Incremental Sparse Gaussian Process Regression for Continuous-time Trajectory Estimation & Mapping

Georgia College of Tech Computing Xinyan Yan¹, Vadim Indelman², Byron Boots¹

¹ College of Computing Georgia Institute of Technology

² Faculty of Aerospace EngineeringTechnion - Israel Institute of Technology



1 Motivation

The problem of simultaneously recovering the location of a robot and a map of its environment from sensor readings is a fundamental challenge in robotics. We want:

- a *continuous-time representation* of the robot trajectory, which elegantly handles asynchronous and sparse measurements, and
- an efficient *incremental approach* to updating the estimate.

2A State Interpolation

Any state can be interpolated from other states by computing the posterior mean: interpolation : $\bar{x}(t) = \mu(t) + K(t)K^{-1}(\bar{x} - \mu)$ linearized mm. $h_i(\bar{\theta}_i + \delta\theta_i) = h_i(\bar{x}(\tau) + \delta x(\tau))$ $\approx h_i(\mu(\tau) + K(\tau)K^{-1}(\bar{x} - \mu)) + H_iK(\tau)K^{-1}\delta x$

We can utilize measurement *i* without explicitly estimating the states it relates to.

Batch Trajectory Estimation & Mapping as GP Regression

Representation¹

2B Sparse Gaussian Process Regression

 K^{-1} is exactly *block-tridiagonal* when the GP is generated by linear, time-varying

robot trajectory: $x(t) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu(t), K(t, t'))$ mm. model: $y_i = h_i(\theta_i) + n_i$ $n_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R_i)$ robot states at mm.: $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, K)$ landmarks (map): $\ell \sim \mathcal{N}(d, W)$ combined states: $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\eta, P)$ $\theta = [x^T \ \ell^T]^T$ $\eta = [\mu^T \ d^T]^T$ $P = \begin{bmatrix} K \\ W \end{bmatrix}$

MAP estimate of the combined states:

nonlinear ls: $\theta^* = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} p(\theta|y) = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\|\theta - \eta\|_P^2 + \|y - h(\theta)\|_R^2)$

• Gauss-Newton method, *batch* update: $\bar{\theta} \leftarrow \bar{\theta} + \delta\theta^*$. At each iteration: linearized mm.: $h_i(\bar{\theta}_i + \delta\theta_i) \approx h_i(\bar{\theta}_i) + H_i\delta\theta_i$ $H_i = \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_i}|_{\bar{\theta}_i}$ linearized ls: $\delta\theta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\delta\theta} \left(\left\| \bar{\theta} + \delta\theta - \eta \right\|_P^2 + \left\| y - h(\bar{\theta}) - H\delta\theta \right\|_R^2 \right)$ solution embedded: $(\underbrace{P^{-1} + H^T R^{-1} H}_I) \delta\theta^* = \underbrace{H^T R^{-1} (y - \bar{h}) - P^{-1} (\bar{\theta} - \eta)}_{\bar{b}}$ solved by Cholesky decomposition ($I = L^T L$) and back substitution



(LTV) stochastic differential equation (SDE)²:

LTV-SDE: $\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + v(t) + F(t)w(t)$

 $K(\tau)K^{-1} \text{ has a specific pattern: only two column blocks are non-zero. } t_{i-1} < \tau < t_i.$ sparse pattern: $K(\tau)K^{-1} = [0 \dots 0 \ \Lambda(\tau) \ \Psi(\tau) \ 0 \dots 0]$ interpolation : $\bar{x}(\tau) = \mu(\tau) + [\Lambda(\tau) \ \Psi(\tau)] \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}(t_{i-1}) \\ \bar{x}(t_i) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \mu(t_{i-1}) \\ \mu(t_i) \end{bmatrix} \right)$ linearized mm. $h_k(\bar{\theta}_k + \delta\theta_k) = h_k(\bar{x}(\tau) + \delta x(\tau))$ $\approx h_k(\bar{x}(\tau)) + H_k[\Lambda(\tau) \ \Psi(\tau)] \begin{bmatrix} \delta x(t_{i-1}) \\ \delta x(t_i) \end{bmatrix}$

3 The Bayes Tree for Incremental Updates to Sparse GPR

In order to incrementally update the combined state, we utilize a Bayes tree³. It leverages a *factor graph* interpretation of the problem to directly update the Cholesky factor *L* with just-in-time relinearization while maintaining sparsity.

factorization: $f(\theta) = \prod_{i} f_i(\theta_i)$ GP factor: $f_j(\theta_j) = f_j(x(t_{i-1}, t_i)) \propto \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} \|\Phi(t_i, t_{i-1})x(t_{i-1}) + v_i - x(t_i)\|_{Q_i}^2\}$

Figure 1 A simple factor graph, with $x(t_2)$ being a missing state.



4 Experimental Results

We evaluate the utilization of Bayes tree and interpolation for incremental updates on both synthetic and real datasets.





Figure 2 Synthetic dataset, 1,500 ts Figure 3 Autonomous mower dataset, 9,658 ts

5 Conclusion

We have introduced an incremental sparse GPR algorithm that elegantly combines

- the benefits of continuous-time GP-based approaches, and
- the state-of-the-art innovations from incremental discrete-time algorithms for smoothing and mapping.

References

[1] Chi Hay Tong, Paul Furgale, and Timothy D Barfoot. Gaussian process gauss-newton for non-parametric simultaneous localization and mapping. IJRR, 32(5):507–525, 2013.

[2] Tim Barfoot, Chi Hay Tong, and Simo Sarkka. Batch continuous-time trajectory estimation as exactly sparse gaussian process regression. RSS, Berkeley, USA, July 2014.

[3] M. Kaess, H. Johannsson, R. Roberts, V. Ila, J.J. Leonard, and F. Dellaert. iSAM2: Incremental smoothing and mapping using the Bayes tree. IJRR, 31(2):217–236, Feb 2012.



Figure 4 Performance on the synthetic dataset

Figure 5 Performance on the autonomous mower dataset