity matrix W given in equation (8).

Figure 5 illustrates the impact of matrix completion onto the egoistic MDS-based translation estimation technique proposed in Subsection III, under the same conditions of Figure 4. It can be observed that indeed matrix completion can lower the error floors observed previously, approximately by a factor of 10. Additionally, the performance of the method of [27] enhanced via matrix completion is shown (for 70% and 80% available information), demonstrating that the SotA approach is not improved by matrix completion.

IV. ROBUST EGOISTIC TRANSLATION ESTIMATION

In spite of its attractive features, in particular the self-reliant framework in terms of not requiring prior knowledge on the conformation of the target object, and the ability to handle rigid bodies of arbitrary shapes with distinct numbers of landmark points, the technique proposed and evaluated in Section III has one limitation that can be improved upon. Although robustness to incompleteness in \hat{D} can be partially alleviated by the incorporation of MC, as discussed above, the method itself offers no particular (additional) means to increase robustness.

A. MDS-based Egoistic Translation Estimation

In light of the above, we introduce a second method, which extends the corrected version of the translation distance estimator of [29], detailed in Appendix A, which is designed to enable the robust estimation of the translation vector \mathbf{t} in an egoistic setup. To that end, first consider the corrected translation distance estimator given in equation (44) of Appendix A, which for the sake of convenience is reproduced below

$$\hat{t} = \frac{1}{N^2} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\|\mathbf{c}_{1,n}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{c}_{2,n}\|_2^2) + \quad (24)$$

$$\text{missing in [29, Sec. 3.2]} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} + \frac{2}{N^2} \mathbf{1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2) \mathbf{1} \\ - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (2\mathbf{c}_{i,1}^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_1 + 2\mathbf{c}_{i,2}^\top \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{t}_2). \end{array} \right.$$

Next, since in the egoistic scenario the conformation matrix of the second rigid body is unknown, equation (43) has to be considered, given by

$$\hat{t} = \frac{-1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{s}_{2,n}\|_2^2) + \|\mathbf{t}_1\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{t}_2\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{N^2} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 + \frac{2}{N^2} \mathbf{1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2) \mathbf{1}. \quad (25)$$

By applying the same knowledge, relations and assumptions as before, (25) can be rewritten to

$$\hat{t} = \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{t} = \frac{-1}{N_1} \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} (\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2) + \frac{-1}{N_2} \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} (\|\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{2,n}\|_2^2) + \|\mathbf{t}\|_2^2 \quad (26)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{N_1 N_2} (\|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 + \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{J}_{N_2} + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top) \mathbf{1}_{N_2}).$$

Since the objective of our proposed method is to estimate the translation vector instead of the distance only, the problem requires the isolation of \mathbf{t} in (26) to be able to construct a corresponding optimization problem. The translation vector \mathbf{t}

is contained in the cross terms, which can be isolated by using vectorization [47], with the corresponding term written as

$$\frac{2}{N_1 N_2} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top) \mathbf{1}_{N_2} = \frac{2}{N_1 N_2} \mathbf{1}_{N_1 N_2}^\top (\mathbf{1}_{N_2} \otimes \mathbf{C}_1^\top) \mathbf{t}. \quad (27)$$

By following the assumptions taken before and the isolation of \mathbf{t} , the estimator can be reformulated and simplified to

$$\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{t} = \frac{-1}{N_1} \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} (\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2) - \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} (\|\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{2,n}\|_2^2) + \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{t} + \frac{1}{N_1 N_2} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 + \frac{2}{N_1 N_2} \mathbf{1}_{N_1 N_2}^\top (\mathbf{1}_{N_2} \otimes \mathbf{C}_1^\top) \mathbf{t} + \frac{2}{N_1 N_2} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{J}_{N_2}) \mathbf{1}_{N_2}. \quad (28)$$

Next, rearranging the equation with its only unknown being \mathbf{t} , the resulting problem can be written as

$$0 = \mathbf{a} \mathbf{t} + b, \quad (29a)$$

where

$$\mathbf{a} \triangleq \frac{2}{N_1 N_2} \mathbf{1}_{N_1 N_2}^\top (\mathbf{1}_{N_2} \otimes \mathbf{C}_1^\top), \quad (29b)$$

$$\mathbf{b} \triangleq \frac{-1}{N_1} \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} (\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2) + \frac{-1}{N_2} \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} (\|\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{2,n}\|_2^2) + \frac{1}{N_1 N_2} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 + \frac{2}{N_1 N_2} \mathbf{1}_{N_1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{J}_{N_2}) \mathbf{1}_{N_2}. \quad (29c)$$

Since the unknown variable is not a scalar but a vector, the problem is underdetermined and does not have a closed form solution. Thus, before formulating an optimization problem, a constraint has to be designed that resolves this issue, additionally adding robustness to the problem. Therefore, a constraint can be added to the problem that minimizes the distance of an artificial distance matrix found by the optimization itself, compared to the measured one. To that extend, an artificial distance matrix can be formed via equation (6), written as

$$\mathbf{D}_{12}^* = \boldsymbol{\psi}_1 \mathbf{1}_N^\top + \mathbf{1}_N \boldsymbol{\psi}_2^\top - 2\mathbf{S}_1^\top \mathbf{S}_2^*, \quad (30a)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i = [\|\mathbf{s}_{1,i}\|_2^2, \dots, \|\mathbf{s}_{N,i}\|_2^2]^\top$, and \mathbf{t} contained in

$$\mathbf{S}_2^* = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{t} \mathbf{1}_N^\top = \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{J}_{N_2} + \mathbf{t}^* \mathbf{1}_N^\top, \quad (30b)$$

which uses the estimated centered $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2$ from the MDS solution and the variable to optimize, *i.e.*, the translation vector \mathbf{t} .

Adding the constraint to the objective, the constraint optimization problem can be written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{t}} \|\mathbf{a} \mathbf{t} + b\|, \quad (31a)$$

s.t.

$$\|(\mathbf{D}_{12}^* - \hat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}) \odot \mathbf{W}\|_F^2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (31b)$$

Algorithm 2 : Robust Egoistic Translation Estimation

Input: Conformation matrix \mathbf{C}_1 , measurements $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}$, hyperparameter ϵ .

Output: Translation vector estimate $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$;

- 1: Construct \mathbf{D}_1 as the EDM of \mathbf{C}_1 and $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ via eq. (18);
 - 2: Obtain an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2^*$ via MDS as per equation (19);
 - 3: Refine the latter estimate into $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2$ via equation (20);
 - 4: Construct the stacked RBL estimate $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ via equation (21);
 - 5: Solve eq. (31) to obtain the translation vector estimate $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$;
-

where \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} denote the parts of equation defined in (29b) and (29c) respectively, ϵ denotes a term representing noise, and \mathbf{D}_{12}^* denotes the auxiliary variable representing the reconstructed distance matrix from equation (6), as described in equation (30a).

As before, the problem can be solved via conventional optimization tools, such as gradient descent or interior point methods [38], [39], and its robustness compared to the method described in Section III can be justified by comparing the two problems itself. In particular, while in the first method the impact of missing measurements in equation (22) can only be compensated by the terms depending on \mathbf{t} , in the second problem, zeros in the distance matrix do not have such a big impact on the estimate. This is observable in the constraint shown in equation (31b), where the zeros are common in both required matrices, and in the objective shown in equation (31a) itself, where the Frobenius norm of the distance matrix is scaled, which does not harm the estimate.

The second proposed method, which for the sake of disambiguation is therefore dubbed Robust Ego RBL, is summarized in Algorithm 2.

B. Performance Evaluation

To evaluate the performance of the robust method, the scenario presented in III-B is revisited, comparing the two proposed methods with a focus on the robustness to incomplete observations. The corresponding results are presented in Figure 6. The first set of results compare the translation estimates between both proposed methods in a non-egoistic genie-aided (GA) scenario, and the egoistic scenario respectively in terms of RMSE. It can be observed that while the robust method performs worse than the MDS-based method, the performance of the egoistic robust method is nearly identical to the GA variation.

Also illustrated in Figure 6, simulations are performed again for different levels of available information, also incorporating the matrix completion aided Algorithm 2. While for 80% available information the performance is close to the fully complete scenario, for 70% available information the method results in an error floor that can be improved by using matrix completion.

Additionally, as shown by the dashed lines that correspond to the error floors of Algorithm 1 at different levels of completeness, for 70% the two methods perform similar, while for 80% Algorithm 2 outperforms the MDS-based method in low range error regimes.

V. EGOISTIC ROTATION MATRIX ESTIMATION

Finally, we offer an egoistic rotation matrix estimator $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ which works solely with distance measurements without requiring knowledge of the conformation matrix \mathbf{C}_2 , and which is entirely complementary to the latter contributions in so far as it also does not require translation vector estimates.

In particular, with the initial location estimate matrix $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2$ obtained via equation (20a) in hands, we seek to obtain an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ of the rotation matrix \mathbf{Q} of the target rigid body via a procedure similar to that described in Subsection II-C.

Before we proceed, let us emphasize that, in principle, $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ can be extracted from the relation

$$(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{J}_{N_2})(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{J}_{N_2})^\top = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{Q}^\top = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{C}_2^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top, \quad (32)$$

where we used $\mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2 = \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \mathbf{J}_{N_2}$ in the last equality.

Notice, however, that the eigenvalue decomposition in equation (32) is such that the eigenvectors are ordered according to the magnitude of the corresponding eigenvalues, which in turn relate to the largest orthogonal dimensions of the body itself [48], [49]. Consequently, the columns of the estimate obtained from equation (32) may be swapped for rigid bodies without distinctly different length, width and height, which may lead to large estimation errors. In order to circumvent this issue, we instead propose the method described below.

First, let us return to equation (13), but this time accounting for the fact that \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 can have different numbers N_1 and N_2 of landmark points, such that

$$\bar{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2} = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J}_{N_1} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{\circ 2} \mathbf{J}_{N_2} = \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C}_2, \quad (33)$$

which if left-multiplied by the pseudo-inverse of \mathbf{C}_1^\top yields

$$\check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2} \triangleq \mathbf{C}_1^\dagger \bar{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C}_2, \quad (34a)$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_1^\dagger \triangleq (\mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_1^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C}_1. \quad (34b)$$

Then, squaring equation (34a) yields

$$\check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2 \top} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{C}_2^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{Q}^\top, \quad (35)$$

leading to the optimization problem

$$\hat{\mathbf{Q}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{Q}} \|\check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2 \top} - \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{Q}^\top\|_F^2. \quad (36)$$

We emphasize that although the solution of problem (36) can be easily obtained via common optimization theory tools [38], [39], the result can also be severely degraded by the order of the eigenvalues in $\mathbf{\Lambda}$. Fortunately, however, in 3D there are only 6 distinct permutations of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, such that the solution with the permutation that yields the smallest objective can be estimated as the correct one.

The proposed egoistic rotation matrix estimation method is summarized in Algorithm 3 for rotation estimation without rigid body conformation knowledge, based on the range information between the two rigid bodies, independent of the translation vector estimate.

Algorithm 3 : Rotation Estimation

Input: Conformation matrix \mathbf{C}_1 , measurements $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}$.

Output: Rotation matrix estimate $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$;

- 1: Construct \mathbf{D}_1 as the EDM of \mathbf{C}_1 and $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ via eq. (18);
 - 2: Obtain an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2^*$ via MDS as per equation (19);
 - 3: Refine the latter estimate into $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_2$ via equation (20);
 - 4: Construct the double-centered distance matrix $\bar{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2}$ via equation (33);
 - 5: Refine the latter into $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{\circ 2}$ via equation (34);
 - 6: Solve eq. (36) to obtain the rotation matrix estimate $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$;
-




Fig. 6. RMSE of the translation estimate of the proposed robust method compared to the MDS-based method aided by matrix completion for different levels of available information, over the range error σ .

A. Performance Evaluation

Next, seek to evaluate the performance of both the translation vector and rotation matrix in terms of their impact on the overall pose estimation of the target rigid body. In doing so, we also rule out simply computing the RMSE of all the landmark points of the target rigid both, so as to keep true to the egoistic characteristic of the contribution, which is not to rely on knowledge of the shape of the target.

In order to circumvent this challenge and capture the errors due to translation estimation and rotation estimation errors jointly, without the explicit knowledge of the conformation matrix, we propose to model each rigid body as unit vector with its origin at the location of body, and its direction as determined by its rotation matrix.

To clarify, referring to Figure 7, let v_P and v_T represent the primary and target rigid bodies, respectively, such that given the true translation vector t and rotation matrix Q relating the location and orientation of the target body relative to the primary, we have

$$v_T = Q \cdot v_P|_t \equiv Q \cdot v_P + t. \quad (37)$$

As illustrated in Figure 7, the entity described in equation (37) is the image of the target, constructed in terms of a translation and rotation of the primary body to the location and orientation of the target. In turn, the equivalence in equation (37) refers to the fact that the end-point of the image $Q \cdot v_P|_t$ is at the location indicated by the vector $Q \cdot v_P + t$.

It follows from the above that in presence of estimates \hat{t} and \hat{Q} , we have

$$\hat{v}_T = \hat{Q} \cdot v_P|_{\hat{t}} \equiv \hat{Q} \cdot v_P + \hat{t}, \quad (38)$$

such that the egoistic pose estimation error for a given k -th Monte-Carlo realization can be defined as

$$\vartheta_k \triangleq |\hat{v}_T^{(k)} - v_T|_2, \quad (39)$$

which yields a corresponding RMSE (over multiple realizations) given by




Fig. 7. Illustration of a rigid body modeled as a unit vector v_P , with the true transformed vector v_T and its estimate \hat{v}_T .

$$\vartheta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K |\hat{v}_T^{(k)} - v_T|_2^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (40)$$

To the best of our knowledge, there is no alternative egoistic method for rigid body orientation estimation against which to compare our proposed technique. In particular, the SotA technique from [27] enables the joint estimation of location and orientation, but only under the assumption that full conformation matrix information is available; and introducing conformation matrix knowledge to the proposed orientation estimation method Algorithm 3 reduces it to the SotA technique of [29], as described in Subsection II-C.

In view of the above, we first compare combinations of the GA variation of Algorithm 3 (*i.e.*, the method in [29]) with either Algorithms 1 or 2, against the SotA alternative [27], in order to obtain an initial reference of their relative performances, and subsequently compare the distinct egoistic methods here proposed among themselves.

The first set of results is offered in Figure 8, which shows the aforementioned comparisons in scenarios with fully- and 80%-complete information.




Fig. 8. RMSE of the genie-aided orientation estimate of the proposed methods in combination with the SotA, compared to the pure SotA solution for different levels of available information, over the range error σ .




Fig. 9. RMSE of the egoistic orientation estimate of the combinations of the proposed methods for different levels of available information, over the range error σ .

It can be observed that the results are similar to the pure translation vector estimation case evaluated in Figures 5 and 6, with Algorithm 1 performing best for the fully complete scenario and Algorithm 2 achieving the best results for 80% available information. These results are further corroborated by Figure 9, which compares the performances of the egoistic methods, where Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 are combined with the rotation estimation of Algorithm 3. It is found that while for the fully complete scenario, the algorithms perform well, for the case of 80% available information both combinations result in an error floor, with Algorithm 2 in combination with Algorithm 3 performing slightly better than Algorithm 2 in combination with Algorithm 3.

These results indicate that matrix completion alone is not sufficient to mitigate the impact of incomplete information on the estimation of orientation matrices, such that more work is required to address that problem. Such work is currently under pursuit and will be addressed in a follow-up article.

B. Complexity Analysis

Finally, for the sake of completeness we assess the proposed RBL pose estimation algorithms in terms their computational complexities, compared to SotA methods. In particular, we show in Table II the complexity orders, in Big-O notation, of each of the compared approaches, highlighting the distinction of results under the genie-aided (GA) and egoistic scenarios, respectively.

We clarify that the expressions capture the complexities of all steps required prior to enabling the corresponding scenario, additionally to the solution of the optimization problem. If matrix completion is applied to the methods, an additional complexity of order $O((N_1 + N_2)^3)$ must be considered.

The results indicate that, in comparison to the non-egoistic method of [27], which has a complexity order that is essentially quadratic on the number of landmark points defining the rigid bodies, the proposed egoistic methods have a slightly larger (cubic) complexity, which therefore can be seen as the price paid for self-reliance. We point out, however, that since matrix completion methods also have cubic complexity, such a “penalty” is already imposed by practical conditions, since it is virtually impossible to ensure that complete information is acquired in real-life applications. A preliminary contribution towards reducing the complexity of pose estimation schemes for rigid bodies can be found in [31], and further work is also under pursuit [50].

VI. CONCLUSION

We proposed novel anchorless RBL algorithms suitable for application in AD, which enables a rigid body to egoistically detect the relative translation (effective distance) and orientation (relative rotation) of another rigid body, based only on measurements of the distances between sensors located at the landmark points defining the two objects, and without knowledge of the shape of the target. Besides the self-reliance (or egoistic) feature, a key point of the proposed methods is that rotation and translation estimation can be performed independent of each other. While the first proposed translation estimator performs well in a fully connected scenario where all distance measurements are available, the second estimator offers improved robustness to incomplete observation, even when both are furnished with matrix completion schemes. Simulation results confirm that the proposed methods outperform SotA alternatives.

APPENDIX A

CORRECTED RELATIVE TRANSLATION ESTIMATOR

As mentioned in Section II-C, the scheme proposed in [29] contains an error, which is demonstrated in this Appendix for the sake of completeness. We emphasize that, in what follows, all conditions and assumptions are the same as those in the original work, namely, that the conformation matrices C_1 and C_2 of both bodies are known to the estimator, and that both rigid bodies have the same size N .

TABLE II
COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY OF RIGID BODY POSE ESTIMATORS

Method	Complexity Order	
	Genie Aided	Egoistic
Proposed Ego-RBL (Alg. 1)	$O((N_1 + N_2)^3 + \eta^3)$	$O(2(N_1 + N_2)^3 + N_1^3)$
Proposed Robust Ego-RBL (Alg. 2)	$O((N_1 + N_2)^3 + \eta^3)$	$O(2(N_1 + N_2)^3 + N_1^3)$
Proposed Rotation Estimator (Alg. 3)	$O(2\eta^3)$ (SotA [29])	$O((N_1 + N_2)^3 + N_1^3 + 2\eta^3)$
SotA Stationary Parameter Est. [27]	$O(\eta^3 + N_1 N_2)$	—

η denotes the dimension of the space (typically $\eta = 3$).

N_1 and N_2 denote the number of landmark points of primary and target rigid bodies, respectively.

Taking advantage of the latter, we therefore drop the subscript N from the notation of the $N \times 1$ all-ones column vector, which therefore shall be denoted here simply as $\mathbf{1}$. Let us start with the Frobenius norm of the squared cross-body measurement distance matrix, which is given by

$$\|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{D}_{12}^{\odot 2} \mathbf{1}. \quad (41)$$

Substituting equations (1) and (6) in the above yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 &= \mathbf{1}^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \boldsymbol{\psi}_2^\top - 2\mathbf{S}_1^\top \mathbf{S}_2) \mathbf{1} \\ &= N \sum_{n=1}^N (\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{s}_{2,n}\|_2^2) - 2N \mathbf{1}^\top \times \\ &\quad (\mathbf{1} \mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2) \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned} \quad (42a)$$

Next, using $\hat{t} = \|\mathbf{t}_1 - \mathbf{t}_2\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{t}_1\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{t}_2\|_2^2 - 2\mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2$ to find a term representing the relative translation \hat{t} we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 &= N \sum_{n=1}^N (\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{s}_{2,n}\|_2^2) \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{t}_1\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{t}_2\|_2^2 + N^2 \underbrace{\|\mathbf{t}_1 - \mathbf{t}_2\|_2^2}_{\hat{t}} \\ &\quad + 2\mathbf{1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2) \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned} \quad (42b)$$

Then, by rearranging equation (42), the relative translation estimate becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{t} &= \frac{-1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{s}_{2,n}\|_2^2) + \|\mathbf{t}_1\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{t}_2\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{N^2} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N^2} \mathbf{1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2) \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Finally, the estimator can be made independent of the rigid body locations \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 by making use of the relation $\|\mathbf{s}_{1,n}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{t}_1\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{c}_{1,n}\|_2^2 + 2\mathbf{c}_{1,n}^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_1$, which yields

$$\hat{t} = \frac{1}{N^2} \|\mathbf{D}_{12}\|_F^2 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\|\mathbf{c}_{1,n}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{c}_{2,n}\|_2^2) + \quad (44)$$

$$\text{missing in [29, Sec. 3.2]} \left\{ \begin{aligned} &+ \frac{2}{N^2} \mathbf{1}^\top (\mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{C}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{C}_2) \mathbf{1} \\ &- \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (2\mathbf{c}_{i,1}^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{t}_1 + 2\mathbf{c}_{i,2}^\top \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{t}_2), \end{aligned} \right.$$

where we have highlighted the terms missing in [29, Sec. 3.2].

Having obtained the corrected estimator and applying the corresponding assumptions from this work, it can be observed that the method is not usable, neither in the proposed framework, not in the SotA, since \mathbf{Q}_1 , \mathbf{Q}_2 , \mathbf{t}_1 , and \mathbf{t}_2 are all unknowns, on which the missing terms depends.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Führling, H. S. Rou, G. T. F. de Abreu, D. González G., and O. Gonsa, "Egoistic MDS-based Rigid Body Localization," to appear at *IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, 2025.
- [2] D. Burghal *et al.*, "A Comprehensive Survey of Machine Learning Based Localization with Wireless Signals," 2020.
- [3] H. Obeidat, W. Shuaieb, O. Obeidat, and R. Abd-Alhameed, "A Review of Indoor Localization Techniques and Wireless Technologies," *Wireless Personal Communications*, vol. 119, pp. 289–327, 2021.
- [4] X. Shan, A. Cabani, and H. Chafouk, "A Survey of Vehicle Localization: Performance Analysis and Challenges," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 107 085–107 107, 2023.
- [5] Z. Wang *et al.*, "Location Awareness in Beyond 5G Networks via Reconfigurable Intelligent Surfaces," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 2011–2025, 2022.
- [6] ITU-R, International Telecommunication Union - Radiocommunication Sector, "M.2160-0: Framework and Overall Objectives of the Future Development of IMT for 2030 and Beyond," Nov. 2023.
- [7] Z. Wang, J. Fang, X. Dai, H. Zhang, and L. Vlacic, "Intelligent Vehicle Self-Localization Based on Double-Layer Features and Multilayer LIDAR," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 616–625, 2020.
- [8] S. Manickam, L. Yarlagadda, S. P. Gopalan, and C. L. Chowdhary, "Unlocking the Potential of Digital Twins: A Comprehensive Review of Concepts, Frameworks, and Industrial Applications," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 135 147–135 158, 2023.
- [9] Q. D. Vo and P. De, "A Survey of Fingerprint-Based Outdoor Localization," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 491–506, 2016.
- [10] N. Führling, H. S. Rou, G. T. F. de Abreu, D. G. G., and O. Gonsa, "Robust Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI)-Based Multitarget Localization via Gaussian Process Regression," *IEEE Journal of Indoor and Seamless Positioning and Navigation*, vol. 1, pp. 104–114, 2023.
- [11] M. A. G. Al-Sadoon, R. Asif, Y. I. A. Al-Yasir, R. A. Abd-Alhameed, and P. S. Excell, "AOA Localization for Vehicle-Tracking Systems Using a Dual-Band Sensor Array," *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 6330–6345, 2020.
- [12] G. Zeng, B. Mu, J. Chen, Z. Shi, and J. Wu, "Global and Asymptotically Efficient Localization From Range Measurements," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 5041–5057, 2022.
- [13] A. Yassin *et al.*, "Recent Advances in Indoor Localization: A Survey on Theoretical Approaches and Applications," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 1327–1346, 2017.
- [14] J. A. Zhang, F. Liu, C. Masouros, R. W. Heath, Z. Feng, L. Zheng, and A. Petropulu, "An Overview of Signal Processing Techniques for Joint Communication and Radar Sensing," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1295–1315, 2021.
- [15] K. R. R. Ranasinghe, H. S. Rou, and G. T. F. de Abreu, "Fast and Efficient Sequential Radar Parameter Estimation in MIMO-OTFS Systems," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2024.
- [16] K. R. R. Ranasinghe, H. S. Rou, G. T. F. de Abreu, T. Takahashi, and K. Ito, "Joint Channel, Data and Radar Parameter Estimation for AFDM Systems in Doubly-Dispersive Channels," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. –, no. –, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [17] Y. Wang, G. Wang, S. Chen, K. C. Ho, and L. Huang, "An Investigation and Solution of Angle Based Rigid Body Localization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 5457–5472, 2020.
- [18] N. Führling, H. S. Rou, G. T. F. de Abreu, D. González G., and O. Gonsa, "Soft-connected Rigid Body Localization: State-of-the-art and Research Directions for 6G," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05002*, 2023.
- [19] N. Führling, H. S. Rou, G. T. F. de Abreu, D. González G., and O. Gonsa, "Enabling Next-Generation V2X Perception: Wireless Rigid Body Localization and Tracking," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00349*, 2024.
- [20] F. Ahmed, M. Phillips, S. Phillips, and K.-Y. Kim, "Comparative Study of Seamless Asset Location and Tracking Technologies," *Procedia Manufacturing*, 30th International Conference on Flexible Automation and Intelligent Manufacturing, vol. 51, pp. 1138–1145, 2020.
- [21] B. Gebregziabher, "Multi Object Tracking for Predictive Collision Avoidance," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02161*, 2023.
- [22] K. Eckenhoff, 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, pp. 1541–1548, 2019.
- [23] Y. Huang, J. Du, Z. Yang, Z. Zhou, L. Zhang, and H. Chen, "A Survey on Trajectory-Prediction Methods for Autonomous Driving," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 652–674, 2022.
- [24] J. Huang, S. Yang, Z. Zhao, Y.-K. Lai, and S. Hu, "ClusterSLAM: A SLAM Backend for Simultaneous Rigid Body Clustering and Motion Estimation," in *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pp. 5874–5883, 2019.
- [25] A. Macario Barros, M. Michel, Y. Moline, G. Corre, and F. Carrel, "A Comprehensive Survey of Visual SLAM Algorithms," *Robotics*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2022.

- [26] H. Bavle, J. L. Sanchez-Lopez, C. Cimorelli, A. Tourani, and H. Voos, "From SLAM to Situational Awareness: Challenges and Survey," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 10, 2023.
- [27] S. Chen and K. C. Ho, "Accurate Localization of a Rigid Body Using Multiple Sensors and Landmarks," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 24, pp. 6459–6472, 2015.
- [28] S. Brás, M. Izadi, C. Silvestre, A. Sanyal, and P. Oliveira, "Nonlinear Observer for 3D Rigid Body Motion Estimation Using Doppler Measurements," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 3580–3585, 2016.
- [29] A. Pizzo, S. P. Chepuri, and G. Leus, "Towards Multi-Rigid Body Localization," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 3166–3170, 2016.
- [30] S. P. Chepuri, A. Simonetto, G. Leus, and A.-J. van der Veen, "Tracking Position and Orientation of a Mobile Rigid Body," in *5th IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP)*, pp. 37–40, 2013.
- [31] V. Vizitiv, H. S. Rou, N. Führling, and G. T. F. de Abreu, "Belief Propagation-based Rotation and Translation Estimation for Rigid Body Localization," to appear at *IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, 2025. Available at *arXiv:2407.09232*, 2024.
- [32] W. S. Torgerson, "Multidimensional Scaling: I. Theory and Method," *Psychometrika*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 401–419, Dec. 1952.
- [33] P. Schönemann, "A Generalized Solution of the Orthogonal Procrustes Problem," *Psychometrika*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 1966.
- [34] H. Fang and D. P. O'Leary, "Euclidean Distance Matrix Completion Problems," *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 27, no. 4-5, pp. 695–717, 2012.
- [35] L. T. Nguyen, J. Kim, and B. Shim, "Low-Rank Matrix Completion: A Contemporary Survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 94 215–94 237, 2019.
- [36] 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)*, pp. 12 861–12 865, 2024.
- [37] C. K. I. Williams and M. Seeger, "Using the Nyström Method to Speed Up Kernel Machines," in *Proceedings of the 13th Int. Conf. on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'00. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, p. 661–667, 2000.
- [38] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, ser. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer New York, NY, 1999.
- [39] S. Ruder, "An Overview of Gradient Descent Optimization Algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747*, 2016.
- [40] M. Grant and S. Boyd, "CVX: Matlab Software for Disciplined Convex Programming, Version 2.1," <https://cvxr.com/cvx>, Mar. 2014.
- [41] —, "Graph Implementations for Nonsmooth Convex Programs," in *Recent Advances in Learning and Control*, ser. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences, V. Blondel, S. Boyd, and H. Kimura, Eds. Springer-Verlag Limited, pp. 95–110, 2008.
- [42] R. Malekian *et al.*, "Guest Editorial Special Issue on Sensor Technologies for Connected Cars: Devices, Systems and Modeling," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 4775–4776, 2018.
- [43] W. Glunt, T. L. Hayden, S. Hong, and J. Wells, "An Alternating Projection Algorithm for Computing the Nearest Euclidean Distance Matrix," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 589–600, 1990.
- [44] R. H. Keshavan, A. Montanari, and S. Oh, "Matrix Completion from a Few Entries," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2980–2998, 2010.
- [45] R. Mazumder, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, "Spectral Regularization Algorithms for Learning Large Incomplete Matrices," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 11, no. 80, pp. 2287–2322, 2010.
- [46] Q. Yao and J. T. Kwok, "Accelerated and Inexact Soft-Impute for Large-Scale Matrix and Tensor Completion," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 1665–1679, 2019.
- [47] H. D. Macedo and J. N. Oliveira, "Typing Linear Algebra: A Biproduct-Oriented Approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4818*, Dec. 2013.
- [48] I. T. Jolliffe, *Principal Component Analysis for Special Types of Data*. Springer, 2002.
- [49] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, J. H. Friedman, and J. H. Friedman, *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer, vol. 2, 2009.
- [50] N. Führling, V. Vizitiv, K. R. R. Ranasinghe, H. S. Rou, G. T. F. de Abreu, D. González G., and O. Gonsa, "6D Rigid Body Localization and Velocity Estimation via Gaussian Belief Propagation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.12133*, 2024.