


Optimal Estimation Methods

(Lecture 12 – Kalman Filtering: Part I)


Dr. John L. Crassidis

University at Buffalo – State University of New York
Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Amherst, NY 14260-4400
johnc@buffalo.edu
<http://www.buffalo.edu/~johnc>

- Least Squares Estimation
 - Applied to systems whose measured variables are related to the estimated parameters by *algebraic* equations
 - We now extend these results to allow estimation of parameters embedded in the model of a dynamical system
 - The model usually includes both *algebraic* and *differential* equations
 - We will find that the least squares sequential estimation results developed for estimation of *algebraic* systems remain valid for estimation of *dynamical* systems upon making the appropriate new interpretations of the matrices involved in the estimation algorithms
 - Must be extended to properly account for “motion” of the dynamical system between measurement and estimation epochs



- Suppose that we have a set of measurements that are a function of some desired states to be estimated
 - For example, say the measurements are from a three-axis magnetometer (TAM)
 - These measurements are both corrupted with noise and do not give full information about the states (e.g., roll, pitch and yaw)
 - A TAM only provides two out of the three pieces of the state (it's usually a combination of the state quantities, i.e. one usually does not obtain inertial pitch directly from a TAM in general) *Magnetic field
not perfect dipole*
 - A dynamic motion model may exist but it is inaccurate
 - For example, a “mission mode” spacecraft may have rates that are nearly constant; we use a constant rate kinematics model to approximate this motion
 - A proper combination of the model and measurements can be used to estimate the states and “filter” the measurements
 - Over time, a TAM with a dynamic model can provide full three-axis information using an estimator (oftentimes called a “filter”)




- Suppose that a “truth” model is generated using

$$\dot{x}(t) = F x(t), \quad x(t_0) = 1$$

$$\tilde{y}(t) = H x(t) + v(t)$$

- Synthetic measurements are created for a 10-second time interval with $F = -1$ and $H = 1$, and assume $v(t)$ is zero-mean Gaussian noise process with the standard deviation given by 0.05
- Suppose now that we wish to estimate $x(t)$ using the available measurements and some dynamic model
 - In practice the actual “truth” model is unknown (if it were known exactly then we wouldn’t need an estimator!)
- For this example, we will assume that the initial condition is known exactly, but the “modeled” value for F is given by $\bar{F} = -1.5$
 - Clearly, if we replace F with \bar{F} and integrate this equation to find an estimate for $x(t)$, we would find that the estimated $x(t)$ is far from the truth




- In order to produce better results, we shall use the age-old adage commonly spoken in control of dynamic systems: “when in doubt, use feedback!”
 - Consider the following linear feedback system for the state and output estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{x}}(t) &= \bar{F} \hat{x}(t) + K[\hat{y}(t) - \bar{H} \hat{x}(t)], \quad \hat{x}(t_0) = 1 \\ \hat{y}(t) &= \bar{H} \hat{x}(t)\end{aligned}$$





model *model*

where $\hat{x}(t)$ denotes the estimate of $x(t)$, K is a constant gain, and $\bar{H} = H = 1$

- At this point we do not consider how to determine the value of K , but instead (since we know the truth) we will pick various values and compare the resulting estimates with the truth
- Three cases: Case 1 ($K = 0.1$), Case 2 ($K = 100$), and Case 3 ($K = 15$)




First-Order Example (iii)




For small gains (such as Case 1) the estimates are far from the truth

Also, for large gains (such as Case 2) the estimates are very noisy

Case 3 depicts a gain that closely follows the truth, while at the same time providing filtered estimates



- This simple example illustrates the basic concepts used in state estimation and filtering
 - Go back to $\dot{\hat{x}}(t) = \bar{F} \hat{x}(t) + K[\tilde{y}(t) - \bar{H} \hat{x}(t)]$
 - As the gain decreases, measurements tend to be ignored and the system relies more heavily on the model (which in this case is incorrect leading to erroneous estimates)
 - As the gain increases the estimates rely more on the measurements; however, if the gain is too large then the model tends to be ignored all together, as shown by Case 2
 - Can be related to frequency domain filtering (bandwidth of the filter)
 - Large bandwidth admits a lot of noise, while too small bandwidth makes the response too slow
 - Try to pick a bandwidth that gives the best of both worlds (or least a good compromise)
- bad way to look at it*



- The full-order observer is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{x}} &= F\hat{x} + Bu + K[\tilde{y} - H\hat{x}] \\ \hat{y} &= H\hat{x}\end{aligned}$$

F-KH.

\tilde{y} must be stable, all eigenvalues in left hand plane.

- As mentioned previously we would like to find a method to determine K
- Look at another form of the observer


$$\dot{\hat{x}} = (F - KH)\hat{x} + Bu + Ky$$

Assume time invariant

- The dynamics of the observer are governed by $E = F - KH$
- Say for now we are given some desired eigenvalues for E ; using these eigenvectors we can form the characteristic equation given by

$$d(s) = s^n + \delta_{n-1}s^{n-1} + \cdots + \delta_1s + \delta_0 = 0$$

- Goal is to determine K to match the desired characteristic equation




- Solution is found using Ackermann's formula

$$K = d(F) \begin{bmatrix} H \\ HF \\ HF^2 \\ \vdots \\ HF^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \equiv d(F)\mathcal{O}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$d(F) = F^n + \delta_{n-1} F^{n-1} + \cdots + \delta_1 F + \delta_0 I$$

- Note that the system must be fully observable because the inverse of the observability matrix is required



- Proof of Ackermann's formula
 - Consider the third-order observer canonical form

$$F_o = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -a_0 \\ 1 & 0 & -a_1 \\ 0 & 1 & -a_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_o = [0 \ 0 \ 1]$$

- The matrix $(F_o - KH_o)$, with $K \equiv [k_1 \ k_2 \ k_3]^T$, is given by


$$F_o - KH_o = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -(a_0 + k_1) \\ 1 & 0 & -(a_1 + k_2) \\ 0 & 1 & -(a_2 + k_3) \end{bmatrix}$$

- The characteristic equation is given by

$$s^3 + (a_2 + k_3)s^2 + (a_1 + k_2)s + (a_0 + k_1) = 0$$

- Suppose that we have a desired characteristic equation formed from a set of desired eigenvalues in the estimator, given by

$$d(s) = s^3 + \delta_2 s^2 + \delta_1 s + \delta_0 = 0$$



- Then, the gain matrix can be obtained by comparing the corresponding coefficients

$$k_1 = \delta_0 - a_0, \quad k_2 = \delta_1 - a_1, \quad k_3 = \delta_2 - a_2$$

- This approach can easily be expanded to higher-order systems
 - However, this can become quite tedious and numerically inefficient
 - Also, must convert gains back to form for general F
- It would be useful if the gain K can be derived using the matrix F directly, without having to convert F into observer canonical form


\Rightarrow must be nonsingular
- Applying the Cayley-Hamilton theorem to the matrix $E = F - KH$ leads to

$$d(E) = E^3 + \delta_2 E^2 + \delta_1 E + \delta_0 I = 0$$

- Performing the multiplications for E^3 and E^2 yields

$$E^2 = F^2 - KHF - EKH$$

$$E^3 = F^3 - KHF^2 - EKHF - E^2KH$$



- Substituting these in $d(E)$ gives

$$F^3 + \delta_2 F^2 + \delta_1 F + \delta_0 I$$

$$- \delta_1 KH - \delta_2 KHF - \delta_2 EKH - KHF^2 - EKHF - E^2 KH = 0$$

- Since the first four terms are defined as $d(F)$, we can rewrite this as

$$d(F) = \begin{bmatrix} (\delta_1 K + \delta_2 EK + E^2 K) & (\delta_2 K + EK) & K \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H \\ HF \\ HF^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

- Therefore, the gain K can be found from

$$K = d(F) \begin{bmatrix} H \\ HF \\ HF^2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

- This can easily be extended to higher-order systems to give Ackermann's formula



- Consider the following example

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} f_{11} & f_{12} \\ f_{21} & f_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H = [h_1 \quad h_2]$$

- Let the gain be given by $K = [k_1 \quad k_2]^T$
- The desired characteristic equation of the estimator is given by


$$d(s) = s^2 + \delta_1 s + \delta_0 = 0$$

- Computing $\det(sI - F + KH)$ allows us to solve for the gain K by comparing coefficients to the desired characteristic equation, which gives (Highly nonlinear)

$$\delta_0 = (k_1 h_1 - f_{11})(k_2 h_2 - f_{22}) - (k_1 h_2 - f_{12})(k_2 h_1 - f_{21})$$

$$\delta_1 = k_1 h_1 + k_2 h_2 - f_{11} - f_{22}$$

- Finding solutions for k_1 and k_2 is not easy from these two equations (try it!)



Example (ii)

- Ackermann's formula directly gives

$$k_1 = \frac{1}{b h_1 - a h_2} [d h_1 - c h_2 + \delta_1 (h_1 f_{12} - h_2 f_{11}) - \delta_0 h_2]$$

$$k_2 = \frac{1}{b h_1 - a h_2} [g h_1 - e h_2 + \delta_1 (h_1 f_{22} - h_2 f_{21}) + \delta_0 h_1]$$

$$a = h_1 f_{11} + h_2 f_{21}$$

$$b = h_1 f_{12} + h_2 f_{22}$$

$$c = f_{11}^2 + f_{12} f_{21}$$


$$d = f_{11} f_{12} + f_{12} f_{22}$$

$$e = f_{11} f_{21} + f_{21} f_{22}$$

$$g = f_{22}^2 + f_{12} f_{21}$$

As $b h_1 - a h_2 \rightarrow 0$ the gains k_1 and k_2 approach infinity. This is due to the fact that $b h_1 - a h_2$ is the determinant of the observability matrix.

Therefore, as observability slips away the gains must increase in order to “see” the states. This can have a negative effect for noisy systems.



- Discrete-time estimator is usually given by two coupled equations

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- = \Phi \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ + \Gamma \mathbf{u}_k$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K[\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k - H \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-]$$

+ : you have measurement

- : no measurement

- The first is known as the *prediction* or *propagation* equation, and the second is known as the *update* equation
- The truth model is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \Phi \mathbf{x}_k + \Gamma \mathbf{u}_k$$

$$\mathbf{y}_k = H \mathbf{x}_k$$

- Error states defined by $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- \equiv \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- - \mathbf{x}_k$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ \equiv \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ - \mathbf{x}_k$
- Substituting terms leads to


errors

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- = \Phi[I - KH]\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^-$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^+ = [I - KH]\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+$$

Predicted
updated

- Note that $\Phi[I - KH]$ and $[I - KH]\Phi$ have the same eigenvalues



- Say we have some desired characteristic equation of the form

$$d(z) = z^n + \delta_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + \delta_1 z + \delta_0 = 0$$


- Ackermann's formula for the discrete-time case is given by

$$K = d(\Phi) \begin{bmatrix} H\Phi \\ H\Phi^2 \\ H\Phi^3 \\ \vdots \\ H\Phi^n \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \equiv d(\Phi)\Phi^{-1}\mathcal{O}_d^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where \mathcal{O}_d is the discrete-time observability matrix

- Introduction

- The estimators derived previously require a desired characteristic equation in the filter dynamics
- The answer to the obvious question “How do we choose the poles of the estimator?” is not trivial
- The *Kalman filter* provides a rigorous theoretical approach to “place” the poles of the estimator, based upon stochastic processes for the measurement error and model error
- We do not know the exact values for these errors; however, we do make some assumptions on the nature of the errors (e.g., a zero-mean Gaussian noise process)
- Note: “sequential state estimation” and “filtering” are used synonymously throughout
 - Sequential state estimation is often used to not only reconstruct state variables but also “filter” noisy measurement processes



- The “truth” model is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_{k+1} &= \Phi_k \mathbf{x}_k + \Gamma_k \mathbf{u}_k + \Upsilon_k \mathbf{w}_k \\ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k &= H_k \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k\end{aligned}$$

process noise

Note “errors” are present in both the state and measurement models

where \mathbf{v}_k and \mathbf{w}_k are zero-mean Gaussian noise processes

$$E \left\{ \mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{v}_j^T \right\} = \begin{cases} 0 & k \neq j \\ R_k & k = j \end{cases}, \quad E \left\{ \mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_j^T \right\} = \begin{cases} 0 & k \neq j \\ Q_k & k = j \end{cases}$$

measurement noise covariance

process noise covariance Tunable

- Estimator form for propagation and update are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- &= \Phi_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ + \Gamma_k \mathbf{u}_k \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ &= \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K_k [\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k - H_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-]\end{aligned}$$

Note that this is the same as before!

- Error covariances

Bound error between estimate or truth

$$\begin{aligned}P_k^- &\equiv E \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{-T} \right\}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- \equiv \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- - \mathbf{x}_k \\ P_k^+ &\equiv E \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{+T} \right\}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ \equiv \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ - \mathbf{x}_k\end{aligned}$$



- Note on covariance P (Error Covariance)
 - Provides information on the state estimation errors
 - Get 3σ bounds from diagonal elements $3\sigma = \sqrt{3 \text{diag}(P)}$
- Propagation error equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- &\equiv \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- - \mathbf{x}_{k+1} \\
 &= \underbrace{\Phi_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ + \Gamma_k \mathbf{u}_k}_{\text{Red bracket}} - \underbrace{\Phi_k \mathbf{x}_k - \Gamma_k \mathbf{u}_k - \Upsilon_k \mathbf{w}_k}_{\text{Green bracket}} \\
 &= \Phi_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ - \Upsilon_k \mathbf{w}_k
 \end{aligned}$$

- Update error equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ &\equiv \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ - \mathbf{x}_k \\
 &= \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K_k [\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k - H_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-] - \mathbf{x}_k \\
 &= \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- - \mathbf{x}_k + K_k [H_k \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k - H_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-] \\
 &= \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- - K_k H_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K_k \mathbf{v}_k \\
 &= (I - K_k H_k) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K_k \mathbf{v}_k
 \end{aligned}$$



- Propagation error equation

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- = \Phi_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ - \Upsilon_k \underline{\mathbf{w}_k}$$

- We see that $\underline{\mathbf{w}_k}$ and $\underline{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+}$ are uncorrelated since $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^-$ (not $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+$) directly depends on $\underline{\mathbf{w}_k}$
- So $E\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ \mathbf{w}_k^T\} = E\{\mathbf{w}_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{+T}\} = 0$
- Propagation covariance

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{k+1}^- &= E\{\Phi_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{+T} \Phi_k^T\} - E\{\Phi_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ \mathbf{w}_k^T \Upsilon_k^T\} = 0 \\
 &\quad \text{--- } \underbrace{\Phi_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+}_{P_k^+} \text{ --- } \underbrace{\mathbf{w}_k^T \Upsilon_k^T}_{= 0} = 0 \\
 &\quad - E\{\Upsilon_k \mathbf{w}_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{+T} \Phi_k^T\} + E\{\Upsilon_k \mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k^T \Upsilon_k^T\} = E\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^{+T}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

- This gives

$$P_{k+1}^- = \Phi_k P_k^+ \Phi_k^T + \Upsilon_k Q_k \Upsilon_k^T$$



- Update error equation

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ = (I - K_k H_k) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K_k \underline{\mathbf{v}_k}$$

- We see that $\underline{\mathbf{v}_k}$ and $\underline{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^-}$ are uncorrelated since $\underline{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+}$ (not $\underline{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^-}$) directly depends on $\underline{\mathbf{v}_k}$
- So $E\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- \mathbf{v}_k^T\} = E\{\mathbf{v}_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{-T}\} = 0$
- Update covariance

$$\begin{aligned} P_k^+ &\equiv E\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{+T}\} \\ &= E\{(I - K_k H_k) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{-T} (I - K_k H_k)^T\} \\ &\quad + E\{(I - K_k H_k) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^- \mathbf{v}_k^T K_k^T\} \\ &\quad + E\{K_k \mathbf{v}_k \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^{-T} (I - K_k H_k)^T\} + E\{K_k \mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{v}_k^T K_k^T\} \end{aligned}$$

$$P_k^+ = [I - K_k H_k] P_k^- [I - K_k H_k]^T + K_k R_k K_k^T$$

Want to use
this form.
better conditioned

- Valid for any $K_k \rightarrow$ Joseph's Stabilized Form

- Minimizing trace of covariance seems logical

$$\text{minimize } J(K_k) = \text{Tr}(P_k^+)$$

- Solution found by taking partial

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial K_k} = 0 = -2(I - K_k H_k) P_k^- H_k^T + 2K_k R_k$$

Achieves Cramer
Bound

- Solving for K_k gives

$$K_k = P_k^- H_k^T [H_k P_k^- H_k^T + R_k]^{-1}$$

- Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_k^+ &= P_k^- - K_k H_k P_k^- - P_k^- H_k^T K_k^T + K_k [H_k P_k^- H_k^T + R_k] K_k^T \\ &= P_k^- - K_k H_k P_k^- \end{aligned}$$

$$P_k^+ = [I - K_k H_k] P_k^-$$

\approx Standard form

- Only valid for the specific K_k shown above



- The gain can also be written as

$$K_k = P_k^+ H_k^T R_k^{-1}$$

- Useful for analysis purposes (not discussed here though)
- Rewrite the covariance update as

$$[I - K_k H_k] = P_k^+ (P_k^-)^{-1}$$

- Also, state update can be written as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ = [I - K_k H_k] \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K_k \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k$$

- Substituting gain and $I - K_k H_k$ into the above yields

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ = P_k^+ \left[(P_k^-)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + H_k^T R_k^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k \right]$$

- This is not particularly useful since the inverse of P_k^- is required, but its helpfulness can be shown in the derivation of the discrete-time fixed-interval smoother



- Proof of the first form
 - Rewrite the gain as


$$\begin{aligned}
 K_k &= P_k^- H_k^T [H_k P_k^- H_k^T + R_k]^{-1} \\
 &= P_k^- H_k^T R_k^{-1} R_k [H_k P_k^- H_k^T + R_k]^{-1} \\
 &= P_k^- H_k^T R_k^{-1} [I + H_k P_k^- H_k^T R_k^{-1}]^{-1}
 \end{aligned}$$

- This can be rewritten

$$K_k [I + H_k P_k^- H_k^T R_k^{-1}] = P_k^- H_k^T R_k^{-1}$$


- Collecting terms now gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 K_k &= P_k^- H_k^T R_k^{-1} - K_k H_k P_k^- H_k^T R_k^{-1} \\
 &= \underbrace{[I - K_k H_k] P_k^-}_{P_k^+} H_k^T R_k^{-1}
 \end{aligned}$$



Model	$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \Phi_k \mathbf{x}_k + \Gamma_k \mathbf{u}_k + \Upsilon_k \mathbf{w}_k, \quad \mathbf{w}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, Q_k)$ $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k = H_k \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k, \quad \mathbf{v}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, R_k)$ ≈ Fixed in Calibration
Initialize	$\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_0$ $P_0 = E \{ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^T(t_0) \}$ ← Initial
Gain	$K_k = P_k^- H_k^T [H_k P_k^- H_k^T + R_k]^{-1}$
Update	$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + K_k [\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k - H_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-]$ $P_k^+ = [I - K_k H_k] P_k^-$
Propagation	$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}^- = \Phi_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ + \Gamma_k \mathbf{u}_k$ $P_{k+1}^- = \Phi_k P_k^+ \Phi_k^T + \Upsilon_k Q_k \Upsilon_k^T$

- The vector v_k is known as the *measurement noise*
 - Its covariance R_k is the measurement noise covariance
 - Usually R_k is well known from sensor calibration
 - Must be careful though because measurement noise process may not be Gaussian in nature
 - Can employ a colored-noise filter to help mitigate this though
- The vector w_k is known as the *process noise*
 - Its covariance Q_k is the process noise covariance
 - The larger the process noise the less we trust the model
 - The matrix Q_k is not easy to find in general
 - How do we know how much to trust the model???
 - Finding this matrix is often referred to as tuning the filter
 - Takes some experience about the problem at hand and usually is done with lots of simulations since we know the truth in this case
 - Adaptive methods can be employed to do this in realtime though



- Combining equations gives *predictor-corrector form*

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} = \Phi_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k + \Gamma_k \mathbf{u}_k + \Phi_k K_k [\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k - H_k \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k]$$

$$K_k = P_k H_k^T [H_k P_k H_k^T + R_k]^{-1}$$

$$P_{k+1} = \Phi_k P_k \Phi_k^T - \Phi_k K_k H_k P_k \Phi_k^T + \Upsilon_k Q_k \Upsilon_k^T$$

with $P_k = P_k^-$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-$

- Although “nice” in the sense that only three equations are required for the Kalman filter, this form is typically not used in practice because it is often desired to store both the updated and propagated values

- Standard form is given by

$$P_k^+ = [I - K_k H_k] P_k^-$$

- Investigate numerical sensitivity by using $K_k \rightarrow K_k + \delta K_k$ and $P_k^+ \rightarrow P_k^+ + \delta P_k^+$, so $P_k^+ + \delta P_k^+ = [I - K_k H_k - \delta K_k H_k] P_k^-$

$$\boxed{\delta P_k^+ = -\delta K_k H_k P_k^-}$$

- Errors are clearly first-order in nature
- This will be highly sensitive to roundoff errors
- Joseph stabilized form

$$P_k^+ = [I - K_k H_k] P_k^- [I - K_k H_k]^T + K_k R_k K_k^T$$

- Performing the same substitutions gives

$$\boxed{\delta P_k^+ = \delta K_k [H_k P_k^- H_k^T + R_k] \delta K_k^T}$$

- Errors are clearly second-order in nature
- Better than standard form but requires more computations



- Consider single-axis attitude estimation problem
 - Update both the attitude-angle estimates and gyro drift rate
 - Angle measurements are corrupted with noise, which can be filtered by using rate information
 - However, all gyros inherently drift over time, which degrades the rate information over time
 - Two error sources are generally present in gyros (there are others but we'll keep it simple)
 - The first is a short-term component of instability referred to as *random drift*
 - The second is a random walk component referred to as *drift rate ramp*
 - The effects of both of these noise sources on the uncertainty of the gyro outputs can be compensated using a Kalman filter with attitude measurements



- The attitude rate $\dot{\theta}$ is assumed to be related to the gyro output $\tilde{\omega}$ by

$$\dot{\theta} = \tilde{\omega} - \beta - \eta_v$$

drift noise

where β is the gyro drift rate, and η_v is a zero-mean Gaussian white-noise process with spectral density given by σ_v^2

Variance in
continuous time

- The drift rate is modeled by a random walk process, given by

$$\dot{\beta} = \eta_u$$

where η_u is a zero-mean Gaussian white-noise process with spectral density given by σ_u^2


From manufacturer
spec with σ_v

- The estimated states clearly follow

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}} = \tilde{\omega} - \hat{\beta}$$

$$\dot{\hat{\beta}} = 0$$

- Need to convert this to discrete-time since we'd like to use the discrete-time Kalman filter



- Assuming a constant sampling interval in the gyro output, the discrete-time error propagation is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_{k+1} \\ \beta_{k+1} - \hat{\beta}_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \Phi \begin{bmatrix} \theta_k - \hat{\theta}_k \\ \beta_k - \hat{\beta}_k \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} p_k \\ q_k \end{bmatrix}$$

where the state transition matrix is given by

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\Delta t \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\Delta t = t_{k+1} - t_k$ is the sampling interval, and

$$p_k = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [-\eta_v(\tau) - (t_{k+1} - \tau)\eta_u(\tau)] d\tau$$

$$q_k = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \eta_u(\tau) d\tau$$


- The process noise covariance matrix can be computed as

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} E\{p_k^2\} & E\{p_k q_k\} \\ E\{q_k p_k\} & E\{q_k^2\} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_v^2 \Delta t + \frac{1}{3} \sigma_u^2 \Delta t^3 & -\frac{1}{2} \sigma_u^2 \Delta t^2 \\ -\frac{1}{2} \sigma_u^2 \Delta t^2 & \sigma_u^2 \Delta t \end{bmatrix}$$

- Note that this is a constant matrix
- Also note off-diagonal terms are nonzero
- If the sampling interval is “small” then this matrix is well approximated using (diagonal matrix) $\Delta t^2 \approx \Delta t^3 \approx 0$

$$Q = \Delta t \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_v^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_u^2 \end{bmatrix} = \Delta t \times \text{Spectral Density}$$



- The attitude-angle measurement is modeled by

$$\tilde{y}_k = \theta_k + v_k$$

where v_k is a zero-mean Gaussian white-noise process with variance given by $\underline{R} = \sigma_n^2$

- The discrete-time system used in the Kalman filter can now be written as


$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \Phi \mathbf{x}_k + \Gamma \tilde{\omega}_k + \mathbf{w}_k$$

$$\tilde{y}_k = H \mathbf{x}_k + v_k$$

where $\mathbf{x} = [\theta \quad \beta]^T$, $\Gamma = [\Delta t \quad 0]^T$, $H = [1 \quad 0]$, and $E\{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k^T\} = Q$

- We should note that the input to this system involves a measurement ($\tilde{\omega}_k$), which is counterintuitive but valid in the Kalman filter form and poses no problems in the estimation process

- Gyro measurements are given in discrete-time, which is why we converted the system to a fully discrete-time one



- Simulation Parameters

- True rate given by $\dot{\theta} = 0.0011 \text{ rad/sec}$
- Sampling interval is 1 second
- The noise parameters are given by

$$\sigma_n = 17 \times 10^{-6} \text{ rad} \quad \begin{matrix} \leftarrow \\ \text{Used in} \\ R \end{matrix}$$


$$\sigma_u = \sqrt{10} \times 10^{-10} \text{ rad/sec}^{3/2} \quad \begin{matrix} \leftarrow \\ \text{Used in} \\ R \end{matrix}$$

$$\sigma_v = \sqrt{10} \times 10^{-7} \text{ rad/sec}^{1/2} \quad \begin{matrix} \leftarrow \\ \text{Used in} \\ Q \end{matrix}$$

- Note this represents a good sensor (e.g. a star tracker) and a very good gyro
- The initial drift β_0 is given as 0.1 deg/hr, and the initial covariance matrix is set to

$$P_0 = \text{diag} [1 \times 10^{-4} \quad 1 \times 10^{-12}]$$

Example (vii)




3 σ bounds are found from diagonal elements of P , taking the square root of each element and multiplying by 3

Note that 3 σ bounds do bound the errors



Example (viii)



Drift is estimated well

Note that it's fairly constant. This is due to the fact that a high quality gyro is used


Drift is often referred as the “bias”



```
% True Rate
dt=1;tf=3600;t=[0:dt:tf]';m=length(t);
wtrue=0.0011;

% Gyro and Attitude Parameters
sigu=sqrt(10)*1e-10;
sigv=sqrt(10)*1e-7;
sign=17*1e-6;

% Measurements with Bias (note: this is in discrete-time)
% Reynolds, R., "Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Stability Parameters for the Standard
% Gyroscopic Error Model," Flight Mechanics Symposium,
% Greenbelt, MD, Oct. 2003, NASA CP-2003-212246, paper #42.
ym=t*wtrue+sign*randn(m,1);
num_g=dt*[1 1];den_g=2*[1 -1];
[phi_g,gam_g,c_g,d_g]=tf2ss(num_g,den_g);
bias=dlsim(phi_g,gam_g,c_g,d_g,sigu/sqrt(dt)*randn(m,1),0.1*pi/180/3600/dt);
wm=wtrue+sqrt(sigv^2/dt+1/12*sigu^2*dt)*randn(m,1)+bias;
```




```
% Discrete-Time Process Noise Covariance  
q=[sigv^2*dt+1/3*sigu^2*dt^3 -1/2*sigu^2*dt^2;-1/2*sigu^2*dt^2 sigu^2*dt];  
phi=[1 -dt;0 1];gam=[dt;0];
```

```
% Initial Covariance
```

```
poa=1e-4;  
pog=1e-12;  
p=[poa 0;0 pog];  
pcov=zeros(m,2);pcov(1,:)=[poa pog];
```

```
% Initial Condition and H Matrix (constant)
```

```
x0=[ym(1);0];xe=zeros(m,2);xe(1,:)=x0';x=x0;  
h=[1 0];
```



```
% Main Loop
```

```
for i = 1:m-1
```

```
% Kalman Gain
```

```
gain=p*h'*inv(h*p*h'+sign^2);
```

```
% Update
```

```
x=x+gain*(ym(i)-h*x);
```

```
p=[eye(2)-gain*h]*p;
```

```
% Propagate
```

```
x=phi*x+gam*wm(i);
```


```
p=phi*p*phi'+q;
```

```
% Store Variables
```

```
xe(i+1,:)=x';
```

```
pcov(i+1,:)=diag(p');
```

```
end
```





Example (xii)

```
% 3-Sigma Outlier  
sig3=pcov.^^(0.5)*3;
```

```
% Plot Results  
plot(t/60,[sig3(:,1) xe(:,1)-t*wtrue -sig3(:,1)]*1e6)  
axis([0 60 -20 20]);grid  
set(gca,'Fontsize',12);set(gca,'Fontname','Helvetica');  
xlabel('Time (Min)');  
hh=get(gca,'Ylabel');  
set(hh,'String','\fontsize{12} {Attitude Error (\{\mu\}rad)}');
```

```
disp(' Press any key to continue')  
pause
```

```
plot(t/60,xe(:,2)*180*3600/pi);grid  
set(gca,'Fontsize',12);set(gca,'Fontname','Helvetica');  
xlabel('Time (Min)');  
ylabel('Bias Estimate (Deg/Hr)')
```

