arXiv:2212.00615v1 [eess.SP] 1 Dec 2022

ONLINE LEARNING-BASED WAVEFORM SELECTION FOR IMPROVED VEHICLE RECOGNITION IN AUTOMOTIVE RADAR

Charles E. Thornton, William W. Howard, and R. Michael Buehrer

Wireless @ Virginia Tech, Bradley Department of ECE, Blacksburg, VA

ABSTRACT

This paper describes important considerations and challenges associated with online reinforcement-learning based waveform selection for target identification in frequency modulated continuous wave (FMCW) automotive radar systems. We present a novel learning approach based on satisficing Thompson sampling, which quickly identifies a waveform expected to yield satisfactory classification performance. We demonstrate through measurement-level simulations that effective waveform selection strategies can be quickly learned, even in cases where the radar must select from a large catalog of candidate waveforms. The radar learns to adaptively select a bandwidth for appropriate resolution and a slow-time unimodular code for interference mitigation in the scene of interest by optimizing an expected classification metric.

***Index Terms*—** Online learning, automotive radar, interference mitigation, radar signal processing

1. INTRODUCTION

Highly autonomous vehicles will rely heavily on active sensing technology for holistic environmental perception [1,2]. To enable greater degrees of autonomy, next-generation active sensors, which include radar and lidar, should exhibit high-resolution imaging capabilities and maintain sufficient reliability in dynamic scenarios [3,4]. Further, to support commercial operation, the active sensors must be highly integrated at a reasonable cost [5].

Considering these fundamental limitations, radar is indispensable for emerging vehicular applications due to its inherent resilience to inclement weather, extended detection range, and relatively low cost of integration. Thus, it is crucial to design radar systems which perform reliably over a broad range of physical scenarios. Cognitive radar is a paradigm which aims to achieve this end by applying artificial intelligence techniques to continually adapt transmission and reception parameters [6]. Herein, we examine the problem of cognitive waveform selection for a frequency modulated continuous wave (FMCW) automotive radar, which is commonly employed in practice due to low measurement time and simplicity of processing [4]. Specifically, the bandwidth and slow-time code of FMCW waveforms are adapted with the goal of improving vehicle classification performance.

In a broad sense, optimal waveform selection for vehicular radar systems is a complicated topic, as there are many types and functions of automotive radar. Basic automotive radar waveform design principles are described in [2, 8, 9]. However, in practice there are often a large number of scatterers in the delay-Doppler response, the scene may change rapidly, and radar-to-radar interference is a considerable challenge due to the proliferation of FMCW technology and large consumption of time-frequency resources [7]. Thus, the resolution requirements of automotive radar systems may change dramatically over time, and thus satisfactory transmission strategies must be quickly learned with limited prior information. In particular, continuous wave radar is highly desirable for automotive applications due to short measurement time and low computational cost. Here, the bandwidth and unimodular code of the FMCW waveform is adapted on a frame-by-frame (equivalently CPI-to-CPI) basis.

In this contribution, we describe a general framework for the application of online reinforcement learning algorithms in a vehicular target classification setting and propose a scalable, time-sensitive approach which results in rapid learning. In general, challenges include efficiently representing the high-dimensional scene, developing an adequate yet computable classification-based loss function, and algorithm parameter selection [10–12]. Herein, we focus on real-time design of FMCW waveforms to mitigate interference with other radars and achieve a balance of resolution and reliability for multi-target recognition and classification.

In order to learn an effective waveform from a large number of candidates we apply the decision-theoretic principle of *satisficing*. Specifically, a satisficing Thompson Sampling (sTS) algorithm is used to quickly identify a satisfactory waveform which is expected to improve classification performance. It is shown that the proposed sTS algorithm allows the radar to learn an effective waveform for classification in a more timely manner than a conventional multi-armed bandit formulation. In the context of automotive radar, this is expected to yield large improvements in classification performance, which is an inherently time-sensitive application.

Correspondence: *thorntonc@vt.edu*.

2. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider an automotive radar which transmits a length N sequence of FMCW chirps each frame (or CPI). The transmitted pulse-train is expressed by the sum

$$s(t) = \sqrt{P_{\text{tx}}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} A_k c(t - kT), \tag{1}$$

where $A_k \in \{-1, 1\}$ is an amplitude, P_{tx} is the transmit power, which is assumed here to be normalized, $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is the chirp index within the frame, T is the chirp duration, N is the number of chirps per frame, and

$$c(t) = \exp\left(j2\pi\left(f_c + \frac{Bt}{2T}\right)t\right) \tag{2}$$

is the frequency modulation function for each chirp. In (2), B is the sweep bandwidth. As seen in (1), the radar employs a slow-time unimodular code specified by $\{A_k\}$. Specifically, at pulse k of the CPI, the radar transmits chirp $A_k c(t - kT)$, where $A_k \in \{-1, 1\}$. The purpose of this code is to mitigate interference due to neighboring radars using similar transmission parameters [13, 14].

We assume the radar scene potentially consists of many scatterers, and may contain returns due to an interfering interfering radar. The received signal is then given by $r(t) = s_T(t) + s_I(t) + n(t)$, where $s_T(t)$ is the return due to target reflections, $s_I(t)$ is a return due to interfering signals, and $n(t)$ is signal-independent additive noise, assumed here to be stationary and Gaussian. We express the first two terms corresponding to the target and interference returns by

$$s_T(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \alpha_i s(t - \tau_i) \exp(j2\pi f_{d,i} t) \tag{3}$$

$$s_I(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_I} \alpha_j s(t - \tau_j) \exp(j2\pi f_{d,j} t), \tag{4}$$

where α_i and α_j are scalar amplitudes due to the reflection from target component i and the incoming signal from interference component j respectively. In general, due to the one-way propagation of the interfering signal, $\alpha_j > \alpha_i$. Thus, true targets in the range-Doppler response can easily be masked by interfering signals. These scattering coefficients can be computed using the radar range equation, but are assumed to be unknown to the radar *a priori*. Similarly, $\{\tau_i, \tau_j\}$ are round trip delays, and $\{f_{d,i}, f_{d,j}\}$ are observed Doppler shifts due to target component i and interference component j, respectively. To maintain a general model, N_T does not necessarily equal N_I. Since automotive radars generally use large bandwidths to achieve high-resolution,

In [13, 14], it is shown that slow-time codes can be used to dramatically mitigate mutual interference. A simple Doppler-shifting scheme is proposed, along with a procedure for finding the optimal code. However, the optimization problem involves a joint optimization of two radars, and the problem is difficult to solve in general. Here, we focus on the selection of a code for a single radar from a pre-defined set. Notably, sub-optimal slow-time codes can be effective in mitigating ghost targets due to interference.

The received signal $r(t)$ is then decoded and de-chirped using the standard Fourier-based procedure described in [4, Sec. II] to produce a range-Doppler response. The range-Doppler response is then passed through a constant false-alarm rate (CFAR) detector and a point cloud is received, which can serve as an input to a clustering algorithm, such as DBSCAN [15] and be used to classify objects in the radar's field of vision.

3. LEARNING FORMULATION

Let the radar's waveform library during frame $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be given by set $\mathcal{W}_t = \{\mathcal{B}_t, \mathcal{C}_t\}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is a set of allowable bandwidths, determined by spectrum regulations and hardware constraints, and $\mathcal{C}$ is a set containing unimodular codes of length N. To evaluate performance, we define a clustering and classification function $g : \mathbb{C}^{N_r \times N_d} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{N_c}$, which takes as an input a range-Doppler response or CFAR point cloud with N_r range cells and N_d Doppler cells, and outputs a real-valued confidence metric corresponding to expected classification performance for each identified cluster. To simplify the learning process we assume $g \in [0, 1]$ without loss of generality. Here, we assume a simple structure for $g(\cdot)$, which uses the DBSCAN clustering algorithm [15] to split the CFAR detections into clusters and then performs classification using hand-crafted features, such as the expected spatial extent and velocity spread of certain types of targets.

Each frame, the radar transmits waveform $w_t \in \mathcal{W}_t$ and receives a loss $\ell_t \in [0, 1]$, which is calculated using information from the range-Doppler response. Let the loss associated with transmitting waveform w_t at frame t be denoted by $\ell_t = \ell(w_t)$. We assume the radar is able to store the history of waveforms and losses up to the current frame in memory, which is given by set $\mathcal{H}_{t-1} = \{w_1, \ell_1, w_2, \ell_2, ..., w_{t-1}, \ell_{t-1}\}$. The radar aims to use the history $\mathcal{H}_{t-1}$ to select a waveform which yields a low expected cost. Here, we take the cost to be an average over the expected classification performance for each of the N_c identified clusters, $1/N_c \sum_{p=0}^{N_c} g[p]$. Let the average loss associated with each waveform w_i be given by parameter θ_{w_i}. Here, the radar attempts to learn a posterior distribution for each waveform $\mathbb{P}(\theta_{w_i})$ and transmits waveforms according to this posterior belief. This is a well-known principle in online decision problems, known as *Thompson Sampling* [17].

Since bandwidth is a continuous value, and the number of possible slow-time codes grows exponentially with frame length N, the waveform catalog $\mathcal{W}$ may be very large. MAB problems with a large number of arms are notoriously difficult to solve, since popular algorithms such as variants of the upper confidence bound principle require each arm to be tested at least once. In order to learn a near-optimal waveform from a large set of candidates over a limited time horizon, the waveform selection process is managed by a satisficing-Thompson Sampling (sTS) algorithm [16]. This algorithm attempts to




Fig. 1. Impact of slow-time coding and bandwidth adaptation on the range-Doppler images is shown in (a) and (b). Impact of waveform adaptation on CFAR-processed point-cloud data is shown in (c) and (d). True targets are located in white circles in the range-Doppler images, and in black circles in the point-cloud data.

find a *satisfactory* waveform $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}$, given by

$$\tilde{w} = \arg\min_{w_i \in \mathcal{W}_t} \{w_i | \mathbb{E}[C(w_i) \geq \ell^* - d]\}, \qquad (5)$$

where $\ell^* = \min_{w_i} \ell(w_i)$ is the minimum cost achievable by the algorithm at the current frame and $d \in [0, 1)$ is a distortion parameter which must be specified as an input to the algorithm. Let the average loss for waveform w_i be specified by θ_{w_i}. The satisficing Thompson Sampling algorithm then proceeds as follows:

1. For each waveform $w \in \mathcal{W}_t$, sample $\theta_w \sim \mathbb{P}(\theta_w | \mathcal{H}_{t-1})$
2. Let $\hat{\tau} = \min\{\tau \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \theta_\tau \geq \ell^* - d\}$
3. If $\hat{\tau}$ is not the null set, transmit $w_{\hat{\tau}}$. Otherwise, transmit an untested waveform. If every waveform has been tested, transmit waveform with lowest expected loss.
4. From range-Doppler response, observe g_t and ℓ_t. Then update the history $\mathcal{H}_t$ and posterior distributions $\mathbb{P}(\theta_w | \mathcal{H}_t)$.

Thus, the sTS algorithm attempts to find the first waveform which is expected to yield a loss within a distance d of the best possible waveform. When $d = 0$, the above algorithm is equivalent to standard Thompson Sampling. The computational efficiency of this algorithm mirrors standard Thompson Sampling implementations, which are feasible in real-time. Since the loss here is a continuous value, the sTS algorithm can be simply implemented using Gaussian TS, described in [17, Algorithm 2]. Further, we shall see that for waveform selection problems with a large waveform catalog, sTS results in superior short-term performance as compared to standard TS, and nearly equivalent long-term performance.

4. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In these simulations, we consider a radar operating at $f_c = 77$ GHz. The radar uses an FMCW waveform, and each frame consists of $N = 128$ FMCW chirps. The scene consists of three targets, randomly distributed in the delay-Doppler space. The radar's maximum detectable range is 120m, which corresponds to a measurement time of 4.4×10^{-6} sec. The radar's bandwidth is selected from library $\mathcal{B}$, which contains a discrete set of values between 30MHz and 1.5GHz. The unimodular code is selected from set $\mathcal{C}$, which consists of binary-valued sequences of length $N = 128$.

In Figure 1, we observe the impact of simultaneous bandwidth adaptation and code selection on the range-Doppler processed data. Additionally, we observe point cloud data consisting of constant false alarm rate (CFAR) detections




Fig. 2. Average loss of waveform selection strategies, corresponding to expected mis-classification performance. The proposed satisficing TS algorithm is employed with two distortion constraints, $d = 0.1$ and $d = 0.3$, and is compared to standard TS and random waveform selection.




Fig. 3. Impact of bandwidth and code selection on clustering performance when DBSCAN algorithm [15] is used. Scene contains three true targets, located in black circles.

when the probability of false alarm is set to $P_{fa} = 10^{-5}$, 5 guard cells, and 10 training cells are used to implement the detector. We observe that when a near-optimal choice of bandwidth and a reasonable unimodular code sequence is selected, many false detections are eliminated. In particular, a scattering return which appears due to an interfering radar at a range of 76m and relative speed of 12m/s is substantially mitigated.

In Figure 2, the average cost achieved by the proposed sTS algorithm is compared to random waveform selection and a standard Thompson Sampling approach, which is equivalent to sTS with $d = 0$. We observe that with a good choice of distortion parameter, namely $d = 0.3$, both near-term and long-term performance is superior to random waveform selection and standard TS. Further, even when a sub-optimal distortion parameter is selected, near-term behavior exceeds that of standard TS. In the long-term, namely as the number of frames approaches 5×10^4, we observe that the expected classification performance of the sTS and standard TS approaches are roughly equivalent. Thus, we observe some degree of robustness for the proposed sTS approach in cases where the waveform library is very large.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper has introduced a computationally feasible online reinforcement learning formulation for cognitive vehicular radar based on the decision-theoretic principle of satisficing. A learning problem was defined to adapt the bandwidth and slow-time code of an FMCW waveform on a frame-by-frame basis. It was shown that satisficing Thompson Sampling can be used to select a near-optimal waveform online while requiring very few frames of exploration, thus markedly improving the probability of correct classification of moving objects.

Future work will focus on modeling additional aspects of the scene and exploring the learnability of specific classifiers, such as deep-learning-based approaches [18, 19], in more detail. We note that the learning framework presented here is expected to maintain good performance in a variety of vehicle classification/recognition tasks. However, considerations related to the specific application may influence the choice of learning parameters. For example, in simple detection problems, few waveforms may be needed to populate $\mathcal{W}$, while classification problems demanding high-resolution may require $\mathcal{W}$ to be large. The nature of the waveform catalog influences the choice of tolerance parameter d in the learning algorithm [20].

6. REFERENCES

[1] Juergen Dickmann et al., ""automotive radar the key technology for autonomous driving: From detection and ranging to environmental understanding"," in *2016 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf)*, 2016, pp. 1–6.

[2] S.M. Patole, M. Torlak, D. Wang, and M. Ali, "Automotive radars: A review of signal processing techniques," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 22–35, 2017.

[3] Gor Hakobyan and Bin Yang, "High-performance automotive radar: A review of signal processing algorithms and modulation schemes," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 32–44, 2019.

[4] Florian Engels, Philipp Heidenreich, Markus Wintermantel, Lukas Stäcker, Muhammed Al Kadi, and Abdelhak M Zoubir, "Automotive radar signal processing: Research directions and practical challenges," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 865–878, 2021.

[5] Christian Waldschmidt, Juergen Hasch, and Wolfgang Menzel, "Automotive radar—from first efforts to future systems," *IEEE Journal of Microwaves*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 135–148, 2021.

[6] Stefan Brüggenwirth, Marcel Warnke, Simon Wagner, and Kilian Barth, "Cognitive radar for classification," *IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 30–38, 2019.

[7] C. Aydogdu, N. Garcia, L. Hammarstrand, and H. Wymeersch, "Radar communications for combating mutual interference of fmcw radars," in *2019 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.

[8] H. Rohling and M-M. Meinecke, "Waveform design principles for automotive radar systems," in *2001 CIE International Conference on Radar Proceedings (Cat No. 01TH8559)*. IEEE, 2001, pp. 1–4.

[9] Hermann Rohling and Christof Moller, "Radar waveform for automotive radar systems and applications," in *2008 IEEE Radar Conference*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1–4.

[10] C.E. Thornton, M.A. Kozy, R.M. Buehrer, A.F. Martone, and K.D. Sherbondy, "Deep reinforcement learning control for radar detection and tracking in congested spectral environments," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 1335–1349, 2020.

[11] C.E. Thornton, R.M. Buehrer, and A.F. Martone, "Constrained contextual bandit learning for adaptive radar waveform selection," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 1133–1148, 2021.

[12] P. Liu, Y. Liu, T. Huang, Y. Lu, and X. Wang, "Decentralized automotive radar spectrum allocation to avoid mutual interference using reinforcement learning," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 190–205, 2020.

[13] Bo Tang, Wenjie Huang, and Jian Li, "Slow-time coding for mutual interference mitigation," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2018, pp. 6508–6512.

[14] Arindam Bose, Bo Tang, Wenjie Huang, Mojtaba Soltanalian, and Jian Li, "Waveform design for mutual interference mitigation in automotive radar," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04398*, 2022.

[15] Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, Xiaowei Xu, et al., "A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise.," in *kdd*, 1996, vol. 96, pp. 226–231.

[16] Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy, "Satisficing in time-sensitive bandit learning," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2022.

[17] Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal, "Near-optimal regret bounds for thompson sampling," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 1–24, 2017.

[18] Nicolas Scheiner, Ole Schumann, Florian Kraus, Nils Appenrodt, Jürgen Dickmann, and Bernhard Sick, "Off-the-shelf sensor vs. experimental radar-how much resolution is necessary in automotive radar classification?," in *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–8.

[19] Kanil Patel, Kilian Rambach, Tristan Visentin, Daniel Rusev, Michael Pfeiffer, and Bin Yang, "Deep learning-based object classification on automotive radar spectra," in *2019 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.

[20] Dilip Arumugam and Benjamin Van Roy, "Deciding what to learn: A rate-distortion approach," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 373–382.