An Adaptive IMM Estimator for Aircraft Tracking
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Abstract—An adaptive Interacting Multiple-Model (IMM) estimator using a small number of models is proposed for maneuvering aircraft tracking. It estimates the difference between the true target control parameter and the value currently used in the IMM models to improve the estimator’s performance. The algorithm performance is compared with the performance of a standard IMM estimator for some maneuver scenarios via Monte Carlo simulations.
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1. Introduction

In recent years the design of reliable and effective multiple-model (MM) algorithms for maneuvering target tracking is a subject of extensive research (see e.g., [1-7]). These algorithms are used to overcome problems caused by structural and parametric uncertainties. The Interacting Multiple-Model (IMM) algorithm is the most commonly used MM estimation algorithm among them. The lack of knowledge about the target’s control parameters is overcome in it by introducing a set of fixed control parameters. This set is expected to cover the range of possible parameter changes. A set of models represents the system behavior in each fixed control value. Kalman filters based on these models are running in parallel and their estimates are finally fused [1-3, 6] to compute the overall estimate. When the range of the expected control parameter is wide, however, IMM needs a large number of models to provide consistent estimation.

One promising solution to this problem is to use variable-structure estimation algorithms [5-7]. An alternative, nontrivial solution is proposed in this paper. It requires a minimal number of models (one for rectilinear motion, one for right turn and one for left turn) to cover the range of all possible target maneuvers. The proposed adaptive IMM algorithm estimates the difference between the control parameter assumed in the current model and its real value. The method has been applied at first for marine targets tracking in [10], where the range of the control parameter is very narrow. To cover the very wide respective range for air targets an additional adaptation mechanism is applied. It is concerned with the IMM transition probabilities and the fudge factor and the noise covariance matrices of the maneuvering models. The algorithm’s performance is evaluated by Monte Carlo simulations and the effectiveness is illustrated by a comparison with 3- and 5-model standard IMM algorithm versions.

2. Aircraft Models

The target motion is described in the horizontal plane xOy by the commonly used model [8]:

\[ \dot{X} = V \sin \phi, \]

\[ \dot{Y} = V \cos \phi, \]
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\[ v = g n_T, \]
\[ \phi = -g n_N / v, \]
where \( n_N = n \sin \gamma \), \( \gamma = \arccos(1/n_N) \); \((X, Y)\) are aircraft mass center coordinates, \(V\) and \(\phi\) are aircraft velocity and heading, \(n_N\) and \(n_T\) are normal and tangential g-load factors (NLF and TLF), \(\gamma\) is roll angle; \(g = 9.81\) is the load factor.

The respective discrete-time model has the form
\[
\begin{align*}
X_k &= X_{k-1} + T v_{k-1} \sin \phi_{k-1}, \\
Y_k &= Y_{k-1} + T v_{k-1} \cos \phi_{k-1}, \\
\phi_k &= \phi_{k-1} + T g n^*_N, \\
v_k &= v_{k-1} + T g n^*_T,
\end{align*}
\]
where \(n^*_N = n_N \sin \gamma_k\), \(\gamma_k = \arccos(1/n_N)\); \(k\) is the current discrete time; \(T\) is the sampling interval. The state vector \(x_k = \left(X_k \ Y_k \ \phi_k \ v_k\right)^T\) should be estimated in the presence of unknown control parameters \(n_N\) and \(n_T\) based on radar measurements \(y_k\), modeled as:
\[ y_k = H x_{k,\text{radar}} + w_k, \]
where \(H\) is measurement matrix and \(w_k\) is white Gaussian noise with a covariance matrix \(R\):
\[ H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, R = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2_x & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma^2_y \end{bmatrix}. \]

### 3. Extended Model and Adaptive IMM

The proposed IMM algorithm uses three models to cover the possible target motions in the horizontal plane: rectilinear motion \((i = 1)\), right turn \((i = 2)\) and left turn \((i = 3)\):
\[
\begin{align*}
X_{i,k} &= X_{i,k-1} + T v_{i,k-1} \sin \phi_{i,k-1}, \\
Y_{i,k} &= Y_{i,k-1} + T v_{i,k-1} \cos \phi_{i,k-1}, \\
\phi_{i,k} &= \phi_{i,k-1} + T g n^*_N, \\
v_{i,k} &= v_{i,k-1} + T g n^*_T,
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\Delta n^*_{N,k} = \Delta n^*_N, \quad \Delta n^*_N = \frac{\Delta n^*_N}{\Delta n^*_N}. \tag{5}
\]
The \(i\)-th difference \(\Delta n^*_{N,k-1}\) is a measure of the mismatch between the NLF currently used by \(i\)-th model and its true value. The extended state vector has the form \(x_k = \left(X_k \ Y_k \ \phi_k \ v_k \ \Delta n^*_N\right)^T\). It is also presumed for all IMM filters that \(n_T = 0\).

The EKF for the \(i\)-th model have the recursion:
\[
\dot{x}_{i,k|k} = \dot{x}_{i,k|k-1} + K_{i,k} y_{i,k}, \tag{6}
\]
\[
\dot{\hat{x}}_{i,k|k-1} = f\left(\hat{x}_{i,k|k-1}, n^*_{N,k-1}\right), \tag{7}
\]
\[
\gamma_{i,k} = y_k - H \dot{x}_{i,k|k-1}, \tag{8}
\]
\[
P_{i,k|k-1} = \Phi_{i,k|k-1} P_{i,k|k-1} \Phi_{i,k|k-1}^T + Q_{i,k}, \tag{9}
\]
\[
S_{i,k} = H P_{i,k|k-1} H^T + R, \tag{10}
\]
\[
K_{i,k} = P_{i,k|k-1} H^T S_{i,k}^{-1}, \tag{11}
\]
\[
P_{i,k} = P_{i,k|k-1} - K_{i,k} S_{i,k} K_{i,k}^T, \tag{12}
\]
where \(\dot{x}_{i,k}^*\) and \(x_{i,k}^*\) are the predicted and filtered estimates of \(x_k\): \(\dot{f}_i = \partial f_i / \partial \dot{x}_i\) given by:
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -T g n^*_N + \Delta \tilde{n}^*_N & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
\gamma_i \text{ and } S_{i,k} \text{ are the filter residual process and its covariance matrix, } P_{i,k} \text{ and } Q_{i,k} \text{ is the error and the system noise covariance matrices, } K_{i,k} \text{ is the filter gain matrix, } f_i > 1 \text{ is a fudge factor (FF).}
\]

The estimate \(\Delta \tilde{n}^*_N\) has no significant physical meaning directly but it contains useful information about the maneuver’s starting/final times and intensity. It allows us to develop an adaptive mechanism for estimation consistency improvement. They are arranged below according to their impact.

- **a) The FF** is adaptively changed according to the unfiltered estimate \(\dot{x}(5)\) in the subsequent times \(k, k-1\):
\[
\phi_{i,k} = \begin{cases} \phi_0 = 1.06, & \text{for } i = 1; \\ 1 + \frac{\dot{x}_i(5) + \dot{x}_{i,k}(5)}{4\Delta n^*_{N_{\text{max}}}} \leq \phi_0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{13}
\]
This adaptive FF is introduced to improve the common filter consistency.

- **b) The fifth diagonal element of the process noise covariance matrix** \(Q_{i,k}, i = 12,3\) of the EKF is adaptively changed to provide faster response to the maneuvers:
\[
Q_{i,k} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2_x & \sigma^2_y & \sigma^2_\phi & \sigma^2_v \\ \sigma^2_y & \sigma^2_x & \sigma^2_\phi & \sigma^2_v \\ \sigma^2_\phi & \sigma^2_\phi & \sigma^2_\phi & \sigma^2_v \\ \sigma^2_v & \sigma^2_v & \sigma^2_v & \sigma^2_v \end{bmatrix} \tag{14}
\]
normalsize
\[
h \dot{x}_i(5) - \dot{x}_{i,k-1}(5) \mid \forall i, j = 2,3; \tag{15}
\]
\]
$P_a(k) = P_a(k) = \frac{1- P_a(k)}{2}; i \neq j \neq l$, $i, j, l \in [1,3].$

where $n_{\text{max}}^N$ (it is set = 7) is the maximal expected value of the NLF $n_{N,k}^a$, and the standard IMM transition probability matrix has the form:

$$P_{a}(k) = P_{a}(0) = \text{const},$$

$$P_{a}(k)=P_{a}(k) = \frac{1- P_{a}(k)}{2}; i \neq j \neq l$$, $i, j, l \in [1,i_{\text{max}}].$

This adaptive transition probability matrix provides faster system mode transition.

4. Performance Evaluation

The performance of the adaptive IMM filter (denoted below as IMM3a) is evaluated by Monte Carlo simulation for 200 independent runs. Its performance is compared with that of a 3- and a 5-model standard IMM (denoted as IMM3 and IMM5). IMM3 and IMM5 use: the model (1)-(4) and the EKF equations (6)-(12), where it is set $\Delta n_{N,i,k-1}^a = 0$ and in the matrix $f_i^x$ the last row and column are excluded.

It is preset:

$$\Sigma_X = \Sigma_Y = 100 m, \sigma_Y = 3^\circ, \sigma_Y = 0.05,$$

$$T = 1 s.$$

$$P(0) = \text{diag}\{10000, 10000, 9, 40000\}$$ for IMM3,

where $\text{diag}\{}$ denotes a diagonal matrix.

For IMM3 and IMM3as it is preset:

$$Pr = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6 & 0.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.1 & 0.8 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}, \mu(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 \\ 1/3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

+For the IMM5 it is preset:

$$Pr = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ 0.05 & 0.8 & 0.05 & 0.05 \\ 0.05 & 0.05 & 0.8 & 0.05 \\ 0.05 & 0.05 & 0.05 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}, \mu(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 1/5 \\ 1/5 \\ 1/5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A target maneuver with $n_N = 7$ is the worst case for IMM3a and IMM3as. The true target trajectory and the NLF change are given in Figs. 1, 2.

The Normalized Estimation Error Squared (NEES) [2] is the most informative and integral measure of performance. So, the respective NEES plots for all algorithms are computed and presented in Fig. 3 ('1' - IMM3, '2' - IMM3as, '3' - IMM5).

Here and below the NEES is computed for the first four components of the state vector.

Obviously the standard 3-model IMM does not provide consistent estimates during the maneuver at all, while the consistency of IMM3as is better than the IMM5.

**Example 2.**

The designed IMM3a (denoted by ‘1’) is compared with IMM5 (denoted by ‘2’) for three types of maneuvers: a fast maneuver with $n_N = 7$, a moderate maneuver with $n_N = 3$ and a weak maneuver with $n_N = 1.2$. A noise covariance matrix is introduced in the EKF equation (9), with elements $j = 1,4$, given in (17). The fifth element of $Q$ in IMMa is adaptively changed according to (14). Obviously, the presence of separate models with $n_N = 3$ and $n_N = 6$ gives advantages to the IMM5 over the IMM3 and IMM3a in the first two test scenarios.
The respective results for the fast maneuver are shown in Figs. 4-14. The NEES is given in Fig. 4. The mean errors (ME) and the root-mean square errors (RMSE) of the state vector are shown in Figs. 5-8 and Figs. 9-11, respectively. The average model probabilities are presented in Figs. 12-13 and the average FF behavior is given in Fig. 14. These results show that IMM3 have better consistency, accuracy and faster response to abrupt maneuvers.
The true trajectory and the true NLF change for the moderate maneuver are represented in Figs. 15-16. The NEES and average FF behavior are given in Figs. 17 and 18, respectively.

The same inferences can be drawn for the next two scenarios. The true trajectory and the true NLF change for the weak maneuver are presented in Figs. 19-20. The NEES and average FF behavior are given in Figs. 21 and 22, respectively.
Fig. 14 Average fudge factor

Fig. 15 True aircraft trajectory for $n_N = 3$

Fig. 16 True aircraft normal load factor

Fig. 17 Normalized Estimation Error Squared

Fig. 18 Average fudge factor

Fig. 19 True aircraft trajectory for $n_N = 1.2$

Fig. 20 True aircraft normal load factor
6. Conclusions

An adaptive IMM algorithm using a small number of models and covering a wide range of possible aircraft maneuvers is proposed. It estimates the difference between the real control parameter and its value used in the current model in real time. This makes it possible to introduce an additional adaptation mechanism to cover a wide range of possible air target maneuvers. This mechanism tunes the IMM transition probabilities, the EKF’s fudge factor and the EKF’s covariance. The algorithm’s efficiency is demonstrated for the worst cases maneuvers.
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