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Abstract—Lidar point cloud distortion from moving objects is an important problem in autonomous driving, and recently becomes even more demanding with the emerging of newer lidars, which feature back-and-forth scanning patterns. Accurately estimating moving object velocity would not only provide a tracking capability but also correct the point cloud distortion with more accurate description of the moving object. Since lidar measures the time-of-flight distance but with a sparse angular resolution, the measurement is precise in the radial measurement but lacks angularly. Camera on the other hand provides a dense angular resolution. In this paper, Gaussian-based lidar and camera fusion is proposed to estimate the full velocity and correct the lidar distortion. A probabilistic Kalman-filter framework is provided to track the moving objects, estimate their velocities and simultaneously correct the point clouds distortions. The framework is evaluated on real road data and the fusion method outperforms the traditional ICP-based and point-cloud only method. The complete working framework is open-sourced¹ to accelerate the adoption of the emerging lidars.

I. INTRODUCTION

Automotive lidar is playing an increasingly important role in modern autonomous driving as it provides direct and accurate 3D description of objects in the field of view (FoV). However velocity of the object is not directly available from the time-of-flight (ToF) measurement method. Full velocity information (e.g. a 4D lidar) is highly desirable that helps in object recognition, motion prediction and decision making [1]. Specifically the velocity information is required in correcting the point cloud distortion typically observed for moving objects [2]. Similar to the mechanism of motion blur in rolling-shutter cameras, the distortion stems from the lidars scanning nature; progressive ToF measurement happens one after another while the observed object is in motion. The distortion from the traditional 360° rotating lidar has been observed in previous works [3, 4, 5], where the phenomenon is usually a deformation of the object (left part of Fig. 1). This distortion becomes more severe in most of the emerging lidars (Table I), where the pattern involves back-and-forth angular scan in a single frame and cause blurring (i.e. oscillating scan, right part of Fig. 1). Typically these oscillating features are associated with the lidars’ cost-down efforts getting ready for automobiles. It is important that the distortions shall be corrected accurately and reliably as some of these new lidars are being incorporated into passenger vehicles. To the best knowledge of the authors, the distortion severity and adoption by car manufacturers of each lidar type is summarized in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lidar Type</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Adopting OEM</th>
<th>Distortion Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flash</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>None/Mild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360° Rotation</td>
<td>Velodyne</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Motion</td>
<td>Cepton</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scan/Rotating Mirror</td>
<td>Luminar</td>
<td>Volvo</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMS Mirror</td>
<td>Innoviz</td>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating Prism</td>
<td>Livox</td>
<td>Xpeng</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full velocity estimation is not trivial with lidar points along. Lidar provides a direct distance measurement, and the velocity along the depth direction (radial direction as in spherical coordinate, Fig. 2) can be extracted by point cloud optimization in successive frames, provided the object could be aligned in the field of view. However the alignment is difficult. Due to limited lidar angular resolution, point cloud measurement precision is lacking in the tangential direction (i.e. polar and azimuthal directions in spherical coordinates). The blurring caused by the oscillating scan makes it more difficult to match the FoV between consecutive frames. On the other hand, cameras provide essentially high angular resolution measurements, but no direct distance (radial) measurement (Fig. 2). For example, the state-of-the-art Velodyne HDL-64E outputs 0.13 million points per frame, as compared to 2 million pixels per frame from a standard 1080p camera.
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Therefore, fusing camera and lidar together for a full 3D velocity estimation combines the strengths of both. In this paper, we devise a sensor fusion approach to simultaneously identify the full velocity of the moving objects as well as recover the blurred point clouds (Fig. 3) from oscillating lidars, with the following contributions:

1) We construct a probabilistic sensor fusion algorithm combining the strengths of camera and lidar information for a full and accurate 3D velocity estimation.
2) The lidar points distortion from oscillating scanning lidars can be corrected to an excellent accuracy, important for the adoption of emerging lidars.
3) We provide a complete system from the frontend sensor detection to the backend tracking with real time performance. We open-sourced the code and dataset on GitHub.

**Fig. 2.** Lidar has a good precision in radial direction, but lacks in angular resolution. Camera has a good angular resolution, but cannot directly detect distance. Fusion of them could provide complementary measurements on the 3D object.

**Fig. 3.** An overview of velocity estimation and point cloud distortion correction from a set of camera and Livox lidars. (a)Camera image. (b)Velocity estimation of the vehicle in (a) with point cloud distortion correction. Blue points are distorted and dark green points are corrected. (c,d) Zoom-in of corrected point clouds from different viewing perspectives.

II. RELATED WORK

In dynamic and complex scenes, lidar point cloud distortion is usually caused by its ego-motion distortion and object motion distortion. For ego-motion estimation, Zhang et al. [6] used the assumption of a uniform motion model to correct the self-motion distortion within the lidar frame (<10Hz), and achieved fine performance in both mapping and positioning accuracy. Xu et al. [7] adopted a tightly coupled IMU scheme and used the assumption of uniform motion at the observation frequency of IMU (>200Hz) to accurately correct the distortion with highly nonlinear motion. Although the ego-motion based mechanism can effectively correct the point cloud of the still scene, it does not correct the moving objects. Velocity estimation is indispensable in distortion correction of dynamic objects, and different methods have been proposed to solve this problem. From the perspective of sensors, these methods are roughly divided into camera based (2D), lidar based (3D), and sensor-fusion based (2D & 3D) methods.

From the perspective of 2D vision, a few different approaches are widely used to estimate the velocity of moving objects in images. The optical flow approaches including Lucas-Kanade, KLT and their variants ([8, 9, 10, 11, 12]) assume the flow is continuous in a local neighbourhood of the pixel under consideration, and solves the optical flow equations for all the pixels in that neighborhood. Direct learning based methods have also been proposed such as FlowNet[13], PWCNet[14] and EPIFlow[15] and obtained satisfactory results. Detection based methods are also popular; semantic-level 2D object detection [16, 17] is widely adopted, which can provide a region of interest (ROI) of the object to estimate the velocity. In general, 2D in-plane velocity estimation is accurate, but the depth information is not directly obtainable.

With lidars, the depth-based (3D) method can be broadly classified into scene-flow based methods([18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]) and point cloud tracking based methods[4, 24, 25, 26]. One common problem of the scene-flow based approach is the adaptability in complex scenes, especially for the oscillating point cloud patterns as illustrated in Fig. 1. Point cloud tracking based approach utilized the incomplete structural information from specific perspectives and velocity estimation might be inaccurate as the viewing point changes. The situation would be even more challenging with the oscillating patterns.

Lidar provides excellent depth information but a low resolution; on the other hand, camera allows better recognition but lacks ranging capability. Based on the complementary characteristics, multi-sensor fusion becomes advantageous for object detection and velocity estimation. David Held et al. [27] used annealed dynamic histograms to globally explore the state space in real-time for object velocity estimation, and an extended model was used to integrate RGB information to track moving objects. Feihu Zhang et al. [28] extracted the ROI and estimate the object’s contour parameters by utilizing the random hypersurface models (RHM) fusing camera and lidar. Daraei et al. proposed a tightly-coupled fusion approach by considering several energy terms related to camera and lidar respective characteristics in the optimization. All above work relies on the lidar point cloud from
360° rotating lidars which suffer much less distortion than the oscillating lidars. Correcting the oscillating pattern distortion has not been explored previously and has been an obstacle in emerging lidar adoption.

III. SYSTEM AND METHOD

A. Overview

Our hardware system is illustrated in Fig. 4. We choose Livox Horizon lidars as an example of oscillating scanning lidars, with scanning pattern shown in Fig. 1. Six Livox Horizon lidars were mounted on top of the moving vehicle. In order to obtain a thorough evaluation, we aligned their field of view (FoV) to obtain an extremely dense point cloud. A RGB camera is mounted with the same FoV as lidars to detect the moving objects and estimate their tangential movement velocity. A GNSS-Inertial system (APX-15) is utilized to accurately measure the ego motion for ego motion distortion correction. The lidars and the camera are triggered by the same TTL signal synchronously at 10 Hz. The APX15 module runs at 100 Hz and syncs with the other sensors. The whole system is mounted on top of a car and real road scenarios data are gathered.

![Fig. 4. The hardware system is composed of 6 Livox Horizon lidars, a RGB camera and a GNSS-Inertial module. This system is mounted on a moving vehicle to gather data from real road scenarios.](image)

With this set of sensor hardware, we proposed a systematic framework to evaluate the moving object velocity and correct the distortion, as illustrated in Fig. 5. The extrinsically calibrated [30][31] lidar and camera data are fed into the preprocessing stage. In the detection part, the moving object needs to be identified, and this can be accomplished with image detection such as YOLO [17] or point cloud detection [32] or both. Once an object is identified, the object image and the associated point cloud are used separately for their respective optimization and velocity estimation at frame rate. Note here that these velocities are ego-motion corrected and thus represent the object velocity in the world coordinate. A probabilistic fusion of these two velocities is performed to obtain a fused velocity. This velocity is then fed into a Kalman filter (KF) process as a measurement, and a final velocity is computed for each tracked object from the KF process. Finally the distorted point cloud of each moving object in the frame are corrected according to the final velocity and point cloud quality is evaluated.

![Fig. 5. The software framework of velocity estimation and distortion correction combining the strengths of both lidar and camera for our vehicle-mounted sensory system. The black fonts represent input and output of the framework.](image)

B. Pre-processing

A unified coordinate is required as the first pre-processing step for all the sensors. Calibrations are performed for all the sensors and they are transformed into the same coordinate. They include the lidar camera extrinsic $T_{lc}$, the lidar-extrinsic $T_{il}$ and the lidar-APX extrinsic $T_{la}$. Time synchronization is performed at hardware level.

The ego-motion distortion of the point cloud needs to be corrected. Since all the sensors are synchronized, we can correct the point cloud data to the start of each camera frame $t_0$. We define the point set as $L_{t_0} = \{ P_{t_0} \}$, collected between the consecutive frames ($t_0$ and $t_1$ respectively). Because of the uniform measurement rate of the Livox lidar, the real collection time $T_{i0}$ of point $P_{t_0}$ is equally distributed over $[t_0, t_1)$. To correct the mismatch between $T_{i0}$ and $t_0$, for each point $P_{t_0}$, we find the closest APX data output in time to obtain a current sensor platform velocity $V_{i0}$. All the points in set $\{ P_{t_0} \}$ will be transformed to the frame start time $t_0$. The corrected position of point $P_{t_0}$ can be formulated as:

$$P_{t_0}^i = P_{t_0}^i - (T_{i0}^i - t_0) V_{i0}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Alternatively if an accurate GNSS-Inertial system is not available, a lidar-inertial-odometry system can be utilized to estimate ego-motion velocity.

After removing the ego-motion distortion, we have to detect the moving objects and associate the lidar points to the object. At each frame, the camera detects the moving objects and the ROI bounding boxes by the YOLO algorithm [17]. The corresponding point cloud of the object is segmented through the bounding box and associated with the object. Alternative methods such as 3D detection algorithm [32] could also be employed in detection and data association in case YOLO-based algorithms do not satisfy application requirements.
C. Tangential Velocity Measurement From Camera

The camera provides a good tangential velocity measurement tool. As we illustrated in Fig. 2, clearly the image resolution is much higher to determine the tangential velocity accurately than using the point cloud where the angular resolution is sparse. For two consecutive frames \((F_{t_0} \text{ and } F_{t_1})\), the motion is relatively small and a KLT sparse optical flow algorithm [11] is performed to track the pixel motion field. Since the detection bounding box for each moving object is available, the optical vectors within the bounding box indicate the relative 2D movement of the object. The distribution of the vectors can be formulated as a 2D Gaussian distribution \(\mathcal{M}^2_{t_0 \rightarrow t_1} \sim (M^2, \Sigma^2)\) where the superscript number represents the dimension. The outliers are removed by the RANSAC method [33]. Following the computation by Daraei et al. [34], the corresponding 3D displacement \(\mathcal{M}^3\) can be derived from the inverse of the projection function \(g\):

\[
M^2 = g(M^3) = \hat{K}M^3
\]

where \(\hat{K}\) is a 2 \times 3 matrix from the camera intrinsic matrix:

\[
\hat{K} = \frac{1}{d_C} \begin{bmatrix} f_u & 0 & -f_u u \\ 0 & f_y & -f_y v \end{bmatrix}
\]

Here \((u, v)\) is the current object center position and \(d_C\) represents the object depth averaged by corresponding point cloud. As a result, the 3D velocity distribution \(V^3_{t_0 \rightarrow t_1} \sim (V^3, \Sigma^3)\) can be evaluated based on camera estimation:

\[
V^3 = \frac{1}{(t_1 - t_0)} M^3
\]

\[
\Sigma^3 = \frac{1}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} J_{g^{-1}} \Sigma^2 J_{g^{-1}}^T
\]

where \(g^{-1}\) is the inverse function of \(g\), \(J_{g^{-1}}\) is the Jacobian matrix of function \(g^{-1}\).

It is noted that although a 3D velocity distribution is computed, the information is limited to the tangential velocity (polar and azimuthal directions) as shown in Fig. 6 because camera could rarely detect the radial movement velocity. In other words, the eigenvalues of \(\Sigma^3\) will have two relatively small values (high certainty along angular direction) and one relatively large value (high uncertainty along radial direction).

D. Lidar Measurement and Optimization

Lidar provides another modality from the camera. The contribution of the lidar are two folds. First, the direct distance measurement allows one to estimate the movement of the object along the radial (depth) direction. This is missing from the camera modality. Second, although relatively sparse, the lidar points could still be used to estimate the tangential velocity (Fig. 6), with computed covariances that is ready to be fused with camera modality. We propose a novel optimization method to estimate object full velocity from lidar. This velocity will be projected onto the radial direction and the tangential directions. The radial part will be used as the estimated object radial velocity while the tangential part will be fused with the camera measurement to combine strength from both modalities.

Our optimization is especially suited for the oscillating pattern of the new lidars (e.g. Livox Horizon). The most notable feature is the back-and-forth scan inside FoV within one frame, which leads to blurred multi-layer point cloud contour in moving object as shown in Fig. 3. Since each point is obtained at a precise and distinct timestamp, the correction can be performed with an accurate velocity estimation to form a crisp point cloud, which has a narrower distribution than the distorted one. On this premise, an orthogonal coordinate system are established aligning with the velocity direction and we calculate the projected variance of the point cloud in all three basis directions as the residual block. To find out the optimal \(V^L \sim N(V^L, \Sigma^L)\), the linear least square problem can be defined as this:

\[
\min_{V^L} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{L} \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\beta} \rho_j \|C_j(P^i, V^L) - \overline{P}_j\|^2
\]

\(\overline{P}_j\) is the point cloud centroid projected on direction \(j\). The \(\alpha, \beta, \gamma\) are the projected basis vector respectively. Function \(C_j\) represents the point that have been compensated by velocity and projected to direction \(j\). Weighting factor \(\rho\) controls the weight of the projection residual in each direction. Ceres Solver [35] is used for optimization. The covariance of the optimal velocity \(V^L\) can be derived:

\[
\Sigma^L = \left(J'(V^L)S^{-1}J(V^L)\right)^{-1}
\]

\(J\) is the Jacobian of \(C_j\) at \(V^L\). \(S\) represent the covariance matrix of all observed raw points \(P\).
E. State Fusion

A Kalman filter is used to combine the different velocity measurements in each frame and maintain a tracked velocity throughout the continuous frames. In each frame the 3D velocity $V^f$ is estimated from the two modalities, $V^L_i \sim \mathcal{N}(V^L_i, \Sigma^L_i)$ from lidar, and $V^C_i \sim \mathcal{N}(V^C_i, \Sigma^C_i)$ from camera. Note $V^C_i$ has information only in tangential directions. The final fused velocity $V^f$ is obtained by projecting onto the radial and tangential direction with functions $h_\parallel$ and $h_\perp$ respectively, with formula:

$$V_{\text{proj}} = h(V), \Sigma_{\text{proj}} = H\Sigma H^T$$

where $h$ is $h_\parallel$ or $h_\perp$, $H$ is the Jacobian matrix of the projection function $h$ derived at velocity $V$.

In radial direction, the velocity optimized with lidar is trusted. In tangential direction, the velocity estimated by camera and by lidar are fused according to their covariances. Therefore the fused velocity measurement $V^f$ in both directions can be derived as:

$$V^f_\parallel = V^L_i, \quad V^f_\perp = V^L_i \oplus V^C_i$$

here $\oplus$ means to fuse two Gaussians using their covariance:

$$A = \Sigma^L_i (\Sigma^L_i + \Sigma^C_i)^{-1}, \quad V^f_\perp = V^L_i + A(V^C_i - V^L_i)$$

where $A$ represent the fusion gain between two independent Gaussians, similar to Kalman gain in Kalman filter.

Finally $V^f$ is combined from $V^f_\parallel$ and $V^f_\perp$ as the input measurement value to the KF backend process depicted in Fig. 5.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

Fig. 7 demonstrates the results of distortion correction and the augmenting capability from camera. When the velocity is only optimized with point cloud from lidar (third row), corrections are slightly lacking in the tangential direction, as compared to correcting from both lidar and camera (fourth row). Note that point cloud from all six lidars were used for display and evaluation, but only one lidar was used in optimization. Kalman filter (KF) is used as the backend to provide better continuous velocity estimations. Comparatively, the ICP based KF method from traditional 360° rotating type point clouds underperformed due to the increased blurriness from the new lidars’ oscillating scan.

In order to quantitatively evaluate the point cloud distortion correction, a crispness score $D_{\text{crisp}}$ can be evaluated to represent the quality of the undistorted point cloud, as defined below:

$$D_{\text{crisp}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{T} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} G(\mathcal{P}_k^i - \mathcal{P}_k^i, \Sigma)$$

where the $T$ is the number of frames for which the object is detected and tracked, $n_i$ is the number of points in Frame i, $\mathcal{P}_k^i$ is the point in Frame i nearest to point $\mathcal{P}_k^i$ in Frame j. $G$ represent the multi-variate Gaussian distribution and $\Sigma$ is the weighting coefficient to control the impact of the distance. Larger crispness value means crisper point cloud and more accurate velocity.

Table II shows the result of the quantitative evaluation at the three cases shown in Fig. 7. ICP based KF method [4], standard method for 360° rotating type lidar corrections, was used as a baseline reference in the first row. Velocity from only lidar point cloud optimization in our proposed method is evaluated on the second row. Velocity from lidar and camera fusion in our proposed method is evaluated on the third row. It is obvious that our proposed method combining lidar and camera obtained the best estimation of point cloud crispness and hence velocity.

To further understand how consistent and robust the proposed method is, Fig. 8 demonstrates the evaluation result on continuous frames (Case 1 in Fig. 7). The lidar-camera-fused method outperforms the lidar-only method consistently. The fused method also shows smaller variations indicating more accurate velocity estimation.
TABLE II
CRISPNESS SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICP based KF</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lidar only with KF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lidar and camera with KF</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. The crispness scores of an object in consecutive frames.

Interestingly, the number of lidars did not boost the performance much in this algorithm. In Fig. 8, we explored the performance of this algorithm with and without camera fusion as a function of lidar quantity. Better results are obtained in each category with more lidars because the lidar points gets denser and give a better description of the object, but the improvement is not as much as the addition of a camera. It again demonstrates that an additional modality compliments lidar sensor brings significant value. This is a good indication that users using a single lidar would get similar performance as 6 lidars, with significant cost reduction of the overall hardware system.

Finally a complete working system in real world scenario is demonstrated in Fig. 9. Detection and tracking of multiple moving objects, velocity estimation and point cloud distortion correction were performed simultaneously in continuous frames. The Kalman filter takes in the lidar-camera fused velocity measurements and maintain the best predicted velocity and correct the distortions. The result shows robust and accurate velocity estimation, object tracking and point cloud distortion correction. The computing time for the whole system is summarized in Table III, where a real time performance is obtained.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have proposed a robust sensor fusion based velocity estimator. Our algorithm could tackle the unique scanning characteristic of the oscillating lidar and correct the point cloud distortion with an accurate object velocity estimation. We have demonstrated that the distortion that come with oscillating scan pattern can be corrected satisfactorily with the proposed system, which fuses camera and lidar modalities with their unique strength. We believe this framework is specifically suited for the new oscillating lidar with capability to track moving objects effectively and accurately. We hope this open-sourced framework would be helpful to both academia and industrial communities in adopting the emerging lidars.
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