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## Abstract

# Adaptive Attitude Reference System Using Center-of-Rotation Estimation 

Minseok Lee<br>Department of Aerospace Engineering The Graduate School Seoul National University

This master's thesis proposes a novel augmented Kalman filter-based attitude reference system (ARS) that uses an inertial sensor comprised of a tri-axial gyroscope and a tri-axial accelerometer. For accurate estimation of attitude using an inertial sensor, effective compensation of the non-gravitational acceleration is crucial. The proposed method resolves this issue by using a novel rotational motion detector to adaptively eliminate non-gravitational acceleration. The types of motions that the system experiences are accurately distinguished by augmenting center of rotation to the state vector. Due to the unconventional augmented state vector, the reformed filter properties have been thoroughly examined, and an observability analysis has been carried out. An extensive experimental validation was conducted under six diversified scenarios from the author-collected and open-source datasets, including both rotation-only and translation-rotation-combined motions. The results demonstrate that the proposed method accurately estimates attitude with sub-degree errors for most trials, proving robustness and accuracy under various motions. A comparative analysis reveals that the proposed method outperforms the conventional
method and the MTx algorithm.
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## Chapter 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Motivation

Since the development of Micro Electro-Mechanical Systems (MEMS) technology, inertial measurement units (IMUs) has been widely utilized on various applications, including indoor navigation [1], motion capture [2], unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) [3], and many more. Thanks to their small-sized, low-cost, and low power consuming nature, IMUs have very little restrictions on which platform they are mounted on, namely smartphones, quadrotors, and wearable devices. Using measurements from the gyroscope, the inertial navigation system (INS) algorithm can deliver orientation (roll, pitch, and yaw) through integrating angular rates, when initial angles are known. However, gyroscopes are vulnerable to a drift which rapidly increases over time. Hence, to achieve long-term stability and accuracy, other sensors are often used together. The most common one is the accelerometer, which outputs specific force. When stationary, the accelerometer can be used to estimate gravity vector, and thus provide attitude (roll and pitch) information of the platform. A system which fuses measurements from gyroscope and accelerometer to estimated attitude is called Attitude Reference System (ARS). When outputs from magnetometer is combined with ARS, the system is now able to estimate heading (yaw), hence called Attitude and Heading Reference System (AHRS). Though the scope of this thesis is ARS, previous works covered in this thesis are not limited to ARS, since many works of AHRS still propose methods to deals with acceleration.

After surveying on existing attitude estimating methods, the author has gathered a few insights and motivations towards developing the novel method proposed in this thesis. First, sensor fusion technique combining outputs of gyroscope and accelerometer that enables robust estimation of attitude is in need. Second, a system should deliver excellent performance under changing circumstances through an
adaptation method that withstands dynamic motions with severe acceleration for a prolonged time. Third, appropriate modelling of the kinematics should be in place to not only facilitate a more accurate attitude estimation but also improve versatility of the system regarding various scenarios and platforms ARS may be utilized. When doing so, using predetermined parameters should be shunned.

### 1.2. Objectives and Contribution

This thesis presents a novel indirect Kalman filter-based ARS that estimates attitude and gyro bias along with center of rotation. The state vector of the filter is augmented to include center of rotation, which not only improves accuracy of attitude estimation but also robustness towards various types of dynamic not limited to rotation-only or translation-only motions. To adaptively cope with changing dynamics, a rotational motion detector is developed to efficiently equip the proposed system with appropriate measurement model consistent with current dynamics. The structure of the filter is thoroughly explained, with a detailed derivation of newly devised measurement noise covariance matrix and an observability analysis. The performance of the proposed ARS is verified experimentally against the MTx algorithm by Xsens and a conventional method based on the work of Li and Wang [14]. The tested scenarios consist of six cases, four of which are from the authorcollected dataset and the rest from the open-source dataset Berlin Robust Orientation Estimation Assessment Dataset (BROAD) [36]. To highlight the accuracy and robustness of the proposed algorithm, the tested datasets are comprised of differing values of accelerations, centers of rotation, and types of motion, including rotationonly and rotation-translation-combined motions.

The main contributions of this thesis are restated as follows:
An indirect Kalman filter-based ARS estimating center of rotation online is proposed. Estimation of the rotational arm improves accuracy as well as the
versatility of the proposed system.
A rotational motion detector is proposed to robustly adapt to ever-changing dynamics with a corresponding measurement model and a noise covariance.

The unconventional measurement noise covariance matrix pertinent to the proposed system is meticulously derived.

### 1.3. Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organized as follows. In Chapter 2, the thesis explains conventional ARS algorithms in two parts. The first part contains the two sensor fusion techniques and the attitude reference systems that adopts the two methods: the complimentary filter-based and the Kalman filter-based. A simple formulation of the Kalman filterbased Attitude Reference System, and a brief summary of previous methods that deal with external acceleration is also provided. The second part deals with the two methods adopted by previous works on ARS to compensate non-gravitational acceleration in dynamic situations: the adaptation methods and the kinematic modeling methods. In Chapter 3, the thesis proposes a novel indirect Kalman filterbased ARS, with a rotational motion detector, that estimates center of rotation online. The chapter includes derivation of the newly developed measurement noise covariance matrix, and an observability analysis of the proposed system. Chapter 4 presents a performance evaluation of the proposed method, compared with conventional methods against several different scenarios, including highly challenging motions. The thesis concludes with Chapter V.

Notations used throughout this thesis is presented in Table 1.1. Less frequently used notations and abbreviations are defined separately when they first appear in this thesis.

Table 1.1. Notations

| Frames |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $b$ | Body frame |
| $n$ | Local navigation frame |
| $N, E, D$ | North, East, Down of the navigation frame |
| Kinematic quantities |  |
| $\gamma, \theta, \psi$ | Roll, Pitch, Yaw |
| $\phi$ | $\left[\begin{array}{lll}\gamma & \theta & \psi\end{array}\right]^{T}$ |
| $\mathrm{C}_{b}^{n}$ | Direction Cosine Matrix (DCM, |
|  | body frame to local navigation frame) |
| $g$ | Gravitational acceleration |
| $r$ | Center of rotation ( $\left\|\mathbf{r}^{b}\right\|$ ) |
| Sensor-related quantities |  |
| f | Accelerometer measurement |
| $\omega$ | Gyroscope measurement |
| $\Delta t$ | Sampling time |
| $b_{g}$ | Gyroscope bias |
| Kalman filter quantities |  |
| x | State vector |
| Ф | System matrix (continuous) |
| F | System matrix (discrete) |
| w | Process noise ( $\mathbf{w} \sim N(0, \mathbf{Q}$ ) |
| z | Measurement |
| H | Observation matrix |
| v | Measurement noise ( $\mathbf{v} \sim N(0, \mathbf{R})$ ) |
| K | Kalman gain |
| P | Error covariance matrix |
| Q | Process noise covariance matrix |
| R | Measurement noise covariance matrix |
| $(\cdot)^{+}$ | Posteriori value |
| $(\cdot)^{-}$ | Priori value |
| Others |  |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{n} \times \mathrm{n}}$ | $n$-by-n Identity matrix |
| $\mathbf{0}_{\mathrm{m} \times \mathrm{n}}$ | $m$-by-n Zeros matrix |
| $[(\cdot) \times]$ | Skew-symmetric matrix |
| ( $\cdot$ ) | Estimate value of ( $\cdot$ ) |
| (c) | Measured value of ( $\cdot$ ) |
| $\delta(\cdot)$ | Error of ( $\cdot$ ) |
| d | External acceleration |
| E[•] | Expectation of ( $\cdot$ ) |
| \|-1 | Norm of ( $\cdot$ ) |
| PSD | Power Spectral Density |
|  |  |

## Chapter 2. Conventional ARS

### 2.1. Sensor Fusion of Gyro and Accelerometer

### 2.1.1. Complimentary Filter based Attitude Reference System

Plentiful works have addressed the means of sensor fusion with respect to ARS and AHRS. The most common approaches, by far, are complementary filter [4]-[10] and Kalman filter or its variants [1], [11]-[29]. Complementary filter is a simple data fusion technique which combines complementary information from two different sensors in the frequency domain. [4] showed that the gyroscope and accelerometer to have complementary frequency response, making them suitable candidates for complementary filter. Generally, gyroscopes and accelerometers are passed through a high-pass filter and a low-pass filter, respectively, as the former experience a drift in the low-frequency domain, and the latter are susceptible to noises of highfrequency domain. Mahony [5] proposed a design of nonlinear complementary filter on special orthogonal group. Madgwick [30] adopted Gradient Descent Algorithm (GDA) to estimate orientation in a computationally efficient manner. More recently, Liu [6] proposed an attitude estimation algorithm of multi-sample equivalent rotation vector using angular rates rather than angular increments. Wu [7] contributed with a quaternion-based fast complementary filter (FCF) that has much less convergence time than the previous works. Despite many advantages including efficiency, above works of complementary filter still suffer from lack of adaptability as their parameters, namely gains, are usually fixed and performance deteriorates quickly when circumstances regarding motions change. To resort to a more robust fusion technique, the proposed method is based on Kalman filter.

### 2.1.2. Kalman Filter based Attitude Reference System

An ARS usually employs the Kalman filter for the fusion of gyro and accelerometer information. The relationship between attitude and accelerometer measurements when the sensor is static is as follows.

$$
\begin{gather*}
\gamma=\arctan \left(\frac{f_{y}}{f_{z}}\right)  \tag{2.1}\\
\theta=\arctan \left(\frac{f_{x}}{\sqrt{f_{y}^{2}+f_{z}^{2}}}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

The nominal state vector $\mathbf{x}$ is defined as

$$
\mathbf{x}=\left[\begin{array}{llllll}
\gamma & \theta & \mid & b_{g, x} & b_{g, y} & b_{g, z} \tag{2.3}
\end{array}\right]^{T}
$$

where $b_{g, x}, b_{g, y}$, and $b_{g, z}$ are the gyro bias in the $\mathrm{x}-, \mathrm{y}-$, and z -axes, respectively. The error state vector $\delta \mathbf{x}$ is defined as

$$
\delta \mathbf{x}=\left[\begin{array}{llllll}
\varphi_{N} & \varphi_{E} & \mid & \delta b_{g, x} & \delta b_{g, y} & \delta b_{g, z} \tag{2.4}
\end{array}\right]^{T}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ is known as the Psi-angle error, used by numerous previous works including [14], representing the difference between the true navigation frame and the computed navigation frame.
$\mathbf{C}_{b}^{n}$ is expressed in terms of Euler angles as follows.

$$
\mathbf{C}_{b}^{n}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
\cos \psi \cos \theta & \cos \psi \sin \theta \sin \gamma-\sin \psi \cos \gamma & \cos \psi \sin \theta \cos \gamma+\sin \psi \sin \gamma  \tag{2.5}\\
\sin \psi \cos \theta & \sin \psi \sin \theta \sin \gamma+\cos \psi \cos \gamma & \sin \psi \sin \theta \cos \gamma-\cos \psi \sin \gamma \\
-\sin \theta & \cos \theta \sin \gamma & \cos \theta \cos \gamma
\end{array}\right]
$$

The relationship between the Euler angle error and the Psi-angle error is defined as
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follows.

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[\begin{array}{l}
\varphi_{N} \\
\varphi_{E}
\end{array}\right] } & =\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\cos \psi & -\sin \psi \\
\sin \psi & \cos \psi
\end{array}\right]\left(\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\cos \theta & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\delta \gamma \\
0
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
\delta \theta
\end{array}\right]\right) \\
& =\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\cos \theta \cos \psi & -\sin \psi \\
\cos \theta \sin \psi & \cos \psi
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\delta \gamma \\
\delta \theta
\end{array}\right] \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

The Euler angle errors shown in above equation are defined as follows.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \delta \gamma=\gamma-\hat{\gamma} \\
& \delta \theta=\theta-\hat{\theta} \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
$$

As for the gyro bias, the relationship between the nominal value and the error is as follows.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta \boldsymbol{b}_{\mathrm{g}}=\boldsymbol{b}_{g}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{b}}_{g} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The indirect Kalman filter corrects the nominal state $\mathbf{x}$ with the error state $\delta \mathbf{x}$ using equations (2.7) and (2.8).

In the absence of external acceleration, the nonlinear continuous system and measurement models adopted from [37] are as follows.

System model (nonlinear, continuous):

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{\gamma}=\omega_{\mathrm{x}}+\omega_{y} & (\sin \gamma \tan \theta)+\omega_{z}(\cos \gamma \tan \theta)+b_{g, x} \\
& +b_{g, y}(\sin \gamma \tan \theta)+b_{g, z}(\cos \gamma \tan \theta)+\mathrm{w}_{x}  \tag{2.9}\\
& +\mathrm{w}_{y}(\sin \gamma \tan \theta)+\mathrm{w}_{z}(\cos \gamma \tan \theta)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{\theta}=\omega_{y} \cos \gamma & -\omega_{z} \sin \gamma+\mathrm{w}_{y} \cos \gamma+b_{g, y} \cos \gamma-\mathrm{w}_{z} \sin \gamma  \tag{2.9}\\
& -b_{g, z} \sin \gamma
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\dot{\boldsymbol{b}}_{g}=\mathbf{w}_{g}
$$

Measurement model (nonlinear, continuous):

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{z} & =\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{b}}=\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & -g
\end{array}\right]^{T}+\mathbf{v}  \tag{2.10}\\
& =\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}\left(\mathbf{I}-\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\boldsymbol{\varphi} \times
\end{array}\right]\right)\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & -g
\end{array}\right]^{T}+\mathbf{v}
\end{align*}
$$

The relationship between $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}$ is adopted from [38], which also provides a detailed derivation.

From above models, the linearized discrete error state models can be shown as follows.

System model (linear, discrete):

$$
\begin{gather*}
\delta \mathbf{x}_{k}=\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k-1} \delta \mathbf{x}_{k-1}+\mathbf{w}_{k-1}  \tag{2.11}\\
\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k}=\mathbf{I}_{5 \times 5}+\mathbf{F}_{k} \Delta t, \mathbf{F}_{k}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2} & \mathbf{C}_{1,2 r} \\
\mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3}
\end{array}\right] \tag{2.12}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{1,2 r}$ is the first two rows of $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{b}^{n}$. The discretization method of $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ is explained in Chapter 3.1.

Measurement model (linearized, discrete):

$$
\begin{gather*}
\delta \mathbf{z}_{k}=\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}+\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & g
\end{array}\right]^{T}=\mathbf{H}_{k} \delta \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{v}_{k}  \tag{2.13}\\
\mathbf{H}_{k}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{C}_{1,2 c} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3}
\end{array}\right] \tag{2.14}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{1,2 c}$ is the first two columns of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}[\mathbf{g} \times], \delta \mathbf{z}_{k}$ is the measurement residual,
and $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}$ is the measurement specific force.
However, in the presence of dynamic motion, the accelerometer measurements also measure non-gravitational acceleration, and hence the force measurement equation is as follows.

$$
\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}=\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & -g \tag{2.15}
\end{array}\right]^{T}+\mathbf{d}_{k}
$$

Note here that the measurement noise $\mathbf{v}_{k}$ is incorporated in external acceleration $\mathbf{d}_{k}$. To deal with such external acceleration, previous studies adopt methods such as adaptation and modeling, which will be explained in Chapter 2.2.

### 2.2. Non-gravitational Acceleration Compensation in Dynamic Situations

### 2.2.1. Adaptation based Methods

When the outputs of gyroscope and accelerometer are fused together, it is imperative to correctly estimate the gravity vector from the accelerometer measurements. Ideally, the system should experience little to no acceleration compared to accelerometer noise to achieve so. However, handheld devices such as smartphones and smartwatches are subject to dynamic motions, making it difficult for accelerometer to estimate a pure gravity vector. To deal with such nongravitational acceleration, or external acceleration, numerous approaches have been proposed, and most can be categorized into two: adaptation [1], [10], [14]-[23], [31], [32] and modelling [3], [24]-[29], [33]. Works that adopt adaptation methods usually distinguishes motion as static and dynamic, and adapts accordingly. Li and Wang [14] proposed a Kalman filter-based AHRS that adaptively tunes the measurement noise covariance depending on three different scenarios of non-acceleration, lowacceleration, and high-acceleration modes. Munguía [15] presented an extended

Kalman filter-based (EKF) AHRS in a quaternion form that detects static mode with the well-known Stance Hypothesis Optimal Detector (SHOE) [34]. Makni [1] proposed an energy-efficient quaternion-based adaptive Kalman filter with a hybrid detector that completely switches off the gyroscope when static. Tong [16] implemented a hidden Markov Model (HMM) recognizer to a multiplicative extended Kalman filter (MEKF) to adaptively tune noise covariance depending on disturbance caused by motion. While stated works show satisfactory results, using adaptation method alone will result in large attitude error when the system is under dynamic situation for an extended period of time. Furthermore, information on the nature of the motion are not fully exploited, since modelling of the non-gravitational acceleration and/or the kinematics itself is absent.

### 2.2.2. Kinematic Modeling based Methods

Dealing with external acceleration through modelling is also a frequently used method in the field of ARS/AHRS. Lee [24] proposed a Kalman filter-based ARS that models the external acceleration as a first-order low-pass filtered white noise process. Though such modelling approach is adopted by several works that followed [11], [25], [26], yet, the model is not based on the actual nature of the nongravitational acceleration, lacking justification behind the approach. [27] adopts the model of [24] and employs an augmented Kalman filter to describe the dynamics, similar to the proposed work. However, [27] is limited to a ball-and-socket joint application, contrary to this study which can be applied to complex motions with varying center of rotation. Kim [3] studied attitude estimation on a small aerial vehicle, where the external acceleration has certain frequency profile as it is induced by the platform vibration of the actuators, and hence implemented second-order infinite impulse response (IIR) notch filter. Maliňák [28] proposed an EKF-based AHRS with a newly developed concept of synthetic acceleration that models the
non-gravitational acceleration differently depending on whether the dynamics of the body is in a nominal or a rare-normal situation. Park [29] presented an indirect Kalman filter-based AHRS where the measurement noise covariance was modelled using ellipsoidal method, rather than modelling the external acceleration itself. Takeda [35] estimated attitude by placing inertial sensors on specific points on limb segments, modelling human gait as a series of rigid body rotation. However, such modelling demanded many parameters that must be measured prior to motion. Although numerous attempts have been made to accurately model the acceleration or the kinematics, the results are still unsatisfactory. The models are either unrealistic with no basis on the actual dynamics, too tailored to a specific application, or in need of predetermined parameters.

## Chapter 3. Center-of-Rotation-based ARS

This chapter presents the proposed center-of-rotation based ARS that uses a rotational motion detector to estimate attitude, gyro bias, and center of rotation. The structure of the proposed indirect Kalman filter-based system and a detailed derivation of the measurement noise covariance matrix are also described in depth.

The structure of the proposed algorithm is illustrated as a schematic block diagram in Fig. 3.1. The system is based on the indirect Kalman filter, where accelerometer measurements with the priori values from time propagation go through the novel rotational motion detector. Depending on which step of the detector the system is determined to be dynamic, the filter adaptively adopts specific measurement model and noise covariance apt for each circumstance. The details of the adaptive algorithm are explained thoroughly in the following subchapters.



### 3.1. Center-of-Rotation-Augmented Kalman Filter

This thesis proposes a kinematic modelling method where the model parameter, center of rotation, is estimated online. The parameters to be estimated are the $x, y$, and $z$ positions of center of rotation in the sensor frame. The center of rotation vector with respect to sensor frame is denoted as $\mathbf{r}^{\mathrm{b}}$, while its $x, y, z$, positions are denoted as $r_{x}, r_{y}$, and $r_{z}$, respectively. The estimated center of rotation is augmented to the nominal state vector as follows.

$$
\mathbf{x}=\left[\begin{array}{ll|llllll}
\gamma & \theta & b_{g, x} & b_{g, y} & b_{g, z} & r_{x} & r_{y} & r_{z} \tag{3.1}
\end{array}\right]^{T}
$$

The error state, which the author uses for the proposed indirect Kalman filter, is as follows.

$$
\delta \mathbf{x}=\left[\begin{array}{llllllll}
\varphi_{N} & \varphi_{E} & \delta b_{g, x} & \delta b_{g, y} & \delta b_{g, z} \mid & \delta r_{x} & \delta r_{y} & \delta r_{z} \tag{3.2}
\end{array}\right]^{T}
$$

The roll, pitch, and gyro bias errors are defined the same as shown in Chapter 2.1.2. The augmented center of rotation error is defined as follows.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta \mathbf{r}^{b}=\mathbf{r}^{b}-\hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By including center of rotation into the state vector, the nature of the dynamics can be estimated and explained in terms of any rotational movement that the system might be experiencing. More importantly, the expected effect of such augmentation is improvement in the accuracy of estimating attitude, which is proven experimentally in Chapter 4.

The Kalman filter equations, including those of time propagation and measurement update, are adopted from [39]. To practice economy, this thesis only
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presents filter properties and equations that deviate from [39].
Expanded from equation (2.9), the nonlinear continuous augmented state system model is as follows.

System model (nonlinear, continuous):

$$
\begin{gather*}
\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\boldsymbol{b}}_{g} \text { from equation (2.9) }  \tag{3.4}\\
\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^{b}=0
\end{gather*}
$$

The augmented error state system model is as follows.
System model (linearized, discrete):

$$
\begin{gather*}
\delta \mathbf{x}_{k}=\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k-1} \delta \mathbf{x}_{k-1}+\mathbf{w}_{k-1}  \tag{3.5}\\
\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k}=\mathbf{I}_{8 \times 8}+\mathbf{F}_{k} \Delta t, \quad \mathbf{F}_{k}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2} & \mathbf{C}_{1,2 r} & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \\
\mathbf{0}_{6 \times 2} & \mathbf{0}_{6 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{6 \times 3}
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.6}
\end{gather*}
$$

with process noise covariance matrix, $\mathbf{Q}$, as a diagonal matrix consisted of noise standard deviation of each state. The noise standard deviation for the augmented $\delta \mathbf{r}^{b}$ is assumed as $10^{-3} \mathrm{~m} / \sqrt{\mathrm{Hz}}$. Some literatures suggest that methods such as RungeKutta ensure a more accurate discretization than the method chosen in equation (3.6) [40]. Yet, equation (3.6) is used instead for three reasons: in the context of a lowgrade IMU (such as the IMU used for the experiments in Chapter 4), the numerical error from the discretization is far smaller than errors from other sources; the discretization error is kept small with a small time-step, $\Delta t$ [40]; the Runge-Kutta method is computationally heavier than the chosen method.

### 3.2. Adaptation using Rotational Motion Detector

The priori values from performing time propagation of the Kalman filter with
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above system model, together with the accelerometer measurement, faces the static detector. The static detector determines whether the system is static by comparing the acceleration measurement with the gravity vector with respect to a threshold. If the system is deemed static, the measurement noise covariance matrix is set as $\mathbf{R}_{a c c}$, which is $\mathbf{R}$ originating from accelerometer only. Then, measurement update is performed to update only the attitude and the gyroscope bias. The adaptive determination of the measurement noise covariance and the measurement model when deemed static by the static detector are as follows.

## Adaptive R:

$$
\mathbf{R}_{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\text { go to rot.detector } & \text { if }\left|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}+\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & g
\end{array}\right]^{T}\right|>\sigma_{z}  \tag{3.7}\\
\mathbf{R}_{\text {acc }} & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

Measurement model (linearized, discrete):

$$
\begin{gather*}
\delta \mathbf{z}_{k}=\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}+\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & g
\end{array}\right]^{T}=\mathbf{H}_{k} \delta \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{v}_{k}  \tag{3.8}\\
\mathbf{H}_{k}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{C}_{1,2 c} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 6}
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\sigma_{z}$ is the measurement noise standard deviation. The above measurement model is similar to the linearized discrete measurement model of equations (2.13) and (2.14) from Chapter 2.1.2, with the difference being the new observation matrix for the augmented error state vector. As for the threshold of the detectors, the value was heuristically set it as the measurement noise standard deviation, $\sigma_{z}$, but the value is a user-determined parameter that may be chosen differently. If the threshold is set too low for any of the detectors, it would inflate the measurement covariance matrix; if the threshold is set too high, it would deflate the measurement covariance matrix. Both cases of false detection would hinder the filter from accurately
capturing the true dynamics, and thus deteriorate the performance of the proposed algorithm.

However, if deemed dynamic, the system goes through a rotational motion detector. The rotational motion detector checks whether the system is rotationally dynamic by comparing gravity vector with acceleration measurement compensated for the acceleration with respect to the estimated center of rotation. When deemed rotationally static, $\mathbf{R}$ is set as $\mathbf{R}_{a c c}+\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$, where the definition and derivation of $\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$ is presented in Chapter 3.3. Conversely, when deemed rotationally dynamic, $\mathbf{R}$ is set as $s\left(\mathbf{R}_{\text {acc }}+\mathbf{R}^{\prime}\right)$. The parameter $s$ is a user-set parameter, which was chosen as 107 for experiments carried out in this thesis. Though very large, the results in Chapter 4 shows that the measurement was still able to influence attitude estimation. The optimal value was chosen through a set of trials. It is also confirmed that the degradation of performance due to using other values that are not widely different from the optimal value is minimal. As the system undergoes the rotational motion detector, the measurement update performs an update on not only the attitude and the gyroscope bias, but also the center of rotation. The adaptive determination of the measurement noise covariance and the measurement model of the second step are as follows.

Adaptive $\mathbf{R}$ :

$$
\mathbf{R}_{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
s\left(\mathbf{R}_{a c c}+\mathbf{R}^{\prime}\right) & \text { if }\left|\left(\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}+\mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)+\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0
\end{array}\right]^{T}\right|>\sigma_{z}  \tag{3.10}\\
\mathbf{R}_{\text {acc }}+\mathbf{R}^{\prime} & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

Measurement model (linearized, discrete):

$$
\begin{gather*}
\delta \mathbf{z}_{k}=\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & g
\end{array}\right]^{T}+\mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}=\mathbf{H}_{k} \delta \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{v}_{k}  \tag{3.11}\\
\mathbf{H}_{k}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\mathbf{C}_{1,2 c} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{H}_{r}
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.12}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}$ is the current estimate of the center of rotation in the sensor frame. Also, $\mathbf{H}_{r}=\left[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{k} \times\right]^{2}+\left[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{k} \times\right]$, and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{k}=\frac{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{k}-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{k-1}}{\Delta t}$, where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{k}$ is the tri-axial gyro measurements at time $k$ with following relation.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{k}=\boldsymbol{\omega}_{k}+\delta \boldsymbol{\omega}_{k} \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the measurement model shown in equation (3.11), the centripetal acceleration due to rotational motion about the fixed point at $\mathbf{r}^{b}$ corresponds to $-\left[\boldsymbol{\omega}_{k} \times\right]^{2} \mathbf{r}^{b}$, whereas the tangential acceleration corresponds to $-\left[\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{k} \times\right] \mathbf{r}^{b}$.

### 3.2. Derivation of Measurement Noise Covariance Matrix

With the presence of an error in $\mathbf{H}_{r}$ from the gyroscope error, the measurement noise covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}_{k}$ is now larger than conventional measurement noise covariance matrix, $\mathbf{R}_{\text {acc }}$. The increment is defined as $\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{R}_{k}=\mathbf{R}_{a c c}+\mathbf{R}^{\prime} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

To derive $\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$, the polysemous notations $l, m$, and $n$ are first defined. The notations correspond to numbers 1,2 , or 3 when denoting components of $\mathbf{H}_{r}$, and correspond to $x, y$, or $z$ when denoting the axes of gyroscope measurement, $\omega$. To elaborate, in case of $\mathbf{H}_{r}(2,3), l$ and $m$ are assigned to $y$ and $z$ axes, and $n$ is automatically assigned to the $x$ axis. Let us define $\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m)$ to be the error in the $(l, m)$-th component of $\mathbf{H}_{r}$. Then, using the definition of $\mathbf{H}_{r}$, following error expressions can be derived:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, l)=-\left(\delta \omega_{m}^{2}+\delta \omega_{n}^{2}\right) \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)= & \delta\left(\omega_{l} \omega_{m}\right)+\delta\left(\alpha_{n}\right) \\
= & \left(\widetilde{\omega}_{l} \widetilde{\omega}_{m}+\widetilde{\alpha}_{n}\right)-\left(\omega_{l} \omega_{m}+\alpha_{n}\right) \\
= & \left(\widetilde{\omega}_{l} \widetilde{\omega}_{m}+\frac{\widetilde{\omega}_{n, t}-\widetilde{\omega}_{n, t-\Delta t}}{\Delta \mathrm{t}}\right) \\
& -\left(\omega_{l} \omega_{m}+\frac{\omega_{n, t}-\omega_{n, t-\Delta t}}{\Delta \mathrm{t}}\right)  \tag{3.16}\\
= & \delta \omega_{l} \delta \omega_{m}+\omega_{l} \delta \omega_{m}+\omega_{m} \delta \omega_{l} \\
& +\frac{\delta \omega_{n, t}-\delta \omega_{n, t-\Delta t}}{\Delta \mathrm{t}}
\end{align*}
$$

With such derivations of each component of the error matrix, the expectations of squared-error terms are drawn. Their derivations are spanned out for all six cases as followed. The final outcome of each case and the full process of the derivations are presented as follows.

Case 1:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, l)^{2}\right]= & \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{4}+\delta \omega_{n}^{4}+2 \delta \omega_{m}^{2} \delta \omega_{n}^{2}\right] \\
= & \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{4}\right]+\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n}^{4}\right]+2 \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{2}\right] \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n}^{2}\right] \\
& \left(\because \delta \omega_{m} \& \delta \omega_{n} \text { indep. }\right) \\
= & 3 \sigma^{4}+3 \sigma^{4}+2 \sigma^{4}  \tag{3.17}\\
= & 8 \sigma^{4} \\
= & 8(\mathrm{PSD})^{2} \Delta t^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Case 2:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2}\right] \\
& =\mathbf{E}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\delta \omega_{l}^{2} \delta \omega_{m}^{2}+\omega_{l}^{2} \delta \omega_{m}^{2}+\omega_{m}^{2} \delta \omega_{l}^{2}+\frac{\delta \omega_{n, t}^{2}+\delta \omega_{n, t-\Delta t}^{2}}{\Delta t^{2}} \\
+(\text { terms containing } \delta \omega \text { to odd powers })
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.18}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{l}^{2}\right] \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{2}\right]+\omega_{l}^{2} \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{2}\right]+\omega_{m}^{2} \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{l}^{2}\right] \\
& \quad+\frac{\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n, t}^{2}\right]+\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n, t-\Delta t}^{2}\right]}{\Delta t^{2}} \\
& =\sigma^{4}+\omega_{l}^{2} \sigma^{2}+\omega_{m}^{2} \sigma^{2}+\frac{\sigma^{2}+\sigma^{2}}{\Delta t^{2}}  \tag{3.18}\\
& =\sigma^{4}+\left(\omega_{l}^{2}+\omega_{m}^{2}+\frac{2}{\Delta t^{2}}\right) \sigma^{2} \\
& =(\mathrm{PSD})^{2} \Delta t^{2}+\frac{2(\mathrm{PSD})^{2}}{\Delta t^{2}}+\underbrace{\left(\omega_{l}^{2}+\omega_{m}^{2}\right)(\mathrm{PSD}) \Delta t}_{\text {dependent on motion }}
\end{align*}
$$

Case 3:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, l) \delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)\right] \\
& =\mathbf{E}[\text { all terms containing } \delta \omega \text { to odd powers }] \\
& =0
\end{aligned}
$$

Case 4:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, l) \delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(m \neq l, m)\right] \\
& =\mathbf{E}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\delta \omega_{m}^{2} \delta \omega_{l}^{2}+\delta \omega_{m}^{2} \delta \omega_{n}^{2}+\delta \omega_{l}^{2} \delta \omega_{n}^{2}+\delta \omega_{n}^{4} \\
+(\text { terms containing } \delta \omega \text { to odd powers })
\end{array}\right] \\
& =\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{2}\right] \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{l}^{2}\right]+\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{2}\right] \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n}^{2}\right]+\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{l}^{2}\right] \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n}^{2}\right] \\
& \quad+\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n}^{4}\right]
\end{aligned} \begin{aligned}
& =\sigma^{4}+\sigma^{4}+\sigma^{4}+3 \sigma^{4}  \tag{3.20}\\
& =6 \sigma^{4} \\
& =6(\mathrm{PSD})^{2} \Delta t^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Case 5:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l) \delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, n \neq l \& m)\right] \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\mathbf{E}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\omega_{m} \omega_{n} \delta \omega_{l}^{2}+\frac{\omega_{l} \delta \omega_{m}^{2}}{\Delta t}+\frac{\omega_{l} \delta \omega_{n}^{2}}{\Delta t} \\
+(\text { terms containing } \delta \omega \text { to odd powers })
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.21}\\
& =\omega_{m} \omega_{n} \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{l}^{2}\right]+\frac{\omega_{l}}{\Delta t} \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{m}^{2}\right]+\frac{\omega_{l}}{\Delta t} \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \omega_{n}^{2}\right] \\
& =\omega_{m} \omega_{n} \sigma^{2}+\frac{2 \omega_{l} \sigma^{2}}{\Delta t} \\
& =\underbrace{\omega_{m} \omega_{n}(\mathrm{PSD}) \Delta t+2 \omega_{l}(\mathrm{PSD})}_{\text {dependent on motion }}
\end{align*}
$$

Case 6:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, l) \delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(m \neq l, n \neq l \& m)\right] \\
& =\mathbf{E}[\text { all terms containing } \delta \omega \text { to odd powers }]  \tag{3.22}\\
& =0
\end{align*}
$$

Assuming that the rotational rate is much smaller than $1 / \Delta t$, which corresponds to $100 \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ for a sampling rate of 100 Hz , above six cases can be approximated and reduced down as follows.

For case 2 from above:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2}\right] \approx \frac{2(\mathrm{PSD})^{2}}{\Delta t^{2}} \tag{3.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

For all other cases:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m) \delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(n, o)\right] \approx 0 \tag{3.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$ is the measurement noise covariance matrix induced from the gyroscope error, or more specifically, from the $\mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}$ of the measurement equation (3.11). In Kalman filter, the measurement noise covariance matrix is the expectation of the
error squared. Accordingly, $\mathrm{R}^{\prime}$ can be expressed as $\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)^{T}\right]$. Expansion of this is shown as follows.

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)^{T}\right] \\
=\mathrm{E}\left[\left[\begin{array}{l}
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(1,1) \cdot r_{x}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(1,2) \cdot r_{y}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(1,3) \cdot r_{z} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(2,1) \cdot r_{x}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(2,2) \cdot r_{y}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(2,3) \cdot r_{z} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(3,1) \cdot r_{x}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(3,2) \cdot r_{y}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(3,3) \cdot r_{z}
\end{array}\right]\right.  \tag{3.25}\\
\cdot\left[\begin{array}{l}
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(1,1) \cdot r_{x}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(1,2) \cdot r_{y}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(1,3) \cdot r_{z} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(2,1) \cdot r_{x}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(2,2) \cdot r_{y}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(2,3) \cdot r_{z} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(3,1) \cdot r_{x}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(3,2) \cdot r_{y}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(3,3) \cdot r_{z}
\end{array}\right]
\end{array}\right]
$$

From equation (3.23) and (3.24), the above equation is only left with the $\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2}$ terms, as shown below.

$$
\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)^{T}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\boldsymbol{v}_{1} & \boldsymbol{v}_{2} & \boldsymbol{v}_{3} \tag{3.26}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \boldsymbol{v}_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{y}^{2}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{z}^{2} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{x} r_{y} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{z} r_{x}
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.27}\\
& \boldsymbol{v}_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{x} r_{y} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{z}^{2}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{x}^{2} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{y} r_{z}
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.28}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\boldsymbol{v}_{3}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{z} r_{x}  \tag{3.29}\\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{y} r_{z} \\
\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{x}^{2}+\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2} \cdot r_{y}^{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Hence, the derivation can be concluded by simplifying the above:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{R}^{\prime} & =\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)\left(\delta \mathbf{H}_{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{b}\right)^{T}\right] \\
& =\mathrm{E}\left[\delta \mathbf{H}_{r}(l, m \neq l)^{2}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
r_{y}^{2}+r_{z}^{2} & r_{x} r_{y} & r_{z} r_{x} \\
r_{x} r_{y} & r_{z}^{2}+r_{x}^{2} & r_{y} r_{z} \\
r_{z} r_{x} & r_{y} r_{z} & r_{x}^{2}+r_{y}^{2}
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.30}\\
& =\frac{2(\mathrm{PSD})^{2}}{\Delta t^{2}}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
r_{y}^{2}+r_{z}^{2} & r_{x} r_{y} & r_{z} r_{x} \\
r_{x} r_{y} & r_{z}^{2}+r_{x}^{2} & r_{y} r_{z} \\
r_{z} r_{x} & r_{y} r_{z} & r_{x}^{2}+r_{y}^{2}
\end{array}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

For a gyroscope with amplitude spectral density (ASD) of $0.05 \mathrm{deg} / \sqrt{\mathrm{Hz}}$ sampled at $100 \mathrm{~Hz}, \sqrt{\frac{2(\mathrm{PSD})^{2}}{\Delta t^{2}}} \approx 0.01 \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$. When $r=\left|\mathbf{r}^{b}\right|=1 \mathrm{~m}$, this value is comparable to an accelerometer noise with standard deviation of $0.01 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$.

Note that $\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$ increases as the rotational radius increases. Since the rotational radius during translational motion is conventionally considered infinite, $\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$ would become infinite under such assumption. This implies that the measurement update of the Kalman filter has practically no effect as $\mathbf{R}_{k}$ is infinite. Instead, the rotational radius is set to zero, in the sense of resetting the value until the system is under a rotational acceleration again. In the implementation aspect, this is much more practical as $\mathbf{R}_{k}$ equals to $s \mathbf{R}_{\text {acc }}$ under translational motion, meaning the filter still performs an update, just with a larger measurement noise covariance matrix to reflect the dynamicity of the motion. Kinematically speaking, setting the rotational radius to zero does not imply a pure translation, but rather a pure rotation. However, despite the rotational radius being both zero, the proposed algorithm is still able to distinguish between the two motions with its static detector: in a purely translational
case, an external acceleration is present, whereas in a purely rotational case, it does not. Furthermore, the outperforming results shown in Chapter 4 also corroborate the validity of the assumption.

### 3.4. Observability Analysis

Since proposed algorithm assumes handheld device applications, where dynamics is limited by the maximum speed of human motion, the Piece-Wise Constant System (PWCS) assumption is employed to analyze the observability of the proposed system. The observability matrix for a PWCS [41] is as follows.

$$
\mathbf{0}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
O_{1}  \tag{3.31}\\
O_{2} \\
\vdots \\
O_{r} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{r-1}^{n-1} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{r-2}^{n-1} \cdots \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{1}^{n-1}
\end{array}\right]^{T}
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{o}_{j}^{T}=\left[\begin{array}{lllllll}
\mathbf{H}_{j}^{T} & \mid & \left(\mathbf{H}_{j} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{j}\right)^{T} & \mid & \cdots & \mid & \left(\mathbf{H}_{j} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{j}^{n-1}\right)^{T} \tag{3.32}
\end{array}\right]
$$

The proposed system is fully observable for rotations about two or more axes. However, for rotations around a single axis, it is only partially observable. In the latter case, the position of center of rotation along the rotation axis is unobservable. A detailed derivation and explanation of the observability matrix is presented as follows:

First, a full expansions of $\mathbf{H}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ is conducted.

$$
\mathbf{H}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\mathbf{C}_{1,2 c} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{H}_{r} \tag{3.33}
\end{array}\right]
$$

$$
\mathbf{C}_{1,2 \mathrm{c}}=\text { first two columns of } \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}[\mathbf{g} \times]
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0 & -g \\
g & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.34}\\
& =\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) g & -\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) g \\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) g & -\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) g \\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,2) g & -\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,1) g
\end{array}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{H}_{r} & =[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \times]^{2}+[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \times] \\
& =\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
-\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z}^{2}\right) & \boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} & \boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \\
\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} & -\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x}^{2}\right) & \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \\
\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} & \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} & -\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y}^{2}\right)
\end{array}\right] \\
& +\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & -\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z} & \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y} \\
\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z} & 0 & -\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x} \\
-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y} & \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x} & 0
\end{array}\right] \\
& =\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\boldsymbol{v}_{4} & \boldsymbol{v}_{5} & \boldsymbol{v}_{6}
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \boldsymbol{v}_{4}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z}-\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \omega_{x} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y} \\
-\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x}^{2}\right) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z}-\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y} \\
\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z}+\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x}^{2}\right) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y}
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.36}\\
& \boldsymbol{v}_{5}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z}^{2}\right) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x} \\
-\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x} \\
-\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z}-\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y}^{2}\right) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x}
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.37}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\boldsymbol{v}_{6}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
-\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z}^{2}\right) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y}-\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x}  \tag{3.38}\\
\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y}-\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z}^{2}+\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x}^{2}\right) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x} \\
\boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{x} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y}-\boldsymbol{\omega}_{y} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{z} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x}
\end{array}\right]
$$

As for $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\boldsymbol{\Phi} & =\mathbf{I}_{8 \times 8}+\mathbf{F} \Delta t \\
& =\mathbf{I}_{8 \times 8}+\left[\begin{array}{cccccc}
\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2} & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,3) & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \\
\mathbf{0}_{6 \times 2} & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,3) & \mathbf{0}_{6 \times 3} & \\
\mathbf{0}_{6 \times 3}
\end{array}\right] \Delta t \\
& =\left[\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
1 & 0 & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) \Delta t & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) \Delta t & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,3) \Delta t & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) \Delta t & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) \Delta t & \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,3) \Delta t & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.39}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, $\mathbf{H \Phi}$ from the observability matrix can be expressed as follows.

$$
\mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\Phi}=\left[\begin{array}{lllllll}
\mathbf{C}_{1,2 \mathrm{c}} & \boldsymbol{v}_{7} & \boldsymbol{v}_{8} & \boldsymbol{v}_{9} & \boldsymbol{v}_{4} & \boldsymbol{v}_{5} & \boldsymbol{v}_{6} \tag{3.40}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where

$$
\boldsymbol{v}_{7}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) \Delta t  \tag{3.41}\\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1)^{2} g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) \Delta t \\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) \Delta t
\end{array}\right]
$$

$$
\boldsymbol{v}_{8}=\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) \Delta t  \tag{3.42}\\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) \Delta t \\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) \Delta t
\end{array}\right]
$$

$$
\boldsymbol{v}_{9}=\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,3) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,3) \Delta t  \tag{3.43}\\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,3) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,3) \Delta t \\
\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,2) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(1,3) \Delta t-\mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(3,1) g \cdot \mathbf{C}_{n}^{b}(2,3) \Delta t
\end{array}\right]
$$

To give an example of an unobservable case, a rotation purely about the z-axis
is assumed. In this case, $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{x}, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{y}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{x}$, and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{y}$ are all zeros. This makes $\boldsymbol{v}_{6}$, the last column of $\mathbf{H \Phi}$, a null vector, hence indicating that $\delta r_{z}$ is unobservable. Despite the unobservable case, the stability of the system is believed not to be compromised as a circumstance where the rotation axis aligns perfectly with one of the axes is highly unrealistic. This thesis further explains the case with regards to the rate table experiment in Chapter 4.1.

## Chapter 4. Experimental Results

To verify the accuracy and robustness of the proposed algorithm, this study conduct an extensive evaluation on total of six scenarios, four collected by the author and two from the benchmark dataset BROAD [36]. In this chapter, the setups and results of each scenario are presented.

For all experiments, the performance evaluation was conducted in terms of root mean square error (RMSE). For fair comparison, an algorithm, referred to as "conventional" hereafter, was devised, adopting measurement noise covariance adaptation scheme based on the work of Li and Wang [14], combined with the states and filter structure described in Chapter 2.1.2. Hence, for attitude estimation, the proposed algorithm was compared with the conventional algorithm and the MTx output, whereas for external acceleration estimation, it was only compared with the conventional algorithm as the MTx output was used to derive the reference value, as explained earlier in this chapter. Since the BROAD dataset does not provide attitude output by Myon Aktos-t, this study compares only with the conventional algorithm for the two BROAD trials.

### 4.1. Rate Table Experiments

The inertial measurement unit (IMU) used to evaluate the proposed attitude estimating algorithm in the author-collected experiments is the Xsens MTx, with its specifications [42] listed in Table 4.1. As a reference, the VICON infrared camera motion capture system was used to track three markers 10 cm apart from one another. However, since VICON only provides attitude values, MTx output was used as acceleration reference. Hence, DCM from VICON attitude multiplied by the gravity vector was deducted from the MTx acceleration value to derive the reference values
of the external acceleration. The external acceleration reference is calculated as below:

$$
\mathbf{d}_{r e f, k}=\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}-\mathbf{C}_{n \text { VICON }}^{b}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & -g \tag{4.1}
\end{array}\right]^{T}
$$

A static calibration of gyroscope bias was performed prior to each motion for 20 seconds. The remaining gyro bias after $T_{\text {align }}$ seconds of calibration is as follows.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta b_{g}=\frac{\sigma_{\text {gyr }}}{\sqrt{T_{\text {align }}}} \approx 0.01 \mathrm{deg} / \mathrm{s} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma_{g y r}$ is the noise standard deviation of the gyroscope. Above value was used in setting the initial gyroscope bias error covariance.

Table 4.1. MTx Specifications

|  | Gyroscope | Accelerometer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measurement range | $\pm 1200 \mathrm{deg} / \mathrm{s}$ | $\pm 5 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| Sampling rate |  | 100 Hz |
| Noise density | $0.05 \mathrm{deg} / \mathrm{s} / \sqrt{\mathrm{Hz}}$ | $200 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \sqrt{\mathrm{Hz}}$ |

Of the four author-collected experiments, the first two were rate table experiments with different rates. The setup of the rate table experiments is as shown in Fig. 4.1. The first scenario is termed as "Rate Table Slow" and the second scenario as "Rate Table Fast." Both scenarios involved periodic bang-bang maneuvers, depicted in Fig.4.2, with trapezoidal velocity profiles. For "Rate Table Slow," the
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average and maximum norm deviations from static acceleration was $0.54 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ and $1.03 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$,respectively. For "Rate Table Fast," the average and maximum norm deviations from static acceleration was $1.25 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ and $1.95 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$, respectively.


Figure 4.1. Setup of the rate table experiments.


Figure 4.2. Schematic view of the rate table experiments. The orange object is the IMU in use.

The results of "Rate Table Slow" scenario are summarized in Table 4.2. The proposed algorithm outperforms both the conventional algorithm and MTx in most cases of attitude estimation, the former by $20-30 \%$, though the conventional algorithm also shows satisfactory results of sub-degree error. For external acceleration estimation, the proposed outperforms the conventional algorithm in all trials by far, showing $80 \%$ less error.

Table 4.2. RMSE Results of Rate Table Slow

| Trial | Roll [deg] |  |  | Pitch [deg] |  |  | Ext. Acc. $\left[\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right]$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | Prop. |
| 1 | 0.54 | 1.48 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9}$ | 2.83 | 0.68 | 0.98 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 9}$ |
| 2 | 0.55 | 1.64 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 2}$ | 0.64 | 3.61 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 0}$ | 0.97 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 9}$ |
| 3 | 0.57 | 1.86 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 9}$ | 0.64 | 3.91 | $\mathbf{0 . 5 3}$ | 0.97 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 9}$ |
| 4 | 0.55 | 1.69 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ | 0.63 | 3.48 | $\mathbf{0 . 5 7}$ | 0.97 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 8}$ |

Fig. 4.5 shows a full graphical comparison of attitude estimation of a single trial. Estimated external acceleration of a single trial compared to the reference value, magnified to show results of 5 seconds, is shown in Fig. 4.3. It can be seen that the proposed algorithm presents superb performance of $80 \%$ less error on average. The estimated center of rotation is shown in Fig. 4.4. The sensor was indeed attached 10 cm from the center of the rate table, indicating that the algorithm has successfully estimated the center of rotation. Though accurate estimation of center of rotation itself is not the focus of this research, such accuracy undoubtedly improves the performance of the filter.


Figure 4.3. Estimated external acceleration from a single trial of "Rate Table Slow".


Figure 4.4. Estimated center of rotation from a single trial of "Rate Table Slow".
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Table 4.3 summarizes the results of "Rate Table Fast" scenario. Similar to the previous scenario, the proposed algorithm outperforms both the conventional algorithm and MTx in most cases of attitude estimation. For external acceleration estimation, the proposed outperforms the conventional algorithm in all trials by an even greater discrepancy than the previous scenario.

Table 4.3. RMSE Results of Rate Table Fast

| Trial | Roll $[\mathrm{deg}]$ |  |  | Pitch [deg] |  |  | Ext. Acc. $\left[\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right]$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | Prop. |
| 1 | 1.08 | 1.57 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 1}$ | 3.53 | 3.89 | $\mathbf{3 . 0 1}$ | 2.15 | $\mathbf{0 . 2 7}$ |
| 2 | 0.48 | 1.08 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 6}$ | 4.08 | 0.87 | 2.11 | $\mathbf{0 . 2 3}$ |
| 3 | 1.13 | 2.35 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 7}$ | 2.02 | 3.76 | $\mathbf{1 . 7 2}$ | 2.24 | $\mathbf{0 . 2 1}$ |
| 4 | 0.98 | 1.86 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5}$ | 1.79 | 4.15 | $\mathbf{1 . 4 9}$ | 2.08 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 0}$ |

Fig. 4.8 shows a full graphical comparison of attitude estimation of a single trial. Estimated external acceleration of a single trial compared to the reference value, magnified to show results of 5 seconds, is shown in Fig. 4.6. Similar to previous scenario, it can be seen that the proposed algorithm presents superb performance of $88 \%$ less error on average. The estimated center of rotation is shown in Fig. 4.7. The algorithm has successfully estimated the center of rotation, which is 10 cm , same as the Rate Table Slow experiment.


Figure 4.6. Estimated external acceleration from a single trial of "Rate Table Fast".


Figure 4.7. Estimated center of rotation from a single trial of "Rate Table Fast".
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### 4.2. Handheld Experiments

The latter two of the author-collected experiments are the handheld experiments to demonstrate performance in actual usage. The setup of the handheld experiments is as shown in Fig. 4.9. The third scenario involved high-dynamic forearm rotations about the vertical axis, as in Fig. 4.10. We call this scenario "Handheld Yaw." The average norm deviation from static acceleration was $7.46 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$, and at times it reached up to $31.18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$. The fourth and last scenario involved high-dynamic swings in figure-of-eight curves, as in Fig. 4.11. The motion is similar to putting an elbow on a table and drawing and " X " with the fist, resulting in a trajectory comprised of two arcs with the center as the elbow. We call this scenario "Handheld Eight." The average acceleration norm deviation from the gravity was $3.87 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$, and at times it reached up to $12.39 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$. All four sequences have fixed center of rotation and are comprised of primarily rotational motion to highlight the efficacy of our contribution. We present quantitative results for all sequences, but only provide full graphical representation for "Rate Table Fast" and "Handheld Eight" to practice economy


Figure 4.9. Setup of the handheld experiments.


Figure 4.10. Schematic view of the "Handheld Yaw" experiment. The orange object is the IMU in use.


Figure 4.11. Schematic view of the "Handheld Eight" experiment. The orange object is the IMU in use.

The results of "Handheld Yaw" scenario are summarized in Table 4.4. For roll estimation, the proposed algorithm demonstrates the best results of near sub-degree error, while MTx shows comparable performance. The proposed algorithm also shows best performance on pitch estimation, while all three methods show performance of sub-degree error. In case of external acceleration estimation, the proposed greatly outperforms the conventional method with $68 \%$ less error. Considering that "Handheld Yaw" is the most dynamic of all four scenarios, it is proven that the proposed algorithm indeed delivers superb performance, withstanding such harsh and challenging conditions. Compared to the rate table
experiments, the accuracy of estimating external acceleration is compromised due to harsh nature of the motion. Yet, the proposed algorithm still outperforms the conventional algorithm by a great deal, proving improved robustness towards harsh motion.

Table 4.4. RMSE Results of Handheld Yaw

| Trial | Roll [deg] |  |  | Pitch [deg] |  |  | Ext. Acc. $\left[\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right]$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | Prop. |
| 1 | 1.73 | 0.82 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 5}$ | 0.47 | 0.56 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ | 11.90 | $\mathbf{4 . 2 3}$ |
| 2 | 1.94 | 1.17 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 0.48 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 1}$ | 0.48 | 12.58 | $\mathbf{4 . 2 7}$ |
| 3 | 2.17 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 7}$ | 0.69 | 0.49 | 0.71 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ | 18.15 | $\mathbf{5 . 6 1}$ |
| 4 | 1.45 | 0.54 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 7}$ | 0.49 | 0.57 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 4}$ | 12.99 | $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$ |

A graphical comparison of attitude estimation of a single trial is presented in Fig. 4.14. Fig. 4.13 shows estimated center of rotation of this scenario. When compared to other scenarios, it can be noted that the estimation has a delay in converging to accurate value of center of rotation, which is the length of the forearm. Finally, Fig. 4.12 shows estimated external acceleration of a single trial compared to the reference value, magnified for 5 seconds.


Figure 4.12. Estimated external acceleration from a single trial of "Handheld Yaw".


Figure 4.13. Estimated center of rotation from a single trial of "Handheld Yaw".
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The results of "Handheld Eight" scenario are summarized in Table 4.5. The proposed method outperforms both conventional and MTx results in most cases, with sub-degree error for both roll and pitch of all four trials. As for estimating external acceleration, proposed algorithm shows better performance compared to the conventional algorithm with $62 \%$ less error, consistent with the results of other scenarios. Together with the results from "Handheld Yaw", it can be confidently claimed that the proposed method successfully estimates attitude and external acceleration in highly dynamic conditions, especially with motions regarding center of rotation. A graphical comparison of attitude estimation of a single trial is presented in Fig. 4.17. Fig. 4.16 shows estimated center of rotation of this scenario, where the same delay also shown in Handheld Yaw can be observed. Such delay can explain a slightly higher error within the timeframe of 0-40 seconds than the rest of the time, shown in Fig. 4.17. Finally, Fig. 4.15 shows estimated external acceleration of a single trial compared to the reference value, magnified for 5 seconds.

Table 4.5. RMSE Results of Handheld Eight

| Trial | Roll [deg] |  |  | Pitch [deg] |  |  | Ext. Acc. $\left[\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right]$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | MTx | Prop. | Conv. | Prop. |
| 1 | 1.26 | 4.58 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9}$ | 1.68 | 0.69 | 5.75 | $\mathbf{2 . 5 2}$ |
| 2 | 1.88 | 2.14 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 9}$ | 0.54 | 2.19 | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ | 7.32 | $\mathbf{2 . 7 1}$ |
| 3 | 1.57 | 2.36 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | 0.73 | 1.91 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 2}$ | 7.02 | $\mathbf{2 . 7 4}$ |
| 4 | 1.96 | 3.51 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 1}$ | 0.86 | 2.84 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 5}$ | 8.01 | $\mathbf{2 . 6 2}$ |



Figure 4.15. Estimated external acceleration from a single trial of "Handheld Eight".


Figure 4.16. Estimated center of rotation from a single trial of "Handheld Eight".
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### 4.3. BROAD Dataset

BROAD dataset [36] is comprised of 39 trials that vary in types of motions, the speeds of motions, and existence of accelerometer and/or magnetometer disturbances. All trials were recorded with 9-axis IMU Myon Aktos-t from Myon AG, Switzerland, with its specifications [36] listed in Table 4.6. For the ground truth data, an Optitrack OMC system of eight cameras was used, providing angular accuracy of 0.2 degrees [36].

Table 4.6. Myon Aktos-t Specifications

|  | Gyroscope | Accelerometer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measurement range | $\pm 2000 \mathrm{deg} / \mathrm{s}$ | $\pm 16 \mathrm{~g}$ |
| Sampling rate | $0.10 \mathrm{deg} / \mathrm{s}$ | 286 Hz |
| Noise standard <br> deviation | $0.056 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ |  |

Of the 39 trials, this study chose two, the $20^{\text {th }}$ and the $39^{\text {th }}$, to evaluate the proposed algorithm on real-world scenarios of complex motions and with varying center of rotation. The former is an undisturbed trial with combination of rotational and translational motions lasting 360 seconds, named "BROAD Combined 360s" hereafter. The sequence goes under average acceleration norm of $4.00 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ and maximum of $11.70 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$. The latter, named "BROAD Disturbed Mixed" hereafter, is a trial of 280 seconds with disturbed and undisturbed phases coexisting. The trial is comprised of several segments of combined motion of rotation and translation with short breaks in between. The sequence goes under average acceleration norm of 3.25 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ and maximum of $40.22 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$. Unlike the author-collected datasets, the
chosen BROAD trials present more complex motions closer to real-world situations with varying center of rotation, shown by their 3D motion paths in Fig. 4.18 and 4.19, thus appropriate for evaluating robustness of the proposed algorithm.

BROAD Combined 360s motion path


Figure 4.18. 3D motion path of the "BROAD Combined 360s" experiment.


Figure 4.19. 3D motion path of the "BROAD Disturbed Mixed" experiment.

The results of "BROAD Combined 360s" scenario are summarized in the first row of Table 4.7. The proposed method outperforms the conventional algorithm by $38 \%$, with sub-degree error for both roll and pitch. A graphical comparison of attitude estimation of a single trial is presented in Fig. 4.22. The accuracy of estimating external acceleration is also improved compared to the conventional method, showing $56 \%$ less error, consistent with the results of author-collected scenarios. Fig. 4.21 shows estimated center of rotation of this scenario. When compared to the previous author-collected dataset, it can be seen that the center of rotation changes irregularly, hence proving that estimating center of rotation online serves a purpose in situations with arbitrary motions. Fig. 4.20 shows estimated external acceleration compared to the reference value, magnified for 5 seconds.

Table 4.7. RMSE Results of BROAD Dataset

| Dataset | Roll [deg] |  | Pitch [deg] |  | Ext. Acc. [m/s ${ }^{2}$ ] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Conv. | Prop. | Conv. | Prop. | Conv. | Prop. |
| Combined 360s | 0.91 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.36 | 0.82 | 0.36 |
| Disturbed Mixed | 1.24 | 0.88 | 0.98 | 0.65 | 2.49 | 1.06 |



Figure 4.20. Estimated external acceleration from a single trial of "BROAD Combined 360s".


Figure 4.21. Estimated center of rotation from a single trial of "BROAD Combined 360s".
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based ARS), respectively Figure 4.22 . Errors of estimated attitude from a single trial of "BROAD Combined 360s". The conventional method and the
proposed method are colored in green and red, respectively, denoted as "Li \& wang" and "CR-ARS" (short for Center-of-Rotation



The second row of Table 4.7 presents the results of "BROAD Disturbed Mixed" scenario. The results show that the proposed method outperforms the conventional method by $32 \%$ in attitude estimation. A full graphical representation of attitude estimation is presented in Fig. 4.25. The proposed algorithm also outperforms the conventional in estimating external acceleration with $57 \%$ less error. Fig. 4.23 shows estimated external acceleration of a single trial compared to the reference value, magnified for 5 seconds. From the graph, we can see that there has been a false detection of external acceleration from 74 to 77 second of the sequence. Judging from the provided sensor data, this deviation can be explained by a sudden change in the gyroscope measurements within that window, which results in an erroneous deduction of the gravity vector. Such false detection leads to deterioration of accuracy in attitude estimation, as explained in Chapter 3.2. The zoomed graph of Fig. 4.25 corroborates the effect of false detection, showing increased attitude estimation error for both roll and pitch. However, it is also shown that false detection does not have a lasting effect on degradation of performance as the error normalizes when the filter starts to correctly detect external acceleration. Lastly, the estimated center of rotation is shown in Fig. 4.24. It is proven once again that the proposed method estimates center of rotation well through the areas with near-zero values, which coincide with the intermittent short breaks between the dynamic phases that "BROAD Disturbed Mixed" has.

The evaluation on both BROAD sequences effectively demonstrate the robustness of the proposed algorithm, proving that the applicability of the proposed method is not limited to situations with rotation-only motions or a fixed center of rotation.


Figure 4.23. Estimated external acceleration from a single trial of "BROAD Disturbed Mixed".


Figure 4.24. Estimated center of rotation from a single trial of "BROAD Disturbed Mixed".
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## Chapter 5. Conclusion

In this thesis, an augmented Kalman filter-based ARS is presented. The proposed system accurately estimates attitude with center of rotation augmented to its error-state vector.

As an accurate estimation of the external acceleration is a key to a successful ARS, knowing the types of undergoing motion is crucial. The augmentation of center of rotation precisely does that: estimated center of rotation allows us to describe the motion with respect to rotational motions as well as translational ones, unlike previous works that do not distinguish whether the motion is translational, rotational, or both.

With a more specific understanding of the motion, the system employs two motion detectors to adaptively adopt a measurement model and noise covariance matrix more fitting to the undergoing motion. The static detector, the first of the two detectors, is similar to those of the conventional threshold-based algorithms: determining whether the system is static or not, without considering the nature of the dynamicity. The superiority of the proposed algorithm lies with the second detector, the rotational motion detector. Effectively taking advantage of the estimated center of rotation, the detector not only distinguishes whether the dynamicity of the system inherits a rotational motion but also provides the filter with a more accurate measurement model that incorporates rotational acceleration. This includes a newly defined component of the measurement noise covariance matrix, $\mathbf{R}^{\prime}$, with its full derivation thoroughly presented in Chapter 3.3.

The proposed algorithm is validated through the author-collected experiments and existing benchmark dataset [36] in Chapter 4. The former is comprised of four experiments: "Rate Table Slow", "Rate Table Fast", "Handheld Yaw", and "Handheld Eight". These experiments are intended to highlight the contribution as
they are almost purely rotational with fixed center of rotation. With the estimated center of rotation and the rotational motion detector, the proposed algorithm outperforms the conventional algorithm and the MTx output in terms of accuracy in estimating the attitude and the external acceleration in almost all sequences. From the benchmark dataset, two sequences were chosen, "BROAD Combined 360s" and "BROAD Disturbed Mixed", to prove the robustness of the proposed algorithm against challenging situations. The sequences consist complex motions, in combination of translational and rotational motions with varying center of rotation. Even in such adverse circumstances, the proposed algorithm outperformed the conventional method with sub-degree errors, proving that the superb performance of the proposed algorithm is not limited to purely rotational motion with fixed center of rotation.

This work may be extended to an ARS for robot applications or generally for any dynamic system, preferably with unknown model parameters and/or under rotational motions. For future work, the relationship between the magnitude of acceleration and performance can be further investigated through additional experiments.
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## 국문초록

본 논문에서는 회전 반경을 상태변수에 추가한 관성 측정 장치 기반 적응형 자세 추정 기법(ARS: Attitude Reference System)을 제안한다. 관성 측정 장치를 이용해 정확한 자세 추정을 하기 위해서는 중력 이외의 비력을 효과적으로 보상해주는 것이 중요하다. 제안된 기법은 회전 동작 검출기를 통해 현재 시스템의 동적 상황에 따라 적응적으로 중력 이외의 비력을 보상하게 된다. 칼만필터의 상태 벡터에 회전 반경을 증강함으로써 기존의 자세 추정 기법들과는 달리 시스템의 동적 특성을 회전 상황까지도 구분해 낼 수 있다. 증강된 상태 벡터로 인해 일반적이지 않은 칼만필터 특성들은 면밀히 설명되었으며, 특히 새로이 고안된 측정치 잡음 공분산 행렬 유도와 가관측성 분석 또한 진행되었다. 실험을 통한 성능 검증은 총 6개의 시나리오에 대해 다방면으로 이루어졌으며, 회전 동작만 있는 시나리오 뿐만 아니라 병진운동과 같이 복합적인 동작을 포함하는 시나리오에 대해서도 검증하였다. 검증 결과, 제안된 자세 추정 기법은 기존의 기법들보다 우수한 자세 추정 성능을 보이며 대부분의 실험에서 1 도 미만의 오차를 보여 다양한 상황에서 강건성과 정확성을 가지는 것을 확인하였다.

주요어 : 자세 추정 기법, 관성 측정 장치, 칼만필터, 적응형 알고리즘, 외력
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