# Localization and Tracking for Cooperative Users in Multi-RIS-assisted Systems: Theoretical Analysis and Principles of Interpretations

Peng Gao, Lixiang Lian, Member, IEEE, Yuan Shen, Senior Member, IEEE

Abstract-Localization and tracking (LocTrack) are fundamental enablers for a wide range of emerging applications. Reconfigurable intelligent surfaces (RISs) have emerged as key components for enhancing the LocTrack performance. This paper investigates a multi-RIS-assisted multi-user (MRMU) LocTrack system, where multiple RISs collaboratively reflect the positionbearing signals for information fusion at the base station, leveraging spatial-temporal correlations in user positions. While studies have shown these correlations improve localization accuracy, their trade-offs with system complexity remain unclear. To address this gap, we characterize the effectiveness of spatialtemporal correlation priors (STPs) utilization in MRMU Loc-Track systems using a metric, termed efficiency of correlation (EoC). To further elucidate correlation propagation and RIS interactions, we provide a "correlation information routing" interpretation of EoC through random walk theory. EoC provides a principled performance evaluation metric, that enables system designers to balance localization accuracy enhancement against the increased complexity. Additionally, we investigate the error propagation phenomenon, analyzing its convergence and asymptotic behavior in MRMU LocTrack systems. Finally, we validate the theoretical results through extensive numerical simulations.

Index Terms—Localization and tracking, spatiotemporal correlation priors, efficiency, information coupling, error propagation.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Localization and tracking (LocTrack) have been envisioned as key capabilities for numerous emerging applications, such as integrated sensing and communication (ISAC), internet of vehicles (IoV) and so on [1]–[8]. Global navigation satellite systems (GNSS), as the default solution for outdoor Loc-Track, are difficult to function effectively for line-of-sight (LoS) obstructed area, e.g., urban area with dense buildings, underground area and indoor scenarios [9]. As a revolutionary technology, reconfigurable intelligent surfaces (RISs) can act as extra anchors and offer additional degrees of freedom (DoFs) for the electromagnetic channel by artificially shaping the traveling signals. RISs have demonstrated great potential

Yuan Shen is with the Department of Electronic Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China (email: shenyuan\_ee@tsinghua.edu.cn).

for wireless LocTrack, especially for non-line-of-sight (NLoS) scenarios [10].

In RIS-assisted localization systems, analyzing performance limits is crucial to bridge the gap between theory and practical implementation, ensuring an efficient, robust, and reliable localization system. Unlike conventional positioning systems assisted by multiple anchors, the RIS-assisted positioning systems exhibit different characteristics [10]. Firstly, the signal from the user arrives at the base station (BS) through cascaded channel via RIS, embedding the location information within the cascaded channel. Considering the impact of multipath effects, extracting meaningful location information from the cascaded channel becomes highly challenging. Secondly, highaccuracy localization systems typically require multiple anchors, which can introduce additional signaling and hardware overhead. In contrast, RISs are cost-effective and flexible to serve as virtual anchors, providing multiple DoFs while avoiding extra signal aggregation overhead. Therefore, in multi-RISassisted systems, the BS naturally receives signals aggregated from multiple RIS reflections. Third, RIS enhances the quality of position-bearing signals through optimized beamforming, improving the efficiency of position information extraction. Understanding the localization performance in multi-RISassisted systems is crucial for optimizing system design and implementation.

However, the existing literature on the multi-RIS-assisted localization systems predominantly focuses on the LocTrack problem for single user or multi-users without accounting for interactions among them [11]-[13]. In contrast, in many scenarios involving multi-user localization, the states of multiple users, such as their motion directions or speeds, often vary systematically following some predefined patterns. This leads to discernible graphical structural features among the positions of multiple users across both spatial and temporal domains, which is referred to as the spatiotemporal correlations of multi-users' positions. For example, in scenarios such as a convoy of vehicles traveling along a high-speed road, a swarm of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) flying towards a common destination to accomplish a task [14], or a group of pedestrians walking along a sidewalk [15], [16], various factors such as motion area limitations [17], traffic regulations or underlying relationships among users impose mutual restrictions on the movement states of multiple users [18], thereby revealing potential spatiotemporal correlations in their positions. Such spatiotemporal correlation priors (STPs) can be leveraged in the design of LocTrack algorithms to enhance the accuracy

The material in this paper was presented in part at the IEEE International Conference on Communications, Rome, Italy, 2023.

Peng Gao is with the School of Information Science and Technology, ShanghaiTech University, Shanghai 201210, China, and also with the State Grid Electric Power Research Institute, NariARI Group Co., Ltd., Nanjing 211106, China. (e-mail: gaopeng8@sgepri.sgcc.com.cn).

Lixiang Lian is with the School of Information Science and Technology, ShanghaiTech University, Shanghai 201210, China. (e-mail: lianlx@shanghaitech.edu.cn). (Corresponding author: Lixiang Lian).

in multi-RIS-assisted multi-user (MRMU) LocTrack systems significantly.

Some of the emerging works have incorporated the spatial [19], [20] or temporal [21]–[23] correlations of user positions into the localization process. Even though the benefits of correlation exploitation for localization accuracy have been extensively verified empirically in [24], [25], whether the improvement is worth the additional system complexities, especially in an MRMU LocTrack system, has not been considered. Moreover, these results are limited to the performance of specific localization algorithms and do not fully elucidate the fundamental relationship between the final localization performance and spatiotemporal correlations among users' positions. In MRMU LocTrack systems, the collaboration among heterogeneous devices across both spatial and temporal domains, along with the correlation priors in users' positions, plays crucial roles in performance analysis. Understanding the role of prior information in the LocTrack process, the efficiency of its utilization, and the impact of multi-RIS cooperation presents fundamental yet challenging performance insights.

In large-scale networks, statistical probability models are commonly employed to describe the spatial or temporal correlation of users' positions. For example, Gamma-Markov model was introduced in [20] to capture the spatial correlation of vehicle positions in the platoon, while Gauss-Markov model was employed in [21] to characterize the temporal correlation of user positions in successive time steps. To leverage the additional information provided by STPs, iterative information exchanges between correlation priors, RISs, and measurements collected at BS, as well as among different location states of users are necessary [21], [26], [27]. Therefore, the implementation of MRMU LocTrack algorithms entails high complexity, which necessitates the consideration of whether the performance gains obtained from the correlation priors justify the additional system complexities.

Besides the additional system complexity, when utilizing the STP for joint LocTrack in MRMU systems, the estimation processes of user positions at different spatial-temporal instances are coupled together. The estimation errors from other location states can affect the current location state estimation, thus affecting the efficiency of correlation prior utilization. This coupling is reflected in the fact that the equivalent Fisher information matrix (EFIM) of user positions is not block-diagonal but contains off-diagonal elements, making it intractable to analytically invert the matrix. The presence of these off-diagonal elements indicate the information coupling (IC) among different location states. One of the most significant IC phenomena in LocTrack systems is the error propagation (EP) in the temporal dimension, where the estimation error at one time instance can affect subsequent estimations. Understanding how error propagates across the process helps in designing more effective LocTrack algorithms to mitigate the error accumulation, and allows for better allocation of system resources to areas which have the most impact on the overall error. In existing literature, IC has been discussed under different settings. For instance, [28] and [29] examined IC in cooperative wireless sensor networks where inter-agent

communication is enabled for cooperative localization. However, the IC in their works arised from the agent cooperation, not from the spatiotemporal correlations as considered in this paper. Thus, their framework is not applicable to analyzing IC in MRMU LocTrack systems, especially concerning EP. Authors in [30] considered a single target tracking problem with a temporal correlation model and focused on EP analysis. However, their framework cannot be utilized to analyze IC in our context.

In this paper, we establish a theoretical framework for analyzing the relationship between localization performance and STP in MRMU LocTrack systems. We introduce the Efficiency of Correlation (EoC) to characterize the STP utilization efficiency, modeling the IC phenomenon and capturing the role of multiple RISs in cooperative information enhancement. Unlike the CramÃl'r-Rao Bound (CRB), which focuses solely on localization accuracy, EoC complements CRB by incorporating both accuracy and system overhead, providing an indirect measure of energy efficiency. To visualize how EoC characterizes the impact of STP and multiple RISs, we interpret it through random walk theory as "correlation information routing." We then analyze a recursive MRMU LocTrack system, examining the spatiotemporal joint evolution of EoC and the EP phenomenon. We derive the convergence conditions and points of the EFIM, demonstrating the system's robustness to sudden changes. Finally, asymptotic analysis reveals the trade-off between localization accuracy and information utilization efficiency as STPs evolve dynamically. Simulation results verify the correctness of our theoretical results. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a general spatiotemporal Markov random field (ST-MRF) to capture the dynamic motion of multiple users in both spatial and temporal domains. The statistical ST-MRF offers inherent flexibility to describe a wide range of user correlations across different applications.
- We propose to decompose the EFIM of user location and characterize the IC phenomenon in STP-assisted MRMU LocTrack systems using a metric of EoC. We provide a "correlation information routing" interpretation of EoC by introducing the random walk model (RWM) theory, which offers a new perspective to elucidate the efficiency of STP utilization and the impact of multiple RISs.
- We analyze the EP effect in MRMU LocTrack systems considering the spatiotemporal joint evolution of EoC. We characterize the EP principle, as well as its convergence behavior over time and its asymptotic behavior under three extreme cases.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the signal model, spatiotemporal prior model, and the derivation of Bayesian CRB (BCRB). Section III analyzes the IC phenomenon based on the EFIM decomposition and provides the graphical interpretation for EoC. Section IV presents the EP phenomenon, analyzing its convergence and asymptotic behavior in LocTrack systems. Finally, extensive simulation results are provided to validate the correctness of our theoretical analysis in the Section V and conclusions are



Fig. 1. Multi-RIS-assisted LocTrack system for spatiotemporal correlated users.

drawn in Section VI.

Notation: Upper case and lower case bold face letters denote matrices and vectors, respectively.  $\mathbf{A} = \text{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ stands for the diagonal matrix with vector  $\alpha$  on the diagonal and  $\alpha = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{A})$  means vector  $\alpha$  is extracted from the diagonal elements of matrix A. A = BlockDiag  $[A_1, A_2]$ stands for a block-diagonal matrix composed of matrix  $A_1$ and A<sub>2</sub>.  $[\mathbf{A}]_{i,j}$  means the (i, j)-th submatrix of  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $2 \times 2$ dimension, while  $[\alpha]_i$  means *i*-th element of vector  $\alpha$ . Re  $\{\cdot\}$ and  $Im \{\cdot\}$  stand for real part and imaginary part operator.  $\otimes$  and  $\odot$  stand for Kronecker product and Element-wise product.  $I_L$  means identity matrix with  $L \times L$  dimension.  $I_L$ means all one matrix with  $L \times L$  dimension.  $\mathbb{E}_{a}[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation operator w.r.t. the random vector  $\boldsymbol{a}$ .  $\boldsymbol{x}$   $\sim$  $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  means that  $\boldsymbol{x}$  follows a Gaussian distribution with mean  $\mu$  and covariance  $\Sigma$ .  $\mathbf{D} = \text{BlockDiag}[\{\mathbf{D}_{t,k}\}]$  stands for  $\mathbf{D} = \text{BlockDiag}[\mathbf{D}_{1,1}\cdots,\mathbf{D}_{1,K},\cdots,\mathbf{D}_{T,1},\cdots,\mathbf{D}_{T,K}].$  $\mathcal{X} \setminus a$  stands for the set  $\mathcal{X}$  excluding element  $a. X \to \infty$  means the non-zero entries of X tend to infinity.

# II. SYSTEM MODEL

Consider an MRMU LocTrack system, where K singleantenna users transmit pilot signals to BS reflected via R RISs for LocTrack, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The BS is equipped with  $N_b$  antennas, and each RIS has  $N_r$  passive elements. We consider that the direct links between BS and users are blocked by obstacles. The positions of BS and the *i*-th RIS are denoted as  $\boldsymbol{b} = [b_x, b_y]^T$  and  $\boldsymbol{r}_i = [r_{x,i}, r_{y,i}]^T$ ,  $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$ , respectively. The position of the k-th user at time step  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  is denoted as  $\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k} = [u_{x,t,k}, u_{y,t,k}]^T$ ,  $\forall k \in \mathcal{K}$ . Set  $\mathcal{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  denote the collections of RIS, user and time horizon indices, respectively. Naturally, the locations of BS and RISs are fixed and known in advance at the BS.

# A. Signal Model

We establish a general multi-RIS-assisted channel model considering the multi-path effect as in Fig. 1. Specifically, the multi-path channel from the *i*-th RIS to BS can be formulated by [31]

$$\mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i} = \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_{BR}}{1 + \kappa_{BR}}} \mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{(LoS)} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 + \kappa_{BR}}} \mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{(NLoS)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\kappa_{BR}$  denotes the multi-path factor between BS and RISs.  $\mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{(NLoS)}$  represents NLoS multi-path components between BS and the *i*-th RIS, in which the entries can be modeled as i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian distribution [31]. The matrix  $\mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{(LoS)}$  denotes the LoS path between BS and the *i*-th RIS, which can be expressed as [32]

$$\mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{\left(LoS\right)} = \rho_{i}^{BR} \boldsymbol{a}_{B} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i}^{BR}\right) \boldsymbol{a}_{R}^{H} \left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{i}^{BR}\right),$$

where  $\theta_i^{BR}$ ,  $\varphi_i^{BR}$  and  $\rho_i^{BR}$  denote AoA, angle-of-departure (AoD) and channel gain from the *i*-th RIS to BS, respectively.  $a_B(\cdot)$  and  $a_R(\cdot)$  denote steering vectors of BS and RIS. Similarly, the multi-path channel from the *k*-th user to the *i*-th RIS can be formulated as

$$oldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k} = \sqrt{rac{\kappa_{RU}}{1+\kappa_{RU}}}oldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k}^{(LoS)} + \sqrt{rac{1}{1+\kappa_{RU}}}oldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k}^{(NLoS)},$$

where  $\kappa_{RU}$  denotes the multi-path factor between RISs and users. The NLoS component  $\boldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k}^{(NLoS)}$  can also be modeled as i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian distribution. LoS component can be expressed as  $\boldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k}^{(LoS)} = \rho_{t,i,k}^{RU} \boldsymbol{a}_R\left(\theta_{t,i,k}^{RU}\right)$  with channel gain  $\rho_{t,i,k}^{RU}$  and AoA  $\theta_{t,i,k}^{RU}$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{h}_{t,k}$  denote cascaded uplink channel between BS and the k-th user reflected via R RISs at time t, which can be formulated as

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{t,k} = \sum_{i=1}^{R} \mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{t,i} \boldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k}, \qquad (2)$$

where  $\Omega_{t,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_r}} \operatorname{diag} \left( e^{j\omega_{t,i,1}}, \ldots, e^{j\omega_{t,i,N_r}} \right) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \operatorname{diag} \left( \omega_{t,i} \right)$ represents the phase control matrix of the *i*-th RIS corresponding to time *t*. The user location-related parameters  $\rho_{t,i,k}^{RU}$  and  $\theta_{t,i,k}^{RU}$  can be calculated from the geometrical relations between RIS and user as follows:

$$\theta_{t,i,k}^{RU} = \arccos\left(\left(u_{x,t,k} - r_{x,i}\right) / \left\|\boldsymbol{r}_{i} - \boldsymbol{u}_{t,k}\right\|\right), \\ \rho_{t,i,k}^{RU} = \left(\left\|\boldsymbol{r}_{i} - \boldsymbol{u}_{t,k}\right\|\right)^{-\alpha/2},$$
(3)

where  $\alpha$  is path loss exponent.

Denote P pilot symbols transmitted by each user of time t as  $\boldsymbol{x}_{t,k} = [\boldsymbol{x}_{t,k}^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_{t,k}^P]^T$  with  $\text{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{t,k}\boldsymbol{x}_{t,k}^H\right) = 1$ . Assume user location  $\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k}$  and NLoS channel are unchanged during the time interval of P pilots, the received signal at BS at time step t can be written as

$$\mathbf{Y}_{t} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \boldsymbol{h}_{t,k} \boldsymbol{x}_{t,k}^{T} + \boldsymbol{N}_{t} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \bar{\boldsymbol{h}}_{t,k} \boldsymbol{x}_{t,k}^{T} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{N}}_{t}, \quad (4)$$

where the entries of noise matrix  $N_t$  are i.i.d. distributed, following a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance  $\sigma_t^2$ .  $\bar{h}_{t,k}$  denotes the direct link channel, given by

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{h}}_{t,k} = \sum_{i=1}^{R} \rho_{t,i,k} \boldsymbol{a}_{B} \left( \theta_{i}^{BR} \right) \boldsymbol{a}_{R}^{H} \left( \varphi_{i}^{BR} \right) \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{t,i} \boldsymbol{a}_{R} \left( \theta_{t,i,k}^{RU} \right),$$

with  $\rho_{t,i,k} = \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_{BR}\kappa_{RU}}{(1+\kappa_{BR})(1+\kappa_{RU})}} \rho_i^{BR} \rho_{t,i,k}^{RU}$ .  $\tilde{N}_t$  is multi-path interference-plus-noise matrix, given by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{N}}_{t} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{R} \left( \xi \mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{(NLoS)} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{t,i} \boldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k}^{(NLoS)} + \xi_{BR} \mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{(LoS)} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{t,i} \boldsymbol{h}_{RU,t,i,k}^{(NLoS)} \right)$$

 $+\xi_{RU}\mathbf{H}_{BR,t,i}^{(NLoS)}\mathbf{\Omega}_{t,i}\mathbf{h}_{RU,t,i,k}^{(LoS)}\right)\mathbf{x}_{t,k}^{T}+\mathbf{N}_{t},$ where  $\xi = \sqrt{\frac{1}{(1+\kappa_{BR})(1+\kappa_{RU})}}$ ,  $\xi_{BR} = \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_{BR}}{(1+\kappa_{BR})(1+\kappa_{RU})}}$ and  $\xi_{RU} = \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_{RU}}{(1+\kappa_{BR})(1+\kappa_{RU})}}$ . Note that entries of  $\tilde{N}_{t}$  also follow zero mean complex Gaussian distribution due to the Rician channel assumption. To extract the observation signals corresponding to each user, we assume the pilot sequences of different users are orthogonal, i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}_{t,k}^{H}\mathbf{x}_{t,k'} = 0, k \neq k', \forall k, k' \in \mathcal{K}$ . When the pilot sequence length exceeds the number of users involved in LocTrack, i.e.,  $P \geq K$ , such orthogonal pilot design becomes straightforward. Therefore, the measurement corresponding to user k is given by

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{t\,k} = \bar{\boldsymbol{h}}_{t,k} + \bar{\boldsymbol{n}}_{t,k}.\tag{5}$$

The goal of MRMU LocTrack is to joint estimate  $\{u_{t,k}\}$  from  $\{y_{t,k}\}$  exploiting the spatiotemporal correlations among users' positions.

To assess the impact of STP on LocTrack performance, we first consider a batch system, which performs smoothing by utilizing both past and future time steps for position estimation. We analyze this with EFIM decomposition for EoC derivation and its graphical interpretation in Section III. Then, we focus on a recursive system, which performs filtering by relying solely on past time steps for position estimation. We analyze the recursive representation of EFIM and the EP phenomenon in Section IV.

## B. Statistical Spatiotemporal Correlation Model

In various sensing applications, multi-user LocTrack performance can be improved by exploiting the correlations among users' positions across spatial and temporal domain. We propose to adopt the MRF [33] model to characterize the spatiotemporal correlations among users' positions u = $[\boldsymbol{u}_1^T, \cdots, \boldsymbol{u}_T^T]^T$ , where  $\boldsymbol{u}_t = [\boldsymbol{u}_{t,1}^T, \cdots, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,K}^T]^T$ . The MRF is a factored probability function specified by an undirected graph (V, E), where V stands for the variable nodes and E specifies the correlation network. If  $(i, j) \in E$ , which means there is direct connection between node i and node j, and node i, j are correlated with each other. Here we assume the graph is undirected, which means if  $(i, j) \in E$ , we have  $(i, i) \in E$ . The joint probability over the random variables in MRF can be factorized as the product of local potential functions  $\phi$  at each node and interaction potentials  $\psi$  defined on neighborhood cliques. A widely adopted MRF model is the pairwise MRF [33], where the cliques are restricted to pairs of nodes. We adopt the pairwise MRF to model the STP of u, called spatiotemporal-MRF (ST-MRF), given by

$$p(\boldsymbol{u}) = p(\boldsymbol{u}_{1}) \prod_{t=2}^{T} p(\boldsymbol{u}_{t} | \boldsymbol{u}_{t-1})$$

$$= \prod_{k=1}^{K} \phi(\boldsymbol{u}_{1,k}) \prod_{(i,j) \in E} \varphi(\boldsymbol{u}_{1,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{1,j})$$

$$\times \prod_{t=2}^{T} \prod_{k=1}^{K} p(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k} | \boldsymbol{u}_{t-1,k}) \prod_{(i,j) \in E} \varphi(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}). \quad (6)$$



Fig. 2. An illustration of ST-MRF priors with K = 5 users.

In (6), the temporal correlations are captured by the transition probability  $p(u_{t,k} | u_{t-1,k})$ , which is designed to follow a Gaussian distribution [21], [33]–[35], i.e.,

$$p(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k} \mid \boldsymbol{u}_{t-1,k}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}_{t-1,k}, \boldsymbol{Q}_{t,k}), \quad (7)$$

where  $Q_{t,k}$  denotes the covariance matrix of uncertainty in the position update at time t. The local potential functions  $\phi(u_{1,k})$  at the first time step are usually set to be Gaussian [36], [37]. The spatial correlations are modeled by pairwise potential functions  $\varphi(u_{t,i}, u_{t,j})$ , which are typically designed as the function of inter-user distances [38]–[41], i.e.,  $\varphi(u_{t,i}, u_{t,j}) = p(d_{ij}^t)$ , with  $d_{ij}^t = ||u_{t,i} - u_{t,j}||$ .

As shown in Fig. 2, we provide a toy example of ST-MRF priors in a LocTrack system for K = 5 users. For example, position of user 1 exhibits correlations not only with its spatially neighboring users 2, 4 and 5, but also with its own state from last time step t - 1. The position of user 5 demonstrates varying spatial correlations in different time steps. For example, it is correlated with users 2, 3, and 4 in time step t - 1, and with users 1, 2, 3, and 4 in time step t. Therefore, the proposed statistical ST-MRF exhibits flexibility in accommodating a wide range of spatial and temporal correlations. In the following, we provide two typical probability models for the pairwise potential function  $\varphi$  in (6) that have been widely adopted in localization works [38]–[41] in different scenarios.

• Pedestrian surveillance: For the pedestrian surveillance problem [38], [39], where several groups of pedestrians or sportsmen walk together in a monitored area, positions of each group exhibits significant inter-correlation. In this case, the potential functions  $\varphi(u_{t,i}, u_{t,j})$  in (6) is given by the square of  $l_2$ -norm priors in a exponential function, i.e.,

$$\varphi\left(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}\right) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(d_{ij}^t\right)^2}{2\sigma_{t,ij}^2}\right),$$
 (8)

where  $\sigma_{t,ij}^2$  is the variance of inter-user distance. Note that the factor  $\frac{1}{2}$  in the exponential term is used to eliminate duplicate multiplication for edge  $(i, j) \in E$  in (6).

• Communities with few distant users: For most of multiuser LocTrack problem, the interaction potential functions can be modeled as a quadratic prior as in (8). However, the  $l_2$ -norm priors can limit the penalty computed for users who are far from the community members, particularly in large sensor networks [40], [41]. To improve the system robustness,  $l_1$ -norm priors can be exploited, i.e.,

$$\varphi\left(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}\right) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d_{ij}^{t}}{2\sigma_{t,ij}^{2}}\right).$$
 (9)

## C. Bayesian Cramer-Rao Bound

Based on the received signal model in (5) and the STP in (6), we can obtain the position error bound of each user at each time step in terms of Bayesian CRB (BCRB), which is a theoretical lower bound of position mean square error (MSE). Denote the unknown parameters in a multi-RIS assisted multi-user LocTrack system as  $\eta = [u^T, \xi^T]^T$ , where u denotes the collection of users' positions,  $\xi$  denotes the nuisance parameters associated with RIS-reflected channels, observation noise, etc. Then the lower bound of position MSE for the unbiased estimator  $\hat{u}$  of u is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\left[\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}-\boldsymbol{u}\right)\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}-\boldsymbol{u}\right)^{T}\right] \succeq \left[\mathbf{J}_{e}(\boldsymbol{u})\right]^{-1}, \quad (10)$$

where  $J_e$  is the EFIM of u with respect to  $\eta$ . Then the BCRB of K users' positions of all time steps is defined as

$$B \triangleq \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left[\mathbf{J}_{e}(\boldsymbol{u})\right]^{-1}\right),$$
 (11)

To characterize the LocTrack performance of each user, we define the BCRB of user k at time t as

$$B_{t,k} \triangleq \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left[\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k})\right]^{-1}\right),$$
 (12)

where  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}$  is the EFIM of  $u_{t,k}$  with respect to  $\eta$ .  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}$  contains all necessary information from measurements and STP for  $u_{t,k}$ , and can be obtained from  $\mathbf{J}_e$  through  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}^{-1} = [\mathbf{J}_e^{-1}]_{(t-1)K+k,(t-1)K+k}$ . In the following, we give the detailed expression of  $\mathbf{J}_e$ .

**Lemma 1** (EFIM of Users' Positions). The EFIM  $\mathbf{J}_e \in \mathbb{R}^{2TK \times 2TK}$  in (11) includes complete positional information of K users for T time steps which can be equivalently expressed as

$$\mathbf{J}_e(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_D + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_P, \tag{13}$$

where  $\Lambda_D$  is a block-diagonal EFIM with  $2 \times 2$  sized blocks derived from the observations  $\boldsymbol{y} = [\boldsymbol{y}_{1,1}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1,2}, \dots, \boldsymbol{y}_{T,K}]$ , and  $\Lambda_P$  is a non-block-diagonal FIM derived from the ST-MRF priors  $p(\boldsymbol{u})$ .  $\Lambda_P$  can be further divided into two submatrices, *i.e.*,

$$\Lambda_P = \Lambda_{PS} + \Lambda_{PT},$$

where  $\Lambda_{PS}$  denotes the FIM from the spatial priors and  $\Lambda_{PT}$  denotes the FIM from the temporal priors.

In particular,  $\Lambda_D$  can be calculated by

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D} = \mathbf{T}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \left( \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{T} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) \mathbf{T}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{T}, \qquad (14)$$

where  $\mathbf{T}_{u}$ ,  $\Lambda_{\theta}$ ,  $\Lambda_{\xi\theta}$  and  $\Lambda_{\xi}$  are given in Appendix A. For a general STP in (6),  $\Lambda_{PS}$  and  $\Lambda_{PT}$  are given in (49) and (51). For  $\forall i \in \{1, ..., TK\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{i} = \{1, ..., TK\} \setminus i$ , we have: (1)  $\Lambda_{PS}$  is a symmetric and block-diagonal FIM with  $K \times K$  sized blocks, satisfying

$$[\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}]_{i,i} = -\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} [\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}]_{i,j} = -\sum_{j \in \{(i,j) \in E\}} [\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}]_{i,j}.$$

(2)  $\Lambda_{PT}$  is a symmetric and tridiagonal block FIM with  $K \times K$  sized blocks, satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT} \end{bmatrix}_{i,i} = -\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT} \end{bmatrix}_{i,j}$$
$$= -\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT} \end{bmatrix}_{i,i+K} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT} \end{bmatrix}_{i,i-K}, \quad (15)$$

with  $[\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT}]_{i,j} = \mathbf{0}$ , if j < 0 or j > K.

Proof: See Appendix A.

As shown in (11), the lower bound of position MSE requires the inverse of the EFIM  $\mathbf{J}_e(\mathbf{u})$ , which can be decomposed into the sum of two FIM matrices.  $\Lambda_D$  represents positional information extracted from observations  $\{y_{k,t}\}$ , embedded within the aggregated reflected signals from multiple RISs. On one hand, leveraging the spatial degrees of freedom provided by multiple RISs, the aggregation of RIS-reflected signals at the BS enhances positional information. On the other hand, the passive beamforming capability of RISs further improves the quality of positional information within each reflected signal. Therefore, in LocTrack systems, the deployment of multiple RISs can effectively enhance information utilization efficiency. Since the BS can observe each user independently, the off-diagonal elements in  $\Lambda_D$  are zero.  $\Lambda_P$  stands for positional information extracted from the STP. Due to spatial and temporal correlations in the location priors,  $\Lambda_P$  does not exhibit a block-diagonal structure with respect to each position state  $u_{t,k}, \forall t, k$ . The off-diagonal elements in  $\Lambda_P$ introduce IC, potentially affecting the efficiency of correlation exploitation. In Section III, we quantify the effectiveness of STP utilization in MRMU LocTrack systems using the EoC metric, which mathematically models the IC effect.

# III. INFORMATION COUPLING ANALYSIS AND EOC INTERPRETATIONS

Due to the non-diagonal structure of EFIM, there exists IC between different location states. To analyze this IC phenomenon, we present a decomposition of EFIM inspired by previous work [28], through which, we introduce an important metric, i.e., EoC, to quantify the effectiveness of leveraging prior information. Following the similar approach to [28], we propose a graphic interpretation of EoC based on the theory of random walks.

# A. EFIM Decomposition for EoC Derivation

Based on Lemma 1, the EFIM in (13) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{J}_{e}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{PS}^{D} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{PT}^{D} - \mathbf{A} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$$
$$= \mathbf{D} \left( \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \right).$$
(16)

 $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_D + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^D + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT}^D$  is a block-diagonal matrix, where each block has dimensions of 2 × 2, corresponding to each position state  $\mathbf{u}_{t,k}$ ,  $\forall t, k$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{D} = \text{BlockDiag}[\{\mathbf{D}_{t,k}\}],$  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_D = \text{BlockDiag}[\{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t,k}\}], \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^D = \text{BlockDiag}[\{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t,k}^D\}]$  and  $\Lambda_{PT}^{D}$  = BlockDiag[{ $\Lambda_{PT,t,k}^{D}$ }], respectively.  $\Lambda_{PS}^{D}$  and  $\Lambda_{PT}^{D}$  correspond to matrices that extract diagonal blocks, each of size 2 × 2, from matrices  $\Lambda_{PS}$  and  $\Lambda_{PT}$ , respectively. Matrix **A** corresponds to the off-diagonal blocks of  $\Lambda_{PS}$  and  $\Lambda_{PT}$ . The expressions of  $\Lambda_{D,t,k}, \Lambda_{PS,t,k}^{D}, \Lambda_{PT,t,k}^{D}$  and **A** can be found in the Appendix A straightforwardly.

Intuitively, in the ST-MRF model, if we view the neighboring states that are connected to the current state  $u_{t,k}$  as weak anchors, these weak anchors along with the multiple-RISs provide positional information for  $u_{t,k}$ . However, due to the positional uncertainties of neighboring states, the information provided by weak anchors becomes degraded. This is the IC phenomenon. We may have

$$\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k}) = \mathbf{D}_{t,k} \mathbf{E}_{t,k} \preceq \mathbf{D}_{t,k}.$$
 (17)

 $\mathbf{D}_{t,k}$  can be interpreted as the nominal position information (NPI) of  $u_{t,k}$  when IC is ignored and all neighboring states are considered as anchors with perfectly known positions. The NPI  $\mathbf{D}_{t,k}$  contains three parts of information: information from measurements at BS originated from the aggregation of multiple RIS-reflected signals, i.e.,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t,k}$ , information from spatial domain neighbors, i.e.,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{DS,t,k}^D$ , and information from temporal domain neighbors, i.e.,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{DT,t,k}^D$ . Etak characterizes how efficiently position state  $u_{t,k}$  utilizes positional information from neighboring states. From (16),  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$  depends on  $\mathbf{A}$ . In the following, we introduce a lemma inspired by Taylor's expansion to give a detailed expression for  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$ .

**Lemma 2** (Decomposition of EFIM ). If the inverse of  $J_e$  exists, the EFIM  $J_{e,t,k}$  for  $u_{t,k}$  can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k}) = \mathbf{D}_{t,k} \left( \mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t,k} \right)^{-1}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\Delta_{t,k} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [\mathbf{P}^n]_{\gamma,\gamma} \succeq \mathbf{0}$  with transition matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  given by

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{R} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

 $\gamma = (t-1)K + k$ , **Q** and **R** are given by  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{2TK \times 2TK}$  and  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \left[ \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,1,1}^T, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,1,2}^T \cdots, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,T,K}^T \right]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2TK \times 2}$ , respectively.

#### *Proof:* See Appendix B.

From the decomposition of EFIM in (18), the EoC for estimating  $u_{t,k}$  can be determined by

$$\mathbf{E}_{t,k} = \left(\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t,k}\right)^{-1},\tag{20}$$

which characterizes the efficiency of correlation prior exploitation. Since  $\Delta_{t,k}$  is non-negative, we have

$$\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{E}_{t,k} \preceq \mathbf{I},$$

which means that the IC can decrease the information gained at state  $u_{t,k}$ , thereby impairing localization performance and inefficiently consuming system resources in acquiring redundant information. In particular, when the overall information derived from multiple RIS-reflected measurements and neighboring states is perfectly utilized at BS for localization without positional uncertainties, it results in  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}$ , leading to  $\Delta_{t,k} =$  $\mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k} = \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k} = \mathbf{D}_{t,k}$ . This indicates that there is no IC among location states, with each neighboring state serving as a perfect anchor, thereby achieving full EoC. Conversely, when the spatial or temporal prior information provided by neighboring states exhibits high positional uncertainties, we may have a smaller  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$ , indicating high IC and poor EoC.

# B. Graphical Interpretation for EoC

The EoC  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$  in (20) depends on STP model (6), configurations of multiple RISs and parameters of the Loc-Track systems. To reveal the relationship between EoC and model/system parameters, we adopt RWM to parse EoC and provide a graphical interpretation of EoC, depicting the correlation information routing between different states. In particular, for matrix P given in (19), it can be observed that  $\mathbf{P}\tilde{\mathbf{I}} = \tilde{\mathbf{I}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{I}} = [\mathbf{I}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{I}_2]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(2TK+2)\times 2}$ . While P does not rigorously satisfy the properties of a probability measure, by treating P as a pseudo-transition probability matrix (PTPM) of a random walk with matrixvalued probabilities  $[\mathbf{P}]_{i,j}$ ,  $1 \leq i,j \leq 2TK + 2$ , we can obtain an elegant interpretation of EoC adopting the classical random walk theory. Denote  $\mathcal{N} = \{(t, k) : t \in \mathcal{T}; k \in \mathcal{K}\}$ as the collection of location states at spatiotemporal domain.  $\mathcal{B} = \{(t,k) : t = T+1; k = 1\}$  represents the multi-RISenhanced state of the BS, which is primarily determined by the aggregation of information from multiple RISs. We have the following proposition.

**Proposition 1** (RWM of EoC [28]). Considering a Markov Chain, which consists of a state space  $S = N \cup B$  together with a family of random variables  $X_0, X_1, X_2, \cdots$  with values in S, the term  $\Delta_{t,k}$  can be expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t,k} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(X_n = (t,k) | X_0 = (t,k)\right), \qquad (21)$$

where  $\mathbb{P}(X_n = (t', k')|X_0 = (t, k))$  is the *n*-step PTPM of the Markov chain with the following one-step PTPM:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n}=(t',k')|X_{n-1}=(t,k)\right)=\left[\mathbf{P}\right]_{(t-1)*K+k,(t'-1)*K+k'}$$

$$=\begin{cases}
-\mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1}\mathbf{\Xi}_{k,k'}^{t} & (t',k')\in\mathcal{N}_{(t,k)}^{S}, (t,k)\notin\mathcal{B}, \\
\mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t',k} & t'=t-1, k'=k, t\in\mathcal{T}\backslash 1, \\
\mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t'-1,k} & t'=t+1; k'=k, t\in\mathcal{T}\backslash T, \\
\mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,t,k} & (t',k')\in\mathcal{B}, (t,k)\notin\mathcal{B}, \\
\mathbf{I}_{2} & (t',k')\in\mathcal{B}, (t,k)\in\mathcal{B}, \\
\mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}$$
(22)

where  $\mathcal{N}_{(t,k)}^S = \{(t',k') : t' = t; k' \neq k, \varphi(\mathbf{u}_{t,k},\mathbf{u}_{t,k'}) \neq 0\}$ denotes the spatial neighbors of node (t,k). The n-step PTPM can be calculated by

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = (t', k') | X_0 = (t, k))$$
  
=  $\sum_{(i,j) \in S} \mathbb{P}(X_n = (t', k') | X_{n-1} = (i, j))$   
×  $\mathbb{P}(X_{n-1} = (i, j) | X_0 = (t, k)).$ 

By the RWM,  $\Delta_{t,k}$  can be expressed as

$$\Delta_{t,k} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [\mathbf{P}^n]_{(t-1)*K+k,(t-1)*K+k},$$
(23)

which can be interpreted as the sum of n-step return probabilities from state (t, k) to itself, where  $n = 1, 2, \ldots, \infty$ ,  $(t,k) \in S$ . Based on the starting state and the destination state, the transition probability presents different forms. Specifically, multi-RIS-enhanced BS state corresponds to the absorbing state of the random walk since the probability of staying at the state representing the BS is 1. The location states can transition between their spatial and temporal neighbors. However, once a transition to the BS state occurs, the process will remain at the BS state indefinitely. To facilitate understanding, we here provide a toy example of RWM interpretation of  $\Delta_{t,k}$ with K = 3 users in T = 2 time steps. In this case, the PTPM matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  takes the form as shown in (24), which can be interpreted by the random walk graph in Fig. 3. Note that the value beside each edge represents the corresponding pseudotransition probability from one state to another.

With the above RWM understanding of EoC, based on the random walk theory in [42], we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2** (Correlation Information Routing). For the location  $u_{t,k}$ , its EoC  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$  can be written as

$$\mathbf{E}_{t,k} = \left(\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t,k}\right)^{-1} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F}_{t,k},\tag{25}$$

where  $\mathbf{F}_{t,k} = \mathbb{P}(X_n = (t,k), \exists n \ge 0 | X_0 = (t,k))$  stands for pseudo-hitting probability [43] of state (t,k).

If a network only consists of users with unknown locations without the assistance of multiple RISs and BS, the corresponding RWM is recurrent, i.e.,  $\mathbf{F}_{t,k} = \mathbf{I}, \forall t, k$ . It implies if there are RISs-BS links that are capable of reflecting, receiving and processing the location-bearing measurements to effectively extract the location information, the random walk starting from the state (t, k) in  $\mathcal{N}$  would always reach the state in  $\{(t, k) \cup \mathcal{B}\}$  at least once. The pseudo-hitting probability  $\mathbf{F}_{t,k}$  thus satisfies

$$\mathbf{F}_{t,k} + \mathbf{F}_{t,k\to\mathcal{B}} = \mathbf{I},\tag{26}$$

where  $\mathbf{F}_{t,k\to\mathcal{B}}$  denotes the pseudo-probability that random walk starting from (t,k) would reach the BS node within finite time. Combining (25) and (26), we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{t,k} = \left(\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t,k}\right)^{-1} = \mathbf{F}_{t,k \to \mathcal{B}},\tag{27}$$

and

$$\mathbf{D}_{t,k} = \mathbf{D}_{t,k}\mathbf{F}_{t,k} + \underbrace{\mathbf{D}_{t,k}\mathbf{F}_{t,k\to\mathcal{B}}}_{\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}}.$$
(28)

Therefore, EoC can be interpreted as the efficiency of correlational position information routing. Specifically, as shown in (28), the NPI  $\mathbf{D}_{t,k}$  can be divided into two parts: information loss  $\mathbf{D}_{t,k}\mathbf{F}_{t,k}$  caused by IC and effective information  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k} = \mathbf{D}_{t,k}\mathbf{F}_{t,k\to\mathcal{B}}$  coming from the effective position information routing. In the graph interpretation, the probability of information loss  $\mathbf{F}_{t,k}$  can be viewed as the information routing starting from node (t, k) and returning to itself, which is represented by red and blue lines in Fig. 3. While the probability of effective information  $\mathbf{F}_{t,k\to\mathcal{B}}$  can be seen as the information routing starting from node (t, k) and returning to multi-RIS-enhanced BS node, which is represented by purple lines. Due to the absence of location priors at the user nodes, the information routing among user nodes fails to provide effective location information. In contract, the BS node, which aggregates signals reflected by multiple virtual anchors, i.e., RISs, can facilitate the localization process by providing effective location information.

## C. Factors Affecting EoC

There are primarily two factors that play dominant roles in EoC: STP priors and measurement model. Consider a simplified scenario with K = 2 users over T = 2 time steps. Assume the spatial correlation priors are given as  $\varphi(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(d_{ij}^t)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)$ , and the covariance matrix for temporal transitions is given as  $\boldsymbol{Q}_{t,k} = \sigma_t^2 \mathbf{I}$  in the ST-MRF  $p(\boldsymbol{u})$ . From the definition of EoC in (20), EoC  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$  can be written as

$$\mathbf{E}_{t,k} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & -\Theta_{1,1}^{s} & -\Theta_{1,1}^{t} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\Theta_{1,2}^{s} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & -\Theta_{1,2}^{t} \\ -\Theta_{2,1}^{t} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & -\Theta_{2,1}^{s} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\Theta_{2,2}^{t} & -\Theta_{2,2}^{s} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}_{\gamma,\gamma}^{-1}^{-1},$$

with  $\gamma = (t-1)K + k$ ,  $\mathbf{D}_{t,k} = \sigma_n^{-2} \bar{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{D,t,k} + (\sigma_s^{-2} + \sigma_t^{-2})\mathbf{I}$  for  $t, k \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $\Theta_{t,k}^{S} = \sigma_s^{-2} \mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1}$  for set  $S = \{s, t, n\}$ , where  $\bar{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{D,t,k}$  represents the EFIM that scales  $\sigma_n^{-2}$  to yield  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t,k}$ . Meanwhile, based on (19), we can obtain the expression of PTPM, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P} = \left[egin{array}{cccccccc} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Theta}_{1,1}^s & \mathbf{\Theta}_{1,1}^t & \mathbf{0} & & \mathbf{\Theta}_{1,1}^n ar{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{D,1,1} & \ \mathbf{\Theta}_{2,1}^s & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Theta}_{1,2}^t & \ \mathbf{\Theta}_{2,1}^n ar{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{D,1,2} & \ \mathbf{\Theta}_{2,1}^n & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Theta}_{2,1}^s & \ \mathbf{\Theta}_{1,1}^n ar{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{D,2,1} & \ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Theta}_{2,2}^t & \mathbf{\Theta}_{2,2}^s & \mathbf{0} & & \ \mathbf{\Theta}_{1,1}^n ar{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{D,2,2} & \ \mathbf{0} & & \mathbf{0} & & \mathbf{I} \end{array}
ight]$$

From the expression of EoC, four primary parameters affect EoC: SNR of the measurements  $\sigma^{-2}$ , configurations of multiple RISs  $\bar{\Lambda}_{D,t,k}$ , the degree of spatial correlation  $\sigma_s^{-2}$  and the degree of temporal correlation  $\sigma_t^{-2}$ . Given the complexity of the expression, it is hard to directly derive the relationships between EoC and these influencing factors. In Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, we numerically illustrate their relationships with  $\sum_{t,k} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{E}_{t,k})/2TK$ , which is used as an indication of EoC value. For comparison, we also present the results of the commonly used estimation error metric, the BCRB, in Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6.

Impact of SNR: It shows that EoC increases as SNR increases. When the information obtained from measurements predominates, the impact of IC is mitigated, thereby enhancing the overall efficiency. From the perspective of random walk interpretation, D<sup>-1</sup><sub>t,k</sub> decreases as SNR increases, leading to smaller transition probabilities between different location states N and larger transition probability between location state N and BS node B. This suggests a reduction in the positional information flow between location states, with a corresponding increase in the information directed toward the BS node. Consequently, this results in the provision of more effective location

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{D}_{1,1}^{-1} \Xi_{1,2}^{1} & -\mathbf{D}_{1,1}^{-1} \Xi_{1,3}^{1} & \mathbf{D}_{1,1}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1,1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & | \mathbf{D}_{1,1}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,1,1} \\ -\mathbf{D}_{1,2}^{-1} \Xi_{1,2}^{1} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{D}_{1,2}^{-1} \Xi_{2,3}^{1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{1,2}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1,2} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{1,2}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,1,2} \\ -\mathbf{D}_{1,3}^{-1} \Xi_{1,3}^{1} & -\mathbf{D}_{1,3}^{-1} \Xi_{2,3}^{1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{1,3}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1,3} & \mathbf{D}_{1,3}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,1,3} \\ \mathbf{D}_{2,1}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1,1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{D}_{2,1}^{-1} \Xi_{1,2}^{2} & -\mathbf{D}_{2,1}^{-1} \Xi_{1,3}^{2} & \mathbf{D}_{2,1}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,2,1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{2,2}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1,2} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{D}_{2,2}^{-1} \Xi_{1,2}^{2} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{D}_{2,2}^{-1} \Xi_{2,3}^{2} & \mathbf{D}_{2,1}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,2,2} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{2,3}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1,3} & -\mathbf{D}_{2,3}^{-1} \Xi_{1,3}^{2} & -\mathbf{D}_{2,3}^{-1} \Xi_{2,3}^{2} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{2,3}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,2,2} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$



Fig. 3. Graph interpretation for EoC with K = 3 users in T = 2 time steps.

information. Meanwhile, an increase in SNR implies higher quality of information provided by measurements, thereby leading to a reduction in the BCRB.

• Configurations of multiple RISs: The impact of RIS is primarily twofold: the number of RISs R and their passive beamforming matrices  $\Omega$ . First, the number of RISs determines the spatial degrees of freedom for localization. More RISs provide greater spatial freedom, enabling the extraction of more position-related information from the aggregated observations at the BS. Second, RISs enhance signal quality at the BS through passive beamforming, improving the SNR of position-bearing signals. Together, these factors increase the effectiveness of position information extraction. From a random walk perspective, as the number of RISs increases and their beamforming capabilities improve, the information flow between location states  $\mathcal{N}$  decreases, while the flow towards effective BS nodes increases, thereby enhancing both information utilization efficiency and localization accuracy. As illustrated in Fig. 6, increasing the number of RISs, particularly when the total number is small, substantially improves both localization accuracy and system efficiency. Furthermore, designing the passive



Fig. 4. EoC and BCRB performance versus SNR for different spatial correlation variances.

beamforming of RISs by aligning them toward users significantly improves performance compared to the case without beamforming design.

• Impact of correlation priors: It shows that EoC increases as degree of correlation reduces. Given the quality of measurements, while strong correlations may provide additional information that results in lower estimation error for the current location state, such strong correlations can also lead to an increased reliance on adjacent position states, whose positions possess positional uncertainties. Consequently, this results in more pronounced IC, thereby reducing the efficiency of information utilization. From the perspective of random walk interpretation, high  $\sigma_s^{-2}$ (or  $\sigma_t^{-2}$ ) will improve the pseudo probability  $\sigma_s^{-2} D_{t,k}^{-1}$ (or  $\sigma_t^{-2} D_{t,k}^{-1}$ ) and decrease  $D_{t,k}^{-1} \Lambda_{D,t,k}$ . This causes most information being trapped between location states, hindering effective transmission to the BS node and reducing information efficiency.

Therefore, the impact of different parameters on BCRB and EoC is different, revealing a trade-off or synergistic relationships between these two performance metrics. Achieving a balanced consideration of both aspects in system design is crucial for enhancing the localization accuracy and optimizing resource utilization efficiency.

*Remark* 1 (How to use EoC for practical design). From the above example, it's evident that although estimation error metrics, such as BCRB, are widely used in ISAC as sensing indicators, they primarily focus on positioning accuracy and neglect the issue of information utilization efficiency



Fig. 5. EoC and BCRB performance versus SNR for different temporal correlation variances.



Fig. 6. EoC and BCRB performance versus the number of RISs for different passive beamforming designs. Blue line stands for random passive beamforming at multiple RISs. Red line stands for aligning the beams of RISs toward the users.

while improving the accuracy. Low EoC indicates that the performance improvement achieved per unit of resource consumption is minor, thus operating the system at low EoC is highly uneconomical. Therefore, a wise transmission scheme for LocTrack system is to jointly consider the BCRB and EoC simultaneously, instead of minimizing BCRB as only one criteria. For example, in the MRMU LocTrack systems, we can design the transmission scheme, such as transmission beamforming vectors, passive beamforming vectors at multiple RISs, by solving the following EoC constrained optimization problem:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} BCRB(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{u})$$
  
s.t.  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{u}) \succeq \mathbf{E}_{th},$  (29)  
 $|\boldsymbol{\omega}|_i = 1,$ 

where  $\omega$  denotes the transmission variables.  $\mathbf{E}_{th}$  is the EoC threshold determined by the performance requirements of the system and the availability of system resources.

# IV. ERROR PROPAGATION ANALYSIS AND ASYMPTOTIC DISCUSSION IN A RECURSIVE LOCTRACK SYSTEM

In this section, we focus on analyzing the EP phenomenon induced by the IC in a recursive LocTrack system. First, we will present the recursive expression of the EFIM. After this, we will examine the convergence and asymptotic behavior of EP. In this section, all quantities derived under recursive systems will be marked with a tilde (e.g.,  $\tilde{J}_{e,t}$ ) to distinguish them from those derived under the batch systems.

#### A. Recursive Expression of EFIM

In a recursive tracking system, at time t, we aim to estimate  $u_t = \{u_{k,t}\}_{k=1}^K$  based on the measurements received up to the current time  $\{y_{\tau}\}_{\tau=1}^t$ , where  $y_{\tau} = [y_{\tau,1}^T, \cdots, y_{\tau,K}^T]^T$ . Therefore, the EFIM for the current location  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}(u_t)$  (simplified as  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t})$  can be expressed as a recursive update of the previous EFIM  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}(u_{t-1})$  (simplified as  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}$ ), integrating the additional information provided by the current time. In the following, we first present the recursive expression of the EFIM  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$ , and then analyze its convergence behaviors, including convergence condition and convergence point. Let  $\Lambda_{PS,t}^o$  denote the off-diagonal blocks of  $-\Lambda_{PS,t}$  in (49). Denoting  $\Lambda_{D,t} = \text{BlockDiag}[\Lambda_{D,t,1}, \cdots, \Lambda_{D,t,K}]$ ,  $\Lambda_{PS,t}^D = \text{BlockDiag}[\Lambda_{PS,t,1}^D, \cdots, \Lambda_{PS,t,K}^D]$  and  $\Gamma_t = \text{BlockDiag}[\Gamma_{t,1}, \cdots, \Gamma_{t,K}]$  with  $\Gamma_{t,k}$  given in (52), respectively, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3** (Recursive Expression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$ ). The EFIM  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$  of  $u_t$  can be written as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t} = \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_t \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t, \tag{30}$$

where the NPI  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_t$  of  $u_t$  is given by

$$\mathbf{D}_t = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^D + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1}$$

with  $\Gamma_0 = 0$ . The EoC  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t$  is a function of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t} = \mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t}^{-1} \left[ \underbrace{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^{o}}_{\text{Spatial IC}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{G}_{t-1}:\text{Temporal IC}} \right].$$
(31)

Proof: See Appendix C.

Similar to the batch system, the EFIM  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$  in a recursive system can be decomposed into product form with NPI  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_t$  and EoC  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t$ . NPI  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_t$  consists of three components: information from measurements  $\Lambda_{D,t}$ , information from spatial neighbors  $\Lambda_{PS,t}^D$ , and information from previous temporal neighbors  $\Gamma_{t-1}$ , under the assumption that no IC is presented. Notably, in comparison to the NPI in the batch system, it can be shown that  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_t \preceq \mathbf{D}_t$ , as the recursive system only captures temporal information from the previous time step, rather than future time steps, leading to less available temporal information.

The EoC  $\mathbf{E}_t$  satisfies the condition  $\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{E}_t \preceq \mathbf{I}$ . Both spatial IC and temporal IC can affect the efficiency. When the information provided by the previous time is perfect, i.e.,  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t-1} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\mathbf{G}_{t-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ , and the information from the

spatial neighbors is also perfect, i.e.,  $\Lambda_{PS,t}^{o} \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$ . This indicates no IC is present and full EoC is achieved. Note that  $\mathbf{G}_{t-1}$  in (31) quantifies the information loss induced by the IC in the temporal domain. Specifically, the location estimation error at the previous time can influence the current estimation, and the impact of this error can propagate over time. Such EP phenomenon can potentially jeopardize the overall localization performance. Therefore, it is crucial to understand the stability of the EP in LocTrack systems, as well as to examine the factors that influence it. Through theoretical analysis, it is demonstrated that the well-conditioned input information from measurements and appropriate STP prior can mitigate the EP phenomenon.

**Lemma 4** (Convergence condition of recursive systems). *The NPI from current time t satisfies the following condition:* 

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^{D} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1}}_{\text{NPI:}\mathbf{\tilde{D}}_{t}} \succeq \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1} + \underbrace{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^{o}}_{\text{Spatial IC}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1} \left( \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1}}_{\text{Temporal IC:}\mathbf{G}_{t-1}},$$
(32)

then EP phenomenon can be eliminated as time goes up, i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t} \succeq \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}$ .

*Proof:* This Lemma can be obtained by rearranging terms straightforwardly.

The convergence condition in (32) means that EFIM obtained by NPI at current time should be able to compensate the spatiotemporal IC, i.e.,  $\Lambda_{PS,t}^o + \mathbf{G}_{t-1}$ , to guarantee a decreased LocTrack error. Therefore, to ensure a converged LocTrack performance, high-quality NPI, proper STP prior, or effective measurement policy is important for practical algorithm designs. In most cases, system inputs can be considered to be stationary over time. Assume that  $\Lambda_{D,t} + \Lambda_{PS,t}^D - \Lambda_{PS,t}^o$  and  $\Gamma_{t-1}$  in (32) remain constant over time, and are denoted as M and T, respectively. Then, the convergence condition (32) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{M} \succeq \left( \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}^{-1} \mathbf{T} \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}^{-1} + \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}^{-1} \right)^{-1} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_t.$$
(33)

The right hand side (RHS) can be interpreted as the temporal information loss in the LocTrack due to the uncertainty in the previous location estimate and the uncertainty in temporal position transition. As shown in (33), the RHS increases with  $\mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1}$ , which guarantees that  $\mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t}$  can converge to a stationary point, i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t} \to \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e}^{\star}$ . In particular, at the beginning of the LocTrack, there is very limited prior information, resulting in a very small  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t}$  and consequently a high localization error. Smaller  $J_{e,t}$  produces a reduced RHS, making it easier to satisfy condition (33) and thus resulting in an increased  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t+1}$ and a decreased localization error. Therefore, as long as (33) is satisfied,  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$  will continue to increase. When  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$  reaches a level where the RHS of (33) exceeds the LHS, the convergence condition will be violated and  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t+1}$  will be smaller than  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t}$ . This decrease in  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t+1}$  reduces the RHS, making the condition (33) to be satisfied in the next time step. Consequently, the LocTrack process converges to a stationary point, at which



Fig. 7. Illustration of convergence condition and convergence point.

the LHS and RHS of (33) are exactly balanced, as illustrated in Fig. 7. The stationary point  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e}^{\star}$  will be given in the following corollary.

**Corollary 1** (Convergence point of recursive systems). In a sufficient long time,  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$  will converge to a stationary point  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e}^{\star}$ , which is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e}^{\star} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{T}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathbf{I} + 4\mathbf{T}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{T}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{T}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{T}^{-1}\right)^{-1}.$$
(34)

Proof: See Appendix D.

From (34), the convergence point is jointly determined by the measurements and STPs. Hence, carefully designing the LocTrack system based on (34) is important to guarantee a low tracking error.

*Remark* 2 (Robustness in the LocTrack system). We have discussed the convergence behaviors of LocTrack systems with the constant system inputs. However, the signal interference or hardware fault can induce an unexpectable input and damage the estimation accuracy dramatically. It is interesting that LocTrack system exhibits great robustness towards the sudden failure. Suppose there is a tracking failure at the time  $\tilde{t}$ , which leads to a small  $\tilde{J}_{e,\tilde{t}}$ . Similar to the initial stage of LocTrack, small  $\tilde{J}_{e,\tilde{t}}$  makes (33) easily to be satisfied. The LocTrack system enters into the next steady-state cycle and reaches the steady state eventually.

# B. Recursive Expression of EFIM for Each User

Following similar approach, we can derive the recursive form of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$ .

**Lemma 5** (Recursive Expression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$ ). The EFIM of the k-th user's position  $\mathbf{u}_{t,k}$  can be calculated by  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} = \left[\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}\right]_{k,k}^{-1}$ , which is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} = \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k},\tag{35}$$

where the NPI  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k}$  is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t,k} + \mathbf{\Xi}_{k,k}^t + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,k}.$$
(36)

The EoC  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k}$  is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} = \left[\mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^{o} + \mathbf{G}_{t-1}\right)\right)_{\gamma,\gamma}^{n}\right]^{-1}, \quad (37)$$

where  $\gamma = (t-1)K + k$ .

*Proof:* Similar to the proof of Lemma 2, which is omitted here.

Due to the complex expression of  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$ , it is difficult to analyze the convergence behavior of  $\mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t,k}$  directly. In the next subsection, we will examine the convergence behavior of  $\mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t,k}$ in three typical asymptotic LocTrack scenarios.

### C. Asymptotic Discussion

In practical LocTrack systems, the asymptotic performance provides baselines to balance the performance gain and the IC in EP, and helps us to demonstrate the impact of system parameters on EP behavior. To simplify the analysis, we assume the spatiotemporal EFIM matrices are in the extreme conditions, i.e.,  $\Lambda_{PS,t} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \rightarrow 0/\infty$  or  $\Gamma_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Gamma^{Asy} \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that when  $\Gamma^{Asy} \rightarrow 0$ , the EFIM reduces to a simple case with only spatial correlations, for which the analysis can be referenced in [44].

1) Impact of Small Spatial Correlation  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to 0$ : Based on (36) and (37), when  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to 0$ , we can simplify  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k}$  as

$$\lim_{\substack{\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \mathbf{0} \\ \lim_{\substack{\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{D}_{t,k} \\ P > \mathbf{0} \\ = \mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k}^{-1} \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,k} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1,k} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,k} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,k}}_{\text{Temporal IC}}.$$
 (38)

Then we can obtain the convergence condition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} \succeq \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1,k}$  as follows:

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t,k} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1,k} \succeq \mathbf{J}_{e,t-1,k} \\ - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1,k} (\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1,k} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1,k})^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1,k}. \end{split}$$
(40)

The convergence state is given by

$$\lim_{t \to \infty, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^{Asy} \to \mathbf{0}} \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}_{k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{I} + 4\mathbf{T}_{k}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{M}_{k}^{-1} \mathbf{T}_{k}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \mathbf{T}_{k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}_{k}^{-1}\right)^{-1},$$
(41)

where  $\mathbf{T}_k$  and  $\mathbf{M}_k$  are the (k, k)-th block submatrices of  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1}$  and  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t}$  under constant input assumptions.

*Remark* 3. When the spatial correlation  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy}$  goes to zero, the positions of users are uncorrelated with each other. The analysis of localization performance can be decoupled across users. Only temporal correlation can impact the LocTrack efficiency and EP performance.

2) Impact of High Spatial Correlation  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ : Based on (36) and (37), when  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ , we can find that  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k} \to \infty$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} \to \mathbf{0}$  by the following Lemma.

**Lemma 6** (Asymptotic  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k}$  when  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ ). When the spatial correlation  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy}$  tends to infinity, we have

$$\lim_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^{Asy}\to\infty}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} = \left[\mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t}^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^{o}\right)_{\gamma,\gamma}^{n}\right]^{-1} \to \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof: See Appendix E.

To obtain the convergence condition of EP in this scenario and derive the convergence point of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$  when  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ , we have the following equivalent expression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$ .

**Lemma 7** (Equivalent expression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$  when  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ ). When the spatial correlation  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy}$  tends to infinity, the EFIM  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$  is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty} \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{s}^{t} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s}$$

$$- \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1,k} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s},$$
(42)

where  $\Gamma_{t-1,s}$  and  $\Lambda_s^t$  are given by  $\Gamma_{t-1,s} = \sum_k \Gamma_{t-1,k}$  and  $\Lambda_s^t = \sum_k \Lambda_{D,t,k}$ , respectively.

Based on above lemma, the EP convergence condition can be formulated as

$$egin{aligned} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t,s} + oldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s} \succeq \mathbf{J}_{e,t-1,k} \ & - oldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s} (\mathbf{ ilde{J}}_{e,t-1,k} + oldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s})^{-1} oldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1,s}. \end{aligned}$$

Compared with (40), it shows that the spatial correlation is beneficial for EP convergence, since when strong special correlation is present, the convergence condition of EP is more easily satisfied, facilitating the mitigation of EP. Denoting  $\mathbf{M}_s = \sum_k \mathbf{M}_k$  and  $\mathbf{T}_s = \sum_k \mathbf{T}_k$  where  $\mathbf{M}_k$  and  $\mathbf{T}_k$  are the (k, k)-th block submatrices of  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,t}$  and  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{t-1}$ , respectively, under constant input assumptions, the convergence point can be given by

$$\lim_{t \to \infty, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^{Asy} \to \mathbf{\omega}} \widetilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}_{s}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{I} + 4\mathbf{T}_{s}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{M}_{s}^{-1} \mathbf{T}_{s}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \mathbf{T}_{s}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}_{s}^{-1}\right)^{-1}.$$
(43)

*Remark* 4. With strong spatial correlations, multiple users become transparent to each other, allowing positional information obtained from measurements and temporal correlations to be superimposed effectively across users, thereby enhancing the overall localization accuracy. As spatial correlation approaches infinity, the IC between users also tends to infinity. The position error of one user can directly affect the position estimation of the neighboring users. From the perspective of RWM, the flow of positional information among users forms a closed loop, leading to limited effective information flow to the BS. Consequently, the EoC approaches zero.

3) Impact of High Temporal Correlation  $\Gamma^{Asy} \to \infty$ : Finally, we examine the asymptotic limits when the temporal correlation is at the high level. When  $\Gamma^{Asy} \to \infty$ , we have  $\lim_{\Gamma_{t-1}\to\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k} \to \infty$  based on (36) and  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} \to \mathbf{0}$  by the following Lemma.

**Lemma 8** (Asymptotic  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k}$  when  $\Gamma^{Asy} \to \infty$ ). When the temporal correlation  $\Gamma^{Asy}$  tends to infinity, we have

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{Asy}\to\infty}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} = \left[\mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_t^{-1}\mathbf{G}_{t-1}\right)_{\gamma,\gamma}^n\right]^{-1} \to \mathbf{0}$$

*Proof:* This proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 6 which is omitted here.

To obtain the convergence condition of EP in this scenario and derive the convergence point of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$  when  $\Gamma^{Asy} \to \infty$ , we have the following equivalent expression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$ .

**Lemma 9** (Equivalent expression of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$  when  $\Gamma^{Asy} \to \infty$ ). When the temporal correlation  $\Gamma^{Asy}$  tends to infinity, the EFIM  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$  is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\Gamma^{Asy}\to\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} = \sum_{\tau=1}^{t} \left( \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,\tau,k} + \mathbf{\Xi}_{k,k}^{\tau} \right) \\ \times \left[ \mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \mathbf{\tilde{D}}_{t}^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,\tau}^{o} \right)_{\gamma,\gamma}^{n} \right]^{-1}.$$
(44)

Proof: See Appendix G.

When system inputs are stable over time,  $\Lambda_{D,t,k}$ ,  $\Xi_{k,k}^{t}$  and  $\Lambda_{PS,\tau}^{o}$  in (44) are constant. Denoting  $\Lambda_{D,t,k} + \Xi_{k,k}^{t} = \mathbf{M}_{k}$ and  $\left[\mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t}^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t} \Lambda_{PS,\tau}^{o}\right)_{\gamma,\gamma}^{n}\right]^{-1} = \mathbf{C}_{k}$ , the convergence condition  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} \succeq \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1,k}$  becomes

$$t\mathbf{M}_{k} \succeq \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1,k} + t\mathbf{M}_{k} \left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{C}_{k}\right).$$
(45)

Since  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1,k} = (t-1)\mathbf{M}_k\mathbf{C}_k$ , convergence condition in (45) is automatically satisfied. Consequently, the EFIM  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k}$  will go to infinity and BCRB will converge to zero when the time step t goes to infinity.

*Remark* 5. With strong temporal correlation, each user accumulates positional information from observations and spatial correlations at each time step. When the accumulated information approaches infinity, the localization error tends toward zero. As temporal correlation goes to infinity, this indicates that the IC across time also tends to infinity. The position error of previous time slot can directly affect the position estimation of the current time, leading to strong positional information flow over time with limited effective information flow to the BS. Consequently, the EoC approaches zero.

#### V. SIMULATION RESULTS

#### A. System Setting

In this section, we present the simulation results to verify theoretical conclusions obtained in this paper. Consider K = 3 users in the R = 4 RIS-assisted LocTrack system with spatiotemporal correlations. The temporal correlations for each user are captured by Gaussian distribution as in



Fig. 8. The movement trajectories of 3 users over 40 time steps.

(7) with  $\sigma_{t,k}^{-2} = \sigma_{tem}^{-2} = 10, t \in [1, T - 1], k \in \mathcal{K}$ . We consider pairwise spatial correlations, where the inter-user distance are captured by Gaussian distribution as in (8) with  $\sigma_{t,ij}^{-2} = \sigma_{spa}^{-2} = 10, t \in \mathcal{T}, i, j \in \mathcal{K}, i \neq j$ . The other system settings are listed as follows: antenna numbers  $N_B = 64$ ,  $N_r = 32$ , carriers frequency  $f_c = 28$  GHz, noise variance  $\sigma_t^{-2} = 1, t \in \mathcal{T}$ , transmit power 10 dBm, LoS path loss factor  $\alpha = -2.08$  and multi-path factor  $\kappa_{BR} = \kappa_{RU} = 20$  dB [21]. Positions of BS and R = 4 RISs are located at  $b = [0,0]^T$  m and  $r_i = [80, 25 + 5i]^T$  m,  $\forall i \in \mathcal{R}$ . Positions of users at the initial time step t = 1 are located at  $u_{1,1} = [100, 10]^T$  m,  $u_{1,2} = [110, 10]^T$  m and  $u_{1,3} = [105, 10 + 5\sqrt{3}]^T$  m, respectively, which randomly move from the initial positions following the predefined spatiotemporal correlation model. One set of typical users' trajectories is shown in Fig. 8. All simulation results are the averages of 2000 Mont-Carlos experiments.

#### B. Convergence Behavior of EP

We then investigate the convergence behaviors of averaged EoC, i.e.,  $\frac{1}{2K} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t)$  in (31), and root of BCRB, i.e.,  $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2K}} \operatorname{Tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}^{-1})$  in (30) under different levels of temporal correlations in a recursive LocTrack system. The theoretical value of converged BCRB can be calculated as  $BCRB^{\star} =$  $\frac{1}{2K} \operatorname{Tr}\left[ (\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e}^{\star})^{-1} \right]$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e}^{\star}$  is given in (34). As shown in Fig. 9, the trends of BCRB align well with the theoretical predictions (dash lines), and the converged values match the theoretical results. Furthermore, a comparison across different correlation levels reveals that strong correlation enhances the BCRB performance. However, the resulting strong IC may hinder efficient information utilization, leading to lower EoC. Therefore, there is a trade-off performance between BCRB and EoC. Additionally, the level of correlation influences the convergence speed of both the EoC and the BCRB. Specifically, higher correlation levels decelerate the convergence of these performance metrics.

To test the robustness, we simulate an abrupt change by reducing the SNR to -10 dB at time step 21, restoring at time step 23. The results show that the LocTrack system



Fig. 9. EP converge behaviors under different levels of temporal correlations.

is resilient to abrupt changes, exhibiting strong robustness, particular under scenarios with strong correlation priors.

# C. Asymptotic Behavior of EP

Finally, we investigate the asymptotic behaviors of averaged EoC, i.e.,  $\frac{1}{2K} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t)$  in (31), and root of BCRB, i.e.,  $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2K} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}^{-1})}$  in (30) under four asymptotic scenarios. We set  $\sigma_{spa}^{-2} = 1\text{e-3}$ ,  $\sigma_{spa}^{-2} = 1\text{e3}$ ,  $\sigma_{tem}^{-2} = 1\text{e-3}$  and  $\sigma_{tem}^{-2} = 1\text{e3}$  to represent the cases of  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Gamma^{Asy} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  and  $\Gamma^{Asy} \rightarrow \infty$ , respectively. As illustrated in Fig. 10, when the spatial correlation is extremely high, such that the interuser position uncertainties vanish, the strong coupling between users leads to rapid propagation of measurement information among users, thereby significantly reducing the EoC to zero. Instead, the transparency among users allows the positional information to be shared and accumulated, thereby enhancing the LocTrack accuracy. When the spatial correlation is negligible such that multiple users can be considered uncorrelated in spatial domain, only temporal IC contributes to the EoC, resulting in a higher EoC. The lack of spatial priors degrades LocTrack accuracy compared to strong spatial correlations.

As shown in Fig. 11, when the temporal correlation tends to infinity such that the position transitions over time becomes deterministic, spatial IC can propagate over time transparently, leading to a zero EoC. Conversely, this temporal transparency allows the positional information to accumulate over time. As time goes to infinity, the BCRB asymptotically approaches zero with log-linear convergence rate. When temporal correlation is weak such that users are uncorrelated over time, only current spatial correlation can affect the EoC, resulting in a higher and steady EoC over time. In this case, less positional information can be obtained, leading to reduced LocTrack accuracy.

# VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we establish a theoretical foundation for analyzing the fundamental relationships between localization performance and STP among users' positions in a multi-RIS assisted multi-user localization and tracking system. We first



Fig. 10. Asymptotic EP behaviors in  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \rightarrow \infty$ . Solid lines are derived from (31) and (30). Dash lines represent the theoretical convergence points of BCRB calculated by (41) (zero spatial correlation), (34) (general spatial correlation) and (43) (infinite spatial correlation). The small circles represent the asymptotic EoC and BCRB values derived from the theoretical analysis.



Fig. 11. Asymptotic EP behaviors in  $\Gamma^{Asy} \to \mathbf{0}$  and  $\Gamma^{Asy} \to \infty$  with T = 1000. Solid lines are derived from (31) and (30).

propose a novel metric EoC by decomposing the EFIM, which indicates the efficiency of information utilization in LocTrack system. Then we analyze the IC phenomenon in a batch LocTrack system and provide a graph interpretation of EoC by RWM theory to reveal the correlational position information routing. We also analyze the EP phenomenon in a recursive LocTrack system and characterize its convergence behaviors and asymptotic behaviors based on EoC metric to unveil the EP principle. Simulation results are provided to verify the correctness of our proposed theoretical foundations.

#### APPENDIX

# A. Proof of Lemma 1

Consider a mapping from  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  to another parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = [\boldsymbol{\theta}^T, \boldsymbol{\xi}^T]^T$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \left[\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1,1}^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t,k}^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{T,K}^T\right]^T$  with

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t,k}^{T} = [\theta_{1,1,1}^{RU}, \rho_{1,1,1}^{RU}, \dots, \theta_{R,t,k}^{RU}, \rho_{R,t,k}^{RU}]^{T}.$$
 (46)

The FIM of  $\eta$  can be calculated as

$$\mathbf{J}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{T}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{T} & \mathbf{T}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{T} \\ \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{T}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{T} & \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{P} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Using the Schur's complement for parameter  $\theta$ , we have  $\mathbf{J}_e = \mathbf{T}_u \left( \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\theta} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\xi\theta}^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\xi}^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\xi\theta} \right) \mathbf{T}_u^T + \mathbf{\Lambda}_P \triangleq \mathbf{\Lambda}_D + \mathbf{\Lambda}_P$ . The submatrices in (47) are given as follows. The Jacobian matrix for the transformation from u to  $\theta$  is given by  $\mathbf{T}_u = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \theta_u}$ , which is a block diagonal matrix.  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\theta} = -\mathbb{E}_{y,\eta} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 \ln p(y|\eta)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ln p(y|\eta)}{\partial \xi \partial \xi^T} \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\xi\theta} = -\mathbb{E}_{y,\eta} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 \ln p(y|\eta)}{\partial \xi \partial \theta^T} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ln p(y|\eta)}{\partial \xi \partial \theta^T} \end{bmatrix}$ , which are also block-diagonal matrices calculated through received signal model in (5). Therefore,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_D$  in (14) is also a block-diagonal matrix.

Since prior  $p(\boldsymbol{u})$  in (6) is in log-linear form, by  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{P} = -\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \left[ \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \boldsymbol{u} \partial \boldsymbol{u}^{T}} \ln p(\boldsymbol{u}) \right]$ , we have

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{P}^{1,1} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{P}^{1,2} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{\Lambda}_{P}^{2,1} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{P}^{2,2} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{P}^{2,3} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{P}^{T,T} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

with  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{P}^{i,j} = -\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \left[ \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{i} \partial \boldsymbol{u}_{j}^{T}} \ln p(\boldsymbol{u}) \right]$ . Due to the Markovian property of  $p(\boldsymbol{u})$  in temporal domain, we have  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{p}^{i,j} = 0, |i - j| \geq 2$ . For any continuous and differentiable functions of distance  $f(d_{t}^{i,j})$  and  $g(d_{t-1,t}^{i})$ , where  $d_{t}^{i,j} = \|\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i} - \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}\|$  and  $d_{t-1,t}^{i} = \|\boldsymbol{u}_{t-1,i} - \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\|, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{K}$ , we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 f(d_t^{i,j})}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}} = \frac{\partial^2 f(d_t^{i,j})}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}}, \frac{\partial^2 g(d_{t-1,t}^i)}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t-1,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}} = \frac{\partial^2 g(d_{t-1,t}^i)}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t-1,i}}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(d_t^{i,j})}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}} = -\frac{\partial^2 f(d_t^{i,j})}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}}, \frac{\partial^2 g(d_{t-1,t}^i)}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}} = -\frac{\partial^2 g(d_{t-1,t}^i)}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t-1,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}}$$

Since the pairwise potential functions  $\varphi(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j})$  and temporal transition probability function  $p(\boldsymbol{u}_{t+1,k}|\boldsymbol{u}_{t,k})$  in (7) can be written as functions of inter-position distances, they both satisfy the above properties. Therefore,  $\Lambda_P$  in (48) has the following properties:

•  $\Lambda_P = \Lambda_{PS} + \Lambda_{PT}$ .

•  $\Lambda_{PS} = \text{BlockDiag} \left[ \Lambda_{PS,1}, \dots, \Lambda_{PS,T} \right]$  with

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Xi}_{1,1}^t & \cdots & \mathbf{\Xi}_{1,K}^t \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{\Xi}_{K,1}^t & \cdots & \mathbf{\Xi}_{K,K}^t \end{bmatrix}, \quad (49)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{i,j}^{t} = \begin{cases} \frac{-2\partial^{2}}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}^{T}} \ln \varphi(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}) & (i,j) \in E, \\ \frac{-2\partial^{2}}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}^{T}} \sum_{i,j} \ln \varphi(\boldsymbol{u}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{u}_{t,j}) & i = j, \\ \boldsymbol{0} & (i,j) \notin E, \end{cases}$$
(50)

Therefore, we have  $[\Lambda_{PS}]_{i,i} = -\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} [\Lambda_{PS}]_{i,j}$ . •  $\Lambda_{PT}$  has the following form:

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{PT} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1} & -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} \\ -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1} & \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{1} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{2} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{T-1} & \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{T-1} \end{bmatrix},$$
(51)

where  $\Gamma_t = \text{BlockDiag}[\Gamma_{t,1}, \cdots, \Gamma_{t,K}]$  is a blockdiagonal matrix with

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t,k} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t,k} \partial \boldsymbol{u}_{t+1,k}^T} \ln p(\boldsymbol{u}_{t+1,k} | \boldsymbol{u}_{t,k}).$$
(52)

Therefore, we have  $[\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT}]_{i,i} = -\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} [\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT}]_{i,j} = -[\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT}]_{i,i-K} - [\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT}]_{i,i+K}$ , with  $[\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PT}]_{i,j} = \mathbf{0}$ , if j < 0 or j > K.

# B. Proof of Lemma 2

Taking matrix inverse for both sides of (16), we have  $\mathbf{J}_e^{-1} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{D}^{-1}$ . Denoting  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ , and expanding  $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q})^{-1}$  using power series, the inverse of EFIM can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{J}_e^{-1} = \left(\mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{Q}^n\right) \mathbf{D}^{-1},$$

which converges as long as  $\mathbf{J}_e^{-1}$  exists. Hence,

$$\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}^{-1} = \left[\mathbf{J}_{e}^{-1}\right]_{\gamma,\gamma} = \left(\mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\mathbf{Q}^{n}\right]_{\gamma,\gamma}\right) \mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1}.$$
 (53)

with  $\gamma = (t-1)K + k$  for brevity. Taking the inverse, we have

$$\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k} = \mathbf{D}_{t,k} \left( \mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ \mathbf{Q}^n \right]_{\gamma,\gamma} \right)^{-1}.$$
 (54)

To facilitate the RWM interpretation, we augment  $\mathbf{Q}$  to generate a transition matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  as defined in (19). Then we have  $[\mathbf{P}^n]_{\gamma,\gamma} = [\mathbf{Q}^n]_{\gamma,\gamma}$ . Combined with (54), we can get (18). Note that  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k}$  is a real symmetric matrix with  $\mathbf{J}_{e,t,k} \preceq \mathbf{D}_{t,k}$ , which implies  $\Delta_{t,k} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ . Then the proof is completed.

# C. Proof of Lemma 3

The EFIM of  $\boldsymbol{u}^{(t)} = \{\boldsymbol{u}_{\tau}\}_{\tau=1}^{t}$  is given by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e}^{(t)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\widetilde{J}}_{e}^{(t-1)} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots \\ -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \cdots & -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\widetilde{D}}_{t} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^{o} \end{bmatrix}$$

Based on the Schur's complement operation, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t} = \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_t - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^o - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1}.$$

Then we can derive (31) readily.

## D. Proof of Convergence Point in Corollary 1

The limits point in (34) can be obtained by solving equality  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t} = \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1}$ ,

$$\mathbf{M} = \left( \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1}^{-1} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1}^{-1} + \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1}^{-1} \right)^{-1}.$$
 (55)

Define the limit point of  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t}$  is  $\mathbf{X}$ , (55) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{T} - \mathbf{T} \left( \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{T} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{X}.$$
 (56)

This is a typical Recitati equation that hard to solve. One particular solution can be obtain by

$$\mathbf{X}^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbf{I} + 4\mathbf{T}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{T}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{T}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}^{-1}.$$
 (57)

It can be verified by substituting (57) into (56) easily.

## E. Proof of Lemma 6

The asymptotic expression of  $\mathbf{E}_{t,k}$  can be obtained by the fact of temporal IC  $\mathbf{G}_{t-1} \preceq \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \preceq \infty$ , due to  $\mathbf{G}_{t-1} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \left( \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \preceq \min \left\{ \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1}, \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,t-1} \right\}$  derived from matrix inverse lemma. Then we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} \rightarrow \left[ \mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t}^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS,t}^{o} \right)_{\gamma,\gamma}^{n} \right]^{-1}$$

when  $\Lambda_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ . Recall the RWM theory and the graph interpretation in Fig. 3,  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k}$  at time step t can be equivalent to K users random walk without any temporal correlations. Thus the PTPM based on (22) among spatial correlated users is  $-\mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1} \Xi_{k,j}^t$  with  $\sum_{j \in E} \mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1} \Xi_{k,j}^t = \mathbf{I}$  where  $(i, j) \in E$ , while the PTPM between BS and itself is  $\mathbf{D}_{t,k}^{-1} \Lambda_{D,t,k} \to \mathbf{0}$ since  $\mathbf{D}_{t,k} \to \infty$ . It implies information trapped into spatial users, resulting  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} \to \mathbf{0}$ .

# F. Proof of Lemma 7

Let us focus on the first time step in tracking system,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,1} = - egin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_1 & \mathbf{\Xi}_{1,2} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{\Xi}_{1,2} & \mathbf{S}_2 & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \ dots & \ddots & \ddots & \mathbf{\Xi}_{K-1,K} \ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Xi}_{K-1,K} & \mathbf{S}_K \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_k = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,k} + \mathbf{\Xi}_{k,k}$  and time index here is omitted for brevity. As  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ , we can obtain  $\mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{e,1,K}$  by Schur's complement similar as proof of Lemma C, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,K} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,K} + \left( \mathbf{\Xi}_{K-1,K}^{-1} + \left( \left[ \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,1} \right]_{1:K-1,1:K-1} \right)^{-1} \right)^{-1} \right)^{-1}$$
$$\stackrel{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S} \to \infty}{=} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,K} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,K-1} + \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,1} \mid_{k=1}^{K-1},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,1} |_{k=1}^{K-1}$  represents removing *K*-th user from  $\widetilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,1}$ . Then repeat the above operation, we have property that  $\lim_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^{Asy}\to\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,1,K} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{D,1,k}$ . Similar results can be extended to any user. Note that by the above property, as  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{PS}^{Asy} \to \infty$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,1,K}$  tends to identity matrix, and hence we can obtain the equality in the Lemma for any time slot. Therefore, we complete the proof.

## G. Proof of Lemma 9

Based on (32), we have the following fact

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1}\to\infty} \left(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} - \mathbf{G}_{t-1}\right) = \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1},$$

indicating previous EFIM of K users can be perfectly transferred into the current time under strong temporal correlations. Rearrange the block-diagonal submatrix as below

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{t-1} \to \boldsymbol{\infty}} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,t,k} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,k}^{t} + \left[ \check{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t-1} \right]_{k,k}$$
$$= \sum_{\tau=1}^{t} \left( \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{D,\tau,k} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,k}^{\tau} \right), \qquad (58)$$

then the EoC-like matrix can be rewritten as  $\lim_{\Gamma_{t-1}\to\infty} \check{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k} = \left[\mathbf{I} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{t}^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t} \Lambda_{PS,\tau}^{o}\right)_{\gamma,\gamma}^{n}\right]^{-1}$ with an equivalent EFIM expression, i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{e,t,k} = \check{\mathbf{D}}_{t,k} \check{\mathbf{E}}_{t,k}$ .

#### REFERENCES

- X. Zhu, J. Liu, L. Lu, T. Zhang, T. Qiu, C. Wang, and Y. Liu, "Enabling intelligent connectivity: A survey of secure ISAC in 6G networks," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, 2024.
- [2] X. Cheng, D. Duan, S. Gao, and L. Yang, "Integrated sensing and communications (ISAC) for vehicular communication networks (VCN)," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 23, pp. 23 441–23 451, 2022.
- [3] Z. Yu, X. Hu, C. Liu, M. Peng, and C. Zhong, "Location sensing and beamforming design for IRS-enabled multi-user ISAC systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 5178–5193, 2022.
- [4] A. Caillot, S. Ouerghi, P. Vasseur, R. Boutteau, and Y. Dupuis, "Survey on cooperative perception in an automotive context," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 14204–14223, 2022.
- [5] H. Chen, M. F. Keskin, A. Sakhnini, N. Decarli, S. Pollin, D. Dardari, and H. Wymeersch, "6G localization and sensing in the near field: Features, opportunities, and challenges," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, 2024.
- [6] R. C. Shit, S. Sharma, D. Puthal, P. James, B. Pradhan, A. v. Moorsel, A. Y. Zomaya, and R. Ranjan, "Ubiquitous localization (ubiloc): A survey and taxonomy on device free localization for smart world," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 3532–3564, 2019.
- [7] C. Laoudias, A. Moreira, S. Kim, S. Lee, L. Wirola, and C. Fischione, "A survey of enabling technologies for network localization, tracking, and navigation," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 3607– 3644, 2018.
- [8] A. Umer, I. Muursepp, M. M. Alam, and H. Wymeersch, "Reconfigurable intelligent surfaces in 6G radio localization: A survey of recent developments, opportunities, and challenges," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, pp. 1–1, 2025.
- [9] Y. Shen and M. Z. Win, "Fundamental Limits of Wideband Localization- Part I: A General Framework," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 4956–4980, 2010.
- [10] E. Basar, G. C. Alexandropoulos, Y. Liu, Q. Wu, S. Jin, C. Yuen, O. A. Dobre, and R. Schober, "Reconfigurable intelligent surfaces for 6G: Emerging hardware architectures, applications, and open challenges," *IEEE Veh. Technol. Mag.*, 2024.
- [11] J. Zhao, Z. Bai, S. Guo, D. Ma, N. Li, and K. S. Kwak, "RIS enabled SCLAM: An approach for simultaneous radio communication, localization, and mapping," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, pp. 1–1, 2025.
- [12] M. Chen, R. Zeng, Z. Zhang, and H. Wang, "Multiple-RIS-aided vibrio foraging optimization positioning algorithm under internet of vehicles environment," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Veh.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 2390–2398, 2024.
- [13] G. Wu, H. Chen, X. Zhao, H. Liu, and J. You, "Accuracy estimation of multi-riss assisted positioning in indoor UWB system," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [14] P. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Zheng, and X. Wang, "Efficient DOA estimation method for reconfigurable intelligent surfaces aided UAV swarm," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 743–755, 2022.
- [15] D. Shi, S. Zhang, J. Wang, and Y. Gong, "Detection and association based multi-target tracking in surveillance video," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Multimedia Big Data.* IEEE, 2015, pp. 377–382.
- [16] L. Kratz and K. Nishino, "Tracking pedestrians using local spatiotemporal motion patterns in extremely crowded scenes," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 987–1002, 2011.
- [17] Y. Yoon, C. Kim, H. Lee, D. Seo, and K. Yi, "Spatio-temporal corridorbased motion planning of lane change maneuver for autonomous driving in multi-vehicle traffic," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 10, pp. 13 163–13 183, 2024.
- [18] M. Wu and X. Peng, "Motion constraint Markov network model for multi-target tracking," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Audio Lang. Image Process.* (*ICALIP*). IEEE, 2008, pp. 981–987.
- [19] T. Shlomo and B. Rafaely, "Blind localization of early room reflections using phase aligned spatial correlation," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 69, pp. 1213–1225, 2021.
- [20] A. Liu, L. Lian, V. Lau, G. Liu, and M.-J. Zhao, "Cloud-assisted cooperative localization for vehicle platoons: A Turbo approach," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 68, pp. 605–620, 2020.

- [21] B. Teng, X. Yuan, R. Wang, and S. Jin, "Bayesian user localization and tracking for reconfigurable intelligent surface aided MIMO systems," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1040–1054, 2022.
- [22] S. Palmucci, A. Guerra, A. Abrardo, and D. Dardari, "Two-timescale joint precoding design and RIS optimization for user tracking in nearfield MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 2023.
- [23] L. Lian, A. Liu, and V. K. N. Lau, "User location tracking in massive MIMO systems via dynamic variational Bayesian inference," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 67, no. 21, pp. 5628–5642, 2019.
- [24] M. Z. Win, Y. Shen, and W. Dai, "A theoretical foundation of network localization and navigation," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 7, pp. 1136–1165, 2018.
- [25] Y. Shen, S. Mazuelas, and M. Z. Win, "Network navigation: Theory and interpretation," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 1823–1834, 2012.
- [26] A. Liu, L. Lian, V. K. Lau, and X. Yuan, "Downlink channel estimation in multiuser massive MIMO with hidden Markovian sparsity," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 66, no. 18, pp. 4796–4810, 2018.
- [27] W. Xu, Y. Xiao, A. Liu, and M. Zhao, "Joint scattering environment sensing and channel estimation for integrated sensing and communication," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 541–546.
- [28] Y. Xiong, N. Wu, Y. Shen, and M. Z. Win, "Cooperative localization in massive networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1237– 1258, 2021.
- [29] S. Mazuelas, Y. Shen, and M. Z. Win, "Spatiotemporal information coupling in network navigation," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 7759–7779, 2018.
- [30] B. Zhou, Q. Chen, and P. Xiao, "The error propagation analysis of the received signal strength-based simultaneous localization and tracking in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 3983–4007, 2017.
- [31] H. Liu, X. Yuan, and Y.-J. A. Zhang, "Matrix-calibration-based cascaded channel estimation for reconfigurable intelligent surface assisted multiuser MIMO," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 2621–2636, 2020.
- [32] P. Gao, L. Lian, and J. Yu, "Wireless area positioning in RIS-assisted mmwave systems: Joint passive and active beamforming design," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 29, pp. 1372–1376, 2022.
- [33] Z. Khan, T. Balch, and F. Dellaert, "MCMC-based particle filtering for tracking a variable number of interacting targets," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 1805–1819, 2005.
- [34] C. Shen, A. van den Hengel, A. Dick, and M. J. Brooks, "2D articulated tracking with dynamic Bayesian networks," in *Proc. 4th Int. Conf. Comput. Inf. Tech. (CIT)*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 130–136.
- [35] A. Oka and L. Lampe, "Compressed sensing of Gauss-Markov random field with wireless sensor networks," in *Proc. 5th IEEE Sensor Array Multichannel Signal Process. Workshop.* IEEE, 2008, pp. 257–260.
- [36] T.-Y. Wang and Q. Cheng, "Collaborative event-region and boundaryregion detections in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2547–2561, 2008.
- [37] M. Üney, B. Mulgrew, and D. E. Clark, "A cooperative approach to sensor localisation in distributed fusion networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 1187–1199, 2015.
- [38] J. Liu and Y. Liu, "Multi-target tracking of time-varying spatial patterns," in Proc. IEEE Comput. Soc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR). IEEE, 2010, pp. 1839–1846.
- [39] T. Yu and Y. Wu, "Decentralized multiple target tracking using netted collaborative autonomous trackers," in *Proc. IEEE Comput. Soc. Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR)*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2005, pp. 939– 946.
- [40] S. Colonnese, P. Di Lorenzo, T. Cattai, G. Scarano, and F. D. V. Fallani, "A joint Markov model for communities, connectivity and signals defined over graphs," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 27, pp. 1160–1164, 2020.
- [41] X. Wang, "Deployment of high altitude platforms in heterogeneous wireless sensor network via MRF-MAP and potential games," in *Proc. IEEE Wireless Commun. Net. Conf. (WCNC)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1446– 1451.
- [42] G. F. Lawler and V. Limic, Random walk: a modern introduction. Cambridge University Press, 2010, vol. 123.
- [43] J. F. Collet, *Discrete stochastic processes and applications*. Springer, 2018.
- [44] P. Gao, L. Lian, and J. Yu, "Efficiency of spatial correlation for multi-RIS-assisted multi-user direct localization," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2741–2746.