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ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a method for minimum mean squared error (MMSE) adaptive waveform design (AWD) in multiple-input-multiple-output (MIMO) active sensing systems which are used to track moving targets. The method proposed herein prompts two computational improvements compared to a related method for static targets. Consideration of moving targets also introduces the possibility of ‘model mismatch’ between the actual motion of the targets, and the model available to the MMSE AWD system. Results show that the proposed method leads to an improvement in mean squared error performance of up to 29% compared to the non-adaptive case.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Active sensing systems have the definitive property that energy is transmitted and reflected off one or more targets which is received and used to gain information about parameters associated with these targets. This motivates the key question of how best to transmit energy to maximise the information gain. Prior research on this has primarily concerned radar as the active sensing modality, known as cognitive radar, and various articles provide a good overview of this topic [1–3].

More specifically, Huleihel et al include a schematic diagram of an active sensing architecture that is generally applicable [4, Fig. 1]. This active sensing formulation is a good fit for spatial waveform shaping using multiple-input-multiple-output (MIMO) active sensing systems, for example, MIMO radar and sonar [5], which is our focus in this paper.

A number of criteria have been proposed to define what is meant by maximising the information gain concerning the target parameters, including maximising the mutual information [6–8], maximising the signal-to-noise ratio [9–12] and minimising the mean squared error of the target parameter estimation (MMSE estimation) [13]. These criteria can be interpreted in terms of optimal experimental design [14], leading to the conclusion that MMSE (A-optimal) estimation is a good criterion in general [15].

So it follows that we consider MMSE adaptive waveform design (AWD) in this paper. [13] expresses analytically the cost function for MMSE AWD, and demonstrates how MMSE AWD can be practically implemented using numerical sums to approximate the integrals present in the aforementioned cost function. Notably, [13] considers only static targets (as the purpose was to use a simple set-up to prove the principle of the method proposed therein), and in this paper we build on the analysis in [13] to enable MMSE AWD for moving targets and thus make an important step towards developing a physically representative MMSE AWD method. Additionally, this shift from a static to a dynamic setting prompts some theoretical refinements in the MMSE AWD method and the particle filter (PF), which conducts the underlying Bayesian estimation of the target parameters, leading to a reduction in the computational complexity. Finally, the formulation we present incorporates the possibility of a discrepancy between the actual motion of the targets and the model of target motion available to the MIMO sensing system, and results show that our MMSE AWD method is effective both with and without such a model mismatch.

2. SYSTEM MODEL

We start with the standard MIMO active sensing system formulation [16] (with $N_T$ transmission elements, $N_R$ receiving elements and $L$ snapshots per step):

$$X_k = H_k(\theta_k)S_k + N_k,$$  (1)

where $S_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_T \times L}$ is the transmitted waveform, $X_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_R \times L}$ is the received waveform, $N_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_R \times L}$ is additive white Gaussian noise, $H_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_R \times N_T}$ represents the channel response as a non-linear function (in general) of $\theta_k = [\Re(\alpha_k); \Im(\alpha_k); \phi_k]$ in which $\alpha_k$ and $\phi_k$ are vectors of complex attenuations and angles of the $Q'$ targets respectively, i.e., $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{C}^{Q' \times 1}$, $\phi_k \in \mathbb{R}^{Q' \times 1}$. This enables us to define:

$$H_k = \sum_{q=1}^{Q'} |\alpha_k| q a_R(q) a_T^T(q),$$  (2)

where $a_R \in \mathbb{C}^{N_R \times 1}$ and $a_T \in \mathbb{C}^{N_T \times 1}$ are the steering vectors for the receive and transmit arrays respectively.
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3. **MMSE AWD METHOD FOR STATIC TARGETS**

First we summarise the MMSE AWD method for static targets [13], which we will subsequently generalise to apply to the moving target scenario. Starting with the expected covariance matrix, first expressed in [13, Eq. (11)]

\[
\Sigma_k = \int \left( \hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k \right) \left( \hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k \right)^T p(\theta_k | X^{k-1}, S^{k-1}) dX_k \ d\theta_k,
\]

where \( \hat{\theta}_k = \mathbb{E}(\theta_k | X_k, X^{k-1}, S_k, S^{k-1}) \), i.e., the expected estimate of \( \theta_k \), itself a random variable. Which in turn enables the MMSE optimisation cost function to be expressed:

\[
\text{minimise: } \text{tr}(\Sigma_k) \quad \text{w.r.t. } S_k
\]

subject to: \( \text{tr} \left( \frac{1}{2} S_k S_k^H \right) \leq P \)

where \( \text{tr}(.) \) is the matrix trace operation and \( P \) is the total transmit power per step. A particle filter (PF) was used to estimate the probability density function (PDF) of the target parameters at each step ( [13] initialised the PF particles on a regular grid and didn’t resample):

\[
p(\theta_k) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} w_k^{(i)} \delta(\theta_k - \theta_k^{(i)}),
\]

where \( w_k \) is the weight of the \( k \)th particle, \( \theta_k^{(i)} \). The PF was itself sampled, to give an additional random set of size \( N_S \) (by definition); for the \( m \)th sample:

\[
\theta_k^{(m)} \sim \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} w_k^{(i)} \delta(\theta_k^{(m)} - \theta_k^{(i)}),
\]

\[
X_k^{(m)} \sim p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, S_k(0))
\]

These definitions were used to numerically approximate the cost function. To do so, it was convenient to use vectorised forms of \( S_k \) and \( X_k \) split into real and imaginary components: \( s_k' \triangleq [\mathbb{R}(\text{vec}(S_k)); \mathbb{I}(\text{vec}(S_k))] \) and similarly for \( X_k \). \( H_k' \) was defined as \( L \) copies of \( H_k \) positioned on the leading diagonal of a larger matrix, whose other elements are all zero, from which \( H_k' \triangleq [\mathbb{R}(H_k'); -\mathbb{I}(H_k'); \mathbb{I}(H_k'); \mathbb{R}(H_k')] \) was also defined. This led to the expression:

\[
\Sigma_k \approx \Sigma_k' = \sum_{m=1}^{N_S} \frac{v_m}{v} u_m^T u_m
\]

where:

\[
v_m = \frac{p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k')}{p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k(0))},
\]

\[
\hat{v} = \sum_{m=1}^{N_S} \frac{p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k')}{p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k(0))},
\]

\[
u_m = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} w_k^{(i)} p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(i)}, s_k') \theta_k^{(i)} - \theta_k^{(m)}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} w_k^{(i)} p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(i)}, s_k')}.
\]

The MMSE AWD method used gradient descent to optimise the cost function, therefore it was also necessary to express:

\[
\nabla s_k' (\Sigma_k') = \sum_{m=1}^{N_S} \frac{v_m}{v} \nabla s_k' (u_m^T u_m) + \frac{\hat{v} \nabla s_k' (v_m) - v_m \nabla s_k' (\hat{v})}{\hat{v}^2} u_m^T u_m.
\]

A single element of \( \nabla s_k' (u_m^T u_m) \) is expressed in (12), also:

\[
\nabla s_k' (v_m) = \frac{\nabla s_k' (p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k'))}{p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k')} \left( \frac{\nabla s_k' (X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k')}{p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k')} \right)
\]

where:

\[
p(X_k^{(m)} | \theta_k^{(m)}, s_k') = \exp \left(- \mathbb{E}(X_k^{(m)}(0)) R_n(1) (X_k^{(m)}(0) - H_k' s_k') / \sqrt{2\pi} \right)
\]

and

\[
\nabla s_k' (\Sigma_k') = \nabla s_k' (\Sigma_k') - s_k' \left( \nabla s_k' (\Sigma_k')^T s_k' \right) s_k'.
\]

4. **MMSE AWD METHOD FOR MOVING TARGETS**

To generalise the static target MMSE AWD method to apply to the case where the targets can move, it is necessary to extend the system model to account for this target motion by statistically defining the actual variation of the target parameters from one step to the next:

\[
\theta_k = f(\theta_{k-1}, v_{k-1}),
\]

where \( f(.) \) is an arbitrary function and \( v_{k-1} \) is noise, which is independent of \( N_k \). Importantly, we also define the model for the variation of the target parameters which is available to the MIMO active sensing system:

\[
\theta_k = \hat{f}(\theta_{k-1}).
\]

It can be seen that this has implications for the PF: whereas for the static target case the particles would remain at their initial location throughout, for the moving target case we have that:

\[
\theta_k^{(i)} = \hat{f}(\theta_{k-1}^{(i)}),
\]

\(^2\text{in general, the formulation developed in this paper would apply if } f(.) \text{ were to change at each step, however for simplicity we fix } f(.) \)
\[
\frac{\partial (u_T^m u_m)}{\partial s_{k,n}} = 2u_T^m \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_P} w_k^{(i)} \frac{\partial p(x_k^{(m)}|\theta_k^{(i)}, s_k^{(i)})}{\partial s_{k,n}} \theta_k^{(i)} \right) - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_P} w_k^{(i)} p(x_k^{(m)}|\theta_k^{(i)}, s_k^{(i)}) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_P} w_k^{(i)} \frac{\partial p(x_k^{(m)}|\theta_k^{(i)}, s_k^{(i)})}{\partial s_{k,n}} \right)^2 \right)
\]

(12)

where (replacing (10)):

\[
u_m = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} p(x_k^{(m)}|\theta_k^{(i)}, s_k^{(i)}) \theta_k^{(i)} - \theta_k^{(m)} \right).
\]

(24)

We also express the gradient of the new cost function (replacing (11)):

\[
\nabla s_k^m (\Sigma_k''') = \sum_{m=1}^{N_S} \frac{\partial }{\partial m} \nabla s_k^m (u_T^m u_m) \left( \hat{\nu} - \nu_m \nabla s_k^m (\hat{\nu}) \right) \nabla s_k^m (u_T^m u_m) \nabla s_k^m (u_T^m u_m)
\]

(25)

where a single element of \( \nabla s_k^m (u_T^m u_m) \) is expressed in (26) (replacing (12)). Which leads to the final expression for the component of the gradient perpendicular to \( s_k' \) as the directions of descent (replacing (17)):

\[
\nabla s_k^m (\Sigma_k'''') = \nabla s_k^m (\Sigma_k''') - s_k' \left( \nabla s_k^m (\Sigma_k''') \right)^T s_k' / s_k'^T s_k' .
\]

(27)

5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We numerically simulate a MIMO active sensing system with co-located half-wavelength spaced transmit and receive arrays based on the setup specified in [13, 15]. We set \( N_T = N_R = 5, L = 1, N_S = 250, N_P = 1000 \) with the threshold for resampling set to 0.9, ASNR = 0 dB where ASNR \( \triangleq \alpha^2 P N R L / (0.5 \sigma_n^2) \) (in which the noise variance, \( \sigma_n^2 \) is the variance of each of the real and imaginary components). We assume that \( \alpha \) is known, and all its elements have equal magnitude. We estimate the vector of two unknown target angles \( \phi_k \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq 30 \). We consider two scenarios (\( \mathcal{N} \) (mean, covariance) denotes a multivariate normal):

1. A random walk with no model mismatch: \( \theta_k = f_1 (\theta_{k-1}, v_{k-1}) = \theta_{k-1} + v_{k-1} \), where \( v_{k-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_2) \); \( f_1 = f_1 \); \( \theta_0 = [-70, -10]^T \).

2. The targets move with constant angular velocity, but the MMSE AWD system treats the motion as a random walk \( \theta_k = f_2 (\theta_{k-1}) = \theta_{k-1} + [1, -1]^T \); \( f_2 = f_2 \); \( \theta_0 = [-80, -21]^T \).

In each case, the root mean squared error (RMSE) was numerically approximated by averaging over 500 trials and the...
\[
\frac{\partial (\tilde{u}_m^T \tilde{u}_m)}{\partial s'_{k,n}} = 2 \tilde{u}_m^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \frac{\partial p(x^{(m)}_k | \theta^{(i)}_k, s'_{k})}{\partial s'_{k,n}} \theta_k^{(i)} \right) - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \frac{\partial p(x^{(m)}_k | \theta_k^{(i)}, s'_k)}{\partial s_{k,n}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} p(x^{(m)}_k | \theta^{(i)}_k, s'_{k}) \right)^2 \right) \right)
\]

(26)

![Fig. 1](image1.png)

**Fig. 1.** RMSE and target motion for scenario 1
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**Fig. 2.** RMSE and target motion for scenario 2

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have made four main contributions, which together represent an important step towards developing a theoretical method of MMSE AWD which can be implemented in actual MIMO active sensing systems.

- We have extended the analysis in [13] for the case where the active sensing system is tracking moving targets. The formulation we provide includes the possibility of model mismatch.
- We have leveraged the fact that the targets are moving to make the algorithm more computationally efficient. Specifically, standard PF techniques of randomised particle initialisation and resampling are used.
- We also introduced the possibility of sampling the particles to estimate the mean of the parameters which yields a further computational saving that is bespoke to our AWD algorithm.
- We have presented numerical results that demonstrate that our AWD algorithm does indeed improve target parameter estimation both with and without a model mismatch.

results are shown in Figs. 1 and 2 for scenarios 1 and 2, respectively. For scenario 1, the reduction in MMSE peaked at 25%, at the 17th pulse; and for scenario 2 the reduction in MMSE peaked at 29%, at the 11th pulse.

The results demonstrate that the MMSE AWD method improves target parameter accuracy both when the system has access to the statistical definition of the target motion (scenario 1) and when there is a model mismatch (scenario 2). To examine the nature of this improvement in a little more detail, it is helpful to think of the estimation as consisting of two parts: an initial target localisation, following by a continuous estimation as the target is tracked. We can see that for both scenarios the MMSE adaptive waveform design method leads to a reduction in RMSE in the target localisation phase, and for scenario 2 there also seems to be a ‘steady-state’ reduction in target parameter estimation variance. Further results (not included here owing to space constraints) confirm that these two possibilities are typical (i.e., that we always see a reduction in RMSE in target localisation and sometimes in continuous estimation when using MMSE adaptive waveform design), however which occurs is not in general dictated by whether there is a model mismatch (as may be concluded by studying scenarios 1 and 2 alone).
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