

Exploring Radar Data Representations in Autonomous Driving: A Comprehensive Review

Shanliang Yao, Runwei Guan, Zitian Peng, Chenhong Xu, Yilu Shi, Weiping Ding, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Eng Gee Lim, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Yong Yue, Hyungjoon Seo, Ka Lok Man, Jieming Ma, Xiaohui Zhu, Yutao Yue

Abstract—With the rapid advancements of sensor technology and deep learning, autonomous driving systems are providing safe and efficient access to intelligent vehicles as well as intelligent transportation. Among these equipped sensors, the radar sensor plays a crucial role in providing robust perception information in diverse environmental conditions. This review focuses on exploring different radar data representations utilized in autonomous driving systems. Firstly, we introduce the capabilities and limitations of the radar sensor by examining the working principles of radar perception and signal processing of radar measurements. Then, we delve into the generation process of five radar representations, including the ADC signal, radar tensor, point cloud, grid map, and micro-Doppler signature. For each radar representation, we examine the related datasets, methods, advantages and limitations. Furthermore, we discuss the challenges faced in these data representations and propose potential research directions. Above all, this comprehensive review offers an in-depth insight into how these representations enhance autonomous system capabilities, providing guidance for radar perception researchers. To facilitate retrieval and comparison of different data representations, datasets and methods, we provide an interactive website at <https://radar-camera-fusion.github.io/radar>.

Index Terms—Radar perception, autonomous driving, data representations, intelligent vehicles, intelligent transportation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the automotive industry has witnessed significant advancements in autonomous driving technologies, revolutionizing intelligent vehicles and intelligent transportation. With the aim of creating safer and more efficient roadways, one crucial aspect is the development of reliable sensor perception for autonomous driving systems. Compared to LiDARs and cameras, the fundamental advantage of radar sensors lies in their capabilities in range, velocity and angle measurements [1], [2]. Additionally, radars have robust sensing capabilities




Fig. 1. Radar perception in autonomous driving. (a) Radars on the vehicle are employed to detect objects in the path and surroundings. (b) Radars inside the cabin are leveraged to monitor occupant vital signs and behaviors. (c) Radars alongside roadways are utilized to measure the speed of passing vehicles and estimate traffic flow.

and exhibit superior effectiveness under adverse lighting and weather conditions [3], [4]. Moreover, radar sensors can even perceive objects behind walls, providing vehicles with early warning of potential obstacles or hazards [5], [6]. All of the above characteristics make radar an indispensable component in ensuring the reliability and superiority of autonomous driving systems, especially in scenarios where other sensor inputs might be limited or compromised.

As depicted in Fig. 1, radar sensors have extensive applications in autonomous driving, serving various purposes in the perception of the surrounding environment. Radars mounted on the roof, front and angular directions of an intelligent vehicle are utilized to detect objects in the path and surroundings, providing essential information for collision avoidance and adaptive cruise control [7]. The radar inside the cabin is leveraged to monitor occupant vital signs, left-behind children and driver behaviors (e.g., drowsiness, dangerous maneuvers, health emergencies) in a privacy-protected manner, allowing the autonomous driving system to make alerts as well as safety measures [8]–[11]. Furthermore, radar systems deployed alongside roadways can measure the speed of passing vehicles and estimate traffic flow. These traffic data are valuable for traffic optimization, congestion management and intelligent transportation systems, leading to improved road safety and smoother traffic operations [12], [13].

As far as radar data is concerned, various application scenarios and radar types provide different data representations.

¹ Shanliang Yao, Runwei Guan, Zitian Peng and Hyungjoon Seo are with Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK. (email: {shanliang.yao, runwei.guan, pspeng, hyungjoon.seo}@liverpool.ac.uk).

² Chenhong Xu, Yilu Shi, Yong Yue, Eng Gee Lim, Ka Lok Man, Jieming Ma and Xiaohui Zhu are with School of Advanced Technology, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou, China. (email: {chenhang.xu21, yilu.shi20}@student.xjtlu.edu.cn. {yong.yue, enggee.lim, ka.man, jieming.ma, xiaohui.zhu}@xjtlu.edu.cn).

³ Weiping Ding is with School of Information Science and Technology, Nantong University, Nantong 226019, China. (email: dwp9988@163.com).

⁴ Yutao Yue is with Thrust of Artificial Intelligence and Thrust of Intelligent Transportation, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou), Guangzhou 511400, China. (email: yutaoyue@hkust-gz.edu.cn).

[†] Corresponding author: xiaohui.zhu@xjtlu.edu.cn, yutaoyue@hkust-gz.edu.cn




Fig. 2. Overview of this review. Section II provides an overview of radar perception, including its working principles and signal processing techniques. Section III presents an in-depth examination on datasets and methods of different radar data representations. Section IV discusses the challenges and potential directions for research and development for radar perception in autonomous driving.

Specifically, each representation has distinct characteristics and challenges, involving different data processing methods and network architectures. Moreover, each representation aims to extract needed information from raw radar measurements and convert it into a suitable format for downstream perception tasks. With limited focus on radar data representations in existing reviews, it is challenging for researchers to comprehensively understand this emerging autonomous driving field. This review attempts to narrow this gap by exploring five radar representations (i.e., ADC signal, radar tensor, point cloud, grid map, micro-Doppler signature) leveraged in autonomous driving and their impact on perception tasks. Specifically, we provide guidance for researchers to differentiate between each representation, understand the advantages and limitations of each, and select the appropriate representation and algorithm for the specific task. Our review offers the following key contributions:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first review that explores different data representations for radar perception in autonomous driving.
- We offer an up-to-date (2019-2024) overview of radar-based datasets and algorithms, providing in-depth research on their advantages and limitations.
- We analyze the significant challenges and open questions

related to these data representations, and propose potential research directions for further investigation.

- We develop an interactive and regularly updated website that facilitates easier retrieval and comparison of the datasets and methods.

The remainder of this review is structured in Fig. 2 and is described as follows: Section II provides an overview of radar working principles and signal processing techniques, serving as the foundation for generating various radar data representations. Section III presents an in-depth examination on datasets and methods for each radar data representation. Additionally, this section discusses the advantages and limitations of each radar data representation, assisting readers in selecting the most suitable approach for their research. Section IV delves into challenges and potential directions in research and development for radar perception in autonomous driving, guiding readers to focus on current hot topics and explore feasible solutions. Lastly, Section V summarizes our study and presents an outlook for future works, inspiring researchers to make further strides in radar perception.

II. RADAR PERCEPTION

In this section, we provide an overview of the underlying principles of radar technology and how it operates within

the autonomous driving system. We delve into the physics behind radar sensing, including the transmission and reception of radio waves, as well as the mechanisms for extracting valuable information from the returned signals. Understanding these principles is crucial for comprehending the capabilities of radar perception and the generation process of various radar data representations.

A. Working Principles

Radar sensors play crucial roles in enabling autonomous systems to sense vehicle occupants, vehicle surroundings, and the traffic environment. The term “radar” stands for “Radio Detection and Ranging”, which emits millimeter waves that bounce off objects and return to the sensor. This operation provides information about the object’s location, relative velocity, and internal characteristics [14]. In the following, we introduce the basic radar working pipeline and sensor characteristics derived from these principles.




Fig. 3. Overview of radar working pipeline.

a) Basic Pipeline: Fig. 3 demonstrates a basic radar system that comprises various analog components, including a synthesizer, a Power Amplifier (PA), transmitters (TX antennas), receivers (RX antennas), a Low Noise Amplifier (LNA), and a mixer, as well as digital components such as an Analog-to-Digital Converter (ADC), a Digital Signal Processor (DSP) and a MicroController Unit (MCU). When the radar starts working, first, the synthesizer generates a linear frequency-modulated pulse called a “chirp”, which is amplified in power and transmitted by the TX antenna. Second, the RX antenna captures the reflected chirp of the target that is amplified with low noise. Third, by combining the RX and TX signals, the mixer produces an Intermediate Frequency (IF) signal, which is then converted into digital values via the ADC. Generally, a radar system contains multiple TX and RX antennas, resulting in multiple IF signals. Information about the target object, such as range, Doppler velocity and azimuth angle, is contained in these IF signals, which can be separated by the DSP using embedding different signal processing algorithms [15]. Based on extracted target information from the DSP and dynamic information from the radar, the MCU serves as a computer to evaluate system requirements and make informed decisions.

Utilizing the Time of Flight (TOF) principle, radar sensors determine the range of an object by calculating the time difference between the transmitted and reflected signals. Additionally, based on the Doppler principle, radar sensors can

measure the relative Doppler velocity of a target by analyzing the frequency difference between the emitted and received waves, capturing any relative movement between the radar and the target. To determine the azimuth angle, an array signal processing method is employed, which involves calculating the phase difference between the chirps reflected from parallel receivers. However, traditional 3D radar sensors with receivers arranged in a 2D manner only provide detection in horizontal coordinates, lacking vertical height information. Recent advancements in radar technologies have led to the development of 4D radar sensors, incorporating antennas arranged both horizontally and vertically [16], [17]. This configuration allows for the measurement of the elevation angle, thereby enabling the capture of elevation information in addition to the range, Doppler velocity, and azimuth angle measurements.

b) Sensor Characteristics: With the basic capabilities of measuring range, Doppler velocity, azimuth angle and elevation angle, radar can determine the location of obstacles, allowing vehicles to make informed decisions and navigate safely. Unlike other light-wave-based sensors, radar sensors emit radio waves at longer wavelengths. This characteristic allows radar waves to penetrate fog, rain, snow, smoke, and dust [18]. Consequently, radar systems can reliably detect and measure distances to objects even in severe weather conditions, making them highly dependable in a wide range of real-world scenarios. Moreover, radar waves can penetrate certain materials (e.g., walls, vegetation) and reflect off the hidden objects, enabling the sensor to detect objects situated around corners or obstructed by other obstacles [5]. This unique characteristic enhances the detection capabilities of the system, particularly in complex urban environments where numerous obstacles may impede direct line of sight.

While radar sensors offer numerous advantages, it is essential to consider their inherent limitations. They exhibit limited angular resolution, making it challenging to differentiate between closely located objects. Additionally, sparse point clouds generated by radars, with only a few points on pedestrians and a small number on cars, are insufficient for accurately outlining object contours and extracting detailed geometric information [19], [20]. While radar measurements provide the radial velocity component, they lack information about tangential velocity. This limitation makes it difficult to accurately estimate the complete motion of objects in dynamic scenes [21], [22]. More importantly, radar data is susceptible to noise from various sources, including multi-path interference, electrical interference, and equipment imperfections [23]–[25]. This noise impacts the precision and reliability of radar measurements, potentially leading to false detections.

B. Signal Processing

In this section, we review the radar signal processing for radar parameters, including range, Doppler velocity, azimuth angle and elevation angle. Subsequently, Radar Cross-Section (RCS) measurement is analyzed to approximate the target’s size, shape and material composition, thereby characterizing its reflection properties. To filter out clutter during the radar signal processing stage, we examine the workflow of Constant

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF RADAR PARAMETER ESTIMATION [14]

Parameter	Estimation	Resolution	Notes
Range	$R = \frac{cf_b}{2S}$ (1)	$R_{res} = \frac{c}{2B}$ (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c is the speed of the light ($3 * 10^8 m/s$). f_b is the instantaneous frequency difference at the mixers from TX-chirp and RX-chirp. S is the slope of a chirp. B refers to the frequency variation range.
Doppler Velocity	$V = \frac{\lambda \Delta \phi}{4\pi T_c}$ (3)	$V_{res} = \frac{\lambda}{2T_f}$ (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> λ is the wavelength of the light. $\Delta \phi$ is a shift in phase. T_c is the duration between the chirps. T_f is cycle time of a frame.
Azimuth Angle	$\theta = \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\lambda \Delta \phi}{2\pi l_a}\right)$ (5)	$\theta_{res} = \frac{\lambda}{N_a l_a \cos(\theta)}$ (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> l_a is the length between RX antennas in azimuth. N_a is the number of RX antennas in azimuth.
Elevation Angle	$\theta = \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\lambda \Delta \phi}{2\pi l_e}\right)$ (7)	$\theta_{res} = \frac{\lambda}{N_e l_e \cos(\theta)}$ (8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> l_e is the length between RX antennas in elevation. N_e is the number of RX antennas in elevation.

False Alarm Rate (CFAR) processing and explore representative CFAR processors.




Fig. 4. Pipeline of radar signal processing. (a) Frequency of chirps emitted by a TX antenna and received by an RX antenna. (b) Frequency of chirps received by multiple RX antennas. (c) Sampling performed on each chirp. (d) Sample-Chirp map generated from sampling on all chirps. (e) Simple-Chirp-Antenna tensor generated from Sample-Chirp maps based on multiple RX antennas.

1) *Parameter Estimation:* Frequency-Modulated Continuous Wave (FMCW) is a special millimeter wave technology employed in autonomous driving that continuously transmits frequency-modulated signals to measure the attributes of objects. As is described in Fig. 4(a), the frequency of the chirp emitted by the TX antenna increases linearly over time, leading to the corresponding frequency of the chirp reflected by the RX antenna. The IF signal containing information on objects is determined by calculating the difference in the instantaneous frequency of the TX-chirp and RX-chirp, expressed by the variable f_b . In the following, we introduce the estimation of each parameter and summarize the mathematical formulation in Table I.

a) *Range:* As depicted in Fig. 4(c), sampling is initially conducted among each chirp signal. Then, the Fast Fourier

Transform (FFT) is performed to produce a spectrum with different peaks, representing different objects at different ranges. Given that FFT operation is utilized to obtain range values, it is also called ‘‘Range-FFT’’. From Equation 1, we know that the range of a target is determined by the difference in the frequency and the slope of a chirp. Range resolution refers to the capability of distinguishing and resolving two objects that are located very close together along the range dimension. According to Fourier transform theory, the range resolution can be improved by extending the IF signal [26]. Extending the IF signal requires increasing the signal bandwidth, which results in range resolution being proportional to the signal bandwidth (B), as shown in Equation 2.

b) *Doppler Velocity:* To measure the Doppler velocity of an object using radar, a common technique involves transmitting two chirps that are separated by a time interval denoted as T_c . For each chirp, the spectrum after Range-FFT peaks at the same position but with different phases. The difference of the measured phase $\Delta \phi$ contains the velocity of an object, as noted in Equation 3. For multiple objects at the same range, it is difficult to identify their velocities as the peaks are located at the same position. Thus, a sequence of signals consisting of N_c chirps is employed, formulating a Simple-Chirp map described in Fig. 4(d). Doppler-FFT is then performed on the phasors generated by Range-FFT to separate objects since the phase differences between consecutive chirps are different. Velocity resolution is the minimum difference in velocity at which a radar can distinguish between two targets at the same range. As expressed in Equation 4, velocity resolution is inversely proportional to the cycle time of a frame denoted as T_f .

c) *Azimuth Angle:* Estimating the azimuth angle is accomplished using at least two RX antennas separated by l_a . The resulting difference in distances from the target to each RX antenna causes a phase change in the FFT spectrum, from which the Direction of Arrival (DoA) can be obtained, as outlined in Equation 5. To measure the azimuth angle of multiple objects located at the same range and moving at the

same velocity, multiple RX antennas are needed, as shown in Fig. 4(b). In this way, the radar signal is described in a Simple-Chirp-Antenna dimension, as illustrated in Fig. 4(e). Then, an Angle-FFT is performed on the phasor sequences corresponding to the peaks after 2D-FFT (Range-FFT and Doppler-FFT) to resolve azimuth angles. Azimuth angle resolution θ_{res} is the minimum angle separation for two objects appearing as separated peaks in the spectrum after Angle-FFT. It can be justified from Equation 6 that the azimuth angle resolution is maximum when measured perpendicular to the radar system's axis ($\theta = 0$). Additionally, it is necessary to increase the number of RX antennas to enhance azimuth angle resolution.

d) Elevation Angle: Similar to azimuth angle estimation, the measurement of elevation angle requires a minimum of two RX antennas, each separated by a specific length, denoted as l_e . The mathematical formulation that describes this azimuth angle estimation is expressed in Equation 7. Additionally, the resolution of elevation angle can be calculated using Equation 8, which can be improved by increasing the number of RX antennas.

2) RCS Measurement: RCS denotes the ability of an object to reflect a radar signal, and a higher RCS value corresponds to an increased likelihood of detection [27]. The value of RCS is expressed as an area in m^2 [28]. However, this value does not simply represent the surface area of the object being detected, but depends on multiple factors, including the target's material, physical geometry, and exterior features of the target, as well as the direction and frequency of the illuminating radar.

In terms of mathematical calculations, RCS is a metric that quantifies the ratio between the scattered density in the direction of the radar and the power density intercepted by the object. Since the power is distributed over a sphere, only a small part of this ($4\pi r^2$) can be received by the radar. Hence, the expression for RCS takes the form:

$$\sigma = \frac{4\pi r^2 S_r}{S_t}, \quad (9)$$

where r refers to the range between the radar and the target, S_r is the scattered power density at the radar, and S_t represents the incident power density the target intercepts.

3) CFAR Processing: The radar sensors not only receive the reflected signals from the objects of interest, but also encounter the internal receiver noise and external interfering signals. Signals generated by these unwanted sources are commonly called clutter. Traditional methods like removing signals with zero Doppler and fixing signal thresholds have drawbacks that lead to false alarms. Consequently, dynamic thresholding, which involves using adaptive threshold values, is crucial in mitigating false alarms and spurious radar detections attributable to noise signals. Compared to fixed thresholds, varied thresholds are involved in reducing false alarms and erroneous radar detections caused by noise. CFAR is the most commonly used method of dynamic thresholding [29], [30], facilitating the radar system to autonomously adapt its sensitivity threshold in response to variations in the amplitude of external interference, thus ensuring a consistent level of false alarm probability.




Fig. 5. Overview of CFAR processing. Set of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N represents the detection window, Y is the value of CUT, Z represents the clutter background level of the CUT, T is the detection threshold, α donates a scaling factor, H_1 declares that an object is located within the CUT, H_0 indicates that there is no object in the current CUT.

Fig. 5 describes the overview processing flow of CFAR processors. Before feeding the data into the CFAR processor, a square law detector is applied to convert the real and imaginary parts of the radar data into a real-valued square of its power [31]. The radar signal then runs through a sliding window comprising reference cells, guard cells, and Cell Under Test (CUT). In the estimation of the clutter background level, the utilization of neighboring reference cells surrounding the CUT is justified owing to the spatial-temporal correlation exhibited by radar echoes. Then, employing various detectors, the clutter background level of the CUT (referred to as Z) can be assessed by utilizing samples within the reference window. The threshold value T is calculated by multiplying Z by a scaling factor α . If the value of the CUT (labeled as Y) exceeds the threshold value T , the comparator will declare that an object is located within the CUT (expressed as H_1). Otherwise, there is no object in the current CUT (expressed as H_0).

A reasonable selection of processors for the clutter statistical model in the CFAR clutter window can significantly mitigate the issues posed by intricate scenarios, such as uniform clutter, multiple targets, and clutter edges. As a result of the multitude of techniques available for estimating clutter within the CFAR framework, a variety of CFAR methods have been proposed. These methods can be broadly classified into three types:

a) Mean-Level Processors: The first type of processor comprises mean-level estimators, including Cell Averaging CFAR (CA-CFAR) [32], Greatest-of CFAR (GO-CFAR) [33] and Smallest-of CFAR (SO-CFAR) [34]. These processors obtain the estimated clutter power level by taking the average value, maximum value and minimum value of the reference cells, respectively. However, the detection mechanism in mean-level processors is not optimized for multiple objects. Other objects within the reference window distort the noise estimation and lead to an increased threshold value, thereby causing potential target detections to be missed.

b) Sorting-Based Processors: The second category of the processor is exemplified by Ordered Statistics CFAR (OS-CFAR) [29], which sorts the reference cells in ascending order and selects the k^{th} value as the estimated clutter power level. After that, numerous methods based on ordered statistics have emerged, called OS-like methods, such as Censored Mean Level Detector CFAR (CMLD-CFAR) [35], and Trimmed

Mean CFAR (TM-CFAR) [30]. However, since the sorting-based processors retain only one ordered reference sample, they rely heavily on prior knowledge about the number and distribution of interference objects.

c) *Neural Network-Based Processors*: Recently, with the rapid development of machine learning and deep learning, traditional CFAR processors have evolved into neural network-based methods. A representative example of this method is DBSCAN-CFAR [36], which combines artificial neural network and Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (DBSCAN) as a clustering algorithm [37]. Unlike conventional methods, DBSCAN-CFAR is able to learn the underlying relationship between normal data and outliers, even in the absence of labeled data or predetermined information regarding the number of clusters. In simulations involving varying object quantities, shape parameters, and false alarm probabilities, DBSCAN-CFAR exhibits superiority and robustness compared to traditional processors like CA-CFAR, SO-CFAR, GO-CFAR, OS-CFAR, and CMLD-CFAR [36]. However, to achieve the advantages mentioned above, DBSCAN-CFAR suffers from a higher computational burden and time consumption when compared to other processors.

III. RADAR DATA REPRESENTATIONS

In this section, we explore what are radar data representations in autonomous driving and how these representations enhance autonomous driving capabilities. Firstly, we introduce the generation progress of different radar data representations and their basic characteristics. Subsequently, for each data representation, we explore the related datasets and representative methods, and discuss the benefits and limitations associated with each representation, thus exploring their capabilities in various perception tasks such as classification, localization, detection, and tracking. In addition, we also outline datasets for radar perception in autonomous driving in Table II.




Fig. 6. Generation progress of five radar data representations (i.e., ADC signal, radar tensor, point cloud, grid map, and micro-Doppler signature).

Fig. 6 illustrates the generation process of five different radar data representations. Initially, the raw output from the radar sensor, known as the **ADC signal**, is hardly interpretable by human observers. Thus, researchers utilize 3D FFTs across the sample, chirp, and antenna dimensions to transform the ADC signal into an image-like representation called the **radar tensor**. Subsequently, peak detection is employed on the radar tensor to eliminate clutter, resulting in a sparse, point-like

representation referred to as the **point cloud**. By accumulating point clouds over a specific duration and applying grid mapping methods, the **grid map** representation is generated for the purpose of identifying static objects. Moreover, some researchers perform a Time-Frequency transform following the Range-FFT to extract the **micro-Doppler signature**, which is utilized for recognizing objects characterized by micro-motion features.

A. ADC Signal

When an analog signal is sampled and quantized by an ADC, it produces a sequential data stream called the ADC signal. As the raw data produced by radar sensors, ADC signals retain all information from the detections, which is highly valuable for deep learning applications. At this stage, the signal lacks spatial coherence among its values, as all information is confined to the time domain [45]. To be represented in a more structured format, the ADC signal is typically converted to a 3D Sample-Chirp-Antenna (SCA) tensor, as illustrated in Fig. 4(e).

1) *Datasets*: With the development of radar technology and increased computing capability, radar data characterized by ADC signal has emerged and garnered widespread attention in recent years. RaDICAL [38] is the first dataset that offers raw ADC signal data collected explicitly for road scenarios in autonomous driving. With access to raw radar measurements, the authors encouraged researchers to design novel processing methods to perform object detection directly or to get downstream data representations. RADIAL [39] is the most comprehensive dataset in terms of radar data representations. In addition to providing ADC signals, the RADIAL dataset contains processed data derived from the ADC signals, including radar tensors and point clouds. Apart from using ADC signals in road scenarios, another significant application is in-cabin vital sign monitoring. However, existing datasets in this area (e.g., [69]–[72]) primarily focus on indoor scenarios like hospitals or home environments, which differ from in-cabin scenarios in autonomous driving. Although some studies (e.g., [9], [10], [73]) investigated monitoring occupant vital signs in cabins, their datasets are unavailable publicly.

2) *Methods*: The ADC signal representation can be applied for both surrounding traffic perception outside the vehicle and occupant vital sign monitoring inside the vehicle. Object perception on roads focuses on detecting vehicles and pedestrians using Doppler shifts and other radar features. Vital sign monitoring in a cabin emphasizes extracting and analyzing physiological information from radar ADC signals to monitor occupants. Since these two situations are handled differently, we classify methods using ADC signals in autonomous driving into road object-based and vital sign-based categories.

a) *Road Object-Based*: In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the development of road object perception using ADC signals, as evidenced by research in motion classification (e.g., [74]–[77]) and object detection (e.g., [78]–[81]). These studies encompass two main research directions. The first direction involves designing individual end-to-end learnable radar perception models (e.g., ADCNet

TABLE II
DATASETS FOR RADAR PERCEPTION IN AUTONOMOUS DRIVING.

Dataset	Representations	Year	Tasks	Sensors	Scenarios
RaDiCaL [38]	ADC Signal	2021	Object Detection	Radar (TI IWR1443), RGB-D Camera	Indoor (people, static clutter), Roads (urban, rural, highway, various traffic scenarios)
RADlal [39]	ADC Signal, Radar Tensor, Point Cloud	2021	Object Detection, Semantic Segmentation	Radar (high-definition), Cameras, LiDAR	Roads (urban, highway, rural)
CARRADA [40]	Radar Tensor	2020	Detection, Semantic Segmentation, Object Tracking	Radar (TI AWR1843), RGB-D Camera, LiDAR	Roads (urban, highway, intersection scenarios)
Zendar [41]	Radar Tensor, Point Cloud	2020	Object Detection, Mapping, Localization	Radar (synthetic aperture), Camera, LiDAR	Roads (diverse urban driving environments)
RADIATE [42]	Radar Tensor	2020	Object Detection	Radar (Navtech CTS350-X), Camera	Roads (wet, snowy, foggy, rainy, nighttime, urban, highway)
MulRan [43]	Radar Tensor	2020	Place Recognition	Radar (Navtech CIR204-H), Cameras, LiDAR	Roads (city, highway, intersection, crosswalks, parks, recreational areas, tunnels, bridges)
Oxford Radar RobotCar [44]	Radar Tensor, Grid Map	2020	Object Detection, Odometry	Radar (Navtech CTS350-X), Camera, LiDAR, GPS, INS	Roads (urban, highway, rural, industrial area, residential area, roundabout, intersection)
SCORP [45]	Radar Tensor	2020	Semantic Segmentation	Radar (76 GHz), Camera	Roads (parking lot)
CRUW [46]	Radar Tensor	2021	Object Detection	Radar (TI AWR1843, DCA1000), Cameras	Roads (parking, campus, city, highway)
RADDet [47]	Radar Tensor	2021	Object Detection	Radar (TI AWR1843), Stereo Cameras	Roads (urban, rural, highway, intersections, weather conditions)
Boreas [48]	Radar Tensor	2022	Object Detection, Localization, Odometry	Radar (Navtech CIR304-H), Camera, LiDAR	Roads (highway, rural, urban)
ColoRadar [49]	Radar Tensor, Point Cloud	2022	Localization	Radar (AWR1843), LiDAR, IMU	Indoor, outdoor environments
K-Radar [50]	Radar Tensor	2022	Object Detection, Object Tracking, SLAM	Radar (RETINA-4ST), Stereo Cameras, LiDAR	Roads (highway, intersection, urban)
OORD [51]	Radar Tensor	2024	Place Recognition	Radar (Navtech CTS350-X), GPS/INS	Roads (off-road, difficult terrain, naturalistic environments)
nuScenes [52]	Point Cloud, Grid Map	2019	Object Detection, Object Tracking	Radar (Continental ARS408), Camera, LiDAR	Roads (intersection, crosswalk, roundabout, pedestrian crossing)
Astyx [53]	Point Cloud	2019	Object Detection	Radar (Astyx 6455 HiRes), Camera, LiDAR	Roads (highway, urban, rural, parking, roundabout)
SeeingThroughFog [54]	Point Cloud	2020	Object Detection	Radar (77GHz), Stereo/Gated/FIR Cameras, LiDAR	Adverse road conditions (clear, rainy, snowy, foggy, nighttime, urban, highway, rural, traffic)
AIODrive [55]	Point Cloud	2020	Object Detection, Semantic Segmentation, Object Tracking, Depth Estimation	Radar (77GHz), RGB/Stereo Cameras, LiDAR	Roads (highway, residential street, parking)
RadarScenes [56]	Point Cloud	2021	Semantic Segmentation, Object Tracking	Radar (77GHz), Documentary Camera	Roads (urban, suburban, rural, highway, tunnel, intersection, roundabout, parking)
Pixset [57]	Point Cloud	2021	Object Detection, Object Tracking	Radar (TI AWR1843), Cameras, LiDARs	Roads (urban, suburban, highway)
VoD [58]	Point Cloud	2022	Object Detection, Object Tracking	Radar (ZF FRGen 21), Stereo Camera, LiDAR	Roads (highway, rural, urban)
TJ4DRadSet [59]	Point Cloud	2022	Object Detection, Object Tracking	Radar (Oculii Eagle), Camera, LiDAR	Roads (intersections, one-way streets)
aiMotive [60]	Point Cloud	2022	Object Detection	Radar (77GHz), Camera, LiDAR, GPS, IMU	Roads (highway, urban, rural)
WaterScenes [61]	Point Cloud	2023	Object Detection, Instance/Semantic/Waterline/Panoptic Segmentation	Radar (Oculii Eagle), Camera, GPS, IMU	Waterways (river, lake, canal, moat)
NTU4DRadLM [62]	Point Cloud	2023	SLAM	Radar (Oculii Eagle), RGB/Thermal Cameras, LiDAR, GPS, IMU	Roads (carpark, garden, campus)
Dual-Radar [63]	Point Cloud	2023	Object Detection, Object Tracking	Radar (ARS548 RDI, Arbe Phoenix), Camera, LiDAR	Roads (urban, suburban, highway, tunnel, parking)
MiliPoint [64]	Point Cloud	2024	Activity Recognition	Radar (TI IWR1843), Stereo Camera	Activities (identification, action classification and keypoint estimation)
Dop-NET [65]	Micro-Doppler Signature	2020	Classification	Radar (Ancortek 24GHz)	Gestures (wave, pinch, click, swipe)
CI4R [66]	Micro-Doppler Signature	2020	Classification	Radar (77GHz, 24GHz, Xethru)	Activities (walking, picking, sitting, crawling, kneeling, limping)
Open Radar Datasets [67]	Micro-Doppler Signature	2021	Classification	Radar (TI AWR2243), Camera, GPS, IMU	Roads (urban, highway, rural)
MCD-Gesture [68]	Micro-Doppler Signature	2022	Classification	Radar (TI AWR1843)	Gestures (push, pull, slide left, slide right, clockwise turning, counterclockwise turning)

[78], T-FFTRadNet [79], and CubeLearn [77]), enabling object perception on ADC signals. These approaches utilize deep learning on ADC signals as an alternative to traditional signal processing procedures. This solution replaces computationally intensive FFTs and simplifies data flow in embedded implementations, thus significantly reducing the computational requirements.

Another direction of road object-based methods focuses on improving the resolution of radar data, which is essential for estimating object locations and velocities. For example, the ADC Super-Resolution (ADC-SR) model [81] leverages ADC signals to enhance the radar’s azimuth resolution, tackling complexities in ADC signals and predicting signals from unseen receivers. Consequently, the hallucinated ADC signals can further refine RAD tensors, enhancing object detection capabilities in autonomous driving.

b) Vital Sign-Based: The vital sign-based methods focus on monitoring the physiological signals of occupants inside the vehicle cabin, including heart rate, respiration rate, and presence detection [9], [73], [82]–[84]. Signal processing techniques, such as spectrogram analysis, Short Time Fourier Transform (STFT) and Wavelet Transform (WT), are employed to extract the vital sign signals from the radar ADC signal [8], [84]. Machine learning algorithms, such as statistical classifiers or regression models, may be trained using labeled data to estimate vital sign parameters from the extracted features [8].

Radar systems used for cabin vital sign monitoring are generally designed for close-range operation, such as within a vehicle or confined space. They focus on high-resolution detection of small movements and physiological changes, and may use less power and have smaller form factors than road-oriented radar systems. However, vital sign-based methods using machine learning algorithms may have limitations in real-time processing, which is crucial in low-latency applications [85], [86].

3) Discussion: Given that the ADC signal encompasses raw data derived from object reflections, it inherently carries the richest information about the object. This information can be effectively utilized for diverse tasks involving fine-grained feature recognition, such as activity classification, hand gesture recognition, and vital sign monitoring. However, there are certain limitations that should be acknowledged. One limitation is the sensitivity of the radar signals to factors such as electromagnetic interference, occupant positions and obstructing objects, requiring some advanced signal processing methods to extract features.

Another limitation is that ADC signals require a developer kit for data acquisition, which makes data processing challenging. Real-time object perception and vital sign monitoring pose computational challenges, requiring efficient hardware and software solutions. Moreover, neural networks processing ADC signals are suitable for classification tasks in closed environments, such as determining the presence or absence of objects and distinguishing between different types of objects [87]. However, in open environments, various distracting factors may lead to inaccurate object feature identification.

B. Radar Tensor




Fig. 7. Representation of radar tensor. (a) Image from the camera sensor. (b) 3D RAD tensor. (c) 2D RA tensor. (d) 2D RD tensor. (e) 2D AD tensor. Images are generated from the CARRADA [40] dataset.

As mentioned before, performing 3D FFTs on ADC signals along the sample, chirp, and antenna dimensions yields 3D RAD tensors. As is shown in Fig. 7, with these three features, two forms of radar tensors are formed: one is in 2D, including the Range-Azimuth (RA) tensor, Range-Doppler (RD) tensor and Azimuth-Doppler (AD) tensor; the other is the whole 3D RAD tensor, with each side consisting of a 2D tensor. Specifically, each 2D tensor represents a 2D pseudo-image that describes the spatial pattern of the received echo. The brighter colors within the tensor represent greater reflection amplitude at that location [88]. Moreover, in contrast to the 3D radar tensor that lacks height information, the 4D radar tensor expands the data representation by incorporating power measurements in four dimensions: range, Doppler velocity, azimuth angle, and elevation angle.

1) Datasets: Datasets representing radar data in tensor form can be categorized into three main groups:

- *2D tensors:* RADIATE [42], CRUW [46], FloW [89], MulRan [43], Oxford Radar RobotCar [44], SCORP [45], OORD [51];
- *3D tensors:* CARRADA [40], Zendar [41], RADDet [47], RADial [39];
- *4D tensors:* K-Radar [50].

The 2D radar tensor dataset has the largest number of all radar tensor datasets. Specifically, RADIATE [42], CRUW [46], MulRan [43], Oxford Radar RobotCar [44] and SCORP [45] are presented in 2D range-azimuth coordinates, representing the Bird’s Eye View (BEV) position of objects. The FloW [89] dataset is in 2D range-Doppler coordinates, showcasing the relationship between range and Doppler velocity for each object. CARRADA [40] is the first dataset that combines synchronized stereo RGB images and 3D radar RAD tensors.

It provides annotations with bounding boxes, sparse points, and dense masks for both range-Doppler and range-azimuth representations. Regarding 4D radar tensors, K-Radar [50] appears to be the only available dataset, offering comprehensive information on range, Doppler, azimuth, and elevation.

2) *Methods*: Radar tensors are expressed in various forms, with processing algorithms differing depending on tensor dimensions. Therefore, we categorize radar tensor methods into 2D, 3D, and 4D tensor-based methods based on currently available tensor dimensions.

a) *2D Tensor-Based*: 2D tensor-based methods typically process 2D input radar data by considering range-Doppler and range-azimuth information. To conduct object classification or detection on radar tensors, image-based network architectures (e.g., Faster R-CNN [90], ResNet [91], U-Net [92]) are applied or modified, as has been demonstrated in various studies using RA tensors [4], [88], [93]–[96] or RD tensors [96]–[99]. For example, Gao *et al.* [88] initiated the object detection process by defining a fixed-size bounding box for each detected object on the RA tensor. In addition, they extracted the radar data within the bounding box from multiple RA tensors and arranged this data in the form of radar data cubes. With the temporal information and object movement pattern, the data cubes serve as features for classifying different objects, such as pedestrians, cars and cyclists. Dong *et al.* [93] applied ResNet [91] architecture on RA tensors for object detection. They also introduced uncertainty estimation for oriented bounding box localization further to enhance the accuracy of the object detection process. In general, 2D tensor-based methods employ a simplified radar data representation, reducing computational complexity. They can exploit correlations between two dimensions to improve detection and localization performance. However, these methods may only employ part of the available 3D spatial information from the radar. With limited representation, the accuracy of complex scenarios with multiple objects or occlusions may be reduced.

b) *3D Tensor-Based*: 3D tensor-based methods process radar data simultaneously using the range, Doppler, and azimuth dimensions, forming a 3D RAD tensor. As such, this approach captures richer spatial information compared to 2D tensor-based methods, thus providing more valuable information to network architectures. Particular architectures have been developed to process aggregated views of 3D RAD tensors for object detection [3], [4], [47], [100], [101] and semantic segmentation [45], [102]–[104]. Specifically, Major *et al.* [3] first demonstrated the effectiveness of a deep learning-based object detection framework that operated on the RAD tensor and proved that the Doppler dimension helps increase detection performance. Similarly to the approach proposed by Major *et al.* [3], Gao *et al.* [100] decomposed the RAD tensor into three parts separately before combining them. The primary distinction between the two approaches is that the RA tensor in [100] consists of complex values that aid in recognizing objects using spatial patterns, thus increasing the accuracy of detection.

c) *4D Tensor-Based*: Recently, with the development of 4D radar sensors, methods on 4D radar tensors are emerging. K-Radar [50] compared the performance of 3D

Range-Azimuth-Elevation (RAE) tensors with 2D RA tensors, demonstrating the importance of elevation information in radar perception. However, this method is still working on the 3D radar tensor without fully using the information of 4D radar tensors. Later, Enhanced K-Radar [105] improved K-Radar by introducing a new representation of 4D radar data named 4D Sparse Radar Tensor (4DSRT), which significantly reduces the 4D radar tensor size using offline density reduction. Specifically, 4DSRT retains the top-N% elements in Cartesian coordinates with the highest power measurements along the XYZ direction. The 3D sparse convolution [106] is then employed to extract the feature maps from the 4DSRT.

Compared to using 2D tensor, 3D tensor-based and 4D tensor-based methods offer a more comprehensive representation of radar data, leveraging the complete spatial information and allowing for precise object detection, segmentation, and localization. These methods can effectively handle complex scenarios involving multiple targets, partial occlusions, and varying azimuth angles. However, the increased dimensions of the tensor may result in higher computational complexity and system delays.

3) *Discussion*: The radar tensor representation combines range, Doppler velocity, azimuth and elevation information into a coherent visual representation. This holistic view of the surrounding objects in the radar’s field of view enables efficient perception and environment understanding. With these advantages, radar tensors are widely used in object detection and semantic segmentation tasks through combined labeling with cameras or LiDARs.

Although radar tensors retain more comprehensive information about an object, they also reserve noise and clutter information, which may limit the ability to capture subtle object characteristics or distinguish between similar objects. Furthermore, the radar tensor provides a condensed representation of radar data, reducing the overall data size compared to raw ADC signals. Nevertheless, the radar tensor representation still requires considerable memory storage as well as a large bandwidth, especially for the new 4D radar tensors.

C. Point Cloud




Fig. 8. Representation of point cloud. (a) Radar point clouds in 3D coordinates. (b) Point clouds projection on 2D image plane. Images are generated from the View-of-Delft [58] dataset.

By CFAR processing on the radar tensor, data in the format of a group of points, which we refer to as the point cloud, is obtained and visualized in Fig. 8(a). The point cloud provides a rough indication of an object’s location, yet it cannot

accurately describe the outline information of the object, as illustrated in Fig. 8(b). Each point contains information about the current reflection, including range, Doppler velocity, azimuth angle, and reflected power.

1) *Datasets*: Conventional 3D radar sensors generate sparse point clouds, as observed in datasets such as nuScenes [52], Zender [41], SeeingThroughFog [54], HawkEye [107], AIO-Drive [55], RADial [39], RadarScenes [56], aiMotive [60] and MiliPoint [64]. Recently, 4D radar datasets have emerged, including Astyx [108], VoD [58], TJ4DRadSet [59], WaterScenes [61] and Dual-Radar [63]. While Astyx [108] stands as the first 4D radar point cloud dataset, it is limited by a small data size of only 500 frames. VoD [58] and TJ4DRadSet [59] datasets represent notable advancements in terms of data categories and data size. Meanwhile, these two datasets also incorporate simultaneous LiDAR data, facilitating comparative analysis between 4D radar point clouds and LiDAR point clouds. Interestingly, WaterScenes [61] is a 4D radar dataset focused on objects in waterway environments, which demonstrates the robustness of using 4D radar on water surfaces, particularly in adverse lighting and weather conditions. Dual-Radar [63] incorporates two types of 4D radars, expanding the comparison of different radar performance and further research on practical 4D radar perception algorithms.

2) *Methods*: Point cloud-based radar algorithms take radar point clouds as input and are widely applied for object detection [5], [109]–[112], semantic segmentation [20], [109], [113]–[118], tracking [119]–[121], odometry [122], [123] and scene flow [124]–[126]. Based on various radar point cloud processing techniques, we categorize point cloud-based methods into three groups: clustering-based, point-based, and voxel-based methods.

a) *Clustering-Based*: Clustering-based methods [127]–[129] aim to group radar points into clusters using clustering algorithms (e.g., DBSCAN [37]), and then perform classification based on their spatial attributes. While clustering methods may be limited compared to deep learning-based methods, they are still effective in extracting individual objects from radar point clouds. The simplicity of clustering-based methods also reduces memory requirements, making them widely used in radar-based segmentation tasks. However, clustering-based methods are sensitive to parameter settings, such as the density threshold in DBSCAN. Additionally, these methods may also struggle with cluttered, overlapping, and closely spaced objects.

b) *Point-Based*: Point-based methods [5], [109], [110], [113], [114], [120], [121] process radar point clouds at the individual point level, extracting spatial features directly from these points. These methods generally draw inspiration from LiDAR-based algorithms, such as PointNet [130], PointNet++ [131] and Frustum PointNets [132]. These techniques leverage neural networks with convolutional filters to process radar points directly, considering spatial coordinates as integral features in the network structure. Schumann *et al.* [113] proposed a structure based on PointNet++ for semantic segmentation on radar point clouds. Specifically, the Multi-Scale Grouping (MSG) module in PointNet++ helps group and generate features for a center point and its neighborhoods.

They demonstrated that incorporating the RCS value and compensated Doppler velocity significantly improved classification accuracy. Inspired by [113], Danzer *et al.* [109] adopted a two-stage method using PointNets [130], [132] for 2D car detection and segmentation. They considered each point as a proposal and adjusted the proposal size according to the object’s prior knowledge. Then, PointNet and Frustum PointNets are used to classify the proposals and each point in the proposal. Finally, the bounding box prediction is executed only for the proposals that are objects. Point-based methods are good at accurate localization and classification of objects by considering individual radar points. However, they are susceptible to noise and occlusion, which may affect feature extraction accuracy.

c) *Voxel-Based*: Voxel-based methods [111], [133]–[135] transform radar point clouds into volumetric representations by discretizing the 3D space into a grid of voxels. Then, 3D convolutions or sparse convolutional neural networks (e.g., VoxelNet [136], SECOND [137]) are leveraged to process the voxels to extract features for perception tasks. For example, GRIF Net [133] initially converts point clouds into voxels. As point clouds typically exhibit sparsity with numerous empty voxels, GRIF Net utilizes the Sparse Block Network (SBN) [138] to convolve only on masked regions, thereby avoiding unnecessary computations on ineffective blank areas. In LXL [135], the input radar point cloud is initially pillarized as in PointPillars [139]. Then, the pillar representation is fed into SECOND to extract multi-level BEV features with spatial and contextual information. Above all, voxel is an efficient representation for processing dense radar point clouds and is robust to varying point densities and occlusion. However, voxel-based methods lose fine-grained spatial information due to voxelization and discretization. Moreover, the limited resolution of voxel grids may lead to decreased accuracy in object detection, especially for small or distant objects.

3) *Discussion*: Point cloud representation provides an intuitive 3D spatial structure of the surroundings. Since radar point clouds are generated by filtering techniques, they have advantages in filtering noise and being a lightweight data representation. However, some potential information within the raw data may inevitably be lost [3]. Additionally, some small objects or objects with weak reflections may not be rendered as point clouds.

Currently, most point cloud detection and segmentation algorithms in radar are based on LiDAR algorithms. Point clouds in LiDARs are dense and can describe the outline of surrounding objects. Conversely, radar point clouds are incredibly sparse, posing challenges to developing practical algorithms. To address this issue, point cloud-based algorithms should explore the intrinsic relationships between point clouds, which can provide additional features, including velocities and RCS values.

D. Grid Map

Leveraging multi-frame point clouds, some researchers transform 3D radar reflections into a BEV pseudo-image called the grid map [113]. There are two primary types of




Fig. 9. Representation of grid map. (a) RGB image from BEV. (b) Occupancy grid map representing obstacles and free-space. (c) Amplitude grid map representing reflected power values. Images are from [140].

grid maps commonly used in radar-based perception: one is the occupancy-based grid map [140]–[149], which represents the obstacles and free-space information; the other is the amplitude-based grid map [140], [141], which displays the reflected power values in that particular area. As shown in Fig. 9(b), an occupancy-based grid map has a clear outline, making it more feasible for outline-based detection tasks (e.g., parking spaces). An amplitude-based grid map, as indicated in Fig. 9(c), emphasizes the reflective characteristics of different objects, rendering it more appropriate for rural roads with a few distinct objects.

1) *Datasets*: There are two main datasets for radar grid map representation. Based on the nuScenes [52] dataset, Sless *et al.* [148] generated a grid map dataset for the semantic segmentation task, containing the actual occupancy state for each cell. Another grid map dataset is derived from Oxford Radar RobotCar [44], a radar dataset using a scanning radar without Doppler information for radar odometry tasks, utilizing the RA tensor as the data representation. Later, Qian *et al.* [150] extended this dataset to a grid map representation by creating 3D bounding boxes of vehicles from LiDAR point clouds. To facilitate grid-map object detection, they utilized visual odometry knowledge to synchronize the radar and LiDAR data.

2) *Methods*: As grid maps are generated from point clouds, clustering algorithms can be used to group radar measurements belonging to the same object. Besides, as the grid map has the same structure as the 2D image, deep learning-based algorithms can be directly implemented for detection and segmentation tasks. In general, methods for grid map representations can be categorized into two main types: occupancy-based and amplitude-based methods.

a) *Occupancy-Based*: Occupancy-based methods [140]–[149], [151] utilize information such as the presence or absence of objects within a grid cell to make occupancy predictions. Traditionally, occupancy grid mapping is performed using an Inverse Sensor Model (ISM) and probabilistic methods (e.g., Bayesian filters [152]) to estimate occupancy probability [146], [153]. Additionally, Extended Kalman Filter (EKF) approaches take into account both measurement and motion models, modeling the environment as a Gaussian random field and estimating the state of each cell using a recursive Bayesian filter [154]. Occupancy-based methods provide a concise environmental representation, simplifying obstacle detection and localization for efficient path planning [155]. However, occupancy-based methods may struggle to estimate occupancy states for cells with cluttered or overlapping radar

returns [156]. Dynamic objects also pose problems due to their changing nature and intermittent radar measurements.

b) *Amplitude-Based*: Amplitude-based methods (e.g., [140], [141], [147], [157]) utilize the measured radar signal reflected intensity information for object detection and classification. Representative algorithms group radar measurements with similar amplitudes to identify potential obstacles. Clustering techniques (e.g., DBSCAN, K-means) are often used in this context [147]. In addition, convolutional neural networks are used as the classifier to distinguish between vehicles and non-vehicles in radar amplitude-based grid maps [141]. Amplitude-based methods offer robustness against clutter and noise, as they exploit variations in radar return amplitudes for object detection. However, amplitude-based representations can be sensitive to sensor noise and uncertainties, as they rely on accurate intensity measurements. The performance of amplitude-based methods may also be influenced by factors like object occlusions, multi-path interference, and the radar’s limited angular resolution.

3) *Discussion*: Radar grid maps provide spatial structure in BEV, offering interpretable and intuitive environmental understanding for geometric localization and obstacle detection. The grid map representation is useful for static objects, as the velocity information is ignored during map construction. By analyzing reflected power values, different object types (e.g., vehicles, pedestrians, buildings) can be distinguished, aiding semantic mapping and scene understanding.

However, as grid maps are constructed from radar point clouds, point cloud sparsity impacts detection, segmentation, and localization accuracy. This may reduce the accuracy of fine-grained object details or small objects in the grid map. Moreover, closely spaced objects may be difficult to distinguish in radar grid maps.

E. Micro-Doppler Signature




Fig. 10. Representation of micro-Doppler signature. (a) Spectrogram showing a pedestrian walking. (b) Spectrogram showing a pedestrian running. (c) Spectrogram showing a vehicle driving. (d) Spectrogram showing a bicycle riding. Images are generated from the Open Radar Datasets [67].

Micro-Doppler signature refers to the representation of micro-motion, such as rotation and vibration caused by object

parts, resulting in a characteristic representation that differs from the Doppler frequency variation. Micro-Doppler signature is generated by the Time-Frequency transform methods (e.g., STFT, WT) on Range-FFT results. As illustrated in Fig. 10, the spectrograms of walking and running pedestrians reveal different features. Specifically, the period of the micro-Doppler for a running pedestrian is shorter than that for a walking pedestrian. Moreover, the spectrograms between different types of objects (e.g., vehicles and bicycles) are unique, making them powerful features for object classification.

1) *Datasets*: The Open Radar Datasets [67] collects different types of outdoor moving targets, such as pedestrian walking and cycling, captured by a stationary radar system. The primary goal of this dataset is to utilize classification techniques for distinguishing between different motion activities. Apart from outdoor environments, some micro-Doppler signature-based datasets (e.g., CI4R [66], Dop-NET [65], MCD-Gesture [68]) for motion recognition (e.g., health monitoring, gesture recognition) are from indoor environments. These indoor datasets can assist in occupant behavior recognition to some extent, but still differ from behavior classification in autonomous driving due to inconsistent acquisition environments.

2) *Methods*: Over the past few years, significant research attention has been paid to the classification and recognition of objects' postures and activities through micro-Doppler signature-based methods, particularly in the areas of object classification [88], [158], human activity and gait recognition [159]–[162], and human gesture recognition [163]. Based on features of the micro-Doppler signature representation, we divide these methods into spectrogram-based methods and cadence velocity diagram-based methods.

a) *Spectrogram-Based*: Spectrograms are a commonly used representation for analyzing micro-Doppler signatures. Spectrogram-based methods simultaneously analyze the micro-Doppler signature in both the time and frequency domains, which has been applied to human motion recognition [160], [162]. The time-varying gait information, including the speed of arm and leg swing, is effectively encoded within the spectrogram representation. Thus, spectrogram-based methods provide feature localization of micro-Doppler signatures, allowing better identification and classification of different motions. However, spectrograms suffer from low time-frequency resolution trade-offs, leading to issues in capturing fast-changing Doppler signatures. Besides, spectrograms are also vulnerable to noise interference, which may obscure relevant information.

b) *Cadence Velocity Diagram-Based*: Apart from the spectrogram presenting Doppler information in the time domain, another representation of micro-Doppler signature is the Cadence-Velocity Diagram (CVD) that exists in the frequency domain, which is derived by performing a Fourier transform along the time axis of the spectrogram [164], [165]. It provides a metric for capturing the frequency repetition patterns (“cadence frequencies”) over a given period. Thus, CVD-based methods provide a valuable measure for periodic changes in body parts at different velocities, such as walking or running [11], [161]. However, CVD-based methods become complex

when dealing with targets having multiple moving parts or irregular motion patterns. Fine details or rapid changes in motion can be challenging to capture accurately, limiting the ability to distinguish between closely spaced components or rapidly changing motions [166].

3) *Discussion*: Micro-Doppler signature recognizes targets by observing minute movement characteristics of objects. This representation not only facilitates the differentiation of various object categories (e.g., pedestrians, bicycles, vehicles), but also enables the recognition of intricate object behaviors like gait and gesture recognition.

However, the transformation to the frequency domain via the Time-Frequency transform suffers from overlapping target components, resulting in suboptimal feature extraction for downstream tasks [75]. Similarly to ADC signal representation, the micro-Doppler signature is insufficient in delineating an object's spatial coordinates for detection and segmentation tasks, so it is commonly employed for classification tasks. Moreover, the micro-Doppler signature representation may have limited resolution in range estimation compared to other representations like the radar tensor. This limitation could impact the ability to accurately determine the exact distance of an object, potentially affecting collision avoidance algorithms.

IV. CHALLENGES AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

In this section, we discuss challenges and potential research directions associated with radar perception in autonomous driving. When conducting academic research or application development on radar-based perception, the first challenge is what kind of radar product and radar data representation should be selected, as they all have their advantages and application scenarios. Subsequently, due to the inherent shortcomings of the radar sensor, such as sparsity, noise and limited resolution, we examine how to improve radar perception performance. Finally, in the trend of multi-sensor fusion with radar as an essential component in autonomous driving, we explore challenges in integrating radar perception with additional sensor modalities, including LiDARs and cameras. This integration aims to enhance the overall accuracy and robustness of perception by leveraging the complementary strengths of each sensor.

A. Which Data Representation Should be Chosen?

As is described in Table III, different radar data representations have unique advantages and limitations, which should be considered when making informed choices. The choice of data representation depends on the specific requirements of the autonomous driving system, including application scenarios and computational efficiency.

1) *Consideration of Application Scenarios*: For applications requiring accurate object detection and tracking, representations like radar tensors or point clouds prove valuable. Radar tensors, such as RAD tensors, offer visualizations of range, Doppler velocity, and azimuth, which can be used to extract features using image-based methods [47], [103]. Point cloud representations deliver 3D spatial information aligned with real-world object locations, enabling utilization with

TABLE III
OVERVIEW OF DIFFERENT RADAR DATA REPRESENTATIONS.

Representations	Main Tasks	Advantages	Limitations
ADC Signal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classification • Object Detection • Vital Sign Monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains all information from raw radar data • High temporal resolution • Fine-grained feature recognition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of semantic information • Complexity in data processing • Sensitive to noise
Radar Tensor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classification • Detection • Segmentation • Localization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides spatial structure with range, azimuth and elevation • Provides rich motion information about the object 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains interference information around the object • Inconsistent resolution between range and azimuth
Point Cloud	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detection • Segmentation • Tracking • Odometry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers 3D spatial representation of the surrounding environment • Light-weight representation for objects • Filters weak reflected signals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sparse in describing the shape of objects • Susceptible to noise and occlusion • Loss of potential information after CFAR processing
Grid Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping • Localization • Odometry • Detection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides structured BEV representation of the surroundings • Offers a concise representation focusing on presence and occupancy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty in representing complex and dynamic scenes • Suffers from noise, occlusions and resolution
Micro-Doppler Signature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion Classification • Vital Sign Monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains information about object motion • Enhances differentiation between objects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited resolution in range estimation • Vulnerable to noise and interference

point-based network architectures [167], [168]. Additionally, point clouds are the output format of conventional radar, benefiting from well-developed product suites and research materials [169].

When considering effective mapping and path planning, grid map representation emerges as a valuable choice. The Grid map offers a structured representation of surroundings, with occupancy grids providing a discretized layout. Grids can be classified as occupied or representing free space, aiding vehicle navigation and optimal path planning.

If the research focuses on vehicle cabins, radar representations of ADC signals and micro-Doppler signatures provide powerful insights. By analyzing the characteristics of the ADC signal, such as its amplitude, frequency, and temporal variations, it becomes possible to monitor vital signs. Additionally, micro-Doppler signatures extract detailed information about human movements, differentiating between vibrations caused by respiratory movements, heartbeats, or even gestures unrelated to vital signs. Thus, these two representations can be utilized in the cabin for health monitoring, detecting distress, and alerting drivers to emergency services.

2) *Consideration of Computational Efficiency:* If real-time processing and low computational complexity are critical, computationally efficient representations such as radar tensors and point clouds are preferable. The radar tensor represents radar echoes in a 2D, 3D or 4D matrix, while the point cloud representation is a set of individual 3D points representing detected objects. As far as computational performance is concerned, some tensor-based methods and point cloud-based methods have already achieved real-time object detection and segmentation [4], [20], [170], [171].

Conversely, ADC signals provide raw radar data with high temporal resolution, but are typically large and computationally expensive to process in real-time, requiring additional algorithms for signal processing and feature extraction [15], [81]. Micro-Doppler signatures may require additional processing, but their feasibility for real-time depends on specific algorithms and computational resources [172], [173]. Grid

maps are structured grid-based formats, simplifying subsequent processing and potentially enabling computational efficiency. However, they may not meet real-time requirements if frequent updates are needed for new scenarios [154], [174].

B. How to Improve Radar Perception Performance?

The constraints inherent in radar sensors and the limitations associated with radar data processing algorithms present challenges to the performance of radar perception. Improving radar perception performance is crucial for autonomous driving, enabling more accurate decisions and predictions. In the following, we explore four areas: creating high-quality datasets, dealing with inherent limitations, improving data processing algorithms, and employing 4D radar sensors. An overview of challenges and research directions in these four areas is described in Table IV.

1) *Creating High-Quality Datasets:* A high-quality dataset provides more accurate ground truth information, enabling the algorithm to learn the correct associations and features required for accurate object classification, detection, tracking, and localization. However, creating a high-quality dataset is challenging for radar, primarily in terms of calibration and annotation.

a) *Calibration:* Ensuring accurate calibration for radar sensors is a prerequisite for radar perception. The triangular corner reflector is a common target for radar calibration. When radar waves encounter the corner reflector, they bounce off each surface and converge at a point, forming a strong reflection that the radar sensor can easily measure [175]. While significant progress has been made in radar calibration techniques (e.g., [176]–[178]), there are still challenges to address and potential research directions to explore.

Designing calibration methods adapted to varying environmental conditions is essential. Research efforts should focus on developing adaptive and self-calibration algorithms that account for changes in clutter, interference, and propagation conditions [179]. Developing advanced algorithms that handle

TABLE IV
OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGES AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS ON IMPROVING RADAR PERCEPTION PERFORMANCE.

Topic	Challenges	Research Directions
Creating High-Quality Datasets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calibration • Annotation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop adaptive and self-calibration algorithms • Design real-time and dynamic calibration techniques • Explore auto-labeling techniques
Dealing with Inherent Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sparsity and limited resolution • Noise and clutter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore the distribution of radar output • Construct features based on physical properties • Model inherent uncertainty
Improving Data Processing Algorithms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parameter estimation • Feature extraction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use neural networks instead of traditional FFTs • Apply graph neural network to extract features • Utilize occupancy prediction for scene understanding
Employing 4D Radar Sensors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large size • Perception algorithms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extract core values from tensor dimensions • Develop efficient 3D object perception models • Design specific architectures on dense information

complex system configurations is a promising research direction. Techniques such as machine learning, optimization, and statistical approaches can be explored to improve calibration accuracy and efficiency [180]. In addition, dynamic radar calibration during driving is challenging. Developing dynamic calibration techniques, such as the Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM), that adapt to changing systems and environments enhances the operational reliability of radar systems [180]. Addressing these challenges and exploring these research directions can lead to improved radar calibration techniques, enabling more accurate and reliable radar measurements in autonomous driving.

b) Annotation: In another aspect, high-quality datasets with accurate and rich annotations are crucial for training and validating perception algorithms. However, the process of data annotation is labor-intensive and time-consuming. This is particularly true when dealing with radar data, as the inherent representation of objects within this data modality does not fully reveal their physical forms. Data describing objects with ground truth information, such as position, velocity, reflected power, and class, should also be annotated to enable training models that generalize well to real-world conditions.

The exploration of auto-labeling techniques for radar data presents a promising avenue to mitigate the burden of manual data labeling. In practice, radar data labels can be derived by leveraging corresponding ground truth from camera images and the extrinsic matrix of radar and camera sensors [61], [176]. However, the efficacy of this labeling approach for radar data remains an issue, given that radar targets may not consistently align with the ground truth depicted in images. Thus, despite the potential benefits associated with auto-labeling radar data, effectively filtering extraneous data around objects remains an ongoing challenge.

2) *Dealing with Inherent Limitations:* While radar sensors offer significant advantages for perception in autonomous driving, they also have certain limitations. Factors such as adverse weather conditions, interference, and the trade-offs between range, resolution, and field of view are significant considerations that impact the reliability and effectiveness of radar systems. Understanding these limitations is crucial for designing appropriate strategies to create a robust and comprehensive perception system.

a) Sparsity and Limited Resolution: The sparse nature of radar data provides less detailed information about object shape and fine structure than LiDAR and camera data. Limited resolution hinders the radar system’s ability to distinguish between closely spaced targets, leading to potential confusion and misinterpretation. Consequently, radar sensors struggle to provide precise localization or detailed shape information, making it challenging to classify and discern fine-grained object features.

While combining multiple frames enhances accuracy, it can also introduce system delays [58], [113], [133], [181]–[184]. Column or pillar expansion methods (e.g., [181], [182], [185]) complement the lack of measurement in the vertical direction, but only alleviate ambiguity to a limited extent. Exploring radar output distribution (e.g., Gaussian distribution) based on the fundamental principles of radar presents a valuable research opportunity [186].

Moreover, existing methods (e.g., PointNet [130], PointNet++ [131]) designed for processing dense LiDAR point clouds are limited for handling sparse radar point clouds [187]. Therefore, developing specialized architectures to address the challenges of sparse radar detection presents a promising research direction. For example, Liu *et al.* [20] leveraged cosine similarity loss and normalized inner product loss as part of the training process for sparse radar detection points, enhancing the performance of point-wise center shift vector-guided clustering.

b) Noise and Clutter: Radar sensors are susceptible to noise, resulting in false detections and inaccurate object positions. Noise arises from various sources, including electronic components within the radar system, thermal noise, atmospheric disturbances, and electromagnetic interference. Clutter refers to unwanted radar returns caused by environmental factors such as ground reflections, vegetation, or other structures.

The signal received by the in-cabin radar sensor not only contains information about the occupant’s vital signs, but also includes unwanted motion induced by engine vibrations [9]. Consequently, monitoring vital signs in a non-stationary environment using a radar sensor becomes rather challenging. Traditional techniques (e.g., [188]–[191]) applied to reduce noise in automotive radars usually draw upon CFAR and peak

detection algorithms. However, these methods have shown limitations in terms of adaptability when faced with varying conditions and unpredictable noise types.

For noise removal in radar tensors, researchers may draw inspiration from principles and techniques used in image denoising and restoration [192]–[198]. By considering radar tensors as images, various techniques, including convolutional neural networks, restoration filters, and wavelet-based methods, can be applied to reduce noise and enhance the quality of these tensors [199], [200]. For mitigating noise in point clouds, removing radar detections that fall outside boundaries defined by ground truth information from cameras or LiDARs is an approach [181], [201]. Constructing features based on physical properties can provide the necessary guidance for models to differentiate targets from clutter. This involves examining point density, spatial arrangement, and other statistical properties to help distinguish signal from noise. However, a unique challenge presented by radar point clouds is their inherent sparsity and inaccuracy. Developing techniques to account for this uncertainty could allow for more robust noise removal and aid in distinguishing objects from noise.

3) *Improving Data Processing Algorithms*: Processing raw radar data to extract meaningful object information is critical for perception accuracy. Advanced signal processing techniques suppress clutter and noise in radar measurements, including adaptive beamforming and spatial filtering [202], [203]. However, data processing using these signal processing techniques remains challenging for radar perception. Utilizing machine learning and deep learning algorithms can also improve perception and object recognition capabilities. We focus on discussing two aspects of algorithm improvement: parameter estimation and feature extraction.

a) *Parameter Estimation*: Radar signals often exhibit complex patterns and non-linear dependencies. Traditional FFT-based methods may only capture part of the relevant information required for parameter estimation [4], [204]. One potential research opportunity is employing neural networks to extract radar parameters instead of traditional FFT operations. This approach is valuable to reduce computational requirements, while simplifying the data flow within embedded implementations [4], [205], [206]. An example can be found in RODNet [4], where FFT operations are selectively applied in the sample and antenna dimensions, while the chirp dimension is preserved to form the range-azimuth-chirp tensor. Then, a neural network is employed to process the chirp dimension for extracting relevant Doppler features. This end-to-end learning approach allows the neural network to learn relevant features and patterns from the radar data, potentially improving the accuracy and efficiency of parameter extraction.

b) *Feature Extraction*: Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) [207] present a promising research direction, enabling operations on graph data to effectively capture relationships between elements within complex structured data (e.g., point clouds, images) [207]. Radar data can also be represented as a graph, where each graph node represents a point from point clouds or a pixel from radar tensors, and the edges capture the spatial or temporal relationships between them. Then, Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) employ graph

convolutional layers to update node embeddings by aggregating and transforming information from neighboring nodes. These layers effectively capture spatial dependencies between objects, facilitating feature learning in graph-based radar data representations. GNN-based methods applied to radar point clouds (e.g., Radar-PointGNN [208], RadarGNN [209]) or radar tensors (e.g., GTR-Net [210]) demonstrate graph representations’ effectiveness in capturing contextual and spatial information, thereby improving the overall performance.

Recently, occupancy prediction (e.g., SurroundOcc [211], OpenOcc [212], Occ3D [213], TPVFormer [214]) using cameras and LiDARs has been a hot research topic in autonomous driving. Compared to 3D bounding boxes, 3D occupancy can not only describe target objects, but also indicate background state and capture fine-grained details [212]. Radar occupancy prediction presents a valuable research direction for radar perception in autonomous driving. By analyzing occupancy patterns in radar data, the structure of the scene, including road boundaries as well as obstacles, can be inferred. Potential research could explore using contextual semantics to enhance radar occupancy prediction accuracy, enabling more comprehensive environment understanding.

4) *Employing 4D Radar Sensors*: Radar sensors have made significant progress, transitioning from 3D to 4D capabilities, including enhanced resolution and elevation measurement capabilities. As a result, more and more research is focused on the 4D radar, with growing numbers of radar datasets and algorithms proposed recently. Given these advancements, employing 4D radar sensors is a promising and potential research direction for radar perception in the broader domain of autonomous driving. However, 4D radar is still challenging in terms of large data size as well as perception algorithms.

a) *Large Size*: The spatial distribution of objects is effectively captured and represented within 4D radar datasets, such as VoD [58], TJ4DRadSet [59], K-Radar [50], WaterScenes [61], and Dual-Radar [63]. However, compared to 3D radar sensors, 4D radars produce prohibitively large data outputs. For example, in the K-Radar [50] dataset, the size of 4D radar tensor only in the forward direction amounts to 12TB, while the size of the synchronously acquired 360-degree LiDAR point cloud data is only 0.6TB. Thus, methods of size reduction are worth consideration. Preliminary investigations involve developing Enhanced K-Radar [105], which extracts higher value by sampling different tensor dimensions. This innovative approach shows potential for enhancing training speed and reducing memory requirements.

b) *Perception Algorithms*: Emerging perception algorithms applied to 4D radar datasets also indicate that the 4D radar data significantly enhances radar perception capabilities [58], [111], [168], [215], [216]. With various architectures (e.g., point-based, voxel-based, pillar-based) proposed, Palmer *et al.* [217] conducted a comprehensive analysis of detection performance achieved by existing models on 4D radar datasets, including VoD [58] and Astyx [108]. They evaluated the performance of Voxel R-CNN [218], SECOND [137], PointRCNN [219], and PV-RCNN [220] through cross-model validation and cross-dataset validation experiments. Numerical results showed no clear best model, with the

TABLE V
OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGES AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS ON RADAR DATA FUSION.

Topic	Challenges	Research Directions
Associating Heterogeneous Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projection-based or geometric-based associations result in ineffective alignment • Sensitive to occluded radar returns and background clutter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize BEV features to enhance spatial understanding • Apply attention mechanisms to mitigate background clutter • Employ joint probabilistic data association methods to estimate the likelihood of associations
Handling Challenging Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive to adverse weather and object occlusions • Uncertainty estimation of different sensor measurements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop adaptive fusion strategies to adjust fusion parameters based on environmental conditions • Employ probabilistic fusion techniques to model and propagate uncertainties

performance varying by object class and distance. Further research is expected to develop efficient 3D object detection models based on 4D radar data, utilizing rich data and feature extraction to address challenges.

C. What about Data Fusion for Radar Representations?

While radar sensors are good at detecting and ranging objects, they provide limited information about object characteristics like color, texture, and fine-grained visual details. Integrating radars with complementary sensors, such as cameras or LiDARs, overcomes this limitation and provides comprehensive perception solutions [1], [221]. However, radar data fusion also faces some challenges, particularly in heterogeneous data association and in challenging condition processing. An overview of these challenges and research directions is summarized in Table V.

1) *Associating Heterogeneous Data*: A significant challenge is the ambiguity in associating radar data with other modalities, as they are heterogeneous. For radar-camera fusion, existing approaches involve projecting radar data onto the image plane and subsequently establishing their correspondence via a calibration matrix [108], [181], [222], [223]. For radar-LiDAR fusion, existing methods exploit geometric information to associate radar and LiDAR point clouds by comparing the position, velocity, and shape of the detected objects to determine if they correspond to the same physical object [224]. However, projection-based or geometric-based associations result in ineffective alignment with object centers. As previously stated, radar data exhibits sparsity, inaccuracy, and noise, thereby causing inadequate associations in both object-level and data-level fusion scenarios.

Therefore, associating radar data with other modalities is a critical but challenging question. In our opinion, the incorporation of BEV features, transformer architectures, and attention mechanisms are valuable research directions that can significantly improve fusion performance. BEV provides a top-down perspective view of the vehicle’s surroundings, thereby enhancing spatial understanding. Using BEV transformations and transformer architectures, radar-camera fusion methods (e.g., RCBEV [225], CRAFT [226], CRN [227], RCFusion [228], LXL [135]) or radar-LiDAR fusion methods (e.g., Bi-LRFusion [229], BEVGuide [230], ACF-Net [231], ST-MVDNet++ [232]) have proven to deliver impressive performance.

Moreover, attention mechanisms have been successfully utilized to deal with complex contextual relationships, which makes them promising for data fusion tasks [1]. Attention mechanisms play a crucial role in determining the relevance of different sensor modalities at different spatial or temporal locations. In the case of data association, the attention mechanism filters occluded radar returns and mitigates background clutter, which facilitates the alignment and matching of objects or features across the different modalities [183], [226]. Thus, attention-based association with adaptive thresholds emerges as a prospective approach for establishing a connection between radar and other modalities. Furthermore, the Joint Probabilistic Data Association (JPDA) method is a potential research direction that leverages Bayesian filtering techniques to estimate the likelihood of associations based on the joint probability distribution of radar and other modalities [233]. By considering uncertainties associated with the measurements and estimates, JPDA enables robust data association.

2) *Handling Challenging Conditions*: Fusion in challenging conditions refers to the ability of a sensor fusion system to maintain reliable and accurate perception even in adverse environments, where individual sensors may face difficulties. In such conditions, sensor measurements are noisy, degraded, or influenced by poor visibility, adverse weather and object occlusions [234]–[237]. Therefore, sensor fusion aims to leverage the complementary strengths of different sensors to compensate for the limitations of one sensor with the capabilities of another. Developing robust fusion algorithms that handle varying environmental conditions and adaptively combine sensor data is critical for reliable perception.

Fusion in challenging conditions may require adaptive fusion strategies that dynamically adjust fusion parameters based on environmental conditions. Developing data weighting techniques that assign appropriate weights to sensor measurements based on reliability can enhance fusion performance under challenging conditions [238], [239]. For example, radar sensors may be more reliable than cameras and LiDARs under adverse weather conditions. Therefore, the fusion algorithm should adaptively emphasize radar data and de-emphasize other sensors.

Effective fusion in challenging conditions also requires uncertainty estimation associated with sensor measurements. It refers to the lack of complete confidence or knowledge about the observations obtained from different sensors in the fusion process. Probabilistic fusion techniques should be incorporated

to model and propagate uncertainties properly. Bayesian neural networks are notable techniques employed for uncertainty estimation, using the prior distribution of network weights to infer the posterior distribution. This enables the computation of probabilities for specific predictions, thereby enhancing the reliability of the fusion network [221], [240]. Such techniques should enable fusion algorithms to make informed decisions considering the uncertainty levels in fused data.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this review explores five radar data representations (i.e., ADC signal, radar tensor, point cloud, grid map, and micro-Doppler signature) in autonomous driving. Through an in-depth study of radar operating principles and signal processing, we reveal the generation process, applications, as well as the advantages and limitations of these representations, providing valuable insights for the continued development of autonomous driving technology. By investigating advanced methods for different data representations, we aim to gain insights into the characteristics of different algorithms as well as emerging trends for radar perception.

Through analyzing various radar data representations, we thoroughly discuss the key challenges and propose potential research directions for radar perception. In general, radar perception is progressing towards data representations containing rich information. On the one hand, representations like ADC signals and radar tensors offer increased potential information, thereby holding significant value for radar perception. On the other hand, new 4D radar sensors bring forth denser point clouds and higher resolutions, representing a noteworthy trend in autonomous driving. In terms of radar perception networks, the incorporation of transformer architectures, attention mechanisms, and BEV features provides valuable research directions to improve the perception performance. Moreover, emerging radar-based sensor fusion works are also hot topics in autonomous driving and are expected in future works. Above all, we hope our review serves as a valuable reference for both researchers and practitioners in developing robust radar perception, making our vehicles and transportation systems safer and more efficient.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was funded by Suzhou Municipal Key Laboratory for Intelligent Virtual Engineering (SZS2022004), Research Development Fund of XJTLU (RDF-19-02-23), XJTLU AI University Research Centre, Jiangsu Province Engineering Research Centre of Data Science and Cognitive Computation at XJTLU, SIP AI innovation platform (YZCXPT2022103) and Suzhou Science and Technology Project (SYG202122). This work received financial support from Jiangsu Industrial Technology Research Institute (JITRI) and Wuxi National Hi-Tech District (WND).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Yao, R. Guan, X. Huang, Z. Li, X. Sha, Y. Yue, E. G. Lim, H. Seo, K. L. Man, X. Zhu *et al.*, "Radar-camera fusion for object detection and semantic segmentation in autonomous driving: A comprehensive review," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [2] A. Venon, Y. Dupuis, P. Vasseur, and P. Merriaux, "Millimeter wave fmcw radars for perception, recognition and localization in automotive applications: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 533–555, 2022.
- [3] B. Major, D. Fontijne, A. Ansari, R. Teja Sukhvasi, R. Gowaikar, M. Hamilton, S. Lee, S. Grzechnik, and S. Subramanian, "Vehicle detection with automotive radar using deep learning on range-azimuth-doppler tensors," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, 2019, pp. 0–0.
- [4] Y. Wang, Z. Jiang, Y. Li, J.-N. Hwang, G. Xing, and H. Liu, "Rodnet: A real-time radar object detection network cross-supervised by camera-radar fused object 3d localization," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 954–967, 2021.
- [5] N. Scheiner, F. Kraus, F. Wei, B. Phan, F. Mannan, N. Appenrodt, W. Ritter, J. Dickmann, K. Dietmayer, B. Sick *et al.*, "Seeing around street corners: Non-line-of-sight detection and tracking in-the-wild using doppler radar," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 2068–2077.
- [6] G. Li, Y. Ge, Y. Wang, Q. Chen, and G. Wang, "Detection of human breathing in non-line-of-sight region by using mmwave fmcw radar," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 71, pp. 1–11, 2022.
- [7] J. Karangwa, J. Liu, and Z. Zeng, "Vehicle detection for autonomous driving: A review of algorithms and datasets," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2023.
- [8] Y. Zhang, R. Yang, Y. Yue, E. G. Lim, and Z. Wang, "An overview of algorithms for contactless cardiac feature extraction from radar signals: Advances and challenges," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 2023.
- [9] S. D. Da Cruz, H.-P. Beise, U. Schröder, and U. Karahasanovic, "A theoretical investigation of the detection of vital signs in presence of car vibrations and radar-based passenger classification," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 3374–3385, 2019.
- [10] F. Wang, X. Zeng, C. Wu, B. Wang, and K. R. Liu, "Driver vital signs monitoring using millimeter wave radio," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 13, pp. 11 283–11 298, 2021.
- [11] S. Chen, W. He, J. Ren, and X. Jiang, "Attention-based dual-stream vision transformer for radar gait recognition," in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 3668–3672.
- [12] W. Jiang, Z. Wei, B. Li, Z. Feng, and Z. Fang, "Improve radar sensing performance of multiple roadside units cooperation via space registration," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 71, no. 10, pp. 10 975–10 990, 2022.
- [13] S. Huang, N. Jiang, Y. Gao, W. Xu, Z. Feng, and F. Zhu, "Radar sensing-throughput tradeoff for radar assisted cognitive radio enabled vehicular ad-hoc networks," *IEEE transactions on vehicular technology*, vol. 69, no. 7, pp. 7483–7492, 2020.
- [14] C. Iovescu and S. Rao, "The fundamentals of millimeter wave sensors," *Texas Instruments*, pp. 1–8, 2017.
- [15] S. Saponara, M. S. Greco, and F. Gini, "Radar-on-chip/in-package in autonomous driving vehicles and intelligent transport systems: Opportunities and challenges," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 71–84, 2019.
- [16] G. Li, Y. L. Sit, S. Manchala, T. Kettner, A. Ossowska, K. Krupinski, C. Sturm, S. Goerner, and U. Lübbert, "Pioneer study on near-range sensing with 4d mimo-fmcw automotive radars," in *2019 20th International Radar Symposium (IRS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–10.
- [17] Z. Han, J. Wang, Z. Xu, S. Yang, L. He, S. Xu, and J. Wang, "4d millimeter-wave radar in autonomous driving: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04242*, 2023.
- [18] R. Appleby and R. N. Anderton, "Millimeter-wave and submillimeter-wave imaging for security and surveillance," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 8, pp. 1683–1690, 2007.
- [19] P. Fritsche, S. Kueppers, G. Briese, and B. Wagner, "Radar and lidar sensorfusion in low visibility environments," in *ICINCO (2)*, 2016, pp. 30–36.
- [20] J. Liu, W. Xiong, L. Bai, Y. Xia, T. Huang, W. Ouyang, and B. Zhu, "Deep instance segmentation with automotive radar detection points," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 84–94, 2022.
- [21] Y. Long, D. Morris, X. Liu, M. Castro, P. Chakravarty, and P. Narayanan, "Full-velocity radar returns by radar-camera fusion," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 16 198–16 207.
- [22] Y. Li, J. Deng, Y. Zhang, J. Ji, H. Li, and Y. Zhang, "Ezfusion: A close look at the integration of lidar, millimeter-wave radar, and camera

- for accurate 3d object detection and tracking,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 11 182–11 189, 2022.
- [23] H. Griffiths, L. Cohen, S. Watts, E. Mokole, C. Baker, M. Wicks, and S. Blunt, “Radar spectrum engineering and management: Technical and regulatory issues,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 85–102, 2014.
- [24] J. Kopp, D. Kellner, A. Piroli, and K. Dietmayer, “Tackling clutter in radar data-label generation and detection using pointnet++,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1493–1499.
- [25] Y. Zhou, L. Liu, H. Zhao, M. López-Benítez, L. Yu, and Y. Yue, “Towards deep radar perception for autonomous driving: Datasets, methods, and challenges,” *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 11, p. 4208, 2022.
- [26] K. M. Cuomo, J. E. Pion, and J. T. Mayhan, “Ultrawide-band coherent processing,” *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 1094–1107, 1999.
- [27] X. Cai, M. Giallorenzo, and K. Sarabandi, “Machine learning-based target classification for mmw radar in autonomous driving,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 678–689, 2021.
- [28] E. F. Knott, J. F. Schaeffer, and M. T. Tully, “Radar cross section,” 2004.
- [29] H. Rohling, “Radar cfar thresholding in clutter and multiple target situations,” *IEEE transactions on aerospace and electronic systems*, no. 4, pp. 608–621, 1983.
- [30] P. P. Gandhi and S. A. Kassam, “Analysis of cfar processors in nonhomogeneous background,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 427–445, 1988.
- [31] A. Melebari, A. K. Mishra, and M. A. Gaffar, “Comparison of square law, linear and bessel detectors for ca and os cfar algorithms,” in *2015 IEEE Radar Conference*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 383–388.
- [32] M. Weiss, “Analysis of some modified cell-averaging cfar processors in multiple-target situations,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, no. 1, pp. 102–114, 1982.
- [33] V. G. Hansen and J. H. Sawyers, “Detectability loss due to ‘greatest of’ selection in a cell-averaging cfar,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, no. 1, pp. 115–118, 1980.
- [34] G. V. Trunk, “Range resolution of targets using automatic detectors,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, no. 5, pp. 750–755, 1978.
- [35] J. T. Rickard and G. M. Dillard, “Adaptive detection algorithms for multiple-target spectral data,” in *1977 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control including the 16th Symposium on Adaptive Processes and A Special Symposium on Fuzzy Set Theory and Applications*. IEEE, 1977, pp. 515–518.
- [36] J. Zhao, R. Jiang, X. Wang, and H. Gao, “Robust cfar detection for multiple targets in k-distributed sea clutter based on machine learning,” *Symmetry*, vol. 11, no. 12, p. 1482, 2019.
- [37] M. Ester, H.-P. Kriegel, J. Sander, X. Xu *et al.*, “A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise,” in *kdd*, vol. 96, no. 34, 1996, pp. 226–231.
- [38] T.-Y. Lim, S. A. Markowitz, and M. N. Do, “Radical: A synchronized fmcw radar, depth, imu and rgb camera data dataset with low-level fmcw radar signals,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 941–953, 2021.
- [39] J. Rebut, A. Ouaknine, W. Malik, and P. Pérez, “Raw high-definition radar for multi-task learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 17 021–17 030.
- [40] A. Ouaknine, A. Newson, J. Rebut, F. Tupin, and P. Pérez, “Carrada dataset: Camera and automotive radar with range-angle-doppler annotations,” in *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 5068–5075.
- [41] M. Mostajabi, C. M. Wang, D. Ranjan, and G. Hsyu, “High-resolution radar dataset for semi-supervised learning of dynamic objects,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, 2020, pp. 100–101.
- [42] M. Sheeny, E. De Pellegrin, S. Mukherjee, A. Ahrabian, S. Wang, and A. Wallace, “Radiate: A radar dataset for automotive perception in bad weather,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [43] G. Kim, Y. S. Park, Y. Cho, J. Jeong, and A. Kim, “Mulran: Multimodal range dataset for urban place recognition,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 6246–6253.
- [44] D. Barnes, M. Gadd, P. Murcutt, P. Newman, and I. Posner, “The oxford radar robotcar dataset: A radar extension to the oxford robotcar dataset,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 6433–6438.
- [45] F. E. Nowruzi, D. Kolhatkar, P. Kapoor, F. Al Hassanat, E. J. Heravi, R. Laganieri, J. Rebut, and W. Malik, “Deep open space segmentation using automotive radar,” in *2020 IEEE MTT-S International Conference on Microwaves for Intelligent Mobility (ICMIM)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–4.
- [46] Y. Wang, G. Wang, H.-M. Hsu, H. Liu, and J.-N. Hwang, “Rethinking of radar’s role: A camera-radar dataset and systematic annotator via coordinate alignment,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 2815–2824.
- [47] A. Zhang, F. E. Nowruzi, and R. Laganieri, “Raddet: Range-azimuth-doppler based radar object detection for dynamic road users,” in *2021 18th Conference on Robots and Vision (CRV)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 95–102.
- [48] K. Burnett, D. J. Yoon, Y. Wu, A. Z. Li, H. Zhang, S. Lu, J. Qian, W.-K. Tseng, A. Lambert, K. Y. Leung *et al.*, “Boreas: A multi-season autonomous driving dataset,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 42, no. 1-2, pp. 33–42, 2023.
- [49] A. Kramer, K. Harlow, C. Williams, and C. Heckman, “Coloradar: The direct 3d millimeter wave radar dataset,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 351–360, 2022.
- [50] D.-H. Paek, S.-H. Kong, and K. T. Wijaya, “K-radar: 4d radar object detection for autonomous driving in various weather conditions,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 3819–3829, 2022.
- [51] M. Gadd, D. De Martini, O. Bartlett, P. Murcutt, M. Towilson, M. Widodo, V. Muşat, L. Robinson, E. Panagiotaki, G. Pramatarov *et al.*, “Oord: The oxford offroad radar dataset,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02845*, 2024.
- [52] H. Caesar, V. Bankiti, A. H. Lang, S. Vora, V. E. Liong, Q. Xu, A. Krishnan, Y. Pan, G. Baldan, and O. Beijbom, “nusenes: A multimodal dataset for autonomous driving,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 11 621–11 631.
- [53] M. Meyer and G. Kuschik, “Automotive radar dataset for deep learning based 3d object detection,” in *2019 16th european radar conference (EuRAD)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 129–132.
- [54] M. Bijelic, T. Gruber, F. Mannan, F. Kraus, W. Ritter, K. Dietmayer, and F. Heide, “Seeing through fog without seeing fog: Deep multimodal sensor fusion in unseen adverse weather,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 11 682–11 692.
- [55] X. Weng, Y. Man, J. Park, Y. Yuan, M. O’Toole, and K. M. Kitani, “All-in-one drive: A comprehensive perception dataset with high-density long-range point clouds,” 2023.
- [56] O. Schumann, M. Hahn, N. Scheiner, F. Weishaupt, J. F. Tilly, J. Dickmann, and C. Wöhler, “Radarscenes: A real-world radar point cloud data set for automotive applications,” in *2021 IEEE 24th International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–8.
- [57] J.-L. Déziel, P. Merriault, F. Tremblay, D. Lessard, D. Plourde, J. Stanguennec, P. Goulet, and P. Olivier, “Pixset: An opportunity for 3d computer vision to go beyond point clouds with a full-waveform lidar dataset,” in *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (itsc)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 2987–2993.
- [58] A. Palffy, E. Pool, S. Baratam, J. F. Kooij, and D. M. Gavrila, “Multi-class road user detection with 3+ 1d radar in the view-of-delft dataset,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 4961–4968, 2022.
- [59] L. Zheng, Z. Ma, X. Zhu, B. Tan, S. Li, K. Long, W. Sun, S. Chen, L. Zhang, M. Wan *et al.*, “Tj4dradset: A 4d radar dataset for autonomous driving,” in *2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 493–498.
- [60] T. Matuszka, I. Barton, Á. Butykai, P. Hajas, D. Kiss, D. Kovács, S. Kunsági-Máté, P. Lengyel, G. Németh, L. Pető *et al.*, “aimotive dataset: A multimodal dataset for robust autonomous driving with long-range perception,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09445*, 2022.
- [61] S. Yao, R. Guan, Z. Wu, Y. Ni, Z. Zhang, Z. Huang, X. Zhu, Y. Yue, Y. Yue, H. Seo *et al.*, “Waterscenes: A multi-task 4d radar-camera fusion dataset and benchmark for autonomous driving on water surfaces,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06505*, 2023.
- [62] J. Zhang, H. Zhuge, Y. Liu, G. Peng, Z. Wu, H. Zhang, Q. Lyu, H. Li, C. Zhao, D. Kircali *et al.*, “Ntu4dradlm: 4d radar-centric multi-modal dataset for localization and mapping,” in *2023 IEEE 26th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 4291–4296.
- [63] X. Zhang, L. Wang, J. Chen, C. Fang, L. Yang, Z. Song, G. Yang, Y. Wang, X. Zhang, and J. Li, “Dual radar: A multi-modal

- dataset with dual 4d radar for autonomous driving,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07602*, 2023.
- [64] H. Cui, S. Zhong, J. Wu, Z. Shen, N. Dahnoun, and Y. Zhao, “Milipoint: A point cloud dataset for mmwave radar,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [65] M. Ritchie, R. Capraru, and F. Fioranelli, “Dop-net: a micro-doppler radar data challenge,” *Electronics Letters*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 568–570, 2020.
- [66] S. Z. Gurbuz, M. M. Rahman, E. Kurtoglu, T. Macks, and F. Fioranelli, “Cross-frequency training with adversarial learning for radar micro-doppler signature classification (rising researcher),” in *Radar Sensor Technology XXIV*, vol. 11408. SPIE, 2020, pp. 58–68.
- [67] D. Gusland, J. M. Christiansen, B. Torvik, F. Fioranelli, S. Z. Gurbuz, and M. Ritchie, “Open radar initiative: Large scale dataset for benchmarking of micro-doppler recognition algorithms,” in *2021 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf21)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [68] Y. Li, D. Zhang, J. Chen, J. Wan, D. Zhang, Y. Hu, Q. Sun, and Y. Chen, “Towards domain-independent and real-time gesture recognition using mmwave signal,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2022.
- [69] K. Shi, S. Schellenberger, C. Will, T. Steigleder, F. Michler, J. Fuchs, R. Weigel, C. Ostgathe, and A. Koelpin, “A dataset of radar-recorded heart sounds and vital signs including synchronised reference sensor signals,” *Scientific data*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 50, 2020.
- [70] J. Gong, X. Zhang, K. Lin, J. Ren, Y. Zhang, and W. Qiu, “Rf vital sign sensing under free body movement,” *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1–22, 2021.
- [71] S. Yoo, S. Ahmed, S. Kang, D. Hwang, J. Lee, J. Son, and S. H. Cho, “Radar recorded child vital sign public dataset and deep learning-based age group classification framework for vehicular application,” *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 7, p. 2412, 2021.
- [72] J. Chen, D. Zhang, Z. Wu, F. Zhou, Q. Sun, and Y. Chen, “Contactless electrocardiogram monitoring with millimeter wave radar,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2022.
- [73] S. M. Islam, N. Motoyama, S. Pacheco, and V. M. Lubecke, “Non-contact vital signs monitoring for multiple subjects using a millimeter wave fmcw automotive radar,” in *2020 IEEE/MTT-S International Microwave Symposium (IMS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 783–786.
- [74] T. Stadelmayer, A. Santra, R. Weigel, and F. Lurz, “Data-driven radar processing using a parametric convolutional neural network for human activity classification,” *IEEE sensors journal*, vol. 21, no. 17, pp. 19 529–19 540, 2021.
- [75] T. Stadelmayer, A. Santra, M. Stadelmayer, R. Weigel, and F. Lurz, “Improved target detection and feature extraction using a complex-valued adaptive sine filter on radar time domain data,” in *2021 29th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1745–1749.
- [76] M. Arsalan, A. Santra, and V. Issakov, “Spiking neural network-based radar gesture recognition system using raw adc data,” *IEEE Sensors Letters*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 1–4, 2022.
- [77] P. Zhao, C. X. Lu, B. Wang, N. Trigoni, and A. Markham, “Cubelearn: End-to-end learning for human motion recognition from raw mmwave radar signals,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2023.
- [78] B. Yang, I. Khatri, M. Happold, and C. Chen, “Adcnnet: End-to-end perception with raw radar adc data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11420*, 2023.
- [79] J. Giroux, M. Bouchard, and R. Laganieri, “T-fftradnet: Object detection with swin vision transformers from raw adc radar signals,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 4030–4039.
- [80] Y. Liu, F. Wang, N. Wang, and Z.-X. ZHANG, “Echoes beyond points: Unleashing the power of raw radar data in multi-modality fusion,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [81] Y.-J. Li, S. Hunt, J. Park, M. O’Toole, and K. Kitani, “Azimuth super-resolution for fmcw radar in autonomous driving,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 17 504–17 513.
- [82] A. R. Diewald, J. Landwehr, D. Tatarinov, P. D. M. Cola, C. Watgen, C. Mica, M. Lu-Dac, P. Larsen, O. Gomez, and T. Goniva, “Rf-based child occupation detection in the vehicle interior,” in *2016 17th international radar symposium (IRS)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–4.
- [83] Y. Eder and Y. C. Eldar, “Sparsity-based multi-person non-contact vital signs monitoring via fmcw radar,” *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, 2023.
- [84] G. Paterniani, D. Sgreccia, A. Davoli, G. Guerzoni, P. Di Viesti, A. C. Valenti, M. Vitolo, G. M. Vitetta, and G. Boriani, “Radar-based monitoring of vital signs: A tutorial overview,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 2023.
- [85] E. Schires, P. Georgiou, and T. S. Lande, “Vital sign monitoring through the back using an uwB impulse radar with body coupled antennas,” *IEEE transactions on biomedical circuits and systems*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 292–302, 2018.
- [86] J. Le Kernec, F. Fioranelli, C. Ding, H. Zhao, L. Sun, H. Hong, J. Lorandell, and O. Romain, “Radar signal processing for sensing in assisted living: The challenges associated with real-time implementation of emerging algorithms,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 29–41, 2019.
- [87] M. Stephan, T. Stadelmayer, A. Santra, G. Fischer, R. Weigel, and F. Lurz, “Radar image reconstruction from raw adc data using parametric variational autoencoder with domain adaptation,” in *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 9529–9536.
- [88] X. Gao, G. Xing, S. Roy, and H. Liu, “Experiments with mmwave automotive radar test-bed,” in *2019 53rd Asilomar conference on signals, systems, and computers*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [89] Y. Cheng, J. Zhu, M. Jiang, J. Fu, C. Pang, P. Wang, K. Sankaran, O. Onabola, Y. Liu, D. Liu *et al.*, “Flow: A dataset and benchmark for floating waste detection in inland waters,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 10 953–10 962.
- [90] S. Ren, K. He, R. Girshick, and J. Sun, “Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [91] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [92] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, “U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation,” in *Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention—MICCAI 2015: 18th international conference, Munich, Germany, October 5-9, 2015, proceedings, part III 18*. Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 234–241.
- [93] X. Dong, P. Wang, P. Zhang, and L. Liu, “Probabilistic oriented object detection in automotive radar,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, 2020, pp. 102–103.
- [94] K. Patel, K. Rambach, T. Visentin, D. Rusev, M. Pfeiffer, and B. Yang, “Deep learning-based object classification on automotive radar spectra,” in *2019 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [95] T.-Y. Huang, M.-C. Lee, C.-H. Yang, and T.-S. Lee, “Yolo-ore: A deep learning-aided object recognition approach for radar systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 2022.
- [96] A.-E. Cozma, L. Morgan, M. Stolz, D. Stoetzel, and K. Rambach, “DeepHybrid: Deep learning on automotive radar spectra and reflections for object classification,” in *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 2682–2687.
- [97] W. Ng, G. Wang, Z. Lin, B. J. Dutta *et al.*, “Range-doppler detection in automotive radar with deep learning,” in *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–8.
- [98] C. Decourt, R. VanRullen, D. Salle, and T. Oberlin, “Darod: A deep automotive radar object detector on range-doppler maps,” in *2022 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 112–118.
- [99] Y. Jin, A. Deligiannis, J.-C. Fuentes-Michel, and M. Vossiek, “Cross-modal supervision-based multitask learning with automotive radar raw data,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [100] X. Gao, G. Xing, S. Roy, and H. Liu, “Ramp-cnn: A novel neural network for enhanced automotive radar object recognition,” *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 5119–5132, 2020.
- [101] A. Palffy, J. Dong, J. F. Kooij, and D. M. Gavrilu, “Cnn based road user detection using the 3d radar cube,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1263–1270, 2020.
- [102] F. E. Nowruz, D. Kolhatkar, P. Kapoor, E. J. Heravi, F. A. Hassanat, R. Laganieri, J. Rebut, and W. Malik, “Polarnet: Accelerated deep open space segmentation using automotive radar in polar domain,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03387*, 2021.
- [103] A. Ouaknine, A. Newson, P. Pérez, F. Tupin, and J. Rebut, “Multi-view radar semantic segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 15 671–15 680.
- [104] Y. Dalbah, J. Lahoud, and H. Cholakkal, “Transradar: Adaptive-directional transformer for real-time multi-view radar semantic segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2024, pp. 353–362.

- [105] D.-H. Paek, S.-H. Kong, and K. T. Wijaya, "Enhanced k-radar: Optimal density reduction to improve detection performance and accessibility of 4d radar tensor-based object detection," in *2023 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [106] B. Liu, M. Wang, H. Foroosh, M. Tappen, and M. Pensky, "Sparse convolutional neural networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 806–814.
- [107] J. Guan, S. Madani, S. Jog, S. Gupta, and H. Hassanieh, "Through fog high-resolution imaging using millimeter wave radar," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 11 464–11 473.
- [108] M. Meyer and G. Kusch, "Deep learning based 3d object detection for automotive radar and camera," in *2019 16th European Radar Conference (EuRAD)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 133–136.
- [109] A. Danzer, T. Griebel, M. Bach, and K. Dietmayer, "2d car detection in radar data with pointnets," in *2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 61–66.
- [110] J. F. Tilly, S. Haag, O. Schumann, F. Weishaupt, B. Duraisamy, J. Dickmann, and M. Fritzsche, "Detection and tracking on automotive radar data with deep learning," in *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–7.
- [111] B. Xu, X. Zhang, L. Wang, X. Hu, Z. Li, S. Pan, J. Li, and Y. Deng, "Rpfa-net: A 4d radar pillar feature attention network for 3d object detection," in *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 3061–3066.
- [112] W. Xiong, J. Liu, Y. Xia, T. Huang, B. Zhu, and W. Xiang, "Contrastive learning for automotive mmwave radar detection points based instance segmentation," in *2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1255–1261.
- [113] O. Schumann, M. Hahn, J. Dickmann, and C. Wöhler, "Semantic segmentation on radar point clouds," in *2018 21st International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 2179–2186.
- [114] Z. Feng, S. Zhang, M. Kunert, and W. Wiesbeck, "Point cloud segmentation with a high-resolution automotive radar," in *AM 2019-Automotive meets Electronics; 10th GMM-Symposium*. VDE, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [115] O. Schumann, M. Hahn, J. Dickmann, and C. Wöhler, "Supervised clustering for radar applications: On the way to radar instance segmentation," in *2018 IEEE MTT-S International Conference on Microwaves for Intelligent Mobility (ICMIM)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–4.
- [116] F. Nobis, F. Fent, J. Betz, and M. Lienkamp, "Kernel point convolution lstm networks for radar point cloud segmentation," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 6, p. 2599, 2021.
- [117] P. Kaul, D. De Martini, M. Gadd, and P. Newman, "Rss-net: Weakly-supervised multi-class semantic segmentation with fmcw radar," in *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 431–436.
- [118] S. Siddhartha, G. Wang, and B. Dutta, "Panoptic segmentation for automotive radar point cloud," in *2022 IEEE Radar Conference (Radar-Conf22)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [119] J. Liu, G. Ding, Y. Xia, J. Sun, T. Huang, L. Xie, and B. Zhu, "Which framework is suitable for online 3d multi-object tracking for autonomous driving with automotive 4d imaging radar?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06036*, 2023.
- [120] Z. Pan, F. Ding, H. Zhong, and C. X. Lu, "Moving object detection and tracking with 4d radar point cloud," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09737*, 2023.
- [121] J. Deng, G. Chan, H. Zhong, and C. X. Lu, "See beyond seeing: Robust 3d object detection from point clouds via cross-modal hallucination," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17336*, 2023.
- [122] S. Lu, G. Zhuo, L. Xiong, X. Zhu, L. Zheng, Z. He, M. Zhou, X. Lu, and J. Bai, "Efficient deep-learning 4d automotive radar odometry method," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [123] H. Chen, Y. Liu, and Y. Cheng, "Drio: Robust radar-inertial odometry in dynamic environments," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- [124] F. Ding, Z. Pan, Y. Deng, J. Deng, and C. X. Lu, "Self-supervised scene flow estimation with 4-d automotive radar," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 8233–8240, 2022.
- [125] F. Ding, A. Palffy, D. M. Gavrilu, and C. X. Lu, "Hidden gems: 4d radar scene flow learning using cross-modal supervision," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 9340–9349.
- [126] F. Ding, Z. Luo, P. Zhao, and C. X. Lu, "milliflow: Scene flow estimation on mmwave radar point cloud for human motion sensing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17010*, 2023.
- [127] O. Schumann, C. Wöhler, M. Hahn, and J. Dickmann, "Comparison of random forest and long short-term memory network performances in classification tasks using radar," in *2017 Sensor Data Fusion: Trends, Solutions, Applications (SDF)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [128] N. Scheiner, N. Appenrodt, J. Dickmann, and B. Sick, "Radar-based feature design and multiclass classification for road user recognition," in *2018 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 779–786.
- [129] N. Scheiner, O. Schumann, F. Kraus, N. Appenrodt, J. Dickmann, and B. 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.
- [130] C. R. Qi, H. Su, K. Mo, and L. J. Guibas, "Pointnet: Deep learning on point sets for 3d classification and segmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 652–660.
- [131] C. R. Qi, L. Yi, H. Su, and L. J. Guibas, "Pointnet++: Deep hierarchical feature learning on point sets in a metric space," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [132] C. R. Qi, W. Liu, C. Wu, H. Su, and L. J. Guibas, "Frustum pointnets for 3d object detection from rgb-d data," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 918–927.
- [133] Y. Kim, J. W. Choi, and D. Kum, "Grif net: Gated region of interest fusion network for robust 3d object detection from radar point cloud and monocular image," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 10 857–10 864.
- [134] F. Nobis, E. Shafiei, P. Karle, J. Betz, and M. Lienkamp, "Radar voxel fusion for 3d object detection," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 12, p. 5598, 2021.
- [135] W. Xiong, J. Liu, T. Huang, Q.-L. Han, Y. Xia, and B. Zhu, "Lxl: Lidar excluded lean 3d object detection with 4d imaging radar and camera fusion," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [136] Y. Zhou and O. Tuzel, "Voxelnet: End-to-end learning for point cloud based 3d object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 4490–4499.
- [137] Y. Yan, Y. Mao, and B. Li, "Second: Sparsely embedded convolutional detection," *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 10, p. 3337, 2018.
- [138] M. Ren, A. Pokrovsky, B. Yang, and R. Urtasun, "Sbnet: Sparse blocks network for fast inference," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 8711–8720.
- [139] A. H. Lang, S. Vora, H. Caesar, L. Zhou, J. Yang, and O. Beijbom, "Pointpillars: Fast encoders for object detection from point clouds," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 12 697–12 705.
- [140] K. Werber, M. Rapp, J. Klappstein, M. Hahn, J. Dickmann, K. Dietmayer, and C. Waldschmidt, "Automotive radar gridmap representations," in *2015 IEEE MTT-S International Conference on Microwaves for Intelligent Mobility (ICMIM)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–4.
- [141] J. Lombacher, M. Hahn, J. Dickmann, and C. Wöhler, "Detection of arbitrarily rotated parked cars based on radar sensors," in *2015 16th International Radar Symposium (IRS)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 180–185.
- [142] J. Lombacher, K. Laudt, M. Hahn, J. Dickmann, and C. Wöhler, "Semantic radar grids," in *2017 IEEE intelligent vehicles symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1170–1175.
- [143] J. Degerman, T. Pernstål, and K. Alenljung, "3d occupancy grid mapping using statistical radar models," in *2016 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 902–908.
- [144] R. Prophet, G. Li, C. Sturm, and M. Vossiek, "Semantic segmentation on automotive radar maps," in *2019 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 756–763.
- [145] R. Prophet, A. Deligiannis, J.-C. Fuentes-Michel, I. Weber, and M. Vossiek, "Semantic segmentation on 3d occupancy grids for automotive radar," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 197 917–197 930, 2020.
- [146] R. Prophet, H. Stark, M. Hoffmann, C. Sturm, and M. Vossiek, "Adaptions for automotive radar based occupancy gridmaps," in *2018 IEEE MTT-S International Conference on Microwaves for Intelligent Mobility (ICMIM)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–4.
- [147] M. Li, Z. Feng, M. Stolz, M. Kunert, R. Henze, and F. Küçükay, "High resolution radar-based occupancy grid mapping and free space detection," in *VEHITS*, 2018, pp. 70–81.
- [148] L. Sless, B. El Shlomo, G. Cohen, and S. Oron, "Road scene understanding by occupancy grid learning from sparse radar clusters using semantic segmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, 2019, pp. 0–0.

- [149] O. Schumann, J. Lombacher, M. Hahn, C. Wöhler, and J. Dickmann, "Scene understanding with automotive radar," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 188–203, 2019.
- [150] K. Qian, S. Zhu, X. Zhang, and L. E. Li, "Robust multimodal vehicle detection in foggy weather using complementary lidar and radar signals," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 444–453.
- [151] A. Popov, P. Gebhardt, K. Chen, and R. Oldja, "Nvradarnet: Real-time radar obstacle and free space detection for autonomous driving," in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 6958–6964.
- [152] T. Li, J. M. Corchado, J. Bajo, S. Sun, and J. F. De Paz, "Effectiveness of bayesian filters: An information fusion perspective," *Information Sciences*, vol. 329, pp. 670–689, 2016.
- [153] Y. Jin, M. Hoffmann, A. Deligiannis, J.-C. Fuentes-Michel, and M. Vossiek, "Semantic segmentation-based occupancy grid map learning with automotive radar raw data," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [154] M. I. Hussain, S. Azam, M. A. Rafique, A. M. Sheri, and M. Jeon, "Drivable region estimation for self-driving vehicles using radar," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 71, no. 6, pp. 5971–5982, 2022.
- [155] Y. Jin, R. Prophet, A. Deligiannis, J.-C. Fuentes-Michel, and M. Vossiek, "Point-cloud-based road course estimation on automotive radar data," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Microwaves, Antennas, Communications and Electronic Systems (COMCAS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 29–34.
- [156] A. Srivastav and S. Mandal, "Radars for autonomous driving: A review of deep learning methods and challenges," *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [157] R. Prophet, Y. Jin, J.-C. Fuentes-Michel, A. Deligiannis, I. Weber, and M. Vossiek, "Cnn based road course estimation on automotive radar data with various gridmaps," in *2020 IEEE MTT-S International Conference on Microwaves for Intelligent Mobility (ICMIM)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–4.
- [158] A. Angelov, A. Robertson, R. Murray-Smith, and F. Fioranelli, "Practical classification of different moving targets using automotive radar and deep neural networks," *IET Radar, Sonar & Navigation*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 1082–1089, 2018.
- [159] S. Z. Gurbuz and M. G. Amin, "Radar-based human-motion recognition with deep learning: Promising applications for indoor monitoring," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 16–28, 2019.
- [160] Y. Kim and T. Moon, "Human detection and activity classification based on micro-doppler signatures using deep convolutional neural networks," *IEEE geoscience and remote sensing letters*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 8–12, 2015.
- [161] A.-K. Seifert, M. G. Amin, and A. M. Zoubir, "New analysis of radar micro-doppler gait signatures for rehabilitation and assisted living," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 4004–4008.
- [162] H. T. Le, S. L. Phung, A. Bouzerdoum, and F. H. C. Tivive, "Human motion classification with micro-doppler radar and bayesian-optimized convolutional neural networks," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 2961–2965.
- [163] J. Zhang, J. Tao, and Z. Shi, "Doppler-radar based hand gesture recognition system using convolutional neural networks," in *Communications, Signal Processing, and Systems: Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Communications, Signal Processing, and Systems*. Springer, 2019, pp. 1096–1113.
- [164] S. Björklund, T. Johansson, and H. Petersson, "Evaluation of a micro-doppler classification method on mm-wave data," in *2012 IEEE Radar Conference*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 0934–0939.
- [165] A.-K. Seifert, M. G. Amin, and A. M. Zoubir, "Toward unobtrusive in-home gait analysis based on radar micro-doppler signatures," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 66, no. 9, pp. 2629–2640, 2019.
- [166] L. Ren, A. Yarovoy, and F. Fioranelli, "Grouped people counting using mm-wave fmcw mimo radar," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2023.
- [167] M. Chamseddine, J. Rambach, D. Stricker, and O. Wasenmuller, "Ghost target detection in 3d radar data using point cloud based deep neural network," in *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 10398–10403.
- [168] B. Tan, Z. Ma, X. Zhu, S. Li, L. Zheng, S. Chen, L. Huang, and J. Bai, "3d object detection for multi-frame 4d automotive millimeter-wave radar point cloud," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 2022.
- [169] X. Li, K.-Y. Lin, M. Meng, X. Li, L. Li, Y. Hong, and J. Chen, "A survey of adas perceptions with development in china," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 14188–14203, 2022.
- [170] Y. Guo, X. Wang, X. Lan, and T. Su, "Traffic target location estimation based on tensor decomposition in intelligent transportation system," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2022.
- [171] S. T. Isele, F. Klein, M. Brosowsky, and J. M. Zöllner, "Learning semantics on radar point-clouds," in *2021 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 810–817.
- [172] Z. Li, F. Fioranelli, S. Yang, J. Le Kernec, Q. Abbasi, and O. Romain, "Human activity classification with adaptive thresholding using radar micro-doppler," in *2021 CIE International Conference on Radar (Radar)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1511–1515.
- [173] Y. Yao, W. Liu, G. Zhang, and W. Hu, "Radar-based human activity recognition using hyperdimensional computing," *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 1605–1619, 2021.
- [174] S. Steyer, G. Tanzmeister, and D. Wollherr, "Grid-based environment estimation using evidential mapping and particle tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 384–396, 2018.
- [175] D. G. Michelson and E. V. Jull, "Depolarizing trihedral corner reflectors for radar navigation and remote sensing," *IEEE transactions on antennas and propagation*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 513–518, 1995.
- [176] J. Dornhof, J. F. Kooij, and D. M. Gavrilu, "A joint extrinsic calibration tool for radar, camera and lidar," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 571–582, 2021.
- [177] H. Cui, J. Wu, J. Zhang, G. Chowdhary, and W. R. Norris, "3d detection and tracking for on-road vehicles with a monovision camera and dual low-cost 4d mmwave radars," in *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 2931–2937.
- [178] J. Zhang, S. Zhang, G. Peng, H. Zhang, and D. Wang, "3dradar2thermalcalib: accurate extrinsic calibration between a 3d mmwave radar and a thermal camera using a spherical-trihedral," in *2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2744–2749.
- [179] N. Petrov, O. Krasnov, and A. G. Yarovoy, "Auto-calibration of automotive radars in operational mode using simultaneous localisation and mapping," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 2062–2075, 2021.
- [180] X. Li, Y. Liu, V. Lakshminarasimhan, H. Cao, F. Zhang, and A. Knoll, "Globally optimal robust radar calibration in intelligent transportation systems," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2023.
- [181] F. Nobis, M. Geisslinger, M. Weber, J. Betz, and M. Lienkamp, "A deep learning-based radar and camera sensor fusion architecture for object detection," in *2019 Sensor Data Fusion: Trends, Solutions, Applications (SDF)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [182] R. Nabati and H. Qi, "Centerfusion: Center-based radar and camera fusion for 3d object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 1527–1536.
- [183] Y. Long, D. Morris, X. Liu, M. Castro, P. Chakravarty, and P. Narayanan, "Radar-camera pixel depth association for depth completion," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 12507–12516.
- [184] A. W. Harley, Z. Fang, J. Li, R. Ambrus, and K. Fragkiadaki, "Simplebev: What really matters for multi-sensor bev perception?" in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2759–2765.
- [185] L.-q. Li and Y.-l. Xie, "A feature pyramid fusion detection algorithm based on radar and camera sensor," in *2020 15th IEEE International Conference on Signal Processing (ICSP)*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2020, pp. 366–370.
- [186] L. Stäcker, P. Heidenreich, J. Rambach, and D. Stricker, "Fusion point pruning for optimized 2d object detection with radar-camera fusion," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 3087–3094.
- [187] W. Wang, R. Yu, Q. Huang, and U. Neumann, "Sgpn: Similarity group proposal network for 3d point cloud instance segmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 2569–2578.
- [188] J. Wang, "Cfar-based interference mitigation for fmcw automotive radar systems," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 12229–12238, 2021.
- [189] R. Zhang and S. Cao, "Support vector machines for classification of automotive radar interference," in *2018 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf18)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 0366–0371.

- [190] F. Jin and S. Cao, "Automotive radar interference mitigation using adaptive noise canceller," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 3747–3754, 2019.
- [191] M. Alhumaidi and M. Wintermantel, "Interference avoidance and mitigation in automotive radar," in *2020 17th European Radar Conference (EuRAD)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 172–175.
- [192] C. Schüßler, M. Hoffmann, I. Ullmann, R. Ebel, and M. Vossiek, "Deep learning based image enhancement for automotive radar trained with an advanced virtual sensor," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 40419–40431, 2022.
- [193] A. Dubey, J. Fuchs, V. Madhavan, M. Lübke, R. Weigel, and F. Lurz, "Region based single-stage interference mitigation and target detection," in *2020 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf20)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [194] N.-C. Ristea, A. Anghel, and R. T. Ionescu, "Fully convolutional neural networks for automotive radar interference mitigation," in *2020 IEEE 92nd Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2020-Fall)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [195] J. Fuchs, A. Dubey, M. Lübke, R. Weigel, and F. Lurz, "Automotive radar interference mitigation using a convolutional autoencoder," in *2020 IEEE International Radar Conference (RADAR)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 315–320.
- [196] S. Chen, J. Taghia, T. Fei, U. Kühnau, N. Pohl, and R. Martin, "A dnn autoencoder for automotive radar interference mitigation," in *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 4065–4069.
- [197] S. Chen, J. Taghia, U. Kühnau, N. Pohl, and R. Martin, "A two-stage dnn model with mask-gated convolution for automotive radar interference detection and mitigation," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 12 017–12 027, 2022.
- [198] M. L. L. de Oliveira and M. J. Bekooij, "Deep convolutional auto-encoder applied for noise reduction in range-doppler maps of fmcw radars," in *2020 IEEE International Radar Conference (RADAR)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 630–635.
- [199] A. E. Ilesanmi and T. O. Ilesanmi, "Methods for image denoising using convolutional neural network: a review," *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 2179–2198, 2021.
- [200] B. Rasti, Y. Chang, E. Dalsasso, L. Denis, and P. Ghamisi, "Image restoration for remote sensing: Overview and toolbox," *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Magazine*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 201–230, 2021.
- [201] Y. Cheng, J. Su, H. Chen, and Y. Liu, "A new automotive radar 4d point clouds detector by using deep learning," in *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 8398–8402.
- [202] H. Nosrati, E. Aboutanios, and D. Smith, "Multi-stage antenna selection for adaptive beamforming in mimo radar," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 1374–1389, 2020.
- [203] P. Kumari, N. J. Myers, and R. W. Heath, "Adaptive and fast combined waveform-beamforming design for mmwave automotive joint communication-radar," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 996–1012, 2021.
- [204] G. Hakobyan and B. 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.
- [205] H. Huang, J. Yang, H. Huang, Y. Song, and G. Gui, "Deep learning for super-resolution channel estimation and doa estimation based massive mimo system," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 8549–8560, 2018.
- [206] Y. Ma, Y. Zeng, and S. Sun, "A deep learning based super resolution doa estimator with single snapshot mimo radar data," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 4142–4155, 2022.
- [207] F. Scarselli, M. Gori, A. C. Tsoi, M. Hagenbuchner, and G. Monfardini, "The graph neural network model," *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 61–80, 2008.
- [208] P. Svenningsson, F. Fioranelli, and A. Yarovsky, "Radar-pointgcn: Graph based object recognition for unstructured radar point-cloud data," in *2021 IEEE Radar Conference (RadarConf21)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [209] F. Fent, P. Bauerschmidt, and M. Lienkamp, "Radargnn: Transformation invariant graph neural network for radar-based perception," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 182–191.
- [210] M. Meyer, G. Kuschik, and S. Tomforde, "Graph convolutional networks for 3d object detection on radar data," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 3060–3069.
- [211] Y. Wei, L. Zhao, W. Zheng, Z. Zhu, J. Zhou, and J. Lu, "Surroundocc: Multi-camera 3d occupancy prediction for autonomous driving," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 21 729–21 740.
- [212] W. Tong, C. Sima, T. Wang, L. Chen, S. Wu, H. Deng, Y. Gu, L. Lu, P. Luo, D. Lin *et al.*, "Scene as occupancy," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 8406–8415.
- [213] X. Tian, T. Jiang, L. Yun, Y. Mao, H. Yang, Y. Wang, Y. Wang, and H. Zhao, "Occ3d: A large-scale 3d occupancy prediction benchmark for autonomous driving," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [214] Y. Huang, W. Zheng, Y. Zhang, J. Zhou, and J. Lu, "Tri-perspective view for vision-based 3d semantic occupancy prediction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2023, pp. 9223–9232.
- [215] J. Liu, Q. Zhao, W. Xiong, T. Huang, Q.-L. Han, and B. Zhu, "Smurf: Spatial multi-representation fusion for 3d object detection with 4d imaging radar," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [216] Q. Yan and Y. Wang, "Mvfan: Multi-view feature assisted network for 4d radar object detection," in *International Conference on Neural Information Processing*. Springer Nature Singapore Singapore, 2023, pp. 493–511.
- [217] P. Palmer, M. Krueger, R. Altendorfer, G. Adam, and T. Bertram, "Reviewing 3d object detectors in the context of high-resolution 3+1d radar," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05478*, 2023.
- [218] J. Deng, S. Shi, P. Li, W. Zhou, Y. Zhang, and H. Li, "Voxel r-cnn: Towards high performance voxel-based 3d object detection," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2021, pp. 1201–1209.
- [219] S. Shi, X. Wang, and H. Li, "Pointrcnn: 3d object proposal generation and detection from point cloud," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 770–779.
- [220] S. Shi, C. Guo, L. Jiang, Z. Wang, J. Shi, X. Wang, and H. Li, "Pv-rcnn: Point-voxel feature set abstraction for 3d object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 10 529–10 538.
- [221] D. Feng, C. Haase-Schütz, L. Rosenbaum, H. Hertlein, C. Glaeser, F. Timm, W. Wiesbeck, and K. Dietmayer, "Deep multi-modal object detection and semantic segmentation for autonomous driving: Datasets, methods, and challenges," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1341–1360, 2020.
- [222] S. Chadwick, W. Maddern, and P. Newman, "Distant vehicle detection using radar and vision," in *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 8311–8317.
- [223] J. Bai, S. Li, L. Huang, and H. Chen, "Robust detection and tracking method for moving object based on radar and camera data fusion," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 10 761–10 774, 2021.
- [224] L. Wang, X. Zhang, J. Li, B. Xu, R. Fu, H. Chen, L. Yang, D. Jin, and L. Zhao, "Multi-modal and multi-scale fusion 3d object detection of 4d radar and lidar for autonomous driving," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 2022.
- [225] T. Zhou, J. Chen, Y. Shi, K. Jiang, M. Yang, and D. Yang, "Bridging the view disparity between radar and camera features for multi-modal fusion 3d object detection," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1523–1535, 2023.
- [226] Y. Kim, S. Kim, J. W. Choi, and D. Kum, "Craft: Camera-radar 3d object detection with spatio-contextual fusion transformer," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2023, pp. 1160–1168.
- [227] Y. Kim, J. Shin, S. Kim, I.-J. Lee, J. W. Choi, and D. Kum, "Crn: Camera radar net for accurate, robust, efficient 3d perception," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 17 615–17 626.
- [228] L. Zheng, S. Li, B. Tan, L. Yang, S. Chen, L. Huang, J. Bai, X. Zhu, and Z. Ma, "Rcfusion: Fusing 4d radar and camera with bird's-eye view features for 3d object detection," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 2023.
- [229] Y. Wang, J. Deng, Y. Li, J. Hu, C. Liu, Y. Zhang, J. Ji, W. Ouyang, and Y. Zhang, "Bi-lrfusion: Bi-directional lidar-radar fusion for 3d dynamic object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 13 394–13 403.
- [230] Y. Man, L.-Y. Gui, and Y.-X. Wang, "Bev-guided multi-modality fusion for driving perception," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 21 960–21 969.

- [231] Y. Tian, X. Zhang, X. Wang, J. Xu, J. Wang, R. Ai, W. Gu, and W. Ding, "Acf-net: Asymmetric cascade fusion for 3d detection with lidar point clouds and images," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [232] Y.-J. Li, M. O'Toole, and K. Kitani, "St-mvdnet++: Improve vehicle detection with lidar-radar geometrical augmentation via self-training," in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [233] Z. Liu, Y. Cai, H. Wang, L. Chen, H. Gao, Y. Jia, and Y. Li, "Robust target recognition and tracking of self-driving cars with radar and camera information fusion under severe weather conditions," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 6640–6653, 2021.
- [234] R. Guan, S. Yao, X. Zhu, K. L. Man, E. G. Lim, J. Smith, Y. Yue, and Y. Yue, "Achelous: A fast unified water-surface panoptic perception framework based on fusion of monocular camera and 4d mmwave radar," in *2023 IEEE 26th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 182–188.
- [235] R. Guan, S. Yao, X. Zhu, K. L. Man, Y. Yue, J. Smith, E. G. Lim, and Y. Yue, "Efficient-vrnet: An exquisite fusion network for riverway panoptic perception based on asymmetric fair fusion of vision and 4d mmwave radar," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10287*, 2023.
- [236] R. Guan, S. Yao, L. Liu, X. Zhu, K. L. Man, Y. Yue, J. Smith, E. G. Lim, and Y. Yue, "Mask-vrnet: A robust riverway panoptic perception model based on dual graph fusion of vision and 4d mmwave radar," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 171, p. 104572, 2024.
- [237] R. Guan, H. Zhao, S. Yao, K. L. Man, X. Zhu, L. Yu, Y. Yue, J. Smith, E. G. Lim, W. Ding *et al.*, "Achelous++: Power-oriented water-surface panoptic perception framework on edge devices based on vision-radar fusion and pruning of heterogeneous modalities," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08851*, 2023.
- [238] H. F. Nweke, Y. W. Teh, G. Mujtaba, and M. A. Al-Garadi, "Data fusion and multiple classifier systems for human activity detection and health monitoring: Review and open research directions," *Information Fusion*, vol. 46, pp. 147–170, 2019.
- [239] T. Meng, X. Jing, Z. Yan, and W. Pedrycz, "A survey on machine learning for data fusion," *Information Fusion*, vol. 57, pp. 115–129, 2020.
- [240] D. J. MacKay, "A practical bayesian framework for backpropagation networks," *Neural computation*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 448–472, 1992.



Shanliang Yao (Student Member, IEEE) received the B.E. degree in 2016 from the School of Computer Science and Technology, Soochow University, Suzhou, China, and the M.S. degree in 2021 from the Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, U.K. He is currently a joint Ph.D. student of University of Liverpool, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University and Institute of Deep Perception Technology, Jiangsu Industrial Technology Research Institute. His current research is centered on multi-modal perception using deep

learning approach for autonomous driving. He is also interested in robotics, intelligent vehicles and intelligent transportation systems. He serves as the peer reviewer of *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems (TITS)*, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles (TIV)*, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (TCSVT)*, *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, etc.



Runwei Guan (Student Member, IEEE) received his M.S. degree in Data Science from University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom, in 2021. He is currently a joint Ph.D. student of University of Liverpool, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University and Institute of Deep Perception Technology, Jiangsu Industrial Technology Research Institute. His research interests include visual grounding, panoptic perception based on the fusion of radar and camera, lightweight neural network, multi-task learning and statistical machine learning. He serves

as the peer reviewer of *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, *Journal of Supercomputing*, *IJCNN*, etc.



immersive realities, path planning algorithmic advancement and cost implication.

Zitian Peng received the M.S. degree in social computing in 2022 from School of Advanced Technology, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University. She is currently a Ph.D. student from University of Liverpool, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University. Her research interests include virtual reality, augmented reality, human-vehicle interaction, and reinforcement learning for gaze estimation and tracking. She is also interested in the application of digital twin in unmanned vehicles research including high-accuracy marine environment modeling, interactive DT via



Chenhang Xu received the B.E. degree in 2018 from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA, and the M.S. degree in 2020 from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA. He is currently a Ph.D. student of University of Liverpool and Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University. His current research is centered on multi-agent reinforcement learning cooperation. He is also interested in robotics and intelligent vehicles.



Yilu Shi is currently an undergraduate student at Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University, majoring in information and computing science. He will complete his undergraduate study in 2024. His research interests include multi-modal detection, tracking and computer vision for autonomous driving. He won the third prize in the 9th "Internet Plus" College Student Innovation and Entrepreneurship Competition in Jiangsu Province and participated the Programme and Poster Competition as a Summer Undergraduate Research Fellow in 2023.



Weiping Ding (M'16-SM'19) received the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing, China, in 2013. In 2016, He was a Visiting Scholar at National University of Singapore, Singapore. From 2017 to 2018, he was a Visiting Professor at University of Technology Sydney, Australia. He is a Full Professor with the School of Information Science and Technology, Nantong University, Nantong, China, and also the supervisor of Ph.D postgraduate by the Faculty of Data Science at City University of Macau, China. His main research directions involve deep neural networks, multimodal machine learning, and medical images analysis. He ranked within the top 2% Ranking of Scientists in the World by Stanford University (2020-2023). He has published over 250 articles, including over 100 *IEEE Transactions* papers. His fifteen authored/co-authored papers have been selected as *ESI Highly Cited Papers*. He serves as an Associate Editor/Editorial Board member of *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, *Information Fusion*, *Information Sciences*, *Neurocomputing*, *Applied Soft Computing*. He is the Leading Guest Editor of Special Issues in several prestigious journals, including *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, and *Information Fusion*.



Eng Gee Lim (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.Eng. (Hons.) and Ph.D. degrees in Electrical and Electronic Engineering (EEE) from Northumbria University, Newcastle, U.K., in 1998 and 2002, respectively. He worked for Andrew Ltd., Coventry, U.K., a leading communications systems company from 2002 to 2007. Since 2007, he has been with Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou, China, where he was the Head of the EEE Department, and the University Dean of research and graduate studies. He is currently the School Dean of Advanced Technology, the Director of the AI University Research Centre, and a Professor with the Department of EEE. He has authored or coauthored over 100 refereed international journals and conference papers. His research interests are artificial intelligence (AI), robotics, AI+ health care, international standard (ISO/IEC) in robotics, antennas, RF/microwave engineering, EM measurements/simulations, energy harvesting, power/energy transfer, smart-grid communication, and wireless communication networks for smart and green cities. He is a Chartered Engineer and a fellow of The Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET) and Engineers Australia. He is also a Senior Fellow of Higher Education Academy (HEA).

University, Suzhou, China. His current research interests include computer graphics, virtual reality, and robot navigation.



Yong Yue Fellow of Institution of Engineering and Technology (FIET), received the B.Eng. degree in mechanical engineering from Northeastern University, Shenyang, China, in 1982, and the Ph.D. degree in computer aided design from Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, U.K., in 1994. He worked in the industry for eight years and followed experience in academia with the University of Nottingham, Cardiff University, and the University of Bedfordshire, U.K. He is currently a Professor and Director with the Virtual Engineering Centre, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool

University, Suzhou, China. His current research interests include computer graphics, virtual reality, and robot navigation.



Hyungjoon Seo (Member, IEEE) received the bachelor's degree in civil engineering from Korea University, Seoul, South Korea, in 2007, and the Ph.D. degree in geotechnical engineering from Korea University in 2013. In 2013, he worked as a research professor in Korea University. He served as a visiting scholar at University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK, and he worked for engineering department in University of Cambridge as a research associate from 2014 to 2016. In August 2016, he got an assistant professor position in the Department of Civil Engineering

at the Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University (XJTLU), China. He has been an assistant professor at the University of Liverpool, UK, from 2020. His research interests are monitoring using artificial intelligence and SMART monitoring system for infrastructure, soil-structure interaction (tunneling, slope stability, pile), Antarctic survey and freezing ground. Hyungjoon is the director of the CSMI (Centre for SMART Monitoring Infrastructure), CSMI is collaborating with University of Cambridge, University of Oxford, University of Bath, UC Berkeley University, Nanjing University, and Tongji University on SMART monitoring. He presented a keynote speech at the 15th European Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering in 2015. He is currently appointed editor of the CivilEng journal and organized two international conferences. He has published more than 50 scientific papers including a book on Geotechnical Engineering and SMART monitoring.



Ka Lok Man (Member, IEEE) received the Dr. Eng. degree in electronic engineering from the Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy, in 1998, and the Ph.D. degree in computer science from Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, in 2006. He is currently a Professor in Computer Science and Software Engineering with Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou, China. His research interests include formal methods and process algebras, embedded system design and testing, and photovoltaics.



Jieming Ma received the M.Sc. degree in advanced microelectronic systems engineering from the University of Bristol, UK, in 2010, and received the Ph.D. degree in computer science from the University of Liverpool, UK, in 2014. He is currently working as an Associate Professor at the Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, China. His research interests include intelligent optimization, machine learning and applications in renewable energy systems.



Xiaohui Zhu (Member, IEEE) received his Ph.D. from the University of Liverpool, UK in 2019. He is currently an associate professor, Ph.D. supervisor and Programme Director with the Department of Computing, School of Advanced Technology, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University. He focuses on advanced techniques related to autonomous driving, including sensor-fusion perception, fast path planning, autonomous navigation and multi-vehicle collaborative scheduling.



Yutao Yue (Member, IEEE) is an associate professor at the Artificial Intelligence Thrust and Intelligent Transportation Thrust of Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou). He received his Bachelor's degree from the University of Science and Technology of China, and Master and PhD degree from Purdue University. He has a dual background in academia and industry, as the team leader of Guangdong Province Introduced Innovation Scientific Research Team, senior scientist of Kuang-Chi Group, and the founder of the Institute

of Deep Perception Technology of JITRI. His research interests include multimodal perception fusion, machine consciousness, artificial general intelligence, causal emergence, etc. He has been engaged in scientific research and technology industrialization for over 20 years. He has co-invented 354 granted Chinese patents, 18 USA patents, and 7 EU patents. He has led 6 major research projects with a total funding of nearly 130 million RMB. He has published over 60 papers, advised 13 postdoc research fellows, and received multiple awards including Wu Wenjun Artificial Intelligence Science and Technology Award.