

SR-LIO++: Efficient LiDAR-Inertial Odometry and Quantized Mapping with Sweep Reconstruction

Zikang Yuan^{1,2}, Ruiye Ming³, Chengwei Zhao⁴, Yonghao Tan^{1,2}, Pingcheng Dong^{1,2}, Hongcheng Luo⁵,
Yuzhong Jiao¹, Xin Yang^{3✉} and Kwang-Ting Cheng^{1,2}

Abstract—Addressing the inherent low acquisition frequency limitation of 3D LiDAR to achieve high-frequency output has become a critical research focus in the LiDAR-Inertial Odometry (LIO) domain. To ensure real-time performance, frequency-enhanced LIO systems must process each sweep within significantly reduced timeframe, which presents substantial challenges for deployment on low-computational-power platforms. To address these limitations, we introduce SR-LIO++, an innovative LIO system capable of achieving doubled output frequency relative to input frequency on resource-constrained hardware platforms, including the Raspberry Pi 4B. Our system employs a sweep reconstruction methodology to enhance LiDAR sweep frequency, generating high-frequency reconstructed sweeps. Building upon this foundation, we propose a caching mechanism for intermediate results (i.e., surface parameters) of the most recent segments, effectively minimizing redundant processing of common segments in adjacent reconstructed sweeps. This method decouples processing time from the traditionally linear dependence on reconstructed sweep frequency. Furthermore, we present a quantized map point management based on index table mapping, significantly reducing memory usage by converting global 3D point storage from 64-bit double precision to 8-bit char representation. This method also converts the computationally intensive Euclidean distance calculations in nearest neighbor searches from 64-bit double precision to 16-bit short and 32-bit integer formats, significantly reducing both memory and computational cost. Extensive experimental evaluations across three distinct computing platforms and four public datasets demonstrate that SR-LIO++ maintains state-of-the-art accuracy while substantially enhancing efficiency. Notably, our system successfully achieves 20 Hz state output on Raspberry Pi 4B hardware.

Index Terms—Sensor fusion, SLAM, localization, aerial systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

LIDAR-inertial odometry (LIO) have been widely recognized as a fundamental solution for localization and mapping in mobile robotics. Recent advancements have led to the development of numerous lightweight LIO systems [1], [5], [7], [29], [30], which demonstrate remarkable capabilities in achieving accurate and robust localization and mapping while maintaining exceptionally low computational overhead.

The emergence of these efficient systems indicates a paradigm shift in LIO development, where the primary limiting factor for output frequency is no longer computational efficiency, but rather the inherent low data acquisition frequency of 3D LiDAR sensors. The limited output frequency will cause a delay in the odometry equal to a full sweep duration [11], and put an unnecessary upper bound for the odometry bandwidth due to the Nyquist–Shannon sampling theorem [19].

To address the above challenge, several methodologies have been proposed, including the segmentation of 360-degree LiDAR sweeps into discrete segments [19] or even individual points [11]. While these approaches effectively increase the LiDAR data acquisition frequency, they fundamentally alter the spatial distribution characteristics of the point cloud, compromising the inherent uniformity of 360-degree scan data and consequently reducing system accuracy and robustness. In contrast, SR-LIO [36] introduces a novel sweep reconstruction method [34], [37] (as illustrated in Fig. 1(a)), which achieves a 20 Hz point cloud data frequency while maintaining the structural integrity of individual sweeps. Although SR-LIO demonstrates stable performance with doubled output frequency on advanced CPU architectures, its computational overhead increases linearly with the frequency of reconstructed sweeps, posing significant challenges for deployment on mobile robotic platforms. These platforms typically employ suboptimal CPU configurations, with many automated guided vehicles (AGVs) utilizing ARM-based microcomputer motherboards. The limited computational resources of mobile platforms pose a fundamental barrier to implementing sweep reconstruction technique, as it cannot sustain the 20 Hz processing frequency required by SR-LIO.

To enable universal and efficient deployment of sweep reconstruction on low-power computational platforms, we present SR-LIO++ in this work. Our proposed system addresses two critical limitations of SR-LIO: 1) Redundant processing of overlapping data segments (illustrated by yellow and red segments in Fig. 1 (a)) between adjacent reconstructed sweeps, which results in a linear increase in computational overhead as sweep segmentation frequency; and 2) The computational inefficiency of standard voxel map management, particularly in nearest neighbor searches which require repetitive Euclidean distance calculations using high-precision floating-point numbers (64-bit double type). To resolve the first limitation, we introduce a novel surface parameter reutilization method. This approach employs a minimal-overhead temporary cache to store intermediate results (surface parameters) of overlapping data segments, effectively eliminating redundant computations. Specifically, for a point $\mathbf{p} \in C_{j+1}^1 \subset P_i$ in Fig.

¹AI Chip Center for Emerging Smart Systems (ACCESS), InnoHK Centers, Hong Kong Science Park, Hong Kong, China. (E-mail: zikangyuan@ust.hk)

²HongKong University of Science and Technology, China. (E-mail: ytanaz@connect.ust.hk; timcheng@ust.hk)

³Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China. (E-mail: xinyang2014@hust.edu.cn)

⁴Hangzhou Qisheng Intelligent Technology Co. Ltd., Hangzhou, China. (E-mail: chengweizhao0427@gmail.com)

⁵Xiaomi EV Technology Co., Ltd., Beijing, China. (E-mail: luohongcheng@xiaomi.com)




Fig. 1. (a) Illustration of the intermediate result (i.e., surface parameter) reutilization for overlapping segments in sweep reconstruction. The proposed method employs minimal storage overhead to eliminate redundant processing of overlapping segments across consecutive reconstructed sweeps. (b) Illustration of quantized map point management, which restrict global map points to predefined locations (as illustrated by yellow points), thereby enabling enumeratively encoding 3D points with fewer bits and in turn optimizing computational efficiency and reducing memory overhead. (c) Benefiting from methods (a) and (b), SR-LIO++ is capable of real-time running at the frequency of 20Hz on Raspberry Pi 4B. (d) We deployed our own platform for data collection and testing in real world. The reconstructed 3D point cloud and the trajectory overlaid on Google Earth are shown in (e) and (f) respectively.

In (a), we compute its nearest neighbors from the global map once and utilize them to fit a surface for constructing point-to-plane residuals. The derived surface parameters (normal vector and normal offset) are then stored in the temporary cache. When subsequent reconstructed sweep P_{i+1} arrives, these pre-stored surface parameters are directly retrieved, bypassing redundant computations for keypoints in segment C_{j+1}^1 and significantly enhancing computational efficiency. For the second limitation, we propose a novel quantized map point management method based on index table mapping. This method transforms the repetitive Euclidean distance calculations from 64-bit double precision to encoded 16-bit short and 32-bit integer formats. Specifically, our approach restricts global 3D points to predefined locations within the voxel map (illustrated by yellow points in Fig. 1(b)), rather than allowing arbitrary placement. This spatial constraint enables efficient enumerative encoding of 3D points utilizing low bit-depth. We encode the global map points with a 4 mm enumeration resolution, such minor precision loss is fully acceptable for state estimation in urban scenarios. The encoded points not only minimize memory overhead but also replace floating-point Euclidean distance calculations with integer-based sum-of-squares operations during nearest neighbor searches, achieving substantial improvements in both memory efficiency and computational performance. We conducted extensive evaluations of SR-LIO++ across three computing platforms with varying

computational capabilities, utilizing four public datasets [4], [13], [26], [31]. Experimental results demonstrate that our proposed methods maintain state-of-the-art accuracy while achieving 42.95% reduction in memory overhead and 22.45% improvement in computational efficiency on Raspberry Pi 4B. Notably, SR-LIO++ successfully achieves a 20 Hz output frequency on Raspberry Pi 4B hardware. Furthermore, we validated our system’s performance through real-world testing using collected data from our own platform, demonstrating its practical effectiveness in real urban environments.

To summarize, the main contributions of this work are four folds: 1) We introduce a novel surface parameter reutilization method that employs minimal storage overhead to maximally eliminate redundant processing of overlapping segments between adjacent reconstructed sweeps. This innovation overcomes the critical limitation of linear processing time growth relative to reconstructed sweep frequency; 2) We develop a quantized map point management method based on index table mapping, which transforms data representation by converting global 3D point storage from 64-bit double precision to 8-bit integer format by implementing enumeration encoding at a resolution that incurs negligible precision loss. This approach additionally transforms the computationally intensive Euclidean distance calculations in nearest neighbor searches from 64-bit double precision to encoded 16-bit short and 32-bit integer formats, achieving significant improvements in both

memory efficiency and computational performance; 3) We conduct comprehensive experimental evaluations to validate the proposed methods and system performance. Extensive testing across three distinct computing platforms and four benchmark datasets demonstrates that SR-LIO++ substantially reduces computational and storage overhead compared to baseline while maintaining comparable accuracy and robustness. Additional validation using our proprietary dataset confirms the system’s effectiveness in real-world scenarios; 4) To support community development and facilitate further research, we commit to immediately releasing the complete source code of SR-LIO++ upon acceptance of this manuscript.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly discuss the relevant literature. Sec. III provides preliminaries. Then Secs. IV details our system SR-LIO++. Sec. V provides experimental evaluation. Finally, we conclude the paper in Sec. VI.

II. RELATED WORK

Over the past decade, the field of LiDAR odometry (LO) and LiDAR-inertial odometry (LIO) has undergone significant evolutionary development, progressing through three distinct research phases. During the initial phase, research efforts were primarily focused on achieving high-precision localization and robust mapping capabilities, resulting in the development of sophisticated yet stable LO/LIO systems. The successful attainment of these fundamental requirements for practical applications subsequently catalyzed a paradigm shift in research focus towards system optimization and lightweight implementation. This second phase witnessed the emergence of numerous computationally efficient systems that maintained operational reliability while achieving substantial computational efficiency improvements. Currently, with the established reliability and computational efficiency of contemporary LO/LIO systems, the research frontier has advanced to address the fundamental limitation imposed by the inherent low acquisition frequency of 3D LiDAR sensors, which has historically constrained the output frequency of lightweight systems. This section systematically reviews and analyzes the landmark works that have shaped these three critical phases.

A. Heavyweight LO/LIO

LOAM [38], [39], as the pioneering LO systems, establish a fundamental framework comprising three core components: 1) Extracting edge and surface features from raw point clouds; 2) Conducting sweep-to-sweep pose estimation; 3) Executing sweep-to-map pose optimization and utilizing the optimized pose to register point clouds to the map. However, due to the substantial volume of 3D point clouds to be processed, LOAM’s output frequency is relatively low. Building upon LOAM, LeGO-LOAM [20] introduces a method to cluster raw point clouds and eliminate those with weak geometric structure information to reduce computational load. Nevertheless, accurately identifying and removing clusters with weak geometry is a nontrivial task, and improper removal of useful clusters can compromise the accuracy and robustness of pose estimation. SuMa [2] proposes a surfel-based map representation that

aggregates information from point clouds. However, real-time performance in SuMa necessitates GPU acceleration, and its pose estimation accuracy does not surpass that of LOAM-based systems. Fast-LOAM [23] streamlines the pose estimation pipeline by eliminating sweep-to-sweep estimation and employing analytic derivatives, while its extension [24] incorporates intensity scan context for enhanced loop detection. IMLS-LOAM [9] proposes an Implicit Moving Least Squares (IMLS) algorithm as an alternative to ICP, though at significant computational cost. The integration of inertial measurements has led to notable advancements, including LINS [17], which implements an error state iterated kalman filter (ESIKF) framework for LiDAR-IMU fusion, and LIO-SAM [21], which pioneers factor graph optimization in LIO systems. Subsequent developments such as RF-LIO [16] and ID-LIO [28] address dynamic environments through adaptive range imaging and indexed point strategies, respectively, though with increased computational demands. Recent trends have focused on optimization frameworks and computational efficiency. Ye et al. [32] introduce a Bundle Adjustment (BA) framework for LiDAR-IMU fusion, complemented by rotation-constrained refinement. LiLi-OM [14] extends this approach with key-sweep selection and multi-sweep optimization, while LIO-Livox [15] provides an open-source framework with dynamic point removal and feature-based optimization. SSL-SLAM3 [25] enhances real-time performance through point-to-plane constraints and IMU pre-integration. The emergence of elastic odometry frameworks, including CT-ICP [8] with its dual-state optimization and logical constraints, and Yuan et al.’s [35] semi-elastic optimization method, represent significant advancements in state estimation and distortion calibration, albeit with ongoing challenges in computational efficiency.

B. Lightweight LO/LIO

The advent of Fast-LIO [30] represents a seminal milestone in the evolution of LiDAR-SLAM, marking the transition to an era dominated by computationally efficient solutions. This pioneering work introduces an innovative Kalman gain computation technique [22] that circumvents the need for high-order matrix inversion, substantially reducing computational complexity. Building upon this foundation, Fast-LIO2 [29] presents the ikd-tree algorithm [3], which significantly optimizes tree construction, traversal, and element removal operations compared to conventional kd-tree implementations. Further advancements include Faster-LIO [1], which introduces an incremental voxel-based approach capable of efficiently processing both spinning and solid-state LiDAR data through parallelized approximate k-nearest neighbor (kNN) queries. Voxel-Map [33] introduces a hierarchical voxel mapping system utilizing Hash tables and octrees, enabling efficient map construction and updates through a probabilistic adaptive framework. The subsequent Voxel-Map++ [27] extends this approach with a plane merging module based on the union-find algorithm, facilitating the identification and consolidation of coplanar relationships across voxels through covariance trace minimization. Recent innovations have focused on enhancing state estimation precision and computational efficiency. DLIO

[5] implements a third-order minimal preservation strategy for state prediction and point distortion calibration, achieving superior pose estimation accuracy. IG-LIO [7] integrates generalized-ICP (GICP) constraints with inertial measurements within a unified estimation framework, complemented by a voxel-based surface covariance estimator for probabilistic environment modeling. The emergence of multi-LiDAR systems is represented by Multi-LIO [6], which employs parallel state updates and voxelized map representations to efficiently process data from multiple LiDAR sensors. These advancements collectively demonstrate that contemporary LO/LIO systems can process individual sweeps with minimal computational overhead, shifting the fundamental limitation of system performance from computational efficiency to the inherent low acquisition frequency of 3D LiDAR sensors.

C. Frequency-Enhanced LO/LIO

To overcome the inherent limitation of low acquisition frequency in 3D LiDAR systems, several innovative approaches have been proposed. LLOL [19] pioneers a streaming sensor paradigm, processing LiDAR data packets incrementally upon arrival. This distributed processing approach significantly enhances system throughput while reducing latency, resulting in a highly efficient and lightweight architecture. Building upon this concept, Point-LIO [11] introduces a point-by-point processing framework that enables state updates at the frequency of individual LiDAR point measurements, achieving unprecedented output frequencies. However, these methods fundamentally alter the spatial distribution characteristics of the point cloud, compromising the inherent 360-degree uniformity of LiDAR sweeps and consequently reducing system accuracy and robustness. Alternative approaches have focused on maintaining data integrity while increasing processing frequency. SDV-LOAM [37] introduces a novel sweep reconstruction method that combines current segments with historical data to generate complete 360-degree sweeps, effectively increasing point cloud frequency while preserving spatial integrity. Despite its innovative approach, SDV-LOAM's computational complexity prevents real-time operation. SR-LIO [36] addresses this limitation by implementing sweep reconstruction within a streamlined ESIKF framework, achieving a 2X frequency enhancement on advanced CPU. Subsequent developments, including AS-LIO [40] and LA-LIO [12], have further demonstrated the effectiveness of sweep reconstruction in mitigating point cloud distortion under aggressive motion conditions. While these advancements have proven effective on personal computing platforms, their deployment on mobile robotic systems presents significant challenges. Mobile platforms typically employ less powerful CPUs compared to desktop systems, with many automated guided vehicles (AGVs) utilizing ARM-based microcomputer architectures. These inherent computational limitations create substantial barriers to implementing sweep reconstruction methods in mobile applications.

TABLE I
DEFINITION OF GENERALIZED VARIATION

	Type of Variables	Computational Formula
\boxplus	$\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ $\mathbf{R} \in SO(3), \boldsymbol{\theta} \in so(3)$ $\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3, \delta \mathbf{g} \in S^2$	$\mathbf{a} \boxplus \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ $\mathbf{R} \boxplus \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{R} \text{Exp}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ $\mathbf{g}_2 = \mathbf{g}_1 \boxplus \delta \mathbf{g} = \text{Exp}(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{g}_1)\delta \mathbf{g})\mathbf{g}_1$
\boxminus	$\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ $\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2 \in SO(3)$ $\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3, \delta \mathbf{g} \in S^2$	$\mathbf{a} \boxminus \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$ $\mathbf{R}_1 \boxminus \mathbf{R}_2 = \text{Log}(\mathbf{R}_2^T \mathbf{R}_1)$ $\delta \mathbf{g} = \mathbf{g}_1 \boxminus \mathbf{g}_2 = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{g}_2)^T \delta \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{g}}$

Denotations: $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{g}}$ is the Lie algebra of rotation from \mathbf{g}_1 to \mathbf{g}_2 .

III. PRELIMINARY

A. Notation

We define $(\cdot)^w$, $(\cdot)^l$ and $(\cdot)^b$ as the representations of a 3D point in the world coordinate system, LiDAR coordinate system, and IMU coordinate system, respectively. The world coordinate system is initialized to coincide with the IMU coordinate system $(\cdot)^b$ at the starting position. For the i -th LiDAR sweep acquired at time t_i , we denote the corresponding LiDAR and IMU coordinate systems as l_i and b_i , respectively. The transformation matrix (i.e., extrinsic parameters) between these coordinate systems is represented as $\mathbf{T}_{l_i}^{b_i} \in SE(3)$, comprising a rotation matrix $\mathbf{R}_{l_i}^{b_i} \in SO(3)$ and a translation vector $\mathbf{t}_{l_i}^{b_i} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Since these extrinsic parameters are typically calibrated offline and remain constant during online operation, we simplify the notation to \mathbf{T}_l^b . The pose transformation from the IMU coordinate system $(\cdot)^{b_i}$ to the world coordinate system $(\cdot)^w$ is precisely defined as $\mathbf{T}_{b_i}^w$. In addition to the pose estimation, our state vector incorporates several crucial parameters: the velocity \mathbf{v} , accelerometer bias \mathbf{b}_a , gyroscope bias \mathbf{b}_ω and gravitational acceleration \mathbf{g}^w , providing a comprehensive representation by a vector:

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[\mathbf{t}^T, \mathbf{q}^T, \mathbf{v}^T, \mathbf{b}_a^T, \mathbf{b}_\omega^T, \mathbf{g}^{wT} \right]^T \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{q} is the quaternion form of the rotation matrix \mathbf{R} . Accordingly, the error state is expressed as:

$$\delta \mathbf{x} = [\delta \mathbf{t}, \delta \boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta \mathbf{v}, \delta \mathbf{b}_a, \delta \mathbf{b}_\omega, \delta \mathbf{g}]^T \quad (2)$$

It is necessary to note that $\delta \boldsymbol{\theta} \in so(3)$, which is the Lie algebra of rotation. $\delta \mathbf{t}, \delta \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{b}_a, \delta \mathbf{b}_\omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\delta \mathbf{g} \in S^2$ due to the fixed length of gravitational acceleration. When updating the nominal state with the error state, the linear addition cannot be directly applied. It is necessary to define generalized addition \boxplus and generalized subtraction \boxminus for iterative state update, which is defined in Table I. In this context, the definition of the matrix $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{g})$ is as follow:

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{g}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}_x^2}{1 + \bar{\mathbf{g}}_z} & -\frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}_x \bar{\mathbf{g}}_y}{1 + \bar{\mathbf{g}}_z} \\ -\frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}_x \bar{\mathbf{g}}_y}{1 + \bar{\mathbf{g}}_z} & 1 - \frac{\bar{\mathbf{g}}_y^2}{1 + \bar{\mathbf{g}}_z} \\ -\bar{\mathbf{g}}_x & -\bar{\mathbf{g}}_y \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where $(\bar{\cdot})$ indicates normalization for a specific element.




Fig. 2. Comparison of the map point management of SR-LIO and SR-LIO++.

B. IMU Measurement Model

An IMU consists of an accelerometer and a gyroscope. The raw accelerometer and gyroscope measurements from IMU, $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_t$, are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{a}}_t &= \mathbf{a}_t + \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_t} + \mathbf{R}_w^t \mathbf{g}^w + \mathbf{n}_a \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_t &= \boldsymbol{\omega}_t + \mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_t} + \mathbf{n}_\omega\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

which combine the force for countering gravity and the platform dynamics, and are affected by acceleration bias $\mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_t}$, gyroscope bias $\mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_t}$, and additive noise. As mentioned in VINs-Mono [18], the additive noise in acceleration and gyroscope measurements can be modeled as Gaussian white noise, $\mathbf{n}_a \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_a^2)$, $\mathbf{n}_\omega \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\omega^2)$. Acceleration bias and gyroscope bias are modeled as random walk, whose derivatives are Gaussian, $\dot{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathbf{a}_t} = \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{b}_a} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{b}_a}^2)$, $\dot{\mathbf{b}}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_t} = \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{b}_\omega} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}^2)$.

C. Voxel Map Management

The system maintains a global map organized through a voxel-based data structure. As depicted in Fig. 2 (a), the voxel map in SR-LIO [36] comprises multiple volumetric units, with the number of units expanding as the robotic platform explores previously unmapped environments. Each volumetric unit measures $1.0 \times 1.0 \times 1.0$ (unit: m) and contains a maximum of 20 points. Each point is represented by its global coordinates (x, y, z) , with each coordinate stored as a 64-bit value.

In SR-LIO++, we implement an optimized storage scheme where each volumetric unit is characterized by a central coordinate stored as three 64-bit variables. Subsequently, individual 3D points within each volume are encoded as offsets relative to this central coordinate. Given the bounded range of the bias

 TABLE II
PARAMETER CONFIGURATION

Parameter	Value
number of selected points per sweep	600
maximum number of iterations	5
number of neighborhood volumes	27
number of nearest neighbors	20
size of each volume	1.0 m
maximum number of points in a volume	20

values (-0.5 to 0.5 m), we can encode them as 8-bit integers. The specific quantization encoding scheme will be detailed in Sec. IV-E2.

D. Parameter Configuration

Sec. IV-E incorporates multiple configuration parameters that govern system performance and computational efficiency. These parameters encompass: 1) the number of selected keypoints per sweep; 2) the maximum iteration count; 3) the number of volumes traversed during nearest neighbor search; 4) the number of nearest neighbors employed for surface fitting; 5) the size of each volume; and 6) the maximum point capacity per volume. While conventional academic practice typically represents such parameters using symbolic notation, we have opted to present specific numerical values to facilitate intuitive understanding of computational overhead reduction at a fundamental level of our method. Each parameter is accompanied by appropriate prefixes or annotations to ensure clarity in interpretation. The parameter values, originally established by the authors of SR-LIO [36], are systematically presented in Table II. Extensive empirical validation in SR-LIO has confirmed the robustness and general applicability of this parameter set across diverse operational scenarios.

IV. OUR SYSTEM SR-LIO++

A. System Overview

Fig. 3 illustrates the framework of our SR-LIO++ which consists of four main modules: cloud processing, static initialization, state prediction and iterative state update. The cloud processing module down-samples the 10Hz input sweep, then segments and reconstructs the 10Hz down-sampled sweep to obtain 20Hz reconstructed sweep, while each reconstructed sweep consists of two segments. The static initialization module utilizes the IMU measurements to estimate some state parameters such as gravitational acceleration, accelerometer bias, gyroscope bias, and initial velocity. The state prediction module estimates an initial state using IMU raw measurements, and performs segmented distortion calibration for each reconstructed sweep. The iterative state update module first searches nearest neighbors for each keypoint of new segment in encoded offset domain, then utilizes these neighbors fitting surface to obtain the surface parameter of new segment (i.e., new surface parameter). Next, the new surface parameters together with the previously stored old surface parameters, are used to construct point-to-plane constraints and solve current state. The entire process is iteratively executed until the convergence criterion is met or the maximum number of




Fig. 3. System Overview of SR-LIO++. The overall system consists of a cloud processing module, a static initialization module, a state prediction module and an iterative state update module. The surface parameter reutilization and quantified map point management are two core contributions, where the former can significantly reduce computational overhead and the latter can reduce both computational and memory overhead simultaneously.

iterations is reached. Finally, upon termination of the iteration, we perform quantization on the new points, and subsequently incorporate the quantized points into the global voxel map.

B. Cloud Processing

1) *Down-Sampling:* To mitigate the substantial computational burden associated with processing a large volume of 3D point cloud data, we implement a down-sampling strategy to reduce the data volume. Initially, we apply a quantitative down-sampling approach, retaining one point for every four points in the original dataset. Subsequently, the down-sampled points are distributed into a volumetric grid with cell dimensions of $0.5 \times 0.5 \times 0.5$ (unit: m), ensuring that each voxel contains no more than a single point cloud.

2) *Sweep Reconstruction:* Sweep reconstruction, initially proposed in SDV-LOAM [37] and subsequently successfully implemented in SR-LIO [36], represents a methodology for generating reconstructed sweeps at 20 Hz from original 10 Hz input sweeps. While the theoretical framework of sweep reconstruction permits frequency enhancement beyond 2X, SR-LIO's implementation is constrained to a twofold increase to maintain real-time processing capabilities and ensure accuracy within its state estimation module. The fundamental principle of sweep reconstruction is illustrated in Fig. 1 (a). Consider consecutive sweeps S_j and S_{j+1} , where S_j spans the interval $[t_{j-1}, t_j]$ and S_{j+1} covers $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$, with each interval lasting 100 ms, corresponding to the standard acquisition frequency of most spinning 3D LiDARs. The reconstruction process leverages the continuous acquisition characteristics of LiDAR by decomposing the original sweep packet into continuous point cloud data streams, which are then reassembled through multiplexing to achieve higher frequency sweeps. The reconstruction algorithm establishes two equidistant temporal points within intervals $[t_{j-1}, t_j]$ and $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$, denoted as t_{α_j} and $t_{\alpha_{j+1}}$ respectively. These temporal markers, along with the original timestamps, form a reconstructed time set:

$$T = \{t_{j-1}, t_{\alpha_j}, t_j, t_{\alpha_{j+1}}, t_{j+1}\} \quad (5)$$

Each temporal element $T[k]$ serves as a starting timestamp, paired with $T[k+2]$ as the corresponding endpoint. The point cloud data stream within $[T[k], T[k+2]]$ is then repackaged to generate the reconstructed sweep. For instance, the data stream between $[t_{\alpha_j}, t_{\alpha_{j+1}}]$ yields the reconstructed sweep P_i . Through this methodology, each original sweep S_{j+1} produces two reconstructed sweeps (P_i and P_{i+1}). Although the temporal duration of P_i remains constant at 100 ms, the inter-sweep interval between consecutive reconstructed sweeps (P_i and P_{i+1}) is effectively halved from 100 ms to 50 ms, thereby doubling the sweep frequency from 10 Hz to 20 Hz.

Different from SR-LIO [36], we do not regard the reconstructed sweep as a monolithic element. Instead, in our specific implementation, it is articulated into two distinct segments: a new segment and an old segment. The subsequent iterative state updates for these two segments will be processed in a differentiated manner.

C. State Initialization

In our system implementation, we employ a static initialization approach, as proposed in [10], to estimate several critical parameters essential for system initialization. This methodology enables the simultaneous estimation of multiple state variables, including the initial velocity vector, gravitational acceleration vector, and the biases of both the accelerometer and gyroscope sensors. For a comprehensive theoretical analysis and implementation details of the static initialization algorithm, readers are referred to the original work presented in [10].

D. State Prediction

1) *IMU Integration:* The state prediction is performed once receiving an IMU input (i.e., $\hat{\omega}_{n+1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n+1}$), while the

optimal state \mathbf{x}_{n+1}^w (i.e., \mathbf{t}_{n+1}^w , \mathbf{R}_{n+1}^w , \mathbf{v}_{n+1}^w , $\mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_{n+1}}$, $\mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{n+1}}$, \mathbf{g}_{n+1}^w) is calculated by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_{n+1}^w &= \mathbf{R}_n^w \text{Exp} \left(\left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_n + \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{n+1}}{2} - \mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_n} \right) \Delta t \right) \\ \mathbf{v}_{n+1}^w &= \mathbf{v}_n^w + \mathbf{R}_n^w \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n+1}}{2} - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_n} - \mathbf{R}_w^n \mathbf{g}_n^w \right) \Delta t \\ \mathbf{t}_{n+1}^w &= \mathbf{t}_n^w + \mathbf{v}_n^w \Delta t + \\ &\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{R}_n^w \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n+1}}{2} - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_n} - \mathbf{R}_w^n \mathbf{g}_n^w \right) \Delta t^2 \\ \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_{n+1}} &= \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_n}, \mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{n+1}} = \mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_n}, \mathbf{g}_{n+1}^w = \mathbf{g}_n^w \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The error state $\delta \mathbf{x}_{n+1}$ and covariance \mathbf{P}_{n+1} is propagated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathbf{x}_{n+1} &= \mathbf{F}_x \delta \mathbf{x}_n \\ \mathbf{P}_{n+1} &= \mathbf{F}_x \mathbf{P}_n \mathbf{F}_x^T + \mathbf{F}_w \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{F}_w^T \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where Δt is the time interval between two consecutive IMU measurements, \mathbf{Q} is the diagonal covariance matrix of noise:

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{\mathbf{a}}^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_{\mathbf{b}_a}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

\mathbf{F}_x is expressed as:

$$\mathbf{F}_x = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 & \mathbf{I} \Delta t & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f_{11} & 0 & 0 & -\mathbf{I} \Delta t & 0 \\ 0 & f_{21} & \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{R}_w^n \Delta t & 0 & f_{25} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & f_{55} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

$$f_{11} = \mathbf{I} - \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_n + \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{n+1}}{2} - \mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_n} \right)^\wedge \Delta t \quad (10)$$

$$f_{21} = -\mathbf{R}_w^n \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n+1}}{2} - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}_n} \right)^\wedge \Delta t \quad (11)$$

$$f_{25} = \mathbf{g}_n^w \wedge \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{g}_n^w) \Delta t \quad (12)$$

$$f_{55} = -\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{g}_n^w\|^2} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{g}_n^w)^T \mathbf{g}_n^w \wedge \mathbf{g}_n^w \wedge \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{g}_n^w) \quad (13)$$

where (\cdot) indicates normalization for a specific element and $(\cdot)^\wedge$ indicates the skew symmetric matrix corresponding to a vector. \mathbf{F}_w is expressed as:

$$\mathbf{F}_w = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{I} \Delta t & 0 & 0 \\ -\mathbf{R}_w^n \Delta t & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\mathbf{I} \Delta t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbf{I} \Delta t \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

2) *Segmented Distortion Correction*: Prior to state update, it is essential to perform distortion calibration for the 3D points within the current reconstructed sweep. As discussed in SR-LIO [36], two distinct approaches exist for implementing distortion correction: 1) applying correction to each complete reconstructed sweep, or 2) performing correction on individual segments. The first approach introduces a critical limitation




Fig. 4. Illustration of segmented distortion correction, which makes the specific point to be undistorted only once, thereby ensuring the consistency of state estimation.

wherein specific point clouds undergo multiple distortion corrections. Given that each correction utilizes different poses, this results in inconsistent world coordinate representations for individual points across successive corrections, ultimately compromising trajectory estimation accuracy. To address this limitation, SR-LIO introduces a segmented distortion correction methodology, as illustrated in Fig. 4. This approach transforms each point (e.g. $\mathbf{p} \in C_{j+1}^2$) within a segment (e.g., C_{j+1}^2) to the world coordinate system using either IMU-integrated poses or a uniform motion model. Following the generation of reconstructed sweep P_{i+1} , all associated points are transformed from world coordinates $(\cdot)^w$ to the local coordinate system $(\cdot)^{l_{i+1}}$, thereby completing the distortion correction process. Our system maintains the implementation of this segmented distortion correction approach, ensuring consistent and accurate point cloud representation.

E. Iterative State Update

The iterative update of the error state through LiDAR point-to-plane constraints represents the core computational component within the ESIKF framework and constitutes the primary computational burden of the entire system. In SR-LIO's implementation, this process involves the random selection of a fixed number of keypoints (typically 600) from the reconstructed sweep to form a keypoint set K for each iteration, followed by the execution of the following four sequential steps:

1) Point Transformation: Each LiDAR point $\mathbf{p}_k \in K$ is transformed into the world coordinate system $(\cdot)^w$ using the current nominal state estimate. **2) Nearest Neighbor Search**: For each transformed point \mathbf{p}_k^w , the algorithm identifies its 20 nearest neighbors within the global map. **3) Surface Fitting**: A local planar surface is estimated from these neighboring points, characterized by a 3D normal vector \mathbf{n} and a scalar offset d . **4) Error State Solution**: Point-to-plane residuals are constructed using the keypoint and the estimated plane parameters to compute the error state increment.

This iterative process continues until either the maximum iteration count is reached or the state increment converges

below a specified threshold. Through comprehensive analysis, we have identified several redundant computational steps in SR-LIO's implementation that present opportunities for optimization. The subsequent sections of this chapter will elaborate on our proposed optimization approach and provide detailed computational analysis.

1) *Surface Parameter Reutilization*: The computational process for each step is mathematically formulated and analyzed as follows: For step 1), the point transformation is mathematically expressed as:

$$\mathbf{p}_k^w = \mathbf{R}_{b_{i+1}}^w \mathbf{p}_k + \mathbf{t}_{b_{i+1}}^w \quad (15)$$

where $R_{b_{i+1}}^w$ and $t_{b_{i+1}}^w$ represent the rotation matrix and translation vector from the body frame $(\cdot)^{b_{i+1}}$ to the world frame $(\cdot)^w$ at timestamp t_{i+1} , respectively. This transformation requires $600 \times m$ matrix-vector multiplications and vector additions, where m denotes the actual iteration count ranging from 1 to 5. In step 2), the algorithm performs nearest neighbor search by computing Euclidean distances between \mathbf{p}_k^w and all points within the 27-neighborhood voxels of its residing volume. As established in Sec. III-C, each voxel maintains a maximum of 20 points. Consequently, this step involves $27 \times 20 \times 600 \times m$ sum-of-squares operations for distance calculations and $600 \times m$ sorting operations of size 27×20 . Step 3) implements surface parameter estimation through eigenvalue decomposition of the covariance matrix constructed from the 20 neighboring points identified in step 2). This computation is performed for each keypoint's neighborhood, resulting in $600 \times m$ eigenvalue decompositions. Following the completion of steps 1) through 3), the system utilizes the 600 transformed keypoints and their corresponding surface parameters to establish point-to-plane constraints, which are subsequently incorporated into the optimization solution.

The computational analysis reveals that steps 1) through 3) serve primarily to derive surface parameters for subsequent utilization in step 4). For a given 3D point, disregarding minor transformation-induced errors, repeated nearest neighbor searches yield identical results, consequently producing consistent surface parameters. Furthermore, as established in Sec. IV-B2, our approach decomposes each reconstructed sweep into distinct old and new segments. Notably, the old segment has already undergone complete processing (steps 1-4) during the previous state update iteration. This characteristic enables the storage and retrieval of previously computed surface parameters, thereby eliminating redundant computations in subsequent iterations. The proposed optimization strategy, illustrated in Fig. 5, implements a balanced keypoint allocation scheme, assigning 300 points each to the old (K_{old}) and new (K_{new}) segments. For each point $\mathbf{p}_{k_{new}}^w$ in K_{new} , the transformation from local to world coordinates (step 1) requires 300×5 third-order matrix operations. The subsequent nearest neighbor search (step 2) involves $27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m$ distance computations and $300 \times m$ sorting operations of size 27×20 . Surface parameter estimation (step 3) necessitates $300 \times m$ eigenvalue decompositions. The computed surface parameters for new segment points are stored in a predefined global cache, while simultaneously retrieving precomputed surface parameters for the old segment. These combined surface parameters are then




Fig. 5. Schematic diagram of surface parameter reuse mechanism. (a)-(d) demonstrate the sequential processing steps applied to the new segment. During subsequent state update iterations, the current new segment transitions to the old segment classification, enabling direct retrieval of its corresponding surface parameters from the temporary cache, thereby eliminating redundant computational overhead.

utilized in step 4) for error state increment computation, completing the optimized iterative update process.

Since the keypoint selection is performed in every iteration, the 300 selected points vary for the new segment, resulting in varying plane parameters. Consequently, it is necessary to record both the surface parameters and other essential variables for each iteration. The memory requirement for storing surface parameters and point indices are calculated based on their composition: each parameter comprises a 3×64 -bit normal vector and a 1×64 -bit offset, and other essential variables occupies 672 bits, resulting in a total cache size of $300 \times 5 \times (4 \times 64 + 672)$ bits (0.166 MB). This implementation demonstrates significant computational efficiency compared to SR-LIO, achieving up to 50% reduction in computational overhead for steps 1) through 3) while maintaining minimal memory footprint. A comprehensive quantitative comparison

TABLE III
COMPUTATION COMPARISON ON THE FIRST THREE STEPS OF ITERATIVE STATE UPDATE

Step	Calculation Type	Number of Operations		Additional Memory	
		SR-LIO	SR-LIO++	SR-LIO	SR-LIO++
1) point transformation	matrix multiplication and addition	$600 \times m$	$300 \times m$	-	0.166MB
2) nearest neighbor search	sum of squares operation	$27 \times 20 \times 600 \times m$	$27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m$		
	sorting operation of size 27×20	$600 \times m$	$300 \times m$		
3) surface fitting	eigenvalue decomposition	$600 \times m$	$300 \times m$		

Denotations: **600**: number of keypoints per reconstructed sweep; **300**: number of keypoint per segment; **m**: actual number of iterations ($1 \leq m \leq 5$); **27**: number of neighborhood volumes; **20**: maximum number of points in a volume.

of computational requirements between SR-LIO and our proposed SR-LIO++ approach is presented in Table III, providing detailed insights into the optimization gains.

While the surface parameter reutilization strategy effectively reduces computational redundancy with minimal memory overhead, it introduces a potential limitation regarding information utilization. In SR-LIO, the random selection of 600 keypoints from each reconstructed sweep ensures uniform probability distribution of information usage. However, SR-LIO++ requires strict correspondence between the current K_{old} and the previous K_{new} , thereby eliminating the random distribution characteristic of the old segment's information utilization. Empirical analysis reveals that the state estimation accuracy and system robustness demonstrate negligible sensitivity to this modification in information distribution. Comprehensive experimental validation of this observation is presented in Sec. V-C, providing quantitative evidence supporting the effectiveness of our approach.

Furthermore, the iterative state update process may terminate prematurely when the error state increment in the m -th iteration ($m < 5$) falls below a predefined threshold, regardless of whether the maximum iteration count has been reached. This early termination scenario introduces a potential limitation: during subsequent state updates, if the process proceeds to the u -th iteration ($u > m$), the temporary cache will lack the necessary surface parameters due to the previous early termination. To address this contingency, we randomly select 300 keypoints from both the new frame and the old frame, and perform nearest neighbor search and plane fitting on all selected keypoints.

2) *Quantized Map Point Management*: The linear growth of global map size with exploration extent poses a significant challenge for LiDAR-Inertial Odometry (LIO) systems. Conventional quantization methods can reduce point representation from 64-bit double precision to 32-bit floating point format, which is the minimum floating-point representation supported by standard CPUs. In contrast, we propose an innovative quantization approach based on index table mapping, which achieves substantial data compression by representing global map points using 8-bit char type, yielding dual benefits: 1) significant reduction in memory requirements for global map storage, and 2) improved computational efficiency in nearest neighbor search operations through reduced bit-width processing.

As depicted in Fig. 6, the quantization process begins with volume indexing for each global 3D point \mathbf{p} . Leveraging the volume center coordinates stored as 3×64 -bit variables




Fig. 6. Schematic diagram of quantized map point management utilizing index table mapping. The process initiates with the computation of spatial offsets between each global 3D point and its corresponding volume center, constrained within the range of -0.5 m to 0.5 m. These offsets are subsequently quantized into 8-bit char type numerical representations through a predefined index table with 4 mm resolution. The quantized data is then stored in their respective volume structures. This quantization approach achieves dual optimization: 1) significant reduction in global map storage requirements, and 2) enhanced computational efficiency for nearest neighbor search operations.

(as detailed in Sec. III-C), we compute the spatial offset $\mathbf{p}_o = [\mathbf{p}_o]_x, [\mathbf{p}_o]_y, [\mathbf{p}_o]_z]^T$ between \mathbf{p} and its volume center. Given the fixed volume dimensions of $1.0 \times 1.0 \times 1.0$ (unit: m), each component of \mathbf{p}_o is constrained to the interval $[-0.5, 0.5]$ meters. The core quantization process, illustrated in Fig. 6 (c), employs a predefined index table to map these 64-bit double precision offsets to compact 8-bit char representations. This transformation is mathematically expressed as:

$$\mathbf{p}_{oe} = \text{char}(\text{round}(\frac{\mathbf{p}_o}{0.004})) \quad (16)$$

where round denotes integer rounding and char represents explicit type conversion to 8-bit char format, achieving a resolution of 4 mm (0.004 m).

TABLE IV
COMPUTATION COMPARISON OF DISTANCE CALCULATION DURING NEAREST NEIGHBOR SEARCH BETWEEN DIFFERENT MANAGEMENT METHODS

Standard Map Point Management		Quantized Map Point Management	
Operation	Computation	Operation	Computation
Calculate $\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z$	$27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m \times 3$ additions in 64-bit double domain	Calculate $\Delta x_e, \Delta y_e, \Delta z_e$	$27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m \times 3$ additions in 16-bit short domain
Calculate $\Delta x^2, \Delta y^2, \Delta z^2$	$27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m \times 3$ multiplications in 64-bit double domain	Calculate $\Delta x_e^2, \Delta y_e^2, \Delta z_e^2$	$27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m \times 3$ multiplications in 32-bit int domain
Calculate Δd^2	$27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m \times 2$ additions in 64-bit double domain	Calculate Δd_e^2	$27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m \times 2$ additions in 32-bit int domain

Denotations: **300**: number of keypoints of a segment; **m**: actual number of iterations ($1 \leq m \leq 5$); **27**: number of neighborhood volumes; **20**: number of points in a volume. The computational efficiency of numerical operations exhibits two key characteristics: 1) lower-bitwidth operations demonstrate superior execution speed compared to higher-bitwidth counterparts, and 2) for operations with equivalent bitwidth, integer arithmetic outperforms floating-point computation in terms of processing speed.




Fig. 7. Schematic illustration of maximum bit-width requirements for variables in 27-neighborhood nearest neighbor search using encoded offset values. The process involves computing encoded differences ($\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z$) within a 16-bit short integer domain, followed by the calculation of squared distance Δd_e^2 in a 32-bit integer domain. This representation demonstrates the optimal bit-width allocation for efficient nearest neighbor search operations.

It is worth emphasizing that the construction of the index table is performed during the initialization phase. As a result, it does not incur any additional computational overhead during system running. Once the index table is established, the encoding value can be directly indexed based on the input offset (i.e., $\text{map}(\cdot)$ operation), or conversely, the offset value can be directly retrieved through reverse indexing based on the encoding value (i.e., $\text{map}^{-1}(\cdot)$ operation). While this quantization introduces minor precision loss, extensive experimental validation in Sec. V-D confirms that the impact on state estimation accuracy remains within acceptable bounds.

3) *Nearest Neighbor Search for New Segment in Short/Int Domain*: The utilization of encoded offset values in the global voxel map representation enables efficient nearest neighbor search operations. The 8-bit char type encoding of offset values significantly enhances computational efficiency for Euclidean distance calculations compared to conventional 64-bit double or 32-bit float representations, thereby accelerating the nearest neighbor search process.

We conducted a comprehensive analysis of the maximum bit-width requirements for all variables involved in the 27-neighborhood nearest neighbor search using encoded offset values. Fig. 7 demonstrates the worst-case scenario for bit-width requirements throughout the search process. In this scenario, the maximum spatial separation occurs when the

distance components ($\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z$) between \mathbf{p}_k^w and candidate point \mathbf{p}_c each measure 1.0m, resulting in encoded values ($\Delta x_e, \Delta y_e, \Delta z_e$) of 512 (2^9). This maximum value necessitates a 9-bit integer representation. To align with standard CPU architecture requirements where variable bit sizes must be multiples of 8, we employ 16-bit short type variables for storing $\Delta x_e, \Delta y_e$ and Δz_e , which are computed as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta x_e \\ \Delta y_e \\ \Delta z_e \end{bmatrix} = [\mathbf{p}_k^w]_{oe} - [\mathbf{p}_c]_{oe} \quad (17)$$

where $[\mathbf{p}_k^w]_{oe}$ and $[\mathbf{p}_c]_{oe}$ represent the encoded offsets of \mathbf{p}_k^w and \mathbf{p}_c , respectively. Eq. 17 demonstrates the transformation from three 64-bit double-precision subtractions to computationally efficient 16-bit short integer operations. Following this transformation, we compute the squared Euclidean distance Δd_e^2 using the encoded offsets through the following formulation:

$$\Delta d_e^2 = \Delta x_e^2 + \Delta y_e^2 + \Delta z_e^2 \quad (18)$$

Given that $\Delta x_e, \Delta y_e$, and Δz_e each equal 2^9 , their squared values ($\Delta x_e^2, \Delta y_e^2, \Delta z_e^2$) consequently become 2^{18} , resulting in a final Δd_e^2 exceeding 2^{19} . This computational requirement necessitates type conversion of $\Delta x_e, \Delta y_e$ and Δz_e from 16-bit short to 32-bit int prior to executing the three multiplications and two additions specified in Eq. 18. Although both int and float types utilize 32-bit representations, integer operations maintain a significant computational speed advantage over their floating-point counterparts. A comprehensive quantitative comparison between standard and quantized map point management approaches for nearest neighbor search is presented in Table IV, providing detailed insights into the computational efficiency gains.

4) *Surface Fitting for New Segment*: Following the identification of 20 nearest neighbors for each \mathbf{p}_k^w ($\mathbf{p}_k \in K_{\text{new}}$), the system proceeds with eigenvalue decomposition to derive surface parameters. As illustrated in Fig. 8, this computational stage necessitates conversion from encoded offset representation to global 3D coordinates. The decoding process transforms the encoded offset values back to their original global coordinate representation through the following procedure:

$$\mathbf{p}_o = \text{map}^{-1}(\mathbf{p}_{oe}) \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbf{p}^w = \mathbf{p}_o + \mathbf{v}_{\text{center}} \quad (20)$$




Fig. 8. Schematic diagram of surface fitting implementation using quantized map point management. The process initiates with the transformation of encoded offset values to global coordinates, requiring $300 \times 20 \times m$ address indexing operations and 64 double-precision additions, where 300 represents the number of segment keypoints, 20 corresponds to the number of nearest neighbors, and m denotes the actual iteration count. This decoding step precedes the surface parameter estimation phase, ensuring accurate geometric representation.

where $\text{map}^{-1}(\cdot)$ represents the inverse mapping operation utilizing the predefined index table for decoding, and $\mathbf{v}_{\text{center}}$ denotes the global 3D coordinates of the containing volume's centroid. As illustrated in Fig. 8 (a), this additional decoding step represents the primary computational overhead introduced by the quantized map management approach compared to standard map point management. However, this overhead remains computationally manageable, requiring only $300 \times 20 \times m$ decoding operations, where 300 corresponds to the number of segment keypoints, 20 indicates the number of nearest neighbors per keypoint, and m represents the actual iteration count. This additional computational cost is justified by the significant memory savings and overall system efficiency improvements achieved through quantization.

5) *Solution*: For each point $\mathbf{p}_k \in K_{\text{old}} \cup K_{\text{new}}$, we have obtained its corresponding surface parameter (i.e., normal vector \mathbf{n} and offset d) via surface parameter reutilization or surface fitting for new segment. Accordingly, we can build the point-to-plane residual $r^{\mathbf{p}_k}$ for \mathbf{p}_k as the observation constraint:

$$\begin{aligned} r^{\mathbf{p}_k} &= \omega_{\mathbf{p}} (\mathbf{n}^T \mathbf{p}_k^w + d) \\ \mathbf{p}_k^w &= \mathbf{R}_{b_{i+1}}^w \mathbf{p}_k + \mathbf{t}_{b_{i+1}}^w \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\omega_{\mathbf{p}}$ is a weight parameter utilized in [8], $\mathbf{R}_{b_{i+1}}^w$ is the rotation from $(\cdot)^{b_{i+1}}$ to $(\cdot)^w$ at t_{i+1} . We can express the observation matrix \mathbf{h} as:

$$\mathbf{h} = [r^{\mathbf{p}_1 T}, r^{\mathbf{p}_2 T}, \dots, r^{\mathbf{p}_m T}]^T \quad (22)$$

The corresponding Jacobian matrix of observation constraint \mathbf{H} is calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} &= \left[\frac{\partial r^{\mathbf{p}_1 T}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{i+1}}, \frac{\partial r^{\mathbf{p}_2 T}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial r^{\mathbf{p}_m T}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{i+1}} \right]^T \\ \frac{\partial r^{\mathbf{p}_k T}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{i+1}} &= [\omega_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{n}^T \quad -\omega_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{n}^T \mathbf{R}_{b_{i+1}}^w \mathbf{p}_k \wedge \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0}]^T \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The corresponding covariance matrix of observation constraint \mathbf{V} is the diagonal matrix of $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \dots, \mathbf{V}_m)$, while $\mathbf{V}_k = 0.001$ in our system.

We define the optimal state calculated from state prediction as $\mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_0$, and define the optimal state before current iteration as $\mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_n$. According to the formula of state update, the incremental $\delta \mathbf{x}$ is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{K} = \left(\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{H} + \left(\mathbf{J}_n^0 \mathbf{P} \mathbf{J}_n^{0 T} \right)^{-1} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \quad (24)$$

$$\delta \mathbf{x} = -\mathbf{K} \mathbf{h} - (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K} \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{J}_n^0 \left(\mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_n \boxplus \mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_0 \right)$$

where \mathbf{J}_n^0 is the partial differentiation of $\left(\mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_n \boxplus \delta \mathbf{x} \right) \boxminus \mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_0$ with respect to $\delta \mathbf{x}$ evaluated at zero:

$$\mathbf{J}_n^0 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 9} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} \\ \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{2} \delta \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^0 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 9} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} \\ \mathbf{0}_{9 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{9 \times 3} & \mathbf{I}_{9 \times 9} & \mathbf{0}_{9 \times 2} \\ \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 9} & \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{g}_n}^0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{g}_n}^0 = \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{g}_{i+1}^w \Big|_0)^T \delta \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{g}_{i+1}^w} \wedge \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{g}_{i+1}^w \Big|_0) \quad (26)$$

$\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^0 = \text{Log} \left(\mathbf{R}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_0^T \mathbf{R}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_n \right)$, $\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{g}_{i+1}^w}$ is the Lie algebra of rotation from $\mathbf{g}_{i+1}^w \Big|_n$ to $\mathbf{g}_{i+1}^w \Big|_0$. After the incremental $\delta \mathbf{x}$ is calculated, we update the optimal state by:

$$\mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_{n+1} = \mathbf{x}_{b_{i+1}}^w \Big|_n \boxplus \delta \mathbf{x} \quad (27)$$

Sec. IV-E3~Sec. IV-E5 are performed alternately until one of the following convergence conditions is met: 1) The maximum number of iterations is reached. 2) The magnitude of incremental is smaller than a threshold (e.g., 0.1 degree for rotation and 0.01 m for translation). After convergence, the covariance is updated as:

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{J}_{n+1}^0 (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K} \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{J}_{n+1}^{0 T} \quad (28)$$

6) *Map Update*: Upon completion of state estimation for the current reconstructed sweep P_{i+1} , the system transforms the new segment's points into the world coordinate system $(\cdot)^w$ and integrates them into the voxel map. Prior to this integration, a crucial quantization step is performed, converting the global coordinates (e.g., \mathbf{p}^w) into encoded offset representations through the following transformation:

$$\mathbf{p}_o = \mathbf{p}^w - \mathbf{v}_{\text{center}} \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{oe} = \text{map}(\mathbf{p}_o) \quad (30)$$

where $\text{map}(\cdot)$ represents the encoding operation through a predefined index table, and $\mathbf{v}_{\text{center}}$ denotes the global 3D coordinates of the containing volume's centroid. This encoding process constitutes the primary computational overhead introduced by the quantized map point management approach during map updates. However, empirical results demonstrate that this additional computational cost remains negligible, with the significant advantages of quantized map management in computational efficiency and memory optimization substantially outweighing its minor drawbacks.

In contrast to SR-LIO's approach of removing distant map points after each state update, which is a computationally

TABLE V
DATASETS FOR EVALUATION

	Velodyne LiDAR		IMU	
	Type	Rate	Type	Rate
<i>nclt</i>	32	7.5	9-axis	100 Hz
<i>utbm</i>	32	10	6-axis	100 Hz
<i>ulhk</i>	32	10	9-axis	100 Hz
<i>kaist</i>	16	10	9-axis	200 Hz

intensive operation due to the substantial overhead of voxel map traversal. The introduction of quantized map management further increases the computational complexity of distance calculations, as they require additional decoding operations. To optimize system performance, we implement a periodic map maintenance routine that removes distant points at 50-second intervals, effectively balancing map management efficiency with computational resource utilization.

V. EXPERIMENTS

Following the evaluation methodology established in SR-LIO [36], we conducted comprehensive experiments on four publicly available datasets: *nclt* [4], *utbm* [31], *ulhk* [26], and *kaist* [13]. The *nclt* dataset, collected using an autonomous unmanned ground vehicle at the University of Michigan’s North Campus, represents a large-scale, long-term dataset featuring a Velodyne HDL-32E LiDAR operating at 7.5 Hz (130~140 ms per 360-degree sweep) and a Microstrain MS25 IMU providing 50 Hz measurements. Notably, the *nclt* dataset presents unique challenges compared to the other three datasets (*utbm*, *ulhk*, and *kaist*), particularly in sequences where the Segway platform transitions from outdoor environments to long indoor corridors. These abrupt scene changes pose significant challenges for ICP point cloud registration, often causing system failures. Consequently, we exclude these challenging segments, typically occurring at sequence ends, from our evaluation. Consistent with SR-LIO’s approach, we enhance the IMU data frequency to 100 Hz through interpolation for improved state estimation.

The *utbm* dataset comprises dual 10 Hz Velodyne HDL-32E LiDARs and a 100 Hz Xsens MTi-28A53G25 IMU, with our implementation utilizing data from the left LiDAR. The *ulhk* dataset provides 10 Hz LiDAR scans from a Velodyne HDL-32E and 100 Hz IMU measurements from a 9-axis Xsens MTi-10 IMU. The *kaist* dataset features two 10 Hz Velodyne VLP-16 LiDARs mounted at approximately 45° tilt angles and a 200 Hz Xsens MTi-300 IMU. Following SR-LIO’s methodology [36], we integrate data from both LiDARs in the *kaist* dataset. All sequences in *utbm*, *ulhk*, and *kaist* were collected in structured urban environments using human-operated vehicles. Table V summarizes the sensor specifications and data rates for each dataset.

Our evaluation employs the same 21 test sequences utilized in SR-LIO, with detailed sequence information provided in Table VI. For quantitative accuracy assessment, we adopt the Absolute Translational Error (ATE) metric. As SR-LIO++ is fundamentally a single-threaded system, its accuracy exhibits no essential variation across different computing platforms.

TABLE VI
DATASETS OF ALL SEQUENCES FOR EVALUATION

	Name	Duration (min:sec)	Distance (km)
<i>nclt_1</i>	2012-01-08	92:16	6.4
<i>nclt_2</i>	2012-02-02	98:37	6.5
<i>nclt_3</i>	2012-02-04	77:39	5.5
<i>nclt_4</i>	2012-02-05	93:40	6.5
<i>nclt_5</i>	2012-05-11	83:36	6.0
<i>nclt_6</i>	2012-05-26	97:23	6.3
<i>nclt_7</i>	2012-06-15	55:10	4.1
<i>nclt_8</i>	2012-08-04	79:27	5.5
<i>nclt_9</i>	2012-08-20	88:44	6.0
<i>nclt_10</i>	2012-09-28	76:40	5.6
<i>nclt_11</i>	2012-12-01	75:50	5.0
<i>utbm_1</i>	2018-07-19	15:26	4.98
<i>utbm_2</i>	2019-01-31	16:00	6.40
<i>utbm_3</i>	2019-04-18	11:59	5.11
<i>utbm_4</i>	2018-07-20	16:45	4.99
<i>utbm_5</i>	2018-07-13	16:59	5.03
<i>ulhk_1</i>	2019-01-17	5:18	0.60
<i>ulhk_2</i>	2019-04-26-1	2:30	0.55
<i>kaist_1</i>	urban_07	9:16	2.55
<i>kaist_2</i>	urban_08	5:07	1.56
<i>kaist_3</i>	urban_13	24:14	2.36




Fig. 9. Illustration of Running SR-LIO++ on Raspberry Pi 4B.

TABLE VII
RMSE OF ATE COMPARISON OF STATE-OF-THE-ART (UNIT: M)

	Fast-LIO2	DLIO	Point-LIO	IG-LIO	SR-LIO	Ours
<i>nclt_1</i>	3.57	3.27	2.55	1.85	1.34	1.34
<i>nclt_2</i>	2.00	1.80	2.45	1.72	1.80	1.56
<i>nclt_3</i>	2.77	5.35	5.31	2.92	2.37	2.25
<i>nclt_4</i>	3.60	18.10	1.73	1.56	1.91	1.54
<i>nclt_5</i>	2.46	3.14	11.24	1.84	1.62	1.92
<i>nclt_6</i>	2.60	12.44	14.89	2.12	2.10	2.24
<i>nclt_7</i>	2.37	2.98	4.39	1.82	2.13	1.96
<i>nclt_8</i>	2.59	7.84	16.28	2.40	2.70	2.44
<i>nclt_9</i>	4.01	2.46	10.59	1.68	2.11	2.35
<i>nclt_10</i>	2.65	7.72	16.22	1.72	1.67	1.63
<i>nclt_11</i>	4.37	3.89	10.78	1.89	1.61	1.54
<i>utbm_1</i>	15.13	14.25	22.71	17.37	7.70	7.29
<i>utbm_2</i>	21.21	13.85	23.02	21.27	16.28	15.25
<i>utbm_3</i>	10.81	55.28	13.81	13.75	8.42	11.31
<i>utbm_4</i>	15.20	18.05	21.76	16.44	11.12	10.46
<i>utbm_5</i>	13.24	14.95	19.88	×	9.14	8.48
<i>ulhk_1</i>	1.20	2.44	1.07	1.15	0.93	1.13
<i>ulhk_2</i>	3.24	×	2.82	3.31	3.21	3.18
<i>kaist_1</i>	0.88	1.04	0.75	61.20	1.10	1.12
<i>kaist_2</i>	16.27	1.91	1.08	3.01	0.92	0.87
<i>kaist_3</i>	×	×	3.04	×	1.36	1.36

Denotations: “×” means the system fails to run entirety on the corresponding sequence.

TABLE VIII
TIME COMPARISON WITH BASELINE (UNIT: MS)

Platform	Intel-Core i9-14900HX				Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V				Raspberry Pi 4B			
Method	SR-LIO	Base	Base+	Ours	SR-LIO	Base	Base+	Ours	SR-LIO	Base	Base+	Ours
<i>nclt_1</i>	27.20	17.94	17.01	15.06	40.01	26.53	24.21	20.54	79.63	58.61	50.39	45.10
<i>nclt_2</i>	25.25	17.88	16.76	14.90	36.31	26.30	23.76	19.93	69.56	51.94	45.86	40.89
<i>nclt_3</i>	24.52	17.88	17.19	15.58	35.79	26.23	24.30	20.89	78.72	55.80	47.97	42.28
<i>nclt_4</i>	25.95	18.49	17.63	15.58	40.13	27.07	24.71	20.97	80.30	58.25	51.20	45.84
<i>nclt_5</i>	25.96	18.57	18.49	16.41	40.21	28.31	26.49	22.15	89.80	64.86	54.80	48.54
<i>nclt_6</i>	25.72	19.21	17.88	15.97	39.27	28.07	25.38	21.16	83.22	59.83	50.72	45.14
<i>nclt_7</i>	24.19	18.00	16.92	15.23	35.51	27.01	24.39	20.24	79.50	58.12	47.65	42.23
<i>nclt_8</i>	27.49	20.03	19.53	17.65	40.72	31.48	29.42	25.06	81.97	61.18	52.08	47.26
<i>nclt_9</i>	26.50	18.49	17.63	15.87	39.68	27.24	25.16	20.98	85.71	60.74	52.19	46.18
<i>nclt_10</i>	26.07	17.92	17.20	15.38	38.44	26.71	24.70	20.07	79.43	57.61	49.44	44.02
<i>nclt_11</i>	24.64	16.57	15.60	13.90	34.14	24.55	21.93	18.19	61.47	47.44	41.46	36.71
<i>utbm_1</i>	20.68	15.29	13.60	12.65	27.88	22.16	19.97	17.96	95.54	57.31	49.01	43.85
<i>utbm_2</i>	21.10	16.60	14.98	13.88	28.44	22.58	20.58	18.57	92.72	59.40	49.39	43.47
<i>utbm_3</i>	20.53	15.86	14.22	13.35	26.67	22.00	19.87	17.93	83.82	57.87	48.87	42.29
<i>utbm_4</i>	21.22	15.29	13.80	12.78	28.88	22.22	19.88	17.96	97.66	60.38	48.87	43.42
<i>utbm_5</i>	20.39	14.61	13.05	12.00	29.47	21.90	19.62	17.73	91.41	56.66	45.56	41.43
<i>ulhk_1</i>	20.80	14.57	13.02	12.45	25.00	23.40	21.34	20.13	74.45	57.22	50.06	45.45
<i>ulhk_2</i>	20.59	14.20	12.83	12.39	25.04	23.19	21.05	20.27	72.77	58.89	51.59	46.07
<i>kaist_1</i>	20.19	14.87	12.87	11.78	25.85	18.32	16.19	14.93	83.90	45.89	36.49	32.75
<i>kaist_2</i>	19.68	14.83	13.64	11.69	23.28	19.72	17.97	15.84	82.74	43.87	37.92	33.09
<i>kaist_3</i>	19.71	13.33	11.06	9.56	24.53	16.48	14.33	12.08	69.44	35.88	25.84	23.50

Denotations: “Base” represents the original SR-LIO with strategic optimizations, particularly the modification of the far-point removal mechanism from its original implementation in every reconstructed sweep to an optimized interval of 50 seconds. “Base+” denotes the subsequent integration of our proposed surface parameter reutilization strategy into the optimized “Base” system. We color the processing time of a single sweep as **non-real-time** when it exceeds 50 ms, and as **real-time** when it is below 50 ms.

Thus, all ATE evaluations were conducted on a PC equipped with an Intel Core i9-14900HX processor. To demonstrate the practical applicability of our approach across different robotic platforms, we extended our evaluation to two additional computing environments: 1) an industrial control computer with an Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V CPU, representing typical hardware for composite robots, and 2) a Raspberry Pi 4B, simulating the computational constraints of simpler robotic systems such as AGVs. The Raspberry Pi 4B evaluation (as illustrated in Fig. 9) specifically demonstrates our method’s capability to maintain a 20 Hz output frequency on resource-constrained platforms.

A. ATE Comparison of the State-of-the-Arts

The field of LiDAR-Inertial Odometry (LIO) has witnessed significant advancements in recent years, accompanied by the proliferation of numerous open-source implementations. For our comparative analysis, we have selected five state-of-the-art LIO systems that represent the most significant developments in the field: Fast-LIO2 [29], DLIO [5], Point-LIO [11], IG-LIO [7], and SR-LIO [36]. These systems, along with our proposed approach, share a common foundation in the ESIKF framework. The comparative ATE results for these systems are obtained from the recorded data in [36].

The experimental results presented in Table VII demonstrate that our proposed approach achieves comparable or superior performance compared to state-of-the-art methods, as evidenced by smaller RMSE of ATE values in more than half of the test sequences. Through comprehensive evaluation, our method exhibits comparable accuracy to two recent advanced works, IG-LIO and SR-LIO. These findings align with our theoretical analysis in Sec. II, suggesting that the accuracy

and robustness of current LiDAR Inertial Odometry (LIO) systems have reached a plateau of technological maturity. This observation has consequently shifted our research focus from pursuing marginal accuracy improvements to developing a system capable of delivering high-frequency outputs on resource-constrained hardware platforms. Notably, since SR-LIO serves as our baseline framework and demonstrates comparable ATE performance with our method, these experimental results substantiate that our innovative surface parameter reutilization strategy and quantized map point management mechanism maintain system accuracy and robustness without significant degradation.

Among the evaluated methods, SR-LIO and our system are distinguished by their ability to output optimized states at a frequency of **20 Hz**, whereas other methods are limited to a state output frequency of **10 Hz** during evaluation. Although Point-LIO is theoretically capable of outputting the pose at the frequency of individual point acquisition, empirical testing reveals that its most stable state output is at 10 Hz. The reason is that the 10 Hz frequency corresponds to the completion of a full 360-degree LiDAR scan, ensuring uniform spatial distribution and balanced utilization of the acquired data points.

B. Time Consumption Comparison with Baseline

We conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the computational overhead between our system and the baseline across three distinct hardware platforms. While several existing methods, including Fast-LIO and IG-LIO, demonstrate faster operational speeds than SR-LIO, none of them possess the capability to enhance the output frequency. The primary objective of our

TABLE IX
ABLATION STUDY OF SURFACE PARAMETER REUTILIZATION ON TIME CONSUMPTION (UNIT: MS)

Platform	Intel-Core i9-14900HX				Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V				Raspberry Pi 4B			
	Residual Building		Total		Residual Building		Total		Residual Building		Total	
Method	Base	Base+	Base	Base+	Base	Base+	Base	Base+	Base	Base+	Base	Base+
<i>nclt_1</i>	6.46	5.16	17.94	17.01	8.44	6.53	26.53	24.21	16.07	12.63	58.61	50.39
<i>nclt_2</i>	6.68	5.22	17.88	16.76	8.62	6.63	26.30	23.76	15.75	12.27	51.94	45.86
<i>nclt_3</i>	6.39	5.19	17.88	17.19	8.40	6.51	26.23	24.30	16.14	12.61	55.80	47.97
<i>nclt_4</i>	6.49	5.31	18.49	17.63	8.57	6.63	27.07	24.71	16.38	12.91	58.25	51.20
<i>nclt_5</i>	5.93	5.22	18.57	18.49	8.39	6.79	28.31	26.49	16.59	13.47	64.86	54.80
<i>nclt_6</i>	6.59	5.23	19.21	17.88	8.62	6.70	28.07	25.38	16.41	12.78	59.83	50.72
<i>nclt_7</i>	6.22	5.07	18.00	16.92	8.64	6.64	27.01	24.39	17.98	15.37	58.12	47.65
<i>nclt_8</i>	5.63	4.89	20.03	19.53	8.80	7.15	31.48	29.42	16.24	13.20	61.18	52.08
<i>nclt_9</i>	6.07	5.09	18.49	17.63	8.34	6.60	27.24	25.16	16.60	12.84	60.74	52.19
<i>nclt_10</i>	6.28	5.13	17.92	17.20	8.53	6.79	26.71	24.70	16.72	12.85	57.61	49.44
<i>nclt_11</i>	6.26	5.02	16.57	15.60	8.19	6.14	24.55	21.93	14.73	11.14	47.44	41.46
<i>utbm_1</i>	6.01	4.32	15.29	13.60	7.87	5.50	22.16	19.97	14.77	10.17	57.31	49.01
<i>utbm_2</i>	5.86	4.69	16.60	14.98	7.80	5.68	22.58	20.58	14.61	10.53	59.40	49.39
<i>utbm_3</i>	6.04	4.57	15.86	14.22	7.90	5.62	22.00	19.87	14.27	10.28	57.87	48.87
<i>utbm_4</i>	6.09	4.44	15.29	13.80	7.99	5.54	22.22	19.88	15.15	10.21	60.38	48.87
<i>utbm_5</i>	5.54	4.13	14.61	13.05	7.87	5.52	21.90	19.62	14.59	10.03	56.66	45.46
<i>ulhk_1</i>	4.52	3.39	14.57	13.02	6.52	4.77	23.40	21.34	13.65	9.81	57.22	50.06
<i>ulhk_2</i>	4.71	3.36	14.20	12.83	6.34	5.46	23.19	21.05	13.63	10.03	58.89	51.59
<i>kaist_1</i>	7.45	5.15	14.87	12.87	8.19	6.00	18.32	16.19	15.95	11.12	45.89	36.49
<i>kaist_2</i>	6.45	5.06	14.83	13.64	7.54	5.85	19.72	17.97	14.30	10.60	43.87	37.92
<i>kaist_3</i>	7.85	5.22	13.33	11.06	8.85	6.48	16.48	14.33	14.79	11.05	35.88	25.84

Denotations: “Base” represents the original SR-LIO with strategic optimizations, particularly the modification of the far-point removal mechanism from its original implementation in every reconstructed sweep to an optimized interval of 50 seconds. “Base+” denotes the subsequent integration of our proposed surface parameter reutilization strategy into the optimized “Base” system. “Residual Building” refers to the computational time for constructing point-to-plane residuals in each state update iteration, comprising nearest neighbor search, surface fitting, and residual Jacobian computation. It is executed m times per reconstructed sweep (where $1 \leq m \leq 5$). “Total” indicates the complete processing time per reconstructed sweep.

work is to enable SR-LIO, with its frequency-enhancing functionality, to achieve 20 Hz state output on hardware platforms with limited computational resources. To this end, we have implemented a series of strategic optimizations to SR-LIO, including modifying the far-point deletion strategy from its original per-reconstructed-sweep execution to a more efficient 50-second interval implementation. This optimized system is designated as “Base”. Subsequently, we incrementally integrate our proposed surface parameter reutilization method into “Base”, resulting in an enhanced system denoted as “Base+”. Finally, we incorporate our novel quantized map point management method into “Base+”, culminating in our ultimate system “Ours”.

The results presented in Table VIII demonstrate the computational overhead comparison among our system, SR-LIO, “Base”, and “Base+”. Although the strategic optimizations yield the most significant improvement in computational efficiency, they still cannot guarantee real-time performance across all test sequences on the Raspberry Pi 4B platform. The incorporation of our proposed surface parameter reutilization method into the “Base” system further enhances computational efficiency. This improvement stems from the fact that the sweep reconstruction results in overlapping data segments between adjacent reconstructed sweeps, and “Base” indiscriminately processes the data in these overlapping segments, leading to redundant computations, “Base+” effectively avoids such unnecessary repetitive calculations. Furthermore, the addition of our quantized map point management method to “Base+” achieves sufficient computational efficiency to enable stable 20 Hz state output and map update on the Raspberry Pi

4B platform. This enhancement is attributed to the fundamental difference in map point management strategies: “Base+” employs a standard voxel-based approach, whereas our method utilizes a quantized representation. Compared to “Base+”, our quantized map point management method requires fewer bits to represent map points, thereby significantly improving computational efficiency during the high-frequency Euclidean distance calculations in the nearest neighbor search step.

C. Ablation Study of Surface Parameter Reutilization

In this section, we conduct an ablation study to systematically evaluate the impact of the surface parameter reutilization method on both computational overhead and accuracy of state estimation. As detailed in Sec. IV-E1, this method is theoretically capable of reducing the computational load of nearest neighbor search and plane fitting operations by up to 50%. In the experimental evaluation, while it would be ideal to separately measure the average time consumption of these two submodules (nearest neighbor search and surface fitting), practical constraints necessitate an alternative approach. During each iterative state update, these operations are executed $300 \times m$ times (where 300 represents the number of keypoints in a new segment and m denotes the actual number of iterations). The high-frequency execution of these operations renders the inherent computational cost of the timing function non-negligible, potentially introducing measurement artifacts. To mitigate the potential inflation of timing measurements caused by the high-frequency execution of timing functions, we instead evaluate the time overhead of the parent function encompassing both operations, namely the

TABLE X
ABLATION STUDY OF SURFACE PARAMETER REUTILIZATION ON ACCURACY (UNIT: M)

	Base	Base+	Metric Error
<i>nclt_1</i>	1.34	1.39	+0.05
<i>nclt_2</i>	1.86	1.88	+0.02
<i>nclt_3</i>	2.09	2.22	+0.13
<i>nclt_4</i>	1.86	1.72	-0.14
<i>nclt_5</i>	1.74	1.80	+0.06
<i>nclt_6</i>	2.37	2.34	-0.03
<i>nclt_7</i>	2.00	2.07	+0.07
<i>nclt_8</i>	2.73	2.64	-0.09
<i>nclt_9</i>	2.28	2.39	+0.11
<i>nclt_10</i>	1.62	1.68	+0.06
<i>nclt_11</i>	1.63	1.68	+0.05
<i>utbm_1</i>	6.73	7.03	+0.30
<i>utbm_2</i>	15.60	15.72	+0.12
<i>utbm_3</i>	9.16	9.99	+0.83
<i>utbm_4</i>	12.75	12.23	-0.52
<i>utbm_5</i>	8.71	8.64	-0.07
<i>ulhk_1</i>	0.99	1.04	+0.05
<i>ulhk_2</i>	3.14	3.22	+0.08
<i>kaist_1</i>	1.15	1.11	-0.04
<i>kaist_2</i>	0.91	0.84	-0.07
<i>kaist_3</i>	1.42	1.37	-0.05

Denotations: “Base” represents the original SR-LIO with strategic optimizations. “Base+” denotes the subsequent integration of our proposed surface parameter reutilization strategy into the optimized “Base” system.

“Residual Building”. This module is executed m times per reconstructed sweep (where $1 \leq m \leq 5$), with each execution comprising: 1) nearest neighbor search and surface parameter fitting for all keypoints in the new segment, and 2) Jacobian computation of each point-to-plane residual for keypoints from both old and new segments. The “Residual Building” module encapsulates all computational components where surface parameter reutilization can potentially contribute to efficiency improvements, making it an appropriate metric for assessing the overall impact of our proposed method.

The experimental results presented in Table IX confirm that our surface parameter reutilization method effectively improves the computational efficiency of the “Residual Building” module, although the observed enhancement is below the theoretical 50% reduction. This performance gap can be attributed to two primary factors: First, as discussed in Sec. IV-E1, when the current state update requires more iterations than the previous one, the surface parameter reutilization cannot optimize the computational load for these additional iterations. Second, the residual Jacobian computation, which must be performed for all keypoints in both old and new segments, remains unaffected by the surface parameter reutilization method.

To rigorously assess the influence of surface parameter reutilization on state estimation accuracy, we conducted comprehensive comparative experiments. As evidenced by the quantitative results presented in Table X, the adoption of surface parameter reutilization yields statistically insignificant variations in estimation accuracy. This empirical finding suggests that the precision and robustness of our state estimation framework exhibit strong resilience to randomness in keypoint distribution patterns. The observed stability further validates

TABLE XI
ABLATION STUDY OF QUANTIZED MAP POINT MANAGEMENT ON MEMORY OVERHEAD (UNIT: GB)

	Standard Map Point Management	Quantized Map Point Management
<i>nclt_1</i>	0.70	0.36
<i>nclt_2</i>	0.72	0.37
<i>nclt_3</i>	0.67	0.37
<i>nclt_4</i>	0.74	0.39
<i>nclt_5</i>	0.83	0.41
<i>nclt_6</i>	0.73	0.38
<i>nclt_7</i>	0.62	0.36
<i>nclt_8</i>	0.73	0.39
<i>nclt_9</i>	0.78	0.37
<i>nclt_10</i>	0.74	0.39
<i>nclt_11</i>	0.65	0.38
<i>utbm_1</i>	0.40	0.25
<i>utbm_2</i>	0.40	0.25
<i>utbm_3</i>	0.41	0.23
<i>utbm_4</i>	0.41	0.25
<i>utbm_5</i>	0.40	0.24
<i>ulhk_1</i>	0.26	0.17
<i>ulhk_2</i>	0.28	0.19
<i>kaist_1</i>	0.40	0.22
<i>kaist_2</i>	0.32	0.20
<i>kaist_3</i>	0.35	0.22

our assumption in Sec. IV-E1 regarding the system’s insensitivity to randomness in keypoint distribution patterns.

D. Ablation Study of Quantized Map Point Management

In this section, we conduct an ablation study to systematically evaluate the effects of our proposed quantized map point management method on three critical aspects: memory consumption, computational efficiency, and accuracy. As detailed in Sec. IV-E2, our method employs an index table mapping scheme to compress originally 64-bit double-precision global map points into 8-bit char-type encoded offsets. The final storage overhead of the global map amounts to 7/40 of the original size, accounting for the additional 3×64 -bit volume centroid coordinates.

The experimental results in Table XI confirm that our quantized map point management method achieves significant memory reduction in LIO operation, though the overall savings fall below the theoretical 7/40 ratio. This discrepancy arises because the system memory footprint comprises not only the global map (where our 8-bit compression applies) but also runtime variables required for LIO’s algorithmic pipeline.

The experimental results in Table XII reveal two key findings regarding computational efficiency: 1) When maintaining SR-LIO’s original nearest neighbor search processing but utilizing quantized map point management (denoted as “Base++”), the computational overhead increases significantly due to the mandatory decoding operations before each Euclidean distance calculation. Specifically, this introduces an additional $27 \times 20 \times 300 \times m$ decoding operations per sweep (27: number of neighborhood volumes; 20: maximum number of points in a volume; 300: number of keypoints in new segment; m : actual number of iterations). 2) By implementing our proposed integer-domain nearest neighbor search, we not only recover the efficiency loss but achieve further computational

TABLE XII
ABLATION STUDY OF QUANTIZED MAP POINT MANAGEMENT ON TIME CONSUMPTION (UNIT: MS)

Platform	Intel-Core i9-14900HX						Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V						Raspberry Pi 4B					
Module	Residual Building			Total			Residual Building			Total			Residual Building			Total		
Method	Base+	Base++	Ours	Base+	Base++	Ours	Base+	Base++	Ours	Base+	Base++	Ours	Base+	Base++	Ours	Base+	Base++	Ours
<i>nclt_1</i>	5.16	6.17	4.89	17.01	17.62	15.06	6.53	9.08	6.08	24.21	26.16	20.54	12.63	15.22	10.95	50.39	52.56	45.10
<i>nclt_2</i>	5.22	6.26	4.98	16.76	17.48	14.90	6.63	9.31	6.06	23.76	25.86	19.93	12.27	14.99	10.64	45.86	49.73	40.89
<i>nclt_3</i>	5.19	6.31	4.95	17.19	18.20	15.58	6.51	9.19	6.11	24.30	26.71	20.89	12.61	15.48	10.98	47.97	51.00	42.28
<i>nclt_4</i>	5.31	6.20	4.89	17.63	18.13	15.58	6.63	9.17	6.12	24.71	26.98	20.97	12.91	15.64	11.24	51.20	54.07	45.84
<i>nclt_5</i>	5.22	6.07	4.45	18.49	19.09	16.41	6.79	9.28	6.13	26.49	28.98	22.15	13.47	16.29	11.53	54.80	58.28	48.54
<i>nclt_6</i>	5.23	6.23	4.89	17.88	18.53	15.97	6.70	9.38	6.08	25.38	27.95	21.16	12.78	15.67	11.08	50.72	53.78	45.14
<i>nclt_7</i>	5.07	6.06	4.81	16.92	17.45	15.23	6.64	9.05	6.01	24.39	26.08	20.24	15.37	15.93	10.71	47.65	51.44	42.23
<i>nclt_8</i>	4.89	5.91	4.63	19.53	20.58	17.65	7.15	9.92	6.55	29.42	33.24	25.06	13.20	16.61	11.34	52.08	57.24	47.26
<i>nclt_9</i>	5.09	6.12	4.81	17.63	18.42	15.87	6.60	9.23	6.05	25.16	27.45	20.98	12.84	15.57	11.05	52.19	54.52	46.18
<i>nclt_10</i>	5.13	6.16	4.83	17.20	17.82	15.38	6.79	9.12	5.91	24.70	26.13	20.07	12.85	16.05	10.96	49.44	53.07	44.02
<i>nclt_11</i>	5.02	5.95	4.67	15.60	16.32	13.90	6.14	8.45	5.62	21.93	24.08	18.19	11.14	13.63	9.69	41.46	44.03	36.71
<i>utbm_1</i>	4.32	4.99	4.07	13.60	14.12	12.65	5.50	6.61	4.83	19.97	20.53	17.96	10.17	11.90	9.16	49.01	50.05	43.85
<i>utbm_2</i>	4.69	5.30	4.37	14.98	15.40	13.88	5.68	6.78	5.03	20.58	21.28	18.57	10.53	12.20	9.47	49.39	49.84	43.47
<i>utbm_3</i>	4.57	5.21	4.32	14.22	14.83	13.35	5.62	6.71	4.97	19.87	20.48	17.93	10.28	12.31	9.35	48.87	49.36	42.29
<i>utbm_4</i>	4.44	5.15	4.16	13.80	14.27	12.78	5.54	6.73	4.87	19.88	20.68	17.96	10.21	12.02	9.20	48.87	49.18	43.42
<i>utbm_5</i>	4.13	4.72	3.84	13.05	13.50	12.00	5.52	6.53	4.82	19.62	20.01	17.73	10.03	11.42	8.99	45.56	46.38	41.43
<i>ulhk_1</i>	3.39	4.19	3.26	13.02	13.29	12.45	4.77	6.66	4.74	21.34	23.09	20.13	9.81	11.76	8.65	50.06	50.93	45.45
<i>ulhk_2</i>	3.36	4.05	3.22	12.83	13.21	12.39	4.56	6.48	4.25	21.05	23.22	20.27	10.03	11.86	9.26	51.59	51.88	46.07
<i>kaist_1</i>	5.15	6.06	4.93	12.87	13.31	11.78	6.00	7.51	5.54	16.19	17.59	14.93	11.12	13.29	10.35	36.49	37.65	32.75
<i>kaist_2</i>	5.06	5.93	4.85	13.64	14.32	11.69	5.85	7.35	5.44	17.97	18.91	15.84	10.60	12.67	9.88	37.92	38.92	33.09
<i>kaist_3</i>	5.22	6.18	4.79	11.06	11.13	9.56	6.48	7.52	5.51	14.33	14.48	12.08	11.05	11.34	8.61	25.84	29.13	23.50

Denotations: “Base+” denotes the enhanced SR-LIO system incorporating both additional strategic optimization and our proposed surface parameter reutilization method. “Base++” extends the “Base+” system by incorporating quantized map point management, where nearest neighbor search operations are performed in double-precision domain after decoding the compressed map points, including full-precision Euclidean distance calculation and sorting. “Residual Building” refers to the computational time for constructing point-to-plane residuals in each state update iteration, comprising nearest neighbor search, surface fitting, and residual Jacobian computation. It is executed m times per reconstructed sweep (where $1 \leq m \leq 5$). “Total” indicates the complete processing time per reconstructed sweep.

improvements over “Base+”, ultimately enabling consistent 20Hz state estimation across all sequences. The same as Sec. V-C, we evaluate the time overhead of “Residual Building” module to mitigate the potential inflation of timing measurements caused by the high-frequency execution of timing functions. The “Residual Building Module” encapsulates all computational components where quantized map point management can potentially contribute to efficiency improvements, making it an appropriate metric for assessing the impact of our proposed method.

As discussed in Sec. IV-E6, the quantized map management scheme introduces additional encoding/decoding operations during the map update phase. We conduct a systematic evaluation to quantify the associated computational overhead. The results in Table XIII demonstrate that while these operations indeed increase the computational load of map update, the absolute overhead remains negligible due to the inherently low baseline computational cost of this module.

Experimental results in Table XIV demonstrate that map quantization induces negligible effects on state estimation accuracy across all sequences except *utbm_3*. This observation validates our assumption in Sec. IV-E2, confirming that the 4 mm-quantization resolution introduces clinically insignificant precision loss for LIO systems.

E. Time Consumption of System Modules

We conduct a comprehensive runtime evaluation across all sequences, measuring the computational overhead of three core modules: 1) Point cloud processing: Raw point cloud data

TABLE XIII
ABLATION STUDY OF QUANTIZED MAP POINT MANAGEMENT ON TIME CONSUMPTION OF MAP UPDATE MODULE (UNIT: MS)

Platform	Intel-Core i9-14900HX		Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V		Raspberry Pi 4B	
Method	Base+	Ours	Base+	Ours	Base+	Ours
<i>nclt_1</i>	0.13	0.19	0.20	0.32	0.59	0.72
<i>nclt_2</i>	0.10	0.17	0.18	0.28	0.48	0.62
<i>nclt_3</i>	0.12	0.18	0.19	0.31	0.56	0.70
<i>nclt_4</i>	0.12	0.18	0.19	0.32	0.62	0.79
<i>nclt_5</i>	0.10	0.16	0.19	0.29	0.66	0.80
<i>nclt_6</i>	0.10	0.17	0.18	0.30	0.68	0.82
<i>nclt_7</i>	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.35	0.66	0.82
<i>nclt_8</i>	0.10	0.15	0.19	0.30	0.63	0.81
<i>nclt_9</i>	0.12	0.18	0.23	0.32	0.72	0.87
<i>nclt_10</i>	0.11	0.18	0.19	0.30	0.53	0.66
<i>nclt_11</i>	0.11	0.18	0.17	0.29	0.48	0.61
<i>utbm_1</i>	0.18	0.28	0.24	0.41	0.71	0.87
<i>utbm_2</i>	0.18	0.29	0.25	0.42	0.69	0.84
<i>utbm_3</i>	0.21	0.31	0.29	0.45	0.74	0.91
<i>utbm_4</i>	0.18	0.29	0.25	0.42	0.75	0.92
<i>utbm_5</i>	0.17	0.25	0.24	0.40	0.72	0.86
<i>ulhk_1</i>	0.09	0.17	0.14	0.27	0.43	0.58
<i>ulhk_2</i>	0.18	0.29	0.26	0.52	0.96	1.20
<i>kaist_1</i>	0.21	0.33	0.23	0.39	0.71	0.88
<i>kaist_2</i>	0.16	0.28	0.19	0.35	0.56	0.75
<i>kaist_3</i>	0.11	0.17	0.12	0.20	0.37	0.46

Denotations: “Base+” denotes the enhanced SR-LIO system incorporating both additional strategic optimization and our proposed surface parameter reutilization method.

down-sampling and sweep reconstruction; 2) State estimation: State prediction and iterative state update (excluding map update); 3) Map update: New point registration and far-point removal. Table XV presents the processing time distribution

TABLE XIV
ABLATION STUDY OF QUANTIZED MAP POINT MANAGEMENT ON ACCURACY (UNIT: M)

	Base+	Ours	Metric Error
<i>nclt_1</i>	1.39	1.34	-0.05
<i>nclt_2</i>	1.88	1.56	-0.32
<i>nclt_3</i>	2.22	2.25	+0.03
<i>nclt_4</i>	1.72	1.54	-0.18
<i>nclt_5</i>	1.80	1.92	+0.12
<i>nclt_6</i>	2.34	2.24	-0.10
<i>nclt_7</i>	2.07	1.96	-0.11
<i>nclt_8</i>	2.64	2.44	-0.20
<i>nclt_9</i>	2.39	2.35	-0.04
<i>nclt_10</i>	1.68	1.63	-0.05
<i>nclt_11</i>	1.68	1.54	-0.14
<i>utbm_1</i>	7.03	7.29	+0.26
<i>utbm_2</i>	15.72	15.25	-0.47
<i>utbm_3</i>	9.99	11.31	+1.32
<i>utbm_4</i>	12.23	10.46	-1.77
<i>utbm_5</i>	8.64	8.48	-0.16
<i>ulhk_1</i>	1.04	1.13	+0.09
<i>ulhk_2</i>	3.22	3.18	-0.04
<i>kaist_1</i>	1.11	1.12	+0.01
<i>kaist_2</i>	0.84	0.87	+0.03
<i>kaist_3</i>	1.37	1.36	-0.01

Denotations: “Base+” denotes the enhanced SR-LIO system incorporating both additional strategic optimization and our proposed surface parameter reutilization method.




Fig. 10. (a) Sensor configuration for experiments on our own platform. (b) A RoboSense RS-LiDAR-16 LiDAR sensor is rigidly synchronized with (c) a XW-GI5690 MEMS GNSS/INS integrated navigation system through hardware triggering for multimodal data collection.

across above modules for individual reconstructed sweeps. Our system demonstrates stable 20 Hz real-time performance across three distinct computational platforms with varying processing capabilities.

F. Evaluation on Custom-Built Sensor System

To validate the effectiveness of SR-LIO++ in real-world scenarios, we deployed our proprietary hardware platform (Fig. 10) for collecting experimental data through field tests, followed by offline evaluations across three hardware platforms with distinct computational capabilities. The platform equips a Robosense RS-LiDAR-16 3D LiDAR and a StarNet XW-GI5690 MEMS GNSS/INS integrated navigation system. The RS-LiDAR-16 acquires point cloud data at 10 Hz, while the integrated navigation system operates at 100 Hz, with both devices synchronized through hardware triggering for precise temporal alignment.




Fig. 11. The comparative visualization between SR-LIO++’s estimated trajectories and the navigation solutions on Google Earth for Seq. 1~4.

We evaluated SR-LIO++ using data collected from urban environments. The global positioning information from the integrated navigation system served as the reference for assessing SR-LIO++’s localization accuracy. A total of five sequences were recorded. However, due to inaccuracies in the integrated navigation output under heavy foliage occlusion and inside buildings, comparative analysis was conducted only on four sequences (i.e., Seq. 1~4) where such interference was absent.

Fig. 11 (a)–(d) present the visualization of SR-LIO++’s estimated trajectories overlaid with the navigation solutions on Google Earth. The near-perfect alignment between the trajectories demonstrates that SR-LIO++ achieves high localization accuracy even in real-world environments. Furthermore, Fig. 12 (a)–(d) display the globally consistent point cloud maps corresponding to the four sequences in Fig. 11, showing high-quality reconstruction without noticeable ghosting artifacts. For Seq. 5 containing indoor segments, we provide the visualization results in Fig. 1, while omitting the comparison with the integrated navigation system’s global positioning data due to its unreliability in GNSS-denied environments. Table XVI documents the average computational overhead required for processing individual reconstructed sweeps across five self-collected sequences on three computing platforms. Notably, SR-LIO++ maintains 20 Hz real-time performance even on the Raspberry Pi 4B.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have introduced SR-LIO++, an advanced LiDAR-Inertial Odometry system that addresses the critical challenge of low-frequency 3D LiDAR data acquisition while maintaining robust real-time performance on computationally

TABLE XV
TIME CONSUMPTION OF SYSTEM MODULES (UNIT: MS)

Platform	Intel-Core i9-14900HX				Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V				Raspberry Pi 4B			
	Cloud Processing	State Estimation	Map Update	Total	Cloud Processing	State Estimation	Map Update	Total	Cloud Processing	State Estimation	Map Update	Total
<i>nclt_1</i>	0.91	11.03	0.19	15.06	1.42	13.94	0.32	20.54	5.80	26.24	0.72	45.10
<i>nclt_2</i>	0.88	10.89	0.17	14.90	1.36	13.51	0.28	19.93	5.27	24.28	0.62	40.89
<i>nclt_3</i>	0.90	11.43	0.18	15.58	1.37	14.31	0.31	20.89	4.74	26.69	0.70	42.28
<i>nclt_4</i>	0.83	11.44	0.18	15.58	1.40	14.53	0.32	20.97	5.31	27.92	0.79	45.84
<i>nclt_5</i>	0.92	12.04	0.16	16.41	1.40	15.68	0.29	22.15	5.00	30.95	0.80	48.54
<i>nclt_6</i>	0.92	11.63	0.17	15.97	1.41	14.64	0.30	21.16	5.00	27.90	0.82	45.14
<i>nclt_7</i>	0.95	10.88	0.19	15.23	1.44	13.74	0.35	20.24	5.18	25.02	0.82	42.23
<i>nclt_8</i>	0.91	13.27	0.15	17.65	1.40	18.72	0.30	25.06	5.32	28.80	0.81	47.26
<i>nclt_9</i>	0.92	11.44	0.18	15.87	1.45	14.49	0.32	20.98	5.35	27.86	0.87	46.18
<i>nclt_10</i>	0.98	10.97	0.18	15.38	1.43	13.66	0.30	20.07	5.56	26.02	0.66	44.02
<i>nclt_11</i>	0.90	9.91	0.18	13.90	1.32	12.21	0.29	18.19	4.91	21.36	0.61	36.71
<i>utbm_1</i>	1.80	7.55	0.28	12.65	3.28	9.25	0.41	17.96	13.44	18.70	0.87	43.85
<i>utbm_2</i>	1.74	8.50	0.29	13.88	3.12	10.11	0.42	18.57	12.65	19.71	0.84	43.47
<i>utbm_3</i>	1.73	8.24	0.31	13.35	3.00	9.83	0.45	17.93	12.42	20.01	0.91	42.29
<i>utbm_4</i>	1.83	7.62	0.29	12.78	3.26	9.19	0.42	17.96	13.18	18.41	0.92	43.42
<i>utbm_5</i>	1.95	7.02	0.25	12.00	3.63	9.07	0.40	17.73	13.26	17.71	0.86	41.43
<i>ulhk_1</i>	4.08	5.72	0.17	12.45	6.22	8.55	0.27	20.13	17.62	16.35	0.58	45.45
<i>ulhk_2</i>	3.21	5.75	0.29	12.39	5.22	10.58	0.52	20.27	20.00	19.61	1.20	46.07
<i>kaist_1</i>	0.54	8.37	0.33	11.78	0.71	9.73	0.39	14.93	4.08	19.29	0.88	32.75
<i>kaist_2</i>	0.53	9.35	0.28	11.69	0.73	10.79	0.35	15.84	4.21	20.45	0.75	33.09
<i>kaist_3</i>	0.48	6.90	0.17	9.56	0.55	8.13	0.20	12.08	3.31	13.68	0.46	23.50




Fig. 12. The visualization of reconstructed point cloud map for Seq. 1~4.

TABLE XVI
TIME CONSUMPTION ON SELF-COLLECTED DATASET (UNIT: MS)

Platform	Intel-Core i9-14900HX	Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V	Raspberry Pi 4B
Seq. 1	14.58	17.97	42.34
Seq. 2	13.44	16.46	40.59
Seq. 3	14.62	16.68	41.29
Seq. 4	16.84	23.31	47.42
Seq. 5	13.83	17.22	45.78

constrained platforms. Building upon the sweep reconstruction method, we incorporate an intelligent caching mechanism for intermediate surface parameters. This architecture effectively eliminates redundant processing of overlapping segments in consecutive reconstructed sweeps, thereby breaking the traditional linear scaling between computational load and output frequency enhancement. Then, we present a groundbreaking quantization scheme for map point management utilizing index table mapping. Our approach achieves a remarkable reduction in memory requirements by transitioning from 64-bit floating-point to compact 8-bit char formats for 3D point storage, while maintaining full reconstruction capability. We also have reformulated the computationally expensive nearest neighbor search operations by transforming the underlying Euclidean distance calculations from 64-bit floating-point arithmetic to optimized 16-bit/32-bit integer domains. This innovation yields substantial improvements in both computational efficiency and memory utilization. Comprehensive experimental evaluation across diverse hardware platforms (including embedded systems) and multiple public datasets demonstrates that SR-LIO++ consistently maintains state-of-the-art localization accuracy while achieving unprecedented computational efficiency. Most notably, the system successfully attains 20Hz real-time state estimation on a Raspberry Pi 4B single-board computer, representing a significant advancement in frequency-enhanced LIO systems for resource-constrained computing platforms. Future work will focus on deploying SR-LIO++ on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and quadraped robots to enable broader applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bai, T. Xiao, Y. Chen, H. Wang, F. Zhang, and X. Gao, "Faster-lio: Lightweight tightly coupled lidar-inertial odometry using parallel sparse incremental voxels," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 4861–4868, 2022.

- [2] J. Behley and C. Stachniss, "Efficient surfel-based slam using 3d laser range data in urban environments." in *Robotics: science and systems*, vol. 2018, 2018, p. 59.
- [3] Y. Cai, W. Xu, and F. Zhang, "ikd-tree: An incremental kd tree for robotic applications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.10808*, 2021.
- [4] N. Carlevaris-Bianco, A. K. Ushani, and R. M. Eustice, "University of michigan north campus long-term vision and lidar dataset," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 35, no. 9, pp. 1023–1035, 2016.
- [5] K. Chen, R. Nemiroff, and B. T. Lopez, "Direct lidar-inertial odometry: Lightweight lio with continuous-time motion correction," in *2023 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 3983–3989.
- [6] Q. Chen, G. Li, X. Xue, and J. Pu, "Multi-lio: A lightweight multiple lidar-inertial odometry system," in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 13 748–13 754.
- [7] Z. Chen, Y. Xu, S. Yuan, and L. Xie, "ig-lio: An incremental gicp-based tightly-coupled lidar-inertial odometry," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 1883–1890, 2024.
- [8] P. Dellenbach, J.-E. Deschaud, B. Jacquet, and F. Goulette, "Ct-icp: Real-time elastic lidar odometry with loop closure," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 5580–5586.
- [9] J.-E. Deschaud, "Imls-slam: Scan-to-model matching based on 3d data," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 2480–2485.
- [10] P. Geneva, K. Eickenhoff, W. Lee, Y. Yang, and G. Huang, "Openvins: A research platform for visual-inertial estimation," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 4666–4672.
- [11] D. He, W. Xu, N. Chen, F. Kong, C. Yuan, and F. Zhang, "Point-lio: Robust high-bandwidth light detection and ranging inertial odometry," *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, vol. 5, no. 7, p. 2200459, 2023.
- [12] J. Huang, Y. Zhang, Q. Xu, S. Wu, J. Liu, G. Wang, and W. Liu, "Lalio: Robust localizability-aware lidar-inertial odometry for challenging scenes," in *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 10 145–10 152.
- [13] J. Jeong, Y. Cho, Y.-S. Shin, H. Roh, and A. Kim, "Complex urban dataset with multi-level sensors from highly diverse urban environments," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 642–657, 2019.
- [14] K. Li, M. Li, and U. D. Hanebeck, "Towards high-performance solid-state-lidar-inertial odometry and mapping," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 5167–5174, 2021.
- [15] Livox, "Lio-livox: A robust lidar-inertial odometry for livox lidar," <https://github.com/Livox-SDK/LIO-Livox>, 2021.
- [16] C. Qian, Z. Xiang, Z. Wu, and H. Sun, "Rf-lio: Removal-first tightly-coupled lidar inertial odometry in high dynamic environments," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09463*, 2022.
- [17] C. Qin, H. Ye, C. E. Pranata, J. Han, S. Zhang, and M. Liu, "Lins: A lidar-inertial state estimator for robust and efficient navigation," in *2020 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 8899–8906.
- [18] T. Qin, P. Li, and S. Shen, "Vins-mono: A robust and versatile monocular visual-inertial state estimator," *IEEE transactions on robotics*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1004–1020, 2018.
- [19] C. Qu, S. S. Shivakumar, W. Liu, and C. J. Taylor, "Lloll: Low-latency odometry for spinning lidars," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 4149–4155.
- [20] T. Shan and B. Englot, "Lego-loam: Lightweight and ground-optimized lidar odometry and mapping on variable terrain," in *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 4758–4765.
- [21] T. Shan, B. Englot, D. Meyers, W. Wang, C. Ratti, and D. Rus, "Lio-sam: Tightly-coupled lidar inertial odometry via smoothing and mapping," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 5135–5142.
- [22] H. W. Sorenson, "Kalman filtering techniques," in *Advances in control systems*. Elsevier, 1966, vol. 3, pp. 219–292.
- [23] H. Wang, C. Wang, C. Chen, and L. Xie, "F-loam : Fast lidar odometry and mapping," in *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 4390–4396.
- [24] H. Wang, C. Wang, and L. Xie, "Intensity scan context: Coding intensity and geometry relations for loop closure detection," in *2020 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 2095–2101.
- [25] —, "Lightweight 3-d localization and mapping for solid-state lidar," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1801–1807, 2021.
- [26] W. Wen, Y. Zhou, G. Zhang, S. Fahandezh-Saadi, X. Bai, W. Zhan, M. Tomizuka, and L.-T. Hsu, "Urbanloco: A full sensor suite dataset for mapping and localization in urban scenes," in *2020 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 2310–2316.
- [27] C. Wu, Y. You, Y. Yuan, X. Kong, Y. Zhang, Q. Li, and K. Zhao, "Voxelmap++: Mergeable voxel mapping method for online lidar (-inertial) odometry," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 427–434, 2023.
- [28] W. Wu and W. Wang, "Lidar inertial odometry based on indexed point and delayed removal strategy in highly dynamic environments," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 11, p. 5188, 2023.
- [29] W. Xu, Y. Cai, D. He, J. Lin, and F. Zhang, "Fast-lio2: Fast direct lidar-inertial odometry," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 2053–2073, 2022.
- [30] W. Xu and F. Zhang, "Fast-lio: A fast, robust lidar-inertial odometry package by tightly-coupled iterated kalman filter," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 3317–3324, 2021.
- [31] Z. Yan, L. Sun, T. Krajník, and Y. Ruichek, "Eu long-term dataset with multiple sensors for autonomous driving. in 2020 ieeec," in *RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 10 697–10 704.
- [32] H. Ye, Y. Chen, and M. Liu, "Tightly coupled 3d lidar inertial odometry and mapping," in *2019 international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3144–3150.
- [33] C. Yuan, W. Xu, X. Liu, X. Hong, and F. Zhang, "Efficient and probabilistic adaptive voxel mapping for accurate online lidar odometry," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 8518–8525, 2022.
- [34] Z. Yuan, J. Deng, R. Ming, F. Lang, and X. Yang, "Sr-livo: Lidar-inertial-visual odometry and mapping with sweep reconstruction," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024.
- [35] Z. Yuan, F. Lang, T. Xu, R. Ming, C. Zhao, and X. Yang, "Semi-elastic lidar-inertial odometry," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07792*, 2023.
- [36] Z. Yuan, F. Lang, T. Xu, and X. Yang, "Sr-lio: Lidar-inertial odometry with sweep reconstruction," in *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 7862–7869.
- [37] Z. Yuan, Q. Wang, K. Cheng, T. Hao, and X. Yang, "Sdv-loam: Semi-direct visual-lidar odometry and mapping," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 9, pp. 11 220–11 220, 2023.
- [38] J. Zhang and S. Singh, "Low-drift and real-time lidar odometry and mapping," *Autonomous robots*, vol. 41, pp. 401–416, 2017.
- [39] J. Zhang, S. Singh *et al.*, "Loam: Lidar odometry and mapping in real-time." in *Robotics: Science and systems*, vol. 2, no. 9. Berkeley, CA, 2014, pp. 1–9.
- [40] T. Zhang, X. Zhang, Z. Liao, X. Xia, and Y. Li, "As-lio: Spatial overlap guided adaptive sliding window lidar-inertial odometry for aggressive fov variation," in *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 10 829–10 836.