


AD-A191 186 ALGORITHMS AND INTUITION(U) JET PROPULSION LAB PASADENA 1/1
CA 17 APR 87 JPL-D-4297 NAS7-918

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 12/3 NL

END

10/11
10/11
10/11



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

2

FILE COPY

AD-A191 186

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

DTIC
SELECTED
JAN 25 1966

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

NO 1 12 1966

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
ALCO-PUB-0023		
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Technical Memo 9, "Algorithms and Intuition."		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER D-4297
7. AUTHOR(s) Mathematical Analysis Research Corp.		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) NAS 7-918
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Jet Propulsion Laboratory ATTN: 171-209 California Institute of Technology 4800 Oak Grove, Pasadena, CA 91109		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS RE 182 AMEND #187
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Commander, USAICS ATTN: ATSI-CD-SF Ft. Huachuca, AZ 85613-7000		12. REPORT DATE 17 Apr 87
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 13
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Commander, USAICS ATTN: ATSI-CD-SF Ft. Huachuca, AZ 85613-7000		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE NONE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Dissemination		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Prepared by Jet Propulsion Laboratory for the US Army Intelligence Center and School's Combat Developer's Support Facility.		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Graphics, Simulation, Ellipse Combination, Fix Algorithms, Bias		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report describes the fix simulation program available at Mathematical Analysis Research Corp. (MARC, 4329 Via Padova, Claremont, CA 91711). This program simulates lines-of-bearing (LOB's) between sensors and emitters, subsequent fix estimation (with several fix algorithms available), and EEP ellipse generation. Results are displayed on a terminal screen and can be obtained in hard copy on a graphics plotter. Finally, the report describes bias results for all of the available fix algorithms. <		

U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE CENTER AND SCHOOL
Software Analysis and Management System

Algorithms and Intuition

EAAF

Technical Memorandum No. 9

17 April 1987

Author:

Michael W. Bonnie James Myhre
MARC
Mathematical Analysis Research Corporation

Approval:

James W. Gillis
James W. Gillis, Subgroup Leader
Algorithm Analysis Subgroup

Edward J. Records
Edward J. Records, Supervisor
USAMS Task

Concur:

A. F. Ellman
A. F. Ellman, Manager
Ground Data Systems Section

Fred Vote
Fred Vote, Manager
Advanced Tactical Systems

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



JET PROPULSION LABORATORY
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California

PREFACE

The work described in this publication was sponsored by the United States Army Intelligence Center and School. The writing and publication of this paper was supported by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NAS 7-918, RE 182, A187.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Technical Memorandum was prepared to satisfy the often asked question by customer personnel in the field " what are algorithms and how do they apply to my work? ". This report was requested verably by the Combat Developers Support Facility personnel during FY-86 and used FY-86 funds.

The work in this tutorial memo is supported by a simulation system which runs on the IBM PC- series of computers. This combination can be useful for training new analysts.



MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS RESEARCH CORPORATION

TO: Jim Gillis

SUBJECT: Algorithms and Intuition

DATE: 23 June 1985

INTRODUCTION

Algorithms have idiosyncrasies and behavior patterns. Study can reveal some of these phenomena. In emitter detection, location and identification, however, a set of algorithms are intertwined into a system. Reduction of behavior patterns of individual algorithms to mathematical expressions does not necessarily resolve the problem of interpreting these results in terms of system behavior. There are two policies that MARC follows to make results more relevant to analysis of system behavior:

- (1) Study combinations of algorithms and algorithm interfaces
- (2) Reduce algorithm behavior to an intuitive format (geometric if possible) so that qualitative analysis may be used to expand algorithmic insights into systematic insights.

The relationship between basing ellipses on the F test and using a Chi-square ellipse combination algorithm is an example where MARC has followed (1) above. It is the objective of this memo, however, to illustrate one of MARC's tools in pursuit of (2) above. In particular MARC uses a graphical LOB simulator which allows overlay of algorithm results including competing algorithms.

In Section I below the current version of the program is discussed briefly. In Section 2 the use of the LOB simulator program is demonstrated by showing some types of screens and reports available. In Section 3 there is a discussion of algorithms which provides some of the basic materials used to develop intuition regarding differences and similarities in Fix behavior. In Section 4 a summary of bias results (which will be reported more completely in another report) is used to illustrate an example of the results of a mix of analysis and intuition.

II. THE LOB AND FIX SIMULATOR PROGRAM

The main menu of this program is shown in figure 1. The options and capabilities of each menu option are discussed below. Note that current capabilities are specified although MARC frequently modifies the program for special applications.

A. Locate Sensors

This option allows one to specify up to 10 locations LOBs will be taken from. (More than 10 locations may be specified with certain limitations when ellipse combination is being used. See options I and J. The limit of 10 is often changed depending on the application and competing memory requirements.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

-

B. Locate the Emitter

Only one emitter may be currently specified although MARC intends to create a modification of this program that allows multiple emitters for study of wild bearings and tests for combination of data.

C. Specify Sensor Accuracy

This option allows specification of different standard deviations for the angular accuracy of individual LOBs. It also allows specification of a standard deviation for location error although it is only implemented for the study of one Fix algorithm. Recent information communicated to MARC has also suggested that a different model may be appropriate for location error.

D. Change Fix Algorithm

This option allows the fix algorithm to be

- 1) none (LOBs can be shown without fixes, etc.. This option has been useful for production of graphs for reports.)
- 2) Perpendicular
- 3) Weighted Perpendicular
- 4) Angular Error Minimization
- 5) Weighted Perpendicular with location error
- 6) F test based weighted perpendicular (the other versions use knowledge of the true accuracy and a Chi-Square distribution)

At the time this option is chosen if an LOB graph is on the screen fixes and ellipses corresponding to the new method are added to the screen except in the case of option 5) above where it would confuse the graph.

E. Graph LOBs

Random errors are generated for each LOB and the results are plotted together with a fix and ellipse if appropriate to the Fix Algorithm active. The user is then given the option of sending the results seen on the screen to a plotter.

F. Simulate Fixes

Similar to E above but only fixes are plotted and up to 5000 runs may be specified. Examples of the results of simulation may be found in Figures 2 and 3. Statistics for the simulation are also shown.

G. Change Save Fix Mode

When this is turned on all subsequent ellipses generated are combined using the standard ellipse combination method. This approach has greater flexibility than the pattern method described below under I and J.

H. Combine Saved Fixes

Actually the combination is done already and this option merely shows the result. To the User this title seemed appropriate, however.

Emitter is at (10 , 55)

Perpendicular Method

XBAR= 9.99831896486

YBAR= 56.3536212819

2 LOBS EACH

True Location

—

Figure 2

• 0

•
<---X--->

40

Emitter is at (10 , 55)

Perpendicular Method

XBAR= 9.90562431082

YBAR= 53.8402451074

10 LOBS EACH

True Location



• 0 <---X---> 40

Figure 3

Copy
permit full,does not
reduction.I. Set Multiple Fix Pattern

This is used to design a simulation of generation and combination of ellipses according to the pattern specified.

J. Combine According To Pattern

This option is redundant as it is the case of 1 simulation according to the pattern defined in I. Future versions of this program may combine this option with option K.

K. Simulate Combinations

This option simulates combinations according to a specified pattern.

L. Graph Scaling:

Allows some rescaling when the program logic does not yield the scale desired.

III. 2-DIMENSIONAL FIX ALGORITHMS

For the purposes of this section we will assume the only source of inaccuracy is error in the direction of the bearing.

It is the intention of this section to discuss similarities and differences in the concept of various algorithms. Actual differences may be seen in the differences in the location estimates they produce. See Figure 4.

2-Dimensional Least Squares Fix Algorithms

Least Squares Algorithms are algorithms that estimate parameters by minimizing a sum of squared terms (usually a measure of error) where each term depends only on the parameters and one observation. For our application the parameters are the x and y coordinates of the location estimate and the observations are LOBs.

All but one of the algorithms to be discussed can be characterized by least squares. This is not the reason for the importance of the least squares characterizations, however. For example, all of the algorithms discussed could be characterized in defining equations for implicit functions yet this gives no insight. The least squares characterizations are important because:

- (1) They allow one to analyze behavior intuitively without reference to mathematical details if necessary.
- (2) Least squares is naturally related to the normal distribution and the level curves associated with it. It is these level curves that EEPs approximate.

Examples of Least Squares Algorithms:

Perpendicular Method: (The term squared is the perpendicular distance from the estimate to the LOB.)

'Intermediate Method': (The term squared is the perpendicular distance from the estimate to the LOB divided by the distance from the sensor to the location estimate. Variations involve adjusting for other terms known to affect location accuracy such as sensor accuracy.)

Emitter is at (5 , 7)

Min Angular Error

XBARR= 4.76759400962

YBAR- 6.72161868043

Perpendicular Method

XBAR- 4.71942641906

YBAR- 6.59194583538

Weighted Perpendicular

XBAR- 4.73255481893

YBAR- 6.626563827

7

Figure 4

☐ ☒ ☐

Angular Minimization Method: (The term squared is the angle between the LOB and a line from the sensor to the location estimate.)

An Algorithm Not Definable In Terms Of Least Squares

Weighted Perpendicular Method: (This is the algorithm which seems to correspond most closely with what MARC has been exposed to in operational algorithms. It is a variation on the perpendicular method which introduces the same weights as the 'intermediate method' but using a different characterization of the perpendicular method. Although this method is not based on least squares its similarity to methods that are is a useful tool in understanding it.)

Basic Definitions (for the Least Square Methods Only):

(X,Y) = true location of the emitter

ω_k = true bearing from the kth sensor to the emitter (X,Y)

θ_k = observed bearing from the kth sensor (multiple readings are treated as coming from different sensors)

$(x,y) = (x(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n), y(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n))$ = estimated location of the emitter

$a_k = a_k(x,y,\theta_k)$ = the 'squared error term' corresponding to the kth LOB and a location estimate of (x,y) for the least square method.

$S(x,y,\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_k$ = the sum of squares that the method minimizes

σ_k = standard deviation of the angular measurement of the kth LOB in radians (multiply by $\pi/180$ if in degrees)

Perpendicular Method

$$a_k = (x-\xi_k)^2 \cos^2 \theta_k + (y-\eta_k)^2 \sin^2 \theta_k - 2(x-\xi_k)(y-\eta_k)$$

Angular Minimization Method

$$a_k = [\text{Arctan}((x-\xi_k)/(y-\eta_k)) - \theta_k]^2$$

'The Intermediate Method'

$$a_k = [(x-\xi_k)^2 \cos^2 \theta_k + (y-\eta_k)^2 \sin^2 \theta_k - 2(x-\xi_k)(y-\eta_k)] / [(x-\xi_k)^2 + (y-\eta_k)^2]$$

The 'Intermediate Method' is so close to the Angular Minimization Method that the title invented here is not really needed. (The relationship is easily shown using Taylor Series expansions.) It was included here because it makes the relationship between the Perpendicular Method and the Angular Minimization Method clearer and because it shows that the Angular Minimization Method is a type of 'weighted' Perpendicular. The method referred to in this method as the Weighted Perpendicular uses the same weights but at a different point.

IV. BIAS

The objective of this section is a specific pattern to differences between particular methods. In this case the differences are differences in bias behavior of the Perpendicular Method and the Angular Minimization Method.

Formula (and notation) for Bias in the General Least Squares Case

Let subscripts on a, x or y which follow a comma denote partial derivatives. For example an 'x' subscript denotes the partial with respect to x or an i subscript denotes the partial with respect to θ_i . Furthermore, let X, Y with a comma and subscript indicate the corresponding x or y term evaluated at the true location and the variables below denote the indicated term EVALUATED at the true LOBs. (Recall that Taylor Series uses evaluated derivatives.)

$$\begin{array}{llllll} b_k = a_{k,x} & c_k = a_{k,y} & b'_k = a_{k,kx} & c'_k = a_{k,ky} & b''_k = a_{k,kx} & c''_k = a_{k,ky} \\ d_k = a_{k,xx} & e_k = a_{k,xy} & f_k = a_{k,yy} & d'_k = a_{k,kxx} & e'_k = a_{k,kxy} & f'_k = a_{k,kyy} \\ g_k = a_{k,xxx} & h_k = a_{k,xxy} & i_k = a_{k,xyy} & j_k = a_{k,yyy} & & \end{array}$$

Computing a Taylor Series for location error in terms angular error by using implicit derivatives, taking the first order term in the series and computing its expected value yields

$$\text{FIRST ORDER BIAS} = (-1/Q) * \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{k=1}^n f_k & -\sum_{k=1}^n e_k \\ -\sum_{k=1}^n e_k & \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \end{bmatrix} * \sum_{k=1}^n \begin{bmatrix} U_k \\ V_k \end{bmatrix} \sigma_k^2$$

$$\text{where } Q = (\sum_{k=1}^n d_k)(\sum_{k=1}^n f_k) - (\sum_{k=1}^n e_k)^2$$

$$\text{and } U_k = (X_k)^2 \sum_{m=1}^n g_m + 2X_k Y_k \sum_{m=1}^n h_m + (Y_k)^2 \sum_{m=1}^n i_m + 2X_k d'_k + 2Y_k e'_k + b''_k$$

$$\text{and } V_k = (X_k)^2 \sum_{m=1}^n h_m + 2X_k Y_k \sum_{m=1}^n i_m + (Y_k)^2 \sum_{m=1}^n j_m + 2X_k e'_k + 2Y_k f'_k + c''_k$$

Implicit function theory also must be used to determine $X_{,k}$ and $Y_{,k}$. It yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{,k} \\ Y_{,k} \end{bmatrix} = (-1/Q) * \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{m=1}^n f_m & -\sum_{m=1}^n e_m \\ -\sum_{m=1}^n e_m & \sum_{m=1}^n d_m \end{bmatrix} * \begin{bmatrix} b'_k \\ c'_k \end{bmatrix}$$

Perpendicular Method versus Angular Minimization Method

To a first order approximation the biases turn out to be identical.

Large numbers of LOBs

Terms that have more sums in the denominator than in the numerator go to zero (unless the terms in a sum in the denominator collapse which does not occur in our application.) As the number of LOBs becomes large our first order bias term approaches the remaining terms, namely

$$\text{FIRST ORDER BIAS} = (-1/Q) * \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{k=1}^n f_k & -\sum_{k=1}^n e_k \\ -\sum_{k=1}^n e_k & \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \end{bmatrix} * \sum_{k=1}^n \begin{bmatrix} b''_k \\ c''_k \end{bmatrix} \sigma_k^2$$

For angular minimization and the weighted perpendicular method this turns out to be equal to zero. Thus as the number of LOBs increases the bias goes to

zero for these two methods. For the perpendicular method this does not happen. In this case

$$b_k'' = X - \xi_k \quad c_k'' = Y - \eta_k$$

Symmetric Case

Many bias effects are of different signs and hence cancel. By restricting attention to a symmetric case it is possible to show the behavior of terms less prone to cancellation. In particular, the formulation given here is for an emitter on the y-axis and such that for every LOB taken from a sensor on one side of the y-axis there is another LOB (from an equally accurate sensor) directly across the y-axis (i.e. (ξ, η) and $(\xi, -\eta)$).

According to the predicted result for symmetric bias in the Perpendicular Method, bias changed from long to short as the number of LOBs increased. In a symmetric situation, bias in the x-direction is predicted to be zero, so bias is entirely in the y-direction. In Figures 2 and 3, only five-hundred simulations were used to generate the plotted illustrations in order to achieve a clear diagram, although more simulations would generate results closer to the predicted results. Figure 3 is identical to Figure 2 except that there are 5 sensors at each location instead of only two. Note the marked change in YBAR between the two diagrams; even five-hundred simulations showed the change of direction in bias as the number of LOBs increased from 2 to 10.

DATE
FILMED
58