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ABSTRACT:
Multisensor systems are essential for autonomous navigation applications to achieve reliable accuracy. Integrating the Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) and the Inertial Navigation System (INS) is the most common integration scheme. However, this integration is unreliable in different scenarios since the GNSS signal may deteriorate in downtown areas or suffer from a blockage in underground and indoor areas. Therefore, other sensors are integrated with INS to compensate for GNSS outages. This paper proposes a novel algorithm for radar/INS tightly-coupled integration for autonomous navigation applications. This algorithm is applied in multiple steps. Radar data analysis is the first and most crucial step to remove the noisy data and the outliers and keep the useful objects. Then, data association is done to match the detected objects between radar frames. The tightly-coupled integration is performed at the measurement level through an Extended Kalman Filter (EKF), where the distance between the INS and the detected objects can be predicted from the INS and measured from the radar. Real data was collected from four Frequency Modulated Continuous Wave (FMCW) radar units in Calgary’s suburban areas and Toronto’s downtown area. The proposed algorithm was tested and assessed by introducing simulated GNSS single outages with different durations. The results show an enhancement in the vehicle's position by about 94% to 96%.

1. INTRODUCTION

GNSS is an all-weather navigation system that can estimate the vehicle’s position with centimeter-level accuracy (Suzuki, 2020). However, GNSS is not reliable in some scenarios or applications, e.g., indoor and underground parking lots, driving through canyons, or in downtown areas where the GNSS signal is blocked or deteriorates due to multipath effects (P. Xie & Petovello, 2015). On the other hand, INS is a dead reckoning system that can estimate the vehicle's relative position, velocity, and attitude with high accuracy but for a short period since the INS solution drifts with time. Therefore, GNSS and INS are integrated to compensate for GNSS outages and overcome INS errors (Chen et al., 2021). Loosely-Coupled and Tightly-Coupled are the most known integration techniques in autonomous navigation (Dong et al., 2020; R. Xu et al., 2018). However, in the case of a long GNSS signal outage, the dependency on INS as a standalone sensor to estimate the vehicle's navigation state is not sufficient. Thus, INS is integrated with other sensors to overcome INS errors and drift. For example, the magnetometer can be an update source to the vehicle's heading angle. However, it is affected by the surrounding magnetic field (Cui et al., 2021; Wu & Wang, 2019). The onboard sensors, e.g., the odometer, measure the vehicle's forward speed and can aid the inertial measurement unit (IMU) (Kim & Bae, 2019). Odometer is affected by slippery roads and unequal tire pressure.

Light detection and ranging (lidar) is used to detect the surrounding environments. Now, lidar is integrated with INS for autonomous vehicle applications and simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) (Chang et al., 2019; Zou et al., 2022). Nevertheless, lidar is affected by different weather conditions, such as fog and rainy weather. Moreover, it requires high computational power due to its dense point clouds. Furthermore, lidar is a high-cost sensor. Vision sensors or cameras use visible light to detect and track objects. Moreover, vision sensors can detect road lanes and traffic signs (Jia et al., 2006; Xing et al., 2018). However, vision sensors are affected by varying light and weather conditions because they cannot work in dark or foggy weather. On the other hand, radio detection and ranging (radar) is known as an all-weather sensor, and it is the only sensor, in addition to INS, that can work in different weather and light conditions. Therefore, this paper studies the integration between radar and INS to estimate the vehicle's navigation state.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains the related work, whereas the methodology is described in Section 3. Section 4 discusses the experimental work and results, and finally, the conclusion is shown in Section 5.

2. RELATED WORK

There are two main types of radar: 360° radar and static radar. The 360° radar, known as the imaging radar, rotates 360 degrees to scan the surrounding environment. The 360° radar measures only the point location of detected objects represented by its range and azimuth angle and provides the intensity value for each point. Due to the continuous movement of the vehicle and the rotation of the radar unit, the point clouds are distorted, and they need to be corrected.

In contrast, the static radar has a specific field of view and higher frequency than the 360° radar unit. Moreover, it provides information about the location of the detected points (range and bearing angle) and the Doppler frequency information between the radar unit and the point clouds. The static radar is also known
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as the Frequency Modulated Continuous Wave (FMCW) radar. The Doppler frequency information can be used to estimate the relative velocity between the radar unit and each point, which can help differentiate between static and moving objects. There are different studies about using radar to estimate the vehicle's pose. These studies can be divided into two categories: radar scan matching and feature detection and matching. The iterative Closest Point (ICP) is the most common technique in radar scan matching. It depends on minimizing the distance between point clouds to estimate the motion and rotation between successive radar frames (Censi, 2008; X. Xu et al., 2018). Normal Distribution Transform (NDT) builds a normal distribution model for one point cloud in each frame. These models are matched together to estimate the vehicle's pose (Biber & Strasser, n.d.). Fourier Mellin Transform (FMT) is another scan-matching technique (Chechcin et al., 2010). For feature detection and matching, Scale-Invariant Feature Transform (SIFT), Speeded-Up Robust Features (SURF), and Oriented fast and Rotated Brief (ORB) are common methods in image processing to detect and extract the features, build the descriptor for each feature, and match these features together (Rublee et al., 2011; S. Xie et al., 2013). Thus, the translation and rotation between successive radar frames can be estimated. Constant False Alarm Rate (CFAR) is another technique to detect and keep the actual features by applying a moving filter to remove the noise and the outliers (Rohling, 2011).

In (Cen & Newman, 2018), a 360° radar unit was employed, and a median filter, binomial filter, and threshold were adopted to remove the outliers and ghost points and keep the real features. The unary descriptor and Euclidean distance between the features were applied for data association. The radar solution can be integrated with IMU to improve navigation solution accuracy and robustness and limit IMU drift. (Elkholy et al., 2022) applied the ORB algorithm on 360° radar data to detect and match the features to estimate the vehicle's relative position. The radar solution was integrated with IMU through a closed-loop EKF to correct the navigation states. In (Elkholy et al., 2022), four static radar units were used for land vehicle navigation applications. The four radar units were mounted on the vehicle's roof to act as one 360° radar unit. With the knowledge of the vehicle's average speed and radar rate, the data association between radar frames can be applied, and the vehicle's ego-motion can be estimated. The radar solution was integrated with INS through an EKF to estimate the vehicle's position in the GNSS-denied environments. Radar can be used to estimate the vehicle's forward speed. Therefore, radar can also be integrated with the Reduced Inertial Sensor System (RISS). RISS uses two accelerometer sensors and one gyroscope. In (Abosekeen et al., 2018), the FMCW radar unit was mounted on the vehicle's front bumper and facing the ground. The estimated relative speed between the radar unit and the ground represents the vehicle's forward speed. The estimated vehicle's forward speed was integrated with RISS through an EKF. (Dawson et al., 2022) exploited two radar units mounted on the vehicle's top roof to detect static objects and estimate the vehicle's forward velocity. The radar solution was integrated with RISS to compensate for GNSS outages.

In (Mohamed Elkholy et al., 2023), four radar units were mounted on the vehicle's roof. The two radar units at the front were used to estimate the vehicle's forward velocity, while all four units were used to estimate the vehicle's ego-motion. Then, two EKFs were applied. One was to integrate the radar solution with an IMU, and the second was to correct the integrated position by applying map matching. In (Almaligoul et al., 2021), the Millimeter-wave (MMWave) Radar was integrated with the IMU sensor through Unscented Kalman Filter (UKF) for indoor applications. To remove radar noise and IMU biases, the NDT with angular velocity from the IMU sensor was adopted. (Kwon et al., 2021) utilized FMCW radar to estimate the velocity for unmanned aerial vehicle applications. Radar velocity was integrated with IMU through an Adaptive EKF. All the previous research provided examples of loosely coupled integration between radar and INS. However, there is no previous research that focuses on the tightly coupled integration between radar and INS.

This paper proposes a novel radar/INS tightly-coupled integration algorithm to compensate for GNSS outages and overcome INS errors and drift. Closed-loop EKF was exploited to implement the radar/INS integration.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this research is applied in multiple steps. The first and most crucial step is data analysis and preprocessing since radar data is noisy and contains outliers and ghost points, which could affect the proposed algorithm. Therefore, the preprocessing technique is adopted to remove all the outliers and moving objects and detect and keep only the static objects. After that, the data association technique is applied to match the detected static objects between radar frames. The detected objects are matched by applying motion and distance constraints to find the corresponding points between radar frames. Finally, the Radar measurements are integrated in a tightly-coupled mode with predicted IMU measurements to provide a continuous, robust Radar/INS solution.

#### 3.1. Data Analysis and Preprocessing

Radar data analysis is a crucial step in the proposed algorithm since data analysis and preprocessing aim to remove all the outliers, ghost points, and moving objects that will affect the following steps. The radar data analysis is performed in multiple steps. The first step is to differentiate between static and moving objects. FMCW radar provides Doppler frequency information, which can be used to estimate the relative velocity between the vehicle and the surrounding objects. For example, if the vehicle is static, the relative velocity between the vehicle and the surrounding static objects should be zero, and if the vehicle is moving, the relative velocity between the vehicle and the static objects equals the vehicle speed. Moreover, in this research, four FMCW radar units were used and mounted on the vehicle's roof to work as a 360° radar. If the vehicle is moving forward, static objects detected by the two front radar units will appear coming toward the vehicle, and the relative velocity sign is negative, whereas the static objects detected by the two rear radar units will appear to move away from the vehicle and the relative velocity sign between the vehicle and the detected objects is positive.

The previous technique is valid when the vehicle is moving forward. However, if the vehicle moves backward, the relative velocity sign between the vehicle and the detected objects from the four radar units will be reversed. The heading angle difference can be utilized to check if the vehicle changed its moving direction. If there is a large drop (about 180°) in the vehicle's heading angle and the vehicle was static before that drop, that means that the vehicle was moving in a specific direction and now the vehicle is moving in the opposite direction. To improve the previous technique in detecting the static objects and removing the moving objects, a median filter was applied to check if there are moving objects were detected and remove them. The detected static objects are filtered by removing the close and far points as they are considered outliers. Moreover, an intensity threshold is applied to remove the outliers.
3.2. Data Association

After detecting and filtering the static objects and removing the outliers and the moving objects, the next step is to find the corresponding objects in the following Radar frame. The proposed method for data association is based on point-to-point matching. The change in azimuth, range, and elevation angle between the corresponding objects can be considered with the knowledge of radar data rate and the average vehicle speed. Therefore, the range, bearing angle, and elevation angle difference between any two corresponding objects should be less than a threshold. Moreover, the rotation angles of all the matched points should be similar to a certain threshold. Then, the corresponding points can be related.

3.3. Radar/INS Tightly Coupled Integration

Figure 1 shows the block diagram of the proposed tightly-coupled Radar/INS integration. The detected objects’ coordinates are measured in the radar frame. Since the lever arm and boresight angle between the radar frame and IMU frame are measured, the detected objects’ coordinates can be transformed into the IMU/body frame or the vehicle frame because the IMU frame is aligned with the vehicle frame.

Assume that the vehicle’s position (INS position) is represented by the latitude \((\varphi_{INS})\) and longitude \((\lambda_{INS})\) at a time \((t)\). Then, with the knowledge of the coordinates of the target points, the target points’ latitude \((\varphi_{PC})\) and longitude \((\lambda_{PC})\) at a time \((t)\) can be calculated.

\[
\varphi_{PC} = \varphi_{INS} + \frac{y}{Rm + h_{INS}} \quad (1)
\]

\[
\lambda_{PC} = \lambda_{INS} + \frac{(Rm + h_{INS}) \cos \varphi_{INS}}{x} \quad (2)
\]

where: \((x, y)\) are the target point coordinates to the INS in the INS body frame. \(h_{INS}\) is the height at time \((t)\), and \(Rm\) is the meridian radius of the earth.

At the time \((t + \Delta t)\), the corresponding target points have the same latitude \((\varphi_{PC})\) and longitude \((\lambda_{PC})\). To correct the navigation state at the time \((t + \Delta t)\), the range between point clouds and the vehicle’s position \((\rho_{INS-PC})\) can be calculated. The calculated range should be equal to the range given by Radar data.

\[
\rho_{INS-PC} = \sqrt{(\varphi_{INS} - \varphi_{PC})^2 + (\lambda_{INS} - \lambda_{PC})^2} \quad (3)
\]

The tightly coupled integration is implemented through a closed-loop EKF. The EKF consists of two models (the motion model and the measurement mode). The system model in the continuous case is described as follows:

\[
\dot{x} = Fx + Gw
\]

where: \(\dot{x}\) is the time rate of change of the state vector. 
\(F\) = dynamic matrix. 
\(G\) = noise coefficient matrix. 
\(w\) = system noise.

The measurement model is described by:

\[
z = \rho_{INS-PC} - \rho_{Radar} = Hx + \eta \quad (5)
\]

where: \(z\) = the measurements.
\(H\) = the design matrix.
\(\eta\) = the measurement noise.

If there are multiple detected objects \((n)\), the measurements will be as follows:

\[
z = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{INS-PC11} - \rho_{Radar1} \\ \rho_{INS-PC1n} - \rho_{Radar1} \\ \rho_{INS-PC21} - \rho_{Radar2} \\ \vdots \\ \rho_{INS-PCn1} - \rho_{Radar2} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\(0_{1x13}\) (6)

The design matrix \((H)\) in this case will be as follows:

\[
H = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{INS-PC11} - \rho_{Radar1} \\ \rho_{INS-PC1n} - \rho_{Radar1} \\ \rho_{INS-PC21} - \rho_{Radar2} \\ \vdots \\ \rho_{INS-PCn1} - \rho_{Radar2} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\(0_{1x13}\) (7)

EKF is implemented in two stages. The first stage is to predict the state vector at time \(t + \Delta t\).

\[
x_{t+\Delta t} = \hat{x}_t + w_t
\]

\(p_{t+\Delta t} = Q_t
\]

where: \(x_{t+\Delta t}\) = the predicted state vector at the time \((t + \Delta t)\).
\(w_t\) = the system noise at the time \((t)\).
\(Q_t\) = the process noise matrix.

The second stage is to update the state based on the measurements.

\[
K_{t+\Delta t} = p_{t+\Delta t}H_{t+\Delta t}^T(H_{t+\Delta t}p_{t+\Delta t}H_{t+\Delta t}^T + R_{t+\Delta t})^{-1}
\]

\[
\hat{x}_{t+\Delta t} = x_{t+\Delta t} + K_{t+\Delta t}(z_{t+\Delta t} - H_{t+\Delta t}x_{t+\Delta t})
\]

\[
p_{t+\Delta t} = [I - K_{t+\Delta t}H_{t+\Delta t}] p_{t+\Delta t}
\]

where: \(K_{t+\Delta t}\) = the gain matrix.
\(R_{t+\Delta t}\) = the covariance matrix of the measurement noise.
\(x_{t+\Delta t}\) = the updated state vector.
\(p_{t+\Delta t}\) = the updated covariance matrix of the state vector.

So, the system model is the core of the prediction stage where the state vector and the covariance matrix can be predicted. The updated stage is based on calculating the gain matrix which depends on the predicted covariance matrix of the state vector, the design matrix, and the covariance matrix of the measurements. Finally, the updated state vector and the updated covariance matrix are calculated from the predicted ones and the updated measurements.
The novel algorithm has the advantage that it can work with only one target point and its corresponding point in the second Radar frame to be implemented.

4. EXPERIMENTAL WORK AND RESULTS

Two real driving datasets were collected to test the proposed algorithm. The first dataset was collected in a suburban area in Calgary. Four FMCW UMRR-11 Type 132 were mounted on the vehicle’s roof. Xsens MTI-G-710 module was used to collect IMU and GNSS data. For reference data, a Novatel SPAN-SE system with an IMU-FSAS was used (Figure 2). Another data was collected in downtown Toronto. Four FMCW UMRR-96 Type 153 radar units were used. In addition, the u-blox ZED-F9R module was used to collect the IMU and GNSS measurements. Finally, the reference data were collected by a Novatel PwrPak7 system with an IMU-KVH1750.

The data association and matching algorithm was implemented. Figure 3 shows the matching results between two successive radar frames.

After applying the data association algorithm, the radar/INS tightly coupled integration was implemented, and a simulated GNSS signal outage was introduced for different outage durations. The GNSS outage durations range from 30 seconds to 120 seconds.

4.1. Calgary Data

The proposed algorithm was applied to Calgary's data to compensate for the GNSS signal outage. Figure 4 shows the proposed integrated solution during a simulated two-minute GNSS signal outage.

The estimated trajectory from radar/INS tightly coupled integration during a simulated GNSS outage in Calgary data.

Table 1 shows the RMSE from the radar/INS tightly coupled integration algorithm and the INS standalone solution during different GNSS signal outage durations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outage Duration</th>
<th>RMSE (m)</th>
<th>Traveled Distance (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS Standalone</td>
<td>Radar/INS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 sec</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 sec</td>
<td>122.15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 sec</td>
<td>255.1</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 1, the proposed integration algorithm enhanced the vehicle's horizontal position by 27.82% and 57.49% for 30-second and 60-second GNSS signal outage durations, respectively. For 90 seconds and two minutes of GNSS signal outages, the horizontal position was improved by 95.25% and 96.25%, respectively. The average percentage error from the proposed algorithm was 1.09%, and the traveled distance was about 1 km.

Another simulated GNSS signal outage was introduced, as shown in Figure 5. Table 2 illustrates the horizontal RMSE from the INS standalone solution and the proposed algorithm where it shows the enhancement in the vehicle's horizontal position after applying the radar/INS tightly coupled integration algorithm. The horizontal position was improved by 95.65% for 30 second GNSS signal outage and by 86.95% for 60 second GNSS signal outage. For 90 seconds and 120 seconds of GNSS signal outages,
the vehicle's horizontal was improved by 92.57% and 94.38%, respectively. The average percentage error was 2.09%, and the traveled distance was 802.33 m.

![Figure 5](image_url)

**Figure 5.** The estimated trajectory from the proposed algorithm during another simulated GNSS outage in Calgary data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outage Duration</th>
<th>RMSE (m)</th>
<th>Traveled Distance (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS Standalone</td>
<td>Radar/INS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 sec</td>
<td>91.55</td>
<td>11.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 sec</td>
<td>119.78</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 sec</td>
<td>219.05</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** RMSE from radar/INS tightly coupled integration and INS standalone solution.

4.2. Toronto Data

For the Toronto dataset, the proposed algorithm was tested, and a simulated GNSS signal outage was introduced (Figure 6). Table 3 illustrates the improvements in the vehicle's position after the integration between radar and INS.

![Figure 6](image_url)

**Figure 6.** The estimated trajectory from radar/INS tightly coupled integration during a simulated GNSS outage in Toronto data.

Table 3 shows the horizontal position enhancement after applying the tightly coupled integration between radar and INS. For 30-second and 60-second GNSS signal outages, the position improved by about 82% and 92.06%, respectively. Moreover, the vehicle's horizontal position was enhanced by 93.64% for the 90-second GNSS signal outage and 94.12% for the two-minute GNSS signal outage. The average percentage error was about 4%, and the traveled distance was 743 m.

From the previous results, the proposed algorithm improved the vehicle's navigation solution. However, the accuracy of the vehicle's position depends on radar data uncertainties, the detection of static objects, and the efficiency of the matching technique between radar frames. Therefore, there is a great enhancement in the Calgary dataset during the first GNSS signal outage and a slight improvement during the other GNSS signal outages.

**Table 3.** RMSE from radar/INS integration solution and INS standalone solution for Toronto data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outage Duration</th>
<th>RMSE (m)</th>
<th>Traveled Distance (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS Standalone</td>
<td>Radar/INS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>60.18</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 sec</td>
<td>192.14</td>
<td>15.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 sec</td>
<td>304.77</td>
<td>19.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 sec</td>
<td>366.53</td>
<td>21.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. CONCLUSION

This paper proposes a novel algorithm for tightly coupled integration between radar and INS for land vehicle navigation applications in GNSS-denied environments. Four FMCW radar units were mounted on the vehicle's roof and utilized to test the proposed algorithm. Data analysis and preprocessing were implemented on radar data to detect the static objects and remove the outliers and moving objects. The detected static objects were matched to find the corresponding points. The range between the detected static objects and INS can be calculated and updated through EKF to achieve tightly coupled integration between radar and INS. The proposed algorithm improved the vehicle's horizontal position during different GNSS signal outages. The horizontal position accuracy was improved by an average of 95%, and the average percentage RMS error was about 2.3%. Moreover, the proposed algorithm has the advantage that one matched static object between two successive radar frames is enough to apply this algorithm and limit the IMU drifts. However, there are some limitations in this research. Since radar data is so noisy, data analysis, preprocessing, and data association are critical and affect the vehicle's position accuracy. Better pre-analysis and matching techniques need to be considered to improve the vehicle's position accuracy, and applying other filtering techniques could help to improve the position's accuracy.
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