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Abstract—We consider the problem of localizing the source using range and range-difference measurements. Both the problems are known to be non-convex and non-smooth, which makes it challenging to solve. In the case of range-difference measurements, most of the current positioning techniques choose a reference sensor, however the source positioning accuracy has been reported to be affected by this approach. In this paper, we localize the source from range-difference measurements without choosing a reference sensor. We develop an iterative algorithm to solve the range-difference problem using Majorization Minimization (MM) approach in which we employ a novel upper bound and minimize it to get a closed form solution at every iteration. The proposed algorithm is referred to as SOLVIT: Source Localization Via an Iterative technique. We also solve the source localization problem based on range measurements and rederive the Standard Fixed Point (SFP) algorithm developed in [1] using the MM approach. By doing so, we show a less intricate way to prove the convergence of the SFP algorithm. Next, we show a computationally efficient way to implement SOLVIT. Various simulations and experiments were conducted to compare SOLVIT with the existing methods. Experiments were conducted in an anechoic chamber to localize an acoustic source. Simulations and experiments confirm that SOLVIT performs better than existing methods in terms of source positioning accuracy. Also, it was found that when compared to the existing methods, SOLVIT does not depend on the positioning of source and sensors to localize a source.

Index terms—Source Localization, Non–convex and Non–smooth minimization, Majorization Minimization

I. INTRODUCTION

There have been growing applications which depend upon the accurate positioning of an object or person. Some of the applications are in teleconferencing, radar, sonar and in wireless communications [2], [3] and [4]. Depending on the nature of the source, it can be localized by using “range” or “range - difference” measurements made using an array of sensors. Range, $r_i$ is the distance between the source and the $i$th sensor and the range - difference $r_{ij}$, is the difference in the range between the $i$th and the $j$th sensor i.e. $r_{ij} = r_i - r_j$.

In the case of source localization using range based measurements, an array of $m$ sensors transmit signal towards the object of interest and each sensor receives the signal reflected back by the object. Then, the Time of Arrival (TOA) of the source signal at the $i$th sensor is estimated by cross - correlating the $i$th transmitted and received signal. Assuming constant velocity propagation medium, range $r_i$ can be estimated at each sensor. However, due to measurement errors, each range $r_i$ is only approximately estimated. Specifically, let $\{y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}\}$ denote the known coordinate of the $i$th sensor and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}\}$ be the unknown source coordinate vector. Then, the approximate or noisy range measurement $r_i$ is given by:

$$r_i = \|x - y_i\|_2 + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots m$$ (1)

where $\varepsilon = [\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots \varepsilon_m]^T$ is the error vector. Hence, in the range based source localization, the problem is to estimate the source position given the noisy range measurements. A straightforward approach to estimate the source position is to minimize the sum of the squared errors or in other words, using the least squares approach. Mathematically, the above problem can be written as:

$$\underset{x}{\text{R-LS: minimize}} \{ f_{R-LS}(x) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{m} (r_i - \|x - y_i\|_2)^2 \}$$

(2)

When $\varepsilon$ follows Gaussian distribution and the errors $[\varepsilon_i]_{i=1}^{m}$ are independent of each other, then this approach also corresponds to the Maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) problem of estimating $x$ from (1). On expanding $f_{R-LS}(x)$ we get:

$$f_{R-LS}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(r_i^2 - 2r_i\|x - y_i\|_2 + \|x - y_i\|_2^2 \right)$$ (3)

Note that the above objective function has $-\|x - y_i\|_2$ which is both non-smooth and non-convex function, which makes the R-LS problem challenging. Geometrically, for $n = 2$, each range measurement defines a circle and the solution for the R-LS problem lies at the intersection of the circles; for which one must have at least three sensors [5]. The authors in [6] tried to solve R-LS problem numerically by constructing a semidefinite relaxation (SDR) of the R-LS problem. Nevertheless, since SDR was relaxation of the original problem it did not always guarantee an optimal solution. Luke et. al. [7] solved (2) using alternating directions method of multipliers (ADMM); however, ADMM suffers from slow convergence [8]. Beck et. al. [1] inspired by the famous “Weiszfeld algorithm” proposed an algorithm - “Standard Fixed Point algorithm” to solve the range only based source localization problem. Similar to the Weiszfeld algorithm it is a fixed point method. Recently, Tzoreff et.al. [9] used Expectation - Maximization algorithm to estimate the source position directly from the range measurements.

In case of source localization using range-difference measurements, the array of $m$ sensors only receive the source
signal. The signal received at each sensor is the delayed source signal itself. The Time Difference of Arrival (TDOA) of the received signal at the \(i\)th and the \(j\)th sensor can be estimated by cross-correlating them. From the TDOA, range-difference \(r_{ij}\) can be estimated. Similar to the R-LS problem, the range-differences are only approximately estimated and hence in range-difference based source localization, the problem is to estimate the source position given the noisy range-differences. Also, note that:

\[
r_{ij} = \|x - y_i\|_2 - \|x - y_j\|_2 = -\left(\|x - y_j\|_2 - \|x - y_i\|_2\right) = -r_{ji}
\]

(4)

Hence, for \(m\) sensors, the number of possible distinct or positive noisy range-differences are \(\frac{m(m-1)}{2}\). As in the range based source localization, the source position can be estimated from the noisy range-differences by the least squares criteria. Mathematically, the problem is written as:

\[
\text{RD-LS:}\quad \minimize_x \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} r_{ij} - \left(\|x - y_i\|_2 - \|x - y_j\|_2\right)^2 \right\}
\]

(5)

Also, note that this approach corresponds to MLE of \(x\), when the noise distribution is Gaussian and the errors are independent. On expanding \(f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x)\) we get:

\[
f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} \left( r_{ij}^2 + \|x - y_i\|_2^2 + \|x - y_j\|_2^2 - 2\|x - y_i\|_2 \|x - y_j\|_2 \right)
\]

(6)

Similar to R-LS problem, the above cost function has \(-\|x - y_i\|_2\) which is both non-convex and non-smooth function. Moreover, \(-\|x - y_i\|_2 \|x - y_j\|_2\) term makes it even more challenging to solve the RD-LS problem when compared to R-LS problem. Geometrically, each range-difference equation corresponds to a hyperbola (for \(n = 2\)) and hence this problem is also called hyperbolic positioning problem \([5]\) and to solve the problem uniquely, one requires four sensors to get a unique solution \([5]\). Numerically, the state-of-the-art algorithms solve the problem in \([5]\) by squaring the range-difference measurements and choosing one of the sensors as a reference sensor. Assuming, the reference sensor is at the origin, then the range-difference \(r_{1i}\) between the \(i\)th sensor and the sensor at origin is given by:

\[
r_{1i} = \|x - y_i\|_2 - \|x\|_2, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots m
\]

(7)

which after squaring and rearranging:

\[
-2y_i^T x - 2r_{1i} \|x\|_2 = r_{i1}^2 - \|y_i\|_2^2, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots m
\]

(8)

The above relation is approximate due to measurement errors. Hence, in the reference based squared range-differences, the source is localized by the minimization of the following least squares criteria:

\[
\text{SRD-LS:}\quad \minimize_x \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-2y_i^T x - 2r_{1i} \|x\|_2 - g_i)^2
\]

(9)

where \(g_i = r_{1i} - \|y_i\|_2^2\). By squaring the range-differences and then minimizing the squared errors, the above problem smartly eliminates the product of norm terms which was present in the RD-LS problem. Hence, the SRD-LS problem is easier to solve when compared to RD-LS problem \([5]\). Many methods have been proposed to solve the SRD-LS problem. Smith et.al. \([10]\) reformulated the non-convex problem in \([9]\) into a convex problem with two unknowns, \(x\) and \(\|x\|_2\). Then, by two-stage unconstrained minimization, \(x\) was estimated. This method is called spherical interpolation method. Friedlander et.al. \([11]\) also solved the problem similar to Smith et.al; however, they eliminated \(\|x\|_2\) by using the orthogonal projection matrix and then estimated the source position using least squares. Linear correction method \([12]\) and the method proposed by Beck et. al. \([13]\) converted the SRD-LS problem into a constraint problem and solved by bisection algorithm. Another approach is to linearize SRD-LS problem using Taylor Series \([14]\) and solve the problem iteratively. Shi et.al. \([15]\) localized the source by minimizing the worst case positioning error. They solved the problem by relaxing the non-convex problem into convex problem by semidefinite relaxation. Recently, based on extended Kalman Filter, Tovkach et.al. \([16]\) developed an recurrent algorithm to localize the source.

All these methods estimate the position using reference sensor. However, in \([11]\) it was found that choosing different reference sensor can affect the positioning accuracy. Only recently, Amar et.al. \([17]\) estimated the source position without choosing the reference sensor using the squared range-differences in the least squares criteria. Nevertheless, the source position estimate obtained by solving SRD-LS problem is sub-optimal in the Maximum Likelihood sense as the errors in \([9]\) are not independent \([18]\) and as demonstrated via simulations in sec. \([19]\) the solution obtained by solving SRD-LS problem is less accurate compared to the solution of RD-LS problem. In this paper, we show a novel way to tackle the RD-LS problem and hence estimate the source position without choosing a reference sensor and without squaring the range-difference measurements.

The major contributions of this paper are:

1. We propose an algorithm to solve the RD-LS problem without choosing a reference sensor by Majorization Minimization approach and also show a computationally efficient way to implement the same. The proposed algorithm is referred as SOLVIT.
2. The monotonicity and convergence to the stationary point is proved for SOLVIT.
3. SOLVIT was compared with the existing methods via various computer simulations and in a real-life scenario.
4) We also solve the R-LS problem and rederive the SFP algorithm using Majorization Minimization technique and show a less intricate proof of convergence.

The paper is organized as follows. In sec. II we briefly introduce Majorization Minimization. In sec. III we present our main contribution - SOLVIT; an iterative method to solve the RD-LS problem. We also show a computationally efficient way to implement SOLVIT and discuss the convergence of the algorithm. At the end of sec. III we prove that the “Standard Fixed Point” algorithm falls under MM and prove its convergence. In section IV, we first briefly discuss about the Cramer - Rao Lower Bound and next evaluate the proposed algorithm by simulations and experiments and finally conclude the paper in sec. V.

Throughout the paper, bold capital and bold small letter denotes matrix and vector, respectively. A scalar is denoted by small letter. The value taken by \( x \) is denoted by \( x^k \). Euclidean and Frobenius norm are denoted by \( \|x\|_2 \) and \( \|x\|_F \), respectively.

II. MAJORIZATION MINIMIZATION

Majorization Minimization(MM) is an iterative procedure which is mostly used to solve a non - convex, non - smooth or even a convex problem more efficiently. In MM, instead of minimizing the difficult optimization problem \( f(x) \) directly, a “surrogate” function which majorizes the problem (at a given value of \( x = x^k \)) is minimized at every iteration. The surrogate function \( g(x) \) is the global upper bound of the objective function \( f(x) \) i.e., it satisfies the following properties:

\[
\begin{align*}
g(x^k, x^k) &= f(x^k) \\
g(x, x^k) &\geq f(x)
\end{align*}
\]

where, \( x^k \) is the value taken by \( x \) at the \( k^{th} \) iteration. Hence, the MM algorithm generates a sequence of points \( \{x^k\} \) according to the following rule:

\[
x^{k+1} \in \arg \min_x g(x, x^k)
\]

By using (10), (11) and (12) we now show that the objective function is monotonically decreased at every iteration:

\[
f(x^{k+1}) \leq g(x^k, x^{k+1}) \leq g(x^k, x^k) = f(x^k)
\]

The first inequality and the last equality are by using (10) and (11), respectively. The second inequality is by (12). The convergence rate and computational complexity of the algorithm depends on how well one formulates the surrogate function. To have lower computational complexity, the surrogate function must be easy to minimize. However, the convergence rate depends on how well the surrogate function follows the shape of the objective function \( f(x) \). Hence, the novelty of MM algorithm lies in the design of the surrogate function. To design surrogate function there are no set steps to follow. However, there are few papers which give guidelines for designing various surrogate functions [19], [20].

III. ALGORITHMS FOR SOURCE LOCALIZATION PROBLEMS BASED ON MM

In this section, we first propose a novel algorithm SOLVIT for the RD-LS problem based on MM. We then discuss its convergence and also show a computationally efficient way to implement it. At the end of this section, we solve R-LS and rederive the SFP algorithm using MM and prove its convergence for the sake of completeness.

A. SOLVIT: Source Localization via an Iterative technique

We now propose SOLVIT, an iterative algorithm to solve RD-LS problem based on MM. On expanding \( f_{RD-LS}(x) \) in (5) we get:

\[
f_{RD-LS}(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} \left( r_{ij}^2 + \|x - y_i\|^2 + \|x - y_j\|^2 - 2r_{ij}\|x - y_i\|\|x - y_j\| \right)
\]

The norm and the product of norm terms in \( f_{RD-LS}(x) \) are not continuously differentiable and hence getting a closed form solution for RD-LS problem is difficult from the first order conditions. Hence, we form a surrogate function \( g(x, x^k) \) to majorize these non-differentiable terms and hence majorize \( f_{RD-LS}(x) \) based on the following lemmas:

**Lemma 3.1:** Given any \( x = x^k \), \( -\|x - y_i\|_2 \) can be upper bounded as

\[
-\|x - y_i\|_2 \leq \frac{(x - y_i)^T (x^k - y_i)}{\|x^k - y_i\|_2}
\]

The upper bound for \( -\|x - y_i\|_2 \) is linear and differentiable in \( x \).

**Proof:** By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have:

\[
(x - y_i)^T (x^k - y_i) \leq \|x - y_i\|_2 \|x^k - y_i\|_2
\]

After rearranging we get:

\[
\|x - y_i\|_2 \geq \frac{(x - y_i)^T (x^k - y_i)}{\|x^k - y_i\|_2}
\]

By taking the negative sign into account, we get the inequality.

**Lemma 3.2:** Given any \( x = x^k \), \( \|x - y_j\|_2 \) can be upper bounded as

\[
\|x - y_j\|_2 \leq \|x^k - y_j\|_2 + \frac{\|x - y_j\|_2 - \|x^k - y_j\|_2^2}{2\|x^k - y_j\|_2}
\]

The upper bound for \( \|x - y_j\|_2 \) is quadratic and differentiable in \( x \).

**Proof:** Let \( t = \|x - y_j\|_2 \). Therefore,

\[
\|x - y_j\|_2 = \sqrt{t}
\]

Since square root is concave in \( R \), linearizing it around \( t^k \) gives the following inequality

\[
\sqrt{t} \leq \sqrt{t^k} + \frac{t - t^k}{2\sqrt{t^k}}
\]
Substituting back for $t$, the inequality can be attained.

**Lemma 3.3:** Given any $x = x^k -\|x - y_i\|_2 (x - y_j)\|_2$ can be upper bounded as

$$-\|x - y_i\|_2 \|x - y_j\|_2 \leq -(x - y_j)^T Q (x - y_i)$$

where

$$Q = \frac{(x^k - y_j)^T (x^k - y_j)}{\|x^k - y_j\|_2^2}$$

(17)

The upper bound is quadratic and differentiable in $x$.

**Proof:** Consider the following problem:

\[\min_{Q, \|Q\|_F = 1} \|Q - (x - y_j) (x - y_j)^T\|_F^2\]

After removing the terms independent of $Q$ and by exploiting the constraint, the above problem can be re-written as:

\[\max_{Q, \|Q\|_F = 1} \text{Tr} \left( Q \left( (x - y_j)(x - y_j)^T \right)^T \right)\]

which can be further re-written as:

\[\max_{Q, \|Q\|_F = 1} (x - y_j)^T Q (x - y_i)\]

The solution of the above problem is:

$$Q^* = \frac{(x - y_j)(x - y_j)^T}{\|x - y_j\|_2^2}$$

and the value the objective function takes at the maximum is $\|x - y_i\|_2 \|x - y_j\|_2$. Therefore, the maximum value $(x - y_j)^T Q (x - y_i)$, for $Q$ equal to $Q^*$, is $\|x - y_i\|_2 \|x - y_j\|_2$ and hence the inequality.

Using lemma 3.1, lemma 3.2, and lemma 3.3 in [14] we get the following surrogate function:

$$g(x, x^k) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} (r_{ij}^2 + \|x - y_i\|_2^2 \|x - y_j\|_2^2 - 2r_{ij} w_i)$$

$$(x - y_i^T) + s_{ij} \|x - y_j\|_2^2 - 2 ((x - y_j)^T Q_{ij} (x - y_i))$$

where

$$w_i = \frac{x^k - y_i}{\|x^k - y_i\|_2}$$

(20)

$$s_{ij} = \frac{r_{ij}}{\|x^k - y_j\|_2}$$

(21)

$$Q_{ij} = \frac{(x^k - y_j)^T (x^k - y_j)}{\|x^k - y_j\|_2^2}$$

(22)

Note that $g(x, x^k) \geq f_{RD-LS}(x)$ for all $x$ and equality is achieved at $x = x^k$. The surrogate function $g(x, x^k)$ in [19] is differentiable in $x$. Hence at any iteration, given $x^k$, the surrogate minimization problem for [2] becomes:

\[\min_{x} g(x, x^k)\]

(23)

where $g(x, x^k)$ is given by [19]. The above problem in contrast to the RD-LS problem admits a closed form solution and is given by:

$$x^{k+1} = A b = \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} M_{ij} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} p_{ij} \right)$$

(24)

where

$$M_{ij} = \left( 2I + s_{ij} I - (Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T) \right)$$

(25)

$$p_{ij} = (y_i + y_j + r_{ij} w_{ij} + s_{ij} y_j - Q_{ij} y_i - Q_{ij}^T y_j)$$

(26)

For $A$ to exist always, it is sufficient to prove that $M_{ij}$ matrix be positive definite for values of $i, j$ from $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ and $r_{ij} > 0$. $M_{ij}$ matrix is positive definite if the maximum eigen value of $(Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T)$ is less than $(2 + s_{ij})$. The same is proved in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4:** $\lambda_{max}$ of $(Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T)$ is less than $(2 + s_{ij}) \forall \{i, j\}$ from $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ and $r_{ij} > 0$

**Proof:** $Q_{ij}$ matrix can be written as $u_j v_i^T$ where

$$u_j = \frac{(x^k - y_j)}{\|x^k - y_j\|_2}$$

(27)

$$v_i = \frac{(x^k - y_i)}{\|x^k - y_i\|_2}$$

(28)

The maximum rank $Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T$ matrix can take is two. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$ denote the two eigen values of $Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T$

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \text{Tr} \left( (Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T) \right) = 2 u_j^T v_i$$

$$\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = \text{Tr} \left( (Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T)^2 \right) = 2 \left( u_j^T v_i \right)^2 + \left( u_j^T u_j \right) \left( v_i^T v_i \right)$$

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2 - (\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) \right)$$

$$\left( u_j^T v_i \right)^2 - \left( u_j^T u_j \right) \left( v_i^T v_i \right)$$

Hence, we find the maximum eigen value by solving the following quadratic equation:

$$\lambda^2 - 2 (u_j^T v_i) \lambda + \left( u_j^T v_i \right)^2 - (u_j^T u_j) \left( v_i^T v_i \right)$$

By solving the above quadratic equation, we get:

$$\lambda_{max} = u_j^T v_i + \|u_j\|_2 \|v_i\|_2$$

By Cauchy - Schwarz inequality and by exploiting the fact that $u$ and $v$ are unit vectors, we get:

$$u_j^T v_i + \|u_j\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 = u_j^T v_i + 1 \leq \|u_j\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 + 1 \leq 2$$

The maximum eigen value of $(Q_{ij} + Q_{ij}^T)$ is always less than two; which is less than two plus $s_{ij}$ (which is always positive). Therefore, $A$ matrix always exists.

**B. Convergence Analysis**

Given that the proposed algorithm is based on Majorization Minimization framework, from [13], the sequence of points $\{x^k\}$ monotonically decrease the RD-LS problem. Moreover,
the RD-LS problem is bounded below by zero. Hence, the sequence \( f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x) \) generated by the proposed algorithm will at least converge to a finite value.

We now show that the sequence \( \{x^k\} \) will converge to the stationary point. A point \( x \) is called stationary if:

\[
f'_{\text{RD-LS}}(x; d) \geq 0
\]

where \( f'_{\text{RD-LS}}(x; d) \) is the directional derivative of function \( f_{\text{RD-LS}}(\cdot) \) at point \( x \) in the direction \( d \) and is defined as:

\[
f'_{\text{RD-LS}}(x; d) = \lim_{\lambda \to 0} \frac{f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x + \lambda d) - f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x)}{\lambda}
\]

From (33), we have:

\[
f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x^0) \geq f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x^1) \geq f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x^2) \cdots
\]

Assume that there is a subsequence \( x^{i_j} \) converging to a limit point \( z \). Then, from (10), (11) and from (31) we obtain:

\[
g(x^{i_j+1}; x^{i_j+1}) = f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x^{i_j+1}) \leq f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x^{i_j+1}) \leq g(x^{i_j+1}; x^{i_j}) \leq g(x, x^{i_j})
\]

Letting \( j \to \infty \), we get

\[
g(z, z) \leq g(x, z)
\]

which implies \( g'(z, z) \geq 0 \). Since the first order behavior of surrogate function is same as function \( f_{\text{RD-LS}}(\cdot), g'(z, z) \geq 0 \) implies \( f'(z) \geq 0 \) [23]. Hence, \( z \) is the stationary point of \( f_{\text{RD-LS}}(\cdot) \) and therefore the proposed algorithm converges to the stationary point of \( f_{\text{RD-LS}}(x) \).

C. Computational Complexity and efficient implementation of \([24]\)

The major computation involved in SOLVIT is in computing the \( A \) matrix. We now show a less expensive way to compute \( A \).

\[
A = \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} M_{ij} \right)^{-1} = \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} \left( 2I + s_{ij} I - Q_{ij} - Q_{ij}^T \right) \right)^{-1}
\]

\[
= \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} \left( 2I + s_{ij} I - u_j u_i^T - v_i v_j^T \right) \right)^{-1}
\]

with \( u_j \) and \( v_i \) defined in (27) and (28) respectively. The above equation can be written compactly as:

\[
A = \left( D - UV^T - VU^T \right)^{-1}
\]

where

\[
D = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} \left( 2I + s_{ij} I \right)
\]

\[
UV^T = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} \left( u_j u_i^T \right)
\]

with columns of \( U \) and \( V \) made of \([u_1, u_2 \cdots u_m]\) and \([v_1, v_2 \cdots v_m]\) and \( m \) is the number of positive range differences and is equal to \( \frac{m(m-1)}{2} \). Let \( B = D - UV^T \). Then \( A \) can be computed efficiently using Woodbury Matrix Identity:

\[
A = \left( B - VU^T \right)^{-1}
\]

\[
= B^{-1} + B^{-1} V \left( I - UTB^{-1}V \right)^{-1} U^T B^{-1}
\]

Inverse of \( B \) matrix can also be computed by Woodbury Matrix Identity:

\[
B^{-1} = \left( D - UV^T \right)^{-1}
\]

\[
= D^{-1} + D^{-1} V (I + V^T D^{-1} U)^{-1} V^T D^{-1}
\]

Note that \( D \) is a diagonal matrix and hence computing its inverse is easier than computing \( A \) matrix.

The complexity of calculating inverse of \( D \) is \( O(n) \) and given inverse of \( D \), the complexity of calculating \( B^{-1} \) is \( O(n^2m) \). Then, given \( B^{-1} \), the complexity of calculating \( A \) is again \( O(n^2m) \). Hence, the total complexity in calculating \( A \) is \( O(n) + O(n^2m) + O(n^2m) \) which is equal to \( O(n^2m) \). The complexity of implementing \( s_{ij} \) from (21) is \( O(nm) \), \( w_i \) from (22) is \( O(nm) \) and \( Q_{ij} \) from (23) is \( O(n^2m) \) for \( \{i, j = 1, 2, \cdots m \} \). Taking into account the complexity of matrix vector multiplication, the complexity of implementing SOLVIT is \( O(n^2m) \), which is much lesser than implementing (34). Pseudocode of the proposed algorithm is shown below:

**Pseudocode of SOLVIT**

**Input:** Sensor locations \((y_1, y_2 \cdots y_m)\), noisy distinct range differences \((r_{21}, r_{31} \cdots r_{m-1}m)_1\).

**Initialize:** Set \( k = 0 \). Initialize \( x^0 \).

**Repeat:**

for \( i, j = 1 : m \)

1) Compute \( s_{ij}, w_i, p_{ij}, u_j \) and \( v_i \) and from (21), (22), (26), (27) and (28) respectively.

2) Compute \( B^{-1} \) from (38) and \( A \) from (37) and compute \( b = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} p_{ij} \)

3) \( x^{k+1} = Ab \)

end

\( k \leftarrow k + 1 \), until \( \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2 \leq 10^{-6} \)

**D. Derivation of Standard Fixed Point (SFP) algorithm using Majorization Minimization**

The SFP algorithm shown in (11) was developed to localize the source using range measurements. SFP is a fixed point algorithm which was derived using the first order optimal conditions. Nevertheless, the proof of monotonic convergence of SFP algorithm is intricate. Here, we rederive the SFP algorithm using Majorization Minimization procedure and show a simple and less intricate way to prove the convergence of SFP.
On expanding \( f_{R-LS}(x) \) in (2) we get:
\[
f_{R-LS}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( r_i^2 - 2r_i \| x - y_i \|_2 + \| x - y_i \|_2^2 \right) \quad (39)
\]
Since \(-\| x - y_i \|_2 \) is not continuously differentiable and hence solving R-LS problem is difficult. Therefore, the following surrogate function is constructed to majorize \(-\| x - y_i \|_2 \) term using lemma [3,1]
\[
g (x, x^k) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( r_i^2 - 2r_i \frac{(x - y_i)^T (x^k - y_i)}{\| x^k - y_i \|_2} \right) + \| x - y_i \|_2^2 \quad (40)
\]
Note that \( g (x, x^k) \geq f_{R-LS}(x) \) for all \( x \) and the equality is achieved at \( x = x^k \). The surrogate function is convex and differentiable in \( x \). Hence at any iteration, the surrogate minimization problem for (2) becomes:
\[
\text{minimize} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( r_i^2 - 2r_i \frac{(x - y_i)^T (x^k - y_i)}{\| x^k - y_i \|_2} \right) + \| x - y_i \|_2^2 \quad (41)
\]
The above problem has a closed-form minimizer and is given by:
\[
x^{k+1} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (y_i + r_i w_i) \quad (42)
\]
where
\[
w_i = \frac{x^k - y_i}{\| x^k - y_i \|_2} \quad (43)
\]
Pseudocode of the MM derived SFP algorithm is as shown below:

**MM derived SFP algorithm for R-LS problem**

**Input:** \((y_1, y_2 \cdots y_m), (r_1, r_2 \cdots r_m)\);

**Initialize:** Set \( k = 0 \). Initialize \( x^0 \).

**Repeat:**

1) Compute \( w_i \) from (43)
2) Compute \( y_i + r_i w_i \)
end
3) \( x^{k+1} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (y_i + r_i w_i) \), \( k \leftarrow k + 1 \)
4) \( \| x^{k+1} - x^k \|_2^2 \leq 10^{-6} \)

The update equation for \( x \) in the Standard Fixed Point algorithm found in [1] is same as (42). Hence, the Standard Fixed point algorithm falls under MM.

We now prove the convergence of Standard Fixed Point algorithm. Since we derived the SFP algorithm using MM framework, from [13] we can see that the sequence of points \( \{x^k\} \) monotonically decrease the R-LS problem. Similar to RD-LS problem, the R-LS problem is bounded below by zero. Hence, the sequence \( f_{R-LS}(x^k) \) generated by SFP algorithm will at the least converge to a finite value.

We now show that the sequence \( \{x^k\} \) will converge to the stationary point. The proof is similar to the convergence proof of RD-LS problem. From (13), we have:
\[
f_{R-LS} (x^0) \geq f_{R-LS} (x^1) \geq f_{R-LS} (x^2) \cdots \quad (44)
\]
Assume that there is a subsequence \( x^{j_0} \) converging to a limit point \( x \). Then, from (10), (11) and from (44) we obtain:
\[
g (x^{j+1}, x^{j+1}) \leq f_{R-LS} (x^{j+1}) \leq g (x^{j+1}, x^{j}) \leq g (x, x^{j}) \quad (45)
\]
Letting \( j \to \infty \), we get
\[
g (z, z) \leq g (x, z) \quad (46)
\]
which implies \( g'(z, z) \geq 0 \). Since the first order behavior of surrogate function is same as function \( f_{LS} (\cdot) \), (22), \( g'(z, z) \geq 0 \) implies \( f_{R-LS}(z) \geq 0 \). Hence, \( z \) is the stationary point of \( f_{R-LS} (\cdot) \) and therefore the proposed algorithm converges to the stationary point.

**IV. Computer Simulations and Experiments**

In this section, we first discuss the Cramer - Rao Lower bound for the estimation problem in (5). Then we compare SOLVIT with the existing method by various computer simulations and experiments.

**A. Cramer - Rao Lower Bound**

To evaluate SOLVIT numerically, we use the Cramer - Rao Lower bound (CRLB) as the benchmark which was computed in [17]. CRLB is the lower bound on the variance of an unbiased estimator i.e. \( \text{cov}(\hat{x}) \geq J^{-1}(x) \), where \( J(x) \) is the Fisher Information Matrix and is given by:
\[
J(x) = H \text{cov}(r, r)^{-1} HT \quad (47)
\]
where \( r \) is a vector containing all the distinct noisy range differences, \( H = [h_2, h_3, \cdots h_n]^T \) and \( h_{m,n} \) is given by:
\[
h_{m,n} = \frac{x - y_m}{\| x - y_m \|} - \frac{x - y_n}{\| x - y_n \|} \quad (48)
\]
[17] computed the entries of \( \text{cov}(r, r) \) by taking the attenuation of the source signal into account and is given by:
\[
\text{cov}(r_m,r_m) = \frac{3e^2}{\pi^2 N \kappa^2 \text{SNR}} \left( 2 + \frac{r_m r_n}{\text{SNR}} \right) \quad (49)
\]
\[
\text{cov}(r_{i,j},r_{i,l}) = \frac{3e^2}{\pi^2 N \kappa^2 \text{SNR}} \phi_{i,j,k,l} \quad (50)
\]
where \( \phi_{i,j,k,l} \) is given by:
\[
\phi_{i,j,k,l} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
1 & \text{if } i = k \text{ and } j \neq l, i \neq k \text{ and } j = l \\
-1 & \text{if } i = l \text{ and } j \neq k, i \neq l \text{ and } j = k \\
0 & \text{if } j \neq k \neq i \neq l
\end{array} \right. \quad (51)
\]
where \( c \) is the signal propagation speed, \( N \) is the number of samples, \( \kappa \) is a constant (related to the attenuation of the source signal) and SNR is the signal to noise ratio defined as:

\[
\text{SNR} = \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_n^2} \tag{52}
\]

where \( \sigma_s^2 \) is the variance of the source signal and \( \sigma_n^2 \) is the variance of the noise \( \varepsilon \). From (49) and (50), the CRLB depends upon the number of samples, speed of the source signal, \( \kappa \) and SNR.

**B. Computer Simulation**

In this section, we evaluate the proposed algorithm with the reference-free method proposed by Amar et al. [17]. They solved the SRD - LS problem without choosing a reference sensor. Also, they compared their algorithm with that of the reference based algorithm and concluded that the reference - free algorithm gives better positioning accuracy. Hence, in the simulation we only consider the method in [17]. The simulation was carried out on a PC with 2.40 GHz Intel Xeon Processor with 64 GB RAM. We don’t show any simulations for algorithms on R-LS problem as we have only rederived the SFP algorithm and numerical simulations regarding SFP can be found in [1]. The root mean square error is taken as the performance measure which is computed as:

\[
\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{exp}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{exp}} \| \hat{x} - x \|_2^2}
\]

where \( \hat{x} \) is the estimated source position and \( N_{exp} \) is the number of simulations which is taken as 500. We compare the RMSE with that of the variance obtained using the Cramer - Rao Lower Bound (CRLB) in [17]. In our simulation, we assumed the speed of sound as 340\( m/s \), \( \kappa = 1 \) and the number of samples as 1000. We varied \( \frac{\kappa^2}{c^2} \) SNR from 0 to 20 dB in steps of 2 dB and evaluated the performance of the positioning algorithms for \( n = 2 \) and \( m = 4 \). The position of sensors was randomly generated from a uniform distribution from \([-50, 50]\). The source position was also randomly generated from a uniform distribution from \([-10, 10]\). Fig. 1 shows the RMSE vs \( \frac{\kappa^2}{c^2} \) SNR for \( n = 2 \). As can be seen from the figure, the proposed algorithm has lower positional error when compared to the available method; one possible explanation for this could be as the available method solves the SRD - LS problem, the direct minimization of RD - LS problem is more robust than minimization of SRD - LS problem.

We also evaluated the proposed algorithms for various array geometries and sensor positions via computer simulations. It was found that the proposed algorithm performs better than the available method. Due to lack of space, we do not display the results.

**C. Real - life experiment**

We next evaluate the positioning accuracy of SOLVIT in a real - life environment. To do so, experiments were conducted in an anechoic chamber. The length and width of the chamber is 3.340 m and 3.040 m, respectively. The experimental set up is as shown in Fig. 2. The corner of the room was taken as origin. A linear array with \( m = 4 \) was considered. The spacing between each sensor is 20 cm. The sound source emits sinusoidal wave of 250 Hz (100 KHz as sampling frequency); which was sent via LabVIEW from a PC with 3.60 GHz Processor with 16 GB RAM through a 24 channel, 2.4 mA PCI. The signal was received through LabVIEW from PCI which was further processed offline in a separate PC with 2.0 GHz Processor with 64 GB RAM in MATLAB.

![Figure 1: \( \frac{\kappa^2}{c^2} \) SNR vs RMSE for \( n=2 \)](image)

The signal received by each of the microphone was first filtered by an IIR Bandpass filter with lower and higher cut - off frequency set as 150 Hz and 350 Hz respectively. The time delay between the \( i \)th and the \( j \)th microphone was then estimated using the standard cross correlation technique. The estimated time delay is multiplied by speed of sound in air to obtain the range - differences \( r_{ij} \{i, j = 1, 2 \ldots 4 \} \). The distinct range - differences was then given as input to SOLVIT and the method in [17]. The position of the four microphones is shown in Table 1.

![Figure 2: Test setup](image)
Table I: Microphone Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1 m</td>
<td>1.7 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1 m</td>
<td>1.3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1 m</td>
<td>1.1 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Received signal by the four microphones

Table II: True position and the Estimated position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Position</th>
<th>X (True)</th>
<th>Y (True)</th>
<th>X (Estimate)</th>
<th>Y (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>0.16 m</td>
<td>2.1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
<td>1.1 m</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.35 m</td>
<td>0.7 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>0.8 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>0.15 m</td>
<td>0.9 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
<td>1.9 m</td>
<td>0.27 m</td>
<td>2.1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
<td>0.32 m</td>
<td>0.21 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>2.5 m</td>
<td>0.95 m</td>
<td>2.4 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

component was 0.03 m and along Y component was 0.01 m. For the method in [17], the matrix $Q$ (ref (29) in [17]) was ill-conditioned. Hence, the source estimate provided by [17] was very poor and hence not included.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed an MM based algorithm - SOLVIT; which solves the RD-LS problem and thereby localizes the source without making any assumption on the reference sensor and without squaring the range - difference measurements. As a result, SOLVIT has better positioning accuracy when compared to the existing reference-free method solver. Also, SOLVIT was evaluated in various sensor array geometry. While the existing reference-free method localizes the source poorly for certain source and sensor positions; it was found that SOLVIT does not depend on the positioning of source and sensors. Experiments were conducted in the anechoic chamber to evaluate the performance of the algorithm in a real world scenario. The mean square error was found to be 0.04 m. We also solve the R-LS problem and rederive the SFP algorithm using MM and show a less intricate proof of convergence.
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