Three-dimensional Surface Reconstruction from Multistatic SAR Images

Brian D. Rigling and Randolph L. Moses

Abstract

This paper discusses reconstruction of three-dimensional surfaces from multiple bistatic SAR images. Techniques for surface reconstruction from multiple monostatic SAR images already exist, including interferometric processing and stereo SAR. We generalize these methods to obtain algorithms for bistatic interferometric SAR and bistatic stereo SAR. We also propose a framework for predicting the performance of our multistatic stereo SAR algorithm, and from this framework, we suggest a metric for use in planning strategic deployment of multistatic assets.

Keywords

SAR, bistatic, ground map, three-dimensional, surface reconstruction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent developments in unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) technology is spurring new interest in the fields of bistatic and multistatic synthetic aperture radar (SAR) [1–8]. A low cost UAV may be teamed with a high-power transmitter at a safe standoff distance to conduct passive ground surveillance using bistatic SAR. Receiving platforms may also exploit illuminators of opportunity including overpassing satellites and local commercial broadcasters.

Several authors have considered bistatic SAR image formation (see, e.g., [9–12]). Soumekh [11, 13] suggests using multiple receiving platforms with a single transmitting platform to form a multistatic system. A multistatic system can be used to form a set of bistatic images. Additionally, the multiple bistatic images can be coherently or incoherently combined to form a three-dimensional reconstruction of the imaged scene.

Earlier works involving multiple monostatic apertures have illustrated methods for height estimation, including interferometric SAR [14–16] and stereo SAR [17, 18]. Interferometric SAR typically involves coherent processing of a pair of images formed from data collected by two separate antennas on the same data collection platform, and has proven to be effective at forming topological ground maps of smoothly varying terrain. However, at coarse resolution, it typically lacks the height estimation accuracy necessary for three-dimensional reconstruction of targets of interest. Stereo SAR requires two or more images formed by platforms separated in aspect angle. Height estimates are obtained by measuring the lay over differences between the images [19,20]. As we will show, monostatic stereo techniques can be generalized for application to images created by a multistatic system, incorporating multiple transmitting and receiving

Corresponding author's address: Randolph L. Moses, Department of Electrical Engineering, Ohio State University, 205 Dreese Labs, 2015 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210, E-mail: (randy@ee.eng.ohio-state.edu).



Fig. 1. Top view of a bistatic data collection geometry. The x-y plane is the ground plane.

platforms, and interferometric techniques may be applied to a pair of bistatic SAR images, formed by a receiver equipped with two or more antennas.

This paper develops the theory required for performing three-dimensional surface reconstruction using a multistatic SAR system. We derive the theory necessary for interferometric processing of two bistatic SAR images to obtain height estimates, and we propose an algorithm which implements stereo processing of two or more bistatic images. Our results generalize existing monostatic SAR algorithms. We provide a framework for predicting the performance of the stereo SAR algorithm, and based on this framework, we propose strategies for coordinating the receiving platforms used in a multistatic system.

An outline of the paper is as follows. In Section II, we state our model for bistatic phase history data collection and bistatic SAR image formation. Based on these models, we illustrate how three-dimensional point scatterers are projected into a two-dimensional bistatic SAR image. This projection is commonly known as lay over. In Section III, we derive and demonstrate interferometric processing of a pair of registered bistatic SAR images. In Section IV, we generalize monostatic stereo SAR processing to develop an algorithm which estimates the heights of surfaces in a scene, based on the difference in lay over between two bistatic images formed at different look angles. In Section V, we extend the stereo SAR concept to consider more than two bistatic apertures, and we provide a framework for predicting the performance of this algorithm. Our performance prediction framework allows us to suggest strategies for coordinating multistatic SAR systems. Finally, in Section VI, we state our conclusions and outline areas of future work.

II. BISTATIC PHASE HISTORY DATA

Consider the bistatic SAR data collection geometry shown in Figure 1. The center of the scene to be imaged is located at the origin of coordinates, and the ground plane is the x-y plane. A scatterer within that scene is located at $\underline{r}_m = (x_m, y_m, z_m)$. At a given time τ , the location of the transmitter is $\underline{r}_t(\tau) = (x_t(\tau), y_t(\tau), z_t(\tau))$, and the location of the receiver is $\underline{r}_r(\tau) = (x_r(\tau), y_r(\tau), z_r(\tau))$. As the transmitter moves along its flight path, the radiating antenna periodically transmits pulses of energy in the direction of the scene center. We assume that transmitted pulses have uniform power over the frequency range $f \in [f_0, f_0 + B]$, where f_0 and B represent the initial frequency and bandwidth of the transmitted pulse, respectively. Each transmitted pulse travels from the transmitter to the scene of interest, where it is reflected by scatterers within the area of illumination. Some of these reflected signals are observed by the antenna on the receiving platform, and are recorded in the form of phase history data. We model this data in the frequency domain as the sum of the time-delayed returns from all of the scatterers in the scene. This model [12] is written as

$$S(f_i, \tau_k) = \sum_m A_m e^{-j2\pi f_i \frac{\Delta R_m(\tau_k)}{c}} + w(f_i, \tau_k)$$

$$\tag{1}$$

where the sampled frequencies f_i are spaced over $[f_0, f_0 + B]$, and the sampled times τ_i are spaced over [-T/2, T/2]. The signal is corrupted by white Gaussian noise, represented by $w(f_i, \tau_k)$. The complex scattering coefficient of the *m*th scattering center is represented by A_m . The time delay of the response from the *m*th scattering center is equal to the bistatic differential range of that scatterer $\Delta R_m(\tau_k)$ divided by the speed of light *c*. In the far-field, the bistatic differential range is well approximated [12] by

$$\Delta R_m(\tau_k) \approx -x_m \cos \phi_t(\tau_k) \cos \theta_t(\tau_k) - y_m \sin \phi_t(\tau_k) \cos \theta_t(\tau_k) - z_m \sin \theta_t(\tau_k) -x_m \cos \phi_r(\tau_k) \cos \theta_r(\tau_k) - y_m \sin \phi_r(\tau_k) \cos \theta_r(\tau_k) - z_m \sin \theta_r(\tau_k)$$
(2)

where the variables $\phi_t(\tau)$ and $\phi_r(\tau)$ ($\theta_t(\tau)$ and $\theta_r(\tau)$) denote the azimuth (elevation) angles of the transmitter and receiver, with respect to the scene center at slow time τ .

Based on (1) and (2), one may form an image by assuming a scatterer is located at the center of each pixel and then independently calculating the maximum likelihood estimate of each scatterer's reflectivity. Thus, a ground plane image (z = 0) may be formed by applying the matched filter

$$P(x,y) = \frac{1}{N_f N_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{N_f} \sum_{k=1}^{N_\tau} S(f_i, \tau_k) \\ \cdot e^{-j\frac{2\pi f_i}{c} \left[x(\cos\phi_t(\tau_k)\cos\theta_t(\tau_k) + \cos\phi_r(\tau_k)\cos\theta_r(\tau_k)) + y(\sin\phi_t(\tau_k)\cos\theta_t(\tau_k) + \sin\phi_r(\tau_k)\cos\theta_r(\tau_k))\right]}$$
(3)

to the phase history data for each (x, y) pixel location.

We remark that the differential range in (2) is subject to errors caused by mis-measurement of the transmitter and receiver positions. We assume that the phase errors induced by these discrepancies, as well as phase errors from other sources, may be corrected to within a linear phase function, resulting in an unknown shift (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) of the final image. Techniques for correcting bistatic motion measurement errors are described in [21,22].

In (1) and (2), the (x, y, z) location of each scatterer is encoded in the observed differential range $\Delta R_m(\tau)$ of that scatterer. However, the matched filter (3) used in image formation assumes that all scatterers lie on the ground plane, thus implying that a projection takes place in the image formation process. To understand the nature of this projection, we will apply further approximations to our expression for the bistatic differential range. We first assume that the ground range and slant range of the transmitter, $r_t = \sqrt{x_t(\tau)^2 + y_t(\tau)^2}$ and $R_t = \sqrt{x_t(\tau)^2 + y_t(\tau)^2 + z_t(\tau)^2}$, are sufficiently large such that they may be treated as constants with respect to slow time τ . We make the same assumption about the ground range and slant range of the receiver, $r_r = \sqrt{x_r(\tau)^2 + y_r(\tau)^2}$ and $R_r = \sqrt{x_r(\tau)^2 + y_r(\tau)^2 + z_r(\tau)^2}$. Finally, we assume that the transmitter and receiver fly linear flight paths at constant velocities and constant altitudes. The locations of the transmitter and receiver at their aperture midpoints are given by $(\bar{x}_t, \bar{y}_t, \bar{z}_t)$ and $(\bar{x}_r, \bar{y}_r, \bar{z}_r)$, and the transmitter and receiver velocity vectors are (v_{xt}, v_{yt}, v_{zt}) and (v_{xr}, v_{yr}, v_{zr}) . Thus, we may approximate $\cos \phi_t(\tau_k)$ with $(\bar{x}_t + v_{xt}\tau)/r_t$, $\cos \theta_t(\tau_k)$ with r_t/R_t , etc.. This allows the approximate differential range function in (2) to be further approximated by a linear function of slow time

$$\Delta R_m(\tau_k) \approx -x_m \frac{\bar{x}_t + v_{xt}\tau}{r_t} \frac{r_t}{R_t} - y_m \frac{\bar{y}_t + v_{yt}\tau}{r_t} \frac{r_t}{R_t} - z_m \frac{\bar{z}_t + v_{zt}\tau_k}{R_t}
-x_m \frac{\bar{x}_r + v_{xr}\tau}{r_r} \frac{r_r}{R_r} - y_m \frac{\bar{y}_r + v_{yr}\tau}{r_r} \frac{r_r}{R_r} - z_m \frac{\bar{z}_r + v_{zr}\tau_k}{R_r}
= -\left[x_m \left(\frac{\bar{x}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{x}_r}{R_r}\right) + y_m \left(\frac{\bar{y}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{y}_r}{R_r}\right) + z_m \left(\frac{\bar{z}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{z}_r}{R_r}\right)\right]
- \left[x_m \left(\frac{v_{xt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{xr}}{R_r}\right) + y_m \left(\frac{v_{yt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{yr}}{R_r}\right) + z_m \left(\frac{v_{zt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{zr}}{R_r}\right)\right] \tau_k
\triangleq -\beta_0 - \beta_1 \tau_k.$$
(4)

Equation (4) describes a transformation which relates the linear approximation of the differential range $\Delta R(\tau) = -\beta_0 - \beta_1 \tau$ to the actual location of a scatterer in the scene. This transformation may be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{x}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{x}_r}{R_r} & \frac{\bar{y}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{y}_r}{R_r} & \frac{\bar{z}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{z}_r}{R_r} \\ \frac{v_{xt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{xr}}{R_r} & \frac{v_{yt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{yr}}{R_r} & \frac{v_{zt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{zr}}{R_r} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_m \\ y_m \\ z_m \end{bmatrix} \triangleq Q \begin{bmatrix} x_m \\ y_m \\ z_m \end{bmatrix}.$$
(5)

In contrast, the image formation process implicitly assumes that scatterers are located on the ground plane (z = 0), and thus defines a transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_m \\ \hat{y}_m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{x}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{x}_r}{R_r} & \frac{\bar{y}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{y}_r}{R_r} \\ \frac{v_{xt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{xr}}{R_r} & \frac{v_{yt}}{R_t} + \frac{v_{yr}}{R_r} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \end{bmatrix} \triangleq P \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(6)

relating the linear approximation of the differential range to an (x, y) pixel location. It is at this approximate pixel location (\hat{x}_m, \hat{y}_m) that a point response will appear, corresponding to the original scatterer located at (x_m, y_m, z_m) . Thus, using (5) and (6), we define the linear operation that projects three-dimensional point scatterers into a 2-D image as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_m \\ \hat{y}_m \end{bmatrix} = PQ \begin{bmatrix} x_m \\ y_m \\ z_m \end{bmatrix}.$$
(7)

Note that if $\bar{z}_t = \bar{z}_r = v_{zt} = v_{zr} = 0$ then $PQ = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and scatterers project vertically onto a ground plane image. The SAR imaging phenomenon represented by the projection operation in (7) is commonly known as lay over. Equation (7) forms the basis of both the interferometric and the stereo height estimation techniques developed in the next two sections.

III. BISTATIC INTERFEROMETRIC SAR

A. Theory

We now consider a bistatic interferometric system involving a transmitting platform and a single receiving platform equipped with two physically separated receiving antennas. This allows formation of two coherent bistatic SAR images, one from the phase history data from each receiving antenna. The differences between these two images, caused by the physical separation of the receiving antennas, allows height estimation to be accomplished interferometrically. Given the geometric configuration of the bistatic system, we can compute the projection matrices (18)-(19) for the two bistatic apertures; then, the ideal lay over in each image due to a scatterer height of one meter is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta x_{mi} \\ \Delta y_{mi} \end{bmatrix} = P_i Q_i \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad i = 1, 2..$$
(8)

To examine the effect of lay over on images formed via matched filtering, we first rewrite equation (3) as

$$P(x,y) = \frac{1}{N_f N_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{N_f} \sum_{k=1}^{N_\tau} S(f_i, \tau_k) e^{-j\frac{2\pi f_i}{c}\Delta R_{xy}(\tau_k)}$$

$$= e^{-j\frac{2\pi f_c}{c}\Delta R_{xy}(\tau_k)} \cdot \frac{1}{N_f N_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{N_f} \sum_{k=1}^{N_\tau} S(f_i, \tau_k) e^{-j\frac{2\pi \delta_f(i-N_f/2)}{c}\Delta R_{xy}(\tau_k)}$$

$$= e^{-j\frac{2\pi f_c}{c}\Delta R_{xy}(\tau_k)} H(x, y)$$
(9)

where we have factored out a constant phase shift corresponding to the center frequency f_c of our collected data. The spacing between frequency samples is given by δ_f , and the two-dimensional differential range function $\Delta R_{xy}(\tau_k)$ is given by equation (2) with $z_m = 0$. The envelope of the imaged point scatterer is represented by H(x, y), and its phase is given by $\exp\{-j\frac{2\pi f_c}{c}\Delta R_{xy}(\tau_k)\}$.

We now make a narrow band assumption about our data, assuming that our frequency samples are close to the center frequency $f_c = f_0 + B/2$ and that our samples in slow time are close to $\tau = 0$. Using (4), (8), and (9), we may then approximate the effect of lay over on each ground plane bistatic SAR image as

$$P_{1}'(x,y) \approx H_{1}(x - z_{m}\Delta x_{m1}, y - z_{m}\Delta y_{m1}) \exp\left\{j\frac{2\pi f_{c}}{c}z_{m}\left[\Delta x_{m1}\left(\frac{\bar{x}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{x}_{r1}}{R_{r1}}\right) + \Delta y_{m1}\left(\frac{\bar{y}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{y}_{r1}}{R_{r1}}\right)\right]\right\}$$
(10)
$$P_{2}'(x,y) \approx H_{2}(x - z_{m}\Delta x_{m2}, y - z_{m}\Delta y_{m2}) \exp\left\{j\frac{2\pi f_{c}}{c}z_{m}\left[\Delta x_{m2}\left(\frac{\bar{x}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{x}_{r2}}{R_{r2}}\right) + \Delta y_{m2}\left(\frac{\bar{y}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{y}_{r2}}{R_{r2}}\right)\right]\right\},$$
(11)

where the response of the *m*th scatterer is assumed to be dominant at (x, y). Equations (10) and (11) show that the principal effects of a non-zero height are to shift the envelope H(x, y) to the laid over position and to shift the image phase at that position. Given a sufficiently small separation between the two receiving antennas, we now make the following assumptions:

- 1. $\Delta x_{m1} \Delta x_{m2}$ is small relative to the image resolution
- 2. $\Delta y_{m1} \Delta y_{m2}$ is small relative to the image resolution

3.
$$H(x - z_m \Delta x_{m1}, y - z_m \Delta y_{m1}) = H_1(x - z_m \Delta x_{m1}, y - z_m \Delta y_{m1}) = H_2(x - z_m \Delta x_{m2}, y - z_m \Delta y_{m2})$$

4. $x_{r1} \approx x_{r2}, y_{r1} \approx y_{r2}$ and $R_{r1} \approx R_{r2}$.

These assumption are analogous to those used in monostatic IFSAR. The product of the first image and the complex conjugate of the second image may thus be approximated as

$$C(x,y) = P_1'(x,y)\overline{P_2'(x,y)}$$

$$\approx |H(x,y)|^2 \exp\left\{j\frac{2\pi}{\lambda_c}z_m\left[\left(\Delta x_{m1} - \Delta x_{m2}\right)\left(\frac{\bar{x}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{x}_{r1}}{R_{r1}}\right) + \left(\Delta y_{m1} - \Delta y_{m2}\right)\left(\frac{\bar{y}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{y}_{r1}}{R_{r1}}\right)\right]\right\}, \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda_c = c/f_c$. Examining the phase of C(x, y)

$$\angle C(x,y) = \frac{2\pi z_m}{\lambda_c} \left[(\Delta x_{m1} - \Delta x_{m2}) \left(\frac{\bar{x}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{x}_{r1}}{R_{r1}} \right) + (\Delta y_{m1} - \Delta y_{m2}) \left(\frac{\bar{y}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{y}_{r1}}{R_{r1}} \right) \right],$$
(13)

we see that the height of the dominant scatterer in an imaged pixel may be estimated as

$$z_m = \frac{\lambda_c \angle C(x,y)}{2\pi} \left[(\Delta x_{m1} - \Delta x_{m2}) \left(\frac{\bar{x}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{x}_{r1}}{R_{r1}} \right) + (\Delta y_{m1} - \Delta y_{m2}) \left(\frac{\bar{y}_t}{R_t} + \frac{\bar{y}_{r1}}{R_{r1}} \right) \right]^{-1}.$$
 (14)

Thus, interferometric height estimates may be computed from two bistatic SAR images by computing the complex product of (12), taking the phase of this product and inserting it into (14). The maximum and minimum unambiguous heights may be calculated by substituting $\angle C(x, y) = \pm \pi$ into (14).

B. Algorithm

Interferometric SAR processing begins by forming two bistatic SAR images, one from each of the receive antennas. These images may in general suffer from differing geo-location errors, thus requiring image registration to be applied in post-processing. A constant false alarm rate detector [23] is then applied to both images. For each pixel whose amplitude exceeds the detection threshold, the complex product of (12) is computed, and the phase resulting from this product is used in (14) to compute a height estimate for a scatterer which has laid over into that pixel. Given a height estimate, we may also estimate the true (x, y) location of a scatterer by removing the shift due to lay over using (7) and (8). Specifically, if a scatterer is observed in the first image at $[\hat{x}_{m1} \ \hat{y}_{m1}]^T$ and has estimated height $\hat{z}_{12}^{(m)}$, then the true (x, y) location of that scatterer may then be computed as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{12}^{(m)} \\ \hat{y}_{12}^{(m)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{m1} \\ \hat{y}_{m1} \end{bmatrix} - P_1 Q_1 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \\ \hat{z}_{12}^{(m)} \end{bmatrix}.$$
(15)

This calculation is commonly known as ortho-rectification. Equation (15) represents a bistatic generalization of corresponding monostatic orthorectication equations found in, e.g., [19,20].

To demonstrate, we generated two images of a scene illuminated by a transmitter with a flight path centered on and orthogonal to the positive x-axis. A simulated receiving platform was located at an azimuth angle of $\phi_r = -20^\circ$ and observed the scene at broadside with two antenna. The two receiving antenna were given a vertical separation of 10 meters. Figures 2a and 2b show the two bistatic images formed from each receiving antenna; their magnitudes are nearly



Fig. 2. The transmitter aperture is centered at $\phi_t = 0^\circ$. a) Image formed by a receiver with aperture centered at $\phi_{r1} = -20^\circ$. b) An image with an identical envelope formed by a second receiver, displaced 10 meters vertically from the first. c) Topographical image formed interferometrically from the two bistatic images. (d) True locations of the simulated point scatterers. The parameters used to generate this example are given in Table I.

identical, in keeping with assumptions (A-1)–(A-4) above, and differences in their phases encode scatterer height. All of the scattering centers shown were equal in amplitude, and they were scaled prior to addition of white Gaussian noise in order to yield a peak signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of 30 dB. The above algorithm was used to coherently process the two images in Figures 2a and 2b to yield height estimates for each point scatterer in the scene. The parameters used in this example are given in Table I. Fusing these height estimates with one of the original images yields the 3-D reconstruction shown in Figure 2c. The true locations of the simulated point scatterers are shown in Figure 2d. Note that Figure 2c gives height estimates only at the point scatterer locations, due to the pixel-by-pixel processing of IFSAR, and does not give the surface effect that we will see in stereo processing.

C. Performance

The accuracy of interferometric height estimates is typically predicted by assuming an uncertainty in the phase of (12). Here, we assume that this uncertainty, written as

$$\operatorname{Var}\left\{\angle C(x,y)\right\} \triangleq \sigma_{\psi}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{\left|C(x,y)\right|^2} + \sigma_s^2,\tag{16}$$

is dependent on the sum of two components. The first term corresponds to the phase noise induced in each image by the measurement noise represented in (1) by $w(f_i, \tau_k) \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. The second term σ_s^2 models the phase scintillation observed in SAR images with slightly different look angles. It is expected that σ_s^2 will decrease as Fourier resolution improves. This is based on the assumption that phase scintillation is caused by the interference of multiple scatterers within a resolution cell. The RMS height estimation accuracy expected, given a phase uncertainty of σ_w^2 , is simply

$$\sigma_{z} = \frac{\lambda_{c}\sigma_{\psi}}{2\pi} \left[(\Delta x_{m1} - \Delta x_{m2}) \left(\frac{\bar{x}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{x}_{r1}}{R_{r1}} \right) + (\Delta y_{m1} - \Delta y_{m2}) \left(\frac{\bar{y}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{y}_{r1}}{R_{r1}} \right) \right]^{-1}.$$
 (17)

The images of Figures 2a and 2b contain point scatterers with a signal-to-noise ratio of 30 dB. For each pixel with an SNR above 20 dB, we compared the estimated height of that pixel in Figure 2c to the actual scatterer height, yielding an RMS height estimation accuracy of 30.6 centimeters. Inserting the parameters shown in Table I into equation (17) predicts an accuracy of $\sigma_z = 29.3$ centimeters, where σ_s^2 has been assumed to be zero. In practice, both the simulated and predicted performance would be worsened by the effects of scintillation.

TABLE I

BISTATIC GEOMETRY PARAMETERS CORRESPONDING TO FIGURE 2.

$\Delta x_{m1} - \Delta x_{m2}$	-0.0613 cm
$\Delta y_{m1} - \Delta y_{m2}$	0.0133 cm
$(\bar{x}_t, \bar{y}_t, \bar{z}_t)$	(30 km, 0 km, 10 km)
$(\bar{x}_{r1}, \bar{y}_{r1}, \bar{z}_{r1})$	(7.5 km, -2.7 km, 3 km)
$(\bar{x}_{r2}, \bar{y}_{r2}, \bar{z}_{r2})$	(7.5 km, -2.7 km, 3.01 km)
λ_c	2.64 cm
σ_{ψ}	0.081

IV. STEREO HEIGHT ESTIMATION FROM TWO BISTATIC APERTURES

A. Theory

We now consider a system wherein two receiving platforms, each with a single antenna, are teamed with a transmitting platform. The first receiving platform traverses a linear flight path with $(\bar{x}_{r1}, \bar{y}_{r1}, \bar{z}_{r1})$ as its midpoint and $(v_{xr1}, v_{yr1}, v_{zr1})$ as its velocity vector. Similarly, the flight path of the second receiving platform is defined by $(\bar{x}_{r2}, \bar{y}_{r2}, \bar{z}_{r2})$ and $(v_{xr2}, v_{yr2}, v_{zr2})$. Based on these parameters, we may define projection matrices for the first and second bistatic apertures as

$$Q_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{x}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{x}_{ri}}{R_{ri}} & \frac{\bar{y}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{y}_{ri}}{R_{ri}} & \frac{\bar{z}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{z}_{ri}}{R_{ri}} \\ \frac{v_{xt}}{R_{t}} + \frac{v_{xri}}{R_{ri}} & \frac{v_{yt}}{R_{t}} + \frac{v_{yri}}{R_{ri}} & \frac{v_{zt}}{R_{t}} + \frac{v_{zri}}{R_{ri}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2$$
(18)

and

$$P_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{x}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{x}_{ri}}{R_{ri}} & \frac{\bar{y}_{t}}{R_{t}} + \frac{\bar{y}_{ri}}{R_{ri}} \\ \frac{v_{xt}}{R_{t}} + \frac{v_{xri}}{R_{ri}} & \frac{v_{yt}}{R_{t}} + \frac{v_{yri}}{R_{ri}} \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$
(19)

Using (18–19), the locations of the mth scatterer in the scene as observed by the first and second receivers, respectively, are

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{m1} \\ \hat{y}_{m1} \end{bmatrix} = P_1 Q_1 \begin{bmatrix} x_m \\ y_m \\ z_m \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_1 \\ \tilde{y}_1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(20)

and
$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{m2} \\ \hat{y}_{m2} \end{bmatrix} = P_2 Q_2 \begin{bmatrix} x_m \\ y_m \\ z_m \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_2 \\ \tilde{y}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$
 (21)

where the vectors $[\tilde{x}_1 \quad \tilde{y}_1]^T$ and $[\tilde{x}_2 \quad \tilde{y}_2]^T$ represent shifts in the imaged scene due to uncompensated motion measurement and geo-location errors. We note that a scatterer at a non-zero height will project differently into the two 2-D images formed from the two bistatic apertures, due to the difference in their lay over geometries and their individual platform motion measurement errors. By measuring the difference in this projection, we may estimate a height for that scatterer. We represent the lay over offset of the *m*th scatterer with

$$\underline{\hat{u}}_{m} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{m1} \\ \hat{y}_{m1} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{m2} \\ \hat{y}_{m2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= P_{1}Q_{1} \begin{bmatrix} x_{m} \\ y_{m} \\ z_{m} \end{bmatrix} - P_{2}Q_{2} \begin{bmatrix} x_{m} \\ y_{m} \\ z_{m} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{1} \\ \tilde{y}_{1} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{2} \\ \tilde{y}_{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= (P_{1}Q_{1} - P_{2}Q_{2}) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ z_{m} \end{bmatrix} + \underline{\tilde{u}}_{12}$$

$$\underline{\hat{u}}_{z} z_{m} + \underline{\tilde{u}}_{12}$$
(22)

where $\underline{\tilde{u}}_{12}$ is the registration error induced between the two images due to their differing motion measurement errors. Furthermore, we do not assume coherency of the image phases for the derivation below, and in practice, it would be difficult, but not impossible, to maintain image phase coherence across two different platforms. From (22), we may compute a height estimate for the *m*th scattering center as

$$\hat{z}_{12}^{(m)} = \frac{\underline{u}_z^T \hat{\underline{u}}_m}{\|\underline{u}_z\|^2} = \frac{\underline{u}_z^T (\underline{u}_z z_m + \tilde{\underline{u}}_{12})}{\|\underline{u}_z\|^2} = z_m + \tilde{z}_{12}.$$
(23)

The lack of perfect geolocation prevents us from recovering an absolute estimate of z_m . However, all of the scatterers in the scene will suffer from the same height estimate offset \tilde{z}_{12} . This implies that relative height measurements, between two scattering centers, may still be meaningful. Given a point of reference with a known height, the offset \tilde{z}_{12} may be removed to yield absolute height estimates for each scatterer in the scene.

B. Algorithm

We will now describe an algorithm for performing multistatic stereo SAR height estimation. This implementation faces two impediments. First, it is possible that multiple scatterers of different heights may lay over into the same image location, thus complicating one's ability to make accurate observations. Second, scatterers observed in the two images must be correctly associated, and adding to this difficulty, some scatterers may be visible in one image but not the other. To circumvent these complications, we make the following assumptions.

(B-1) Scatterers lie on a surface h(x, y) that is smoothly varying, such that multiple scatterers do not lay over into the same image location.

(B-2) This surface is locally flat.

(B-3) Multiple scatterers on a locally flat area of this surface may be correctly associated by cross-correlation of sub-images extracted from the two bistatic images.

Our basic algorithm for multistatic SAR stereo height estimation is then as follows. Two bistatic SAR images are formed on the same pixel grid. Given these two images, we first apply a constant false alarm rate detector [23] to the first image to obtain the pixel locations of strong scatterer returns. We then apply a peak finding algorithm, such that out of a cluster of adjacent detections only the pixel with the largest magnitude is returned. This effectively reduces the complexity of the algorithm by limiting the number of detected pixels corresponding to each point scatterer response in the image.

We now iterate through the list of peak detections and attempt to find the shift in location between each detection in the first image and the corresponding return in the second image. To do this, we extract a square sub-image, centered about the current peak detection, from the first image, and we extract a larger square sub-image, centered about the same pixel location, from the second image. The sub-image taken from the first image should be large enough to possess distinct features, which will sufficiently differentiate it from other areas of the scene. The size of the second sub-image is determined by the size of the first sub-image, the maximum shift expected due to lay over differences, and the maximum shift expected due to geo-location errors. We now compute the two-dimensional cross-correlation of the magnitudes of the two sub-images. By extracting the location of the peak cross-correlation, we obtain the relative shift between the two sub-images. After determining relative shifts for all of the peak detections, we compute height estimates using (23) and orthorectify using (15). The following two examples demonstrate the above algorithm. In the first example, we generated two images of a scene illuminated by a transmitter with a flight path centered on the positive x-axis and two receivers located at azimuth angles of $\phi_{r1} = -20^{\circ}$ and $\phi_{r2} = 5^{\circ}$. The elevation angles of all three platforms are approximately 20°, and all three platforms view the scene at broadside. The scene contains 190 point scatterers, configured in the shape of a target. As in the interferometric examples, the amplitude of all of the scattering centers were set equal, and they were scaled before adding white Gaussian noise in order to yield a peak SNR of 30 dB. The two original images both with square 4-inch resolution cells are shown in Figures 3a and 3b. Note that a lateral separation (in x-y) was maintained between scatterers at different heights. This prevents ambiguities due to overlapping lay over, thus artificially satisfying assumption (B-1) above.

We applied the above algorithm twice, alternating which image is used as the first image and using 1 meter squared sub-images, thus obtaining two sets of height estimates $\{\hat{z}_{12}^{(m)}\}$ and $\{\hat{z}_{21}^{(m)}\}$. Using (15), we then shifted the sub-images of the first image to their true locations, as indicated by the $\{\hat{z}_{12}^{(m)}\}$, and shifted the sub-images of the second image as indicated by the $\{\hat{z}_{21}^{(m)}\}$. We then averaged the magnitudes of these two height registered images and fused the result with the extracted height estimates. The resulting 3-D reconstruction is shown in Figure 3c. The 3-D target reconstruction is fairly accurate, except in areas corresponding to the shadow boundaries of each image. Shadow boundaries were simulated by assigning, on a pulse-by-pulse basis, an amplitude of 1 to scatterers with azimuth angles

$$\phi_m = \arctan\left(\frac{y_m}{x_m}\right) \tag{24}$$

within 90° of the transmitter and receiver look angles, and by assigning an amplitude of 0 to all other scattering centers.

In the second example, the same data collection geometry was implemented, but the simulated scattering centers were arrayed in a tighter configuration in x-y. The second set of example images is shown in Figures 4a and 4b, where geometry and scatterer configuration used for the image shown in Figure 4a is identical to that which was used for Figure 2a. Stereo processing of these images gives the 3-D reconstruction shown in Figure 4c. One may observe that regions containing scatterers laid over from both simulated heights are subject to greater variance in their height estimates. The accuracy of this reconstruction is lower than that of Figure 3, but the 3-D shape of the object is still recognizable.

C. Performance

The accuracy of stereo height estimates depends entirely on the accuracy of the relative shift estimates between the extracted sub-images. Image resolution, scatterer scintillation, sub-image decorrelation, and interpolation accuracy all affect the accuracy of the cross-correlation. If one assumes that the shift estimates $\{\hat{u}_m\}$ have Gaussian errors with zero means and covariance K_{xy} , then from (23) the variance of the relative height estimate is

$$\sigma_{z12}^2 = \frac{\underline{u}_z^T K_{xy} \underline{u}_z}{\|\underline{u}_z\|^4} \tag{25}$$

where the unknown offset due to geolocation errors \tilde{z}_{12} has been omitted. The variance of the shift estimate errors (the diagonal elements of K_{xy}) will decrease with improved resolution and will increase with increasing clutter and noise



Fig. 3. The transmitter aperture is centered at $\phi_t = 0^\circ$. a) Image formed by a receiver with aperture centered at $\phi_{r1} = -20^\circ$. b) Image formed by a receiver with aperture centered at $\phi_{r2} = 5^\circ$. c) 3-D surface reconstruction formed from (a) and (b). Lateral separation between scatterers at different heights prevents ambiguous height estimates.



Fig. 4. The transmitter aperture is centered at $\phi_t = 0^\circ$. a) Image formed by a receiver with aperture centered at $\phi_{r1} = -20^\circ$. b) Image formed by a receiver with aperture centered at $\phi_{r2} = 5^\circ$. c) 3-D surface reconstruction formed from (a) and (b). Tightly spaced scatterers lay over onto the same image regions, thus hindering stereo height estimation.

powers in the image. The covariance K_{xy} can be written as

$$K_{xy} = \underline{e}_1 \underline{e}_1^T \sigma_{e1}^2 + \underline{e}_2 \underline{e}_2^T \sigma_{e2}^2 \tag{26}$$

where $\sigma_{e_1}^2$ is the variance of shift estimates in the \underline{e}_1 direction, and $\sigma_{e_2}^2$ is the variance of shift estimates in the \underline{e}_2 direction. The unit vectors \underline{e}_1 and \underline{e}_2 correspond to nominal range and azimuth directions, such that $\sigma_{e_1}^2$ and $\sigma_{e_2}^2$ are related to range and azimuth resolution values. In images with square resolution cells, K_{xy} will be diagonal.

To test the above assertions, we synthesized multistatic phase history data for the return from a single point scatterer. The transmitting platform was located at $(\bar{\phi}_t, \bar{\theta}_t) = (0^\circ, 20^\circ)$, and the two receiving platforms were located at $(\bar{\phi}_{r1}, \bar{\theta}_{r1}) = (5^\circ, 20^\circ)$ and $(\bar{\phi}_{r2}, \bar{\theta}_{r2}) = (-20^\circ, 20^\circ)$, respectively. All three platforms viewed the scene at broadside.

In each of 200 Monte Carlo simulations, two bistatic SAR images were formed, one corresponding to the phase history data from each receiver. Within each image, a point scatterer was randomly placed, and white Gaussian noise, commensurate with the SNR under study, was added. The relative shift of the scatterer between images was then estimated and subtracted from the actual shift, to yield a shift estimate error. After all Monte Carlo simulations for a particular SNR and resolution had been completed, the ensemble of shift estimate errors was used to compute an estimate of K_{xy} in (26), which was then input to (25) to obtain an estimate of σ_{z12}^2 . This value predicts the variance of height estimates from a pair of bistatic SAR images with a given SNR, a given resolution, and the described geometric configuration. Simulations were performed at SNRs ranging from 15 to 30 dB, and with 4-inch (0.1 meter) and 12-inch (0.3 meter) square Fourier resolution cells.

Figure 5a (without the thick line) compares the σ_{z12}^2 computed via simulation to the accuracy predicted by an approximated Cramér-Rao Lower Bound (CRLB) [24]. The CRLB is a well documented means for computing optimal achievable performance of unbiased estimators. The CRLB for a parametric model gives the minimum variance that an unbiased estimator of that model can achieve in the presence of additive noise under a given distribution. The details involved in deriving our approximation of the CRLB are given in the appendix of this paper. For moderate SNR the algorithm provides performance close to the CRLB. At low SNR the algorithm deviates from the CRLB because of estimation errors in the correlation peak finding process. At high SNR, the deviation in algorithm performance is due to bias errors that result from using simple interpolation methods and images that are less than twice over-sampled; generation of highly over-sampled images, and use of better interpolation methods in the peak-finding algorithm, would reduce the bias, at the expense of greater computational complexity.

Figure 5b shows the RMS height accuracy values using the scenario from Figure 3, but with differing SNR values. At each SNR, the RMS height error is computed over all of the detected scattering centers in the image. These results are not directly comparable to the simulation errors or bounds in Figure 5a, because in this case we have multiple scattering centers in each sub-image. However, the observed performance for this complex scene has RMS height errors that are close to the CRLB prediction and simulation. We hypothesize that the lower RMS error at low SNR (compared to the CRLB in Figure 5a) is due to a boosted SNR in some sub-images, resulting from multiple scattering centers in the same sub-image. At higher SNR, we hypothesize that the higher RMS values in Figure 5b are caused by interference between



Fig. 5. (a) Predicted RMS accuracy of stereo height estimates (dotted lines) and observed RMS accuracy (solid lines) for a single, isolated point scatterer. Two radar image resolutions are considered. (b) Observed RMS height error for the example in Figure 3, for various SNR values.

the multiple scattering centers in a sub-image.

V. COORDINATION STRATEGIES FOR MULTISTATIC SAR

The performance prediction framework developed in Section IV may be extended to consider the availability of more than two bistatic apertures. As each aperture will result in a scene shifted by that aperture's motion measurement errors, these geo-location errors add a new layer of complexity to the problem. Thus, for the remainder of our discussion, we will assume that all of the multistatic images produced by our system are perfectly registered; therefore, the shift observed between sub-images from different apertures is solely due to the lay over differences between those apertures. In section IV, we demonstrated that the accuracy of stereo height estimates from a pair of bistatic apertures is dependent on the variance of relative shift estimates, via K_{xy} in (25).

Note that σ_{z12}^2 in (25) is inversely proportional to $||\underline{u}_z||^2$, indicating that adding geometric diversity to increase the norm of \underline{u}_z will enhance the quality of height estimates. However, the variance expressed in (25) is based solely on the geometry of the respective bistatic apertures. It does not take into account variations in the visibility of scatterers in the scene and other scintillation effects. By viewing a given target from two bistatic look angles separated greatly enough in azimuth, one would naturally expect that the resultant images would be largely decorrelated, and thus it would be impossible to accurately measure a relative shift. Therefore, we propose a quality measure defined as

$$Q_{ij} = \frac{W(\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj})}{\sigma_{zij}^2} \tag{27}$$

where the quality of the height estimates obtained from the *i*th and *j*th images improves as Q_{ij} increases. The function $W(\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj})$ models the degree to which images formed from two given bistatic look angles are correlated. The variables $\bar{\phi}_{bi}$ and $\bar{\phi}_{bj}$ are the bistatic look angles of the *i*th and *j*th apertures. Zebker and Villasenor propose a triangular model

for image decorrelation in [25]

$$W\left(\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj}\right) = 1 - \frac{|\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj}|}{a} \text{ for } |\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj}| < a.$$

$$\tag{28}$$

In our experiments, we found that the above model and a Gaussian model

$$W\left(\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj}\right) = \exp\left\{-2\frac{\left(\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj}\right)^2}{a^2}\right\}$$
(29)

behaved similarly.

The quality metric given in (27) may also be applied to multistatic scenarios involving more than a pair of bistatic apertures. Before evaluating the accuracy of height estimates from such multistatic systems, we must define a means of estimation. One simple method of computing a height estimate from multistatic measurements is to first compute a height estimate from each of the possible pairings of apertures and then to linearly combine these estimates. The number of possible pairings in a system consisting of N_{ap} apertures is $\binom{N_{ap}}{2}$. Based on the parameters of each pair of apertures, one may use the methods of Section IV to compute a height estimate $\hat{z}_{ij}^{(m)}$ from the *i*th and *j*th apertures and to compute a variance σ_{zij}^2 for that estimate. A linear esimator of the true height, given independent estimates, may then be calculated as

$$\hat{z}^{(m)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{ap}-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N_{ap}} \hat{z}_{ij}^{(m)} \sigma_{zij}^{-2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{ap}-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N_{ap}} \sigma_{zij}^{-2}},$$
(30)

and the quality of this aggregate estimate is computed as

$$Q = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_{ap}-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N_{ap}} W(\bar{\phi}_{bi} - \bar{\phi}_{bj}) \sigma_{zij}^{-2}\right)^{-1}.$$
(31)

In actuality, the estimates $\hat{z}_{ij}^{(m)}$ will be correlated to some degree, depending on the azimuth spacing of the bistatic apertures. This implies (31) will function as an upper bound on the achievable height estimate quality.

Using (31) as a metric for predicted performance, with σ_{zij}^2 defined by (25), we may propose strategies for coordinating multistatic systems. We first consider an example requiring placement of a second receiver, given the location of the transmitter and the first receiver, such that the height estimation quality Q_{12} is maximized. We assume a Gaussian decorrelation model, as in (29), with a spread of $a = 20^{\circ}$. The transmitter is located at $\phi_t = 0^{\circ}$, and the first receiver is located at $\phi_{r1} = -10^{\circ}$. The transmitter and receivers view the scene at broadside, and the elevation angles of the receivers and the transmitter are fixed at 20° . Figure 6a shows the height estimation quality, computed using (27), as a function of the azimuth location of the second receiver. As one might expect, the height estimation accuracy at first improves as the receiver separation increases; however, the scene decorrelation model eventually begins to dominate and worsens the predicted performance. As shown in Figure 6b, positioning the second receiver at $\phi_{r2} = -40^{\circ}$ or $\phi_{r2} = 20^{\circ}$ gives the best predicted height estimation quality.

As a second example, we add a third receiver to the scenario of the first example. Now, two receivers with identical and fixed elevation angles must be placed in azimuth in order to best complement each other and the original receiver. Figures 7a and 7b show the height estimation quality Q, computed using (29) and (31), as a function of the azimuth



Fig. 6. (a) Height estimation quality of a two receiver multistatic system with transmitter at $\phi_t = 0^\circ$ azimuth and first receiver at $\phi_{r1} = -10^\circ$ azimuth, as a function of the location of the 2nd receiver. (b) Positioning the second receiver at $\phi_{r2} = -40^\circ$ or $\phi_{r2} = 20^\circ$ gives the best predicted height estimation quality.



Fig. 7. (a) and (b) Height estimation quality of a three receiver multistatic system with transmitter at $\phi_t = 0^\circ$ azimuth and first receiver at $\phi_{r1} = -10^\circ$ azimuth, as a function of the location of the 2nd and 3rd receivers. (c) and (d) Two candidate receiver configurations that are predicted to give high quality height estimates.

locations of the two added receivers. Figures 7c and 7d show two candidate receiver configurations that are predicted to give high quality height estimation. The peaks of this plot are consistent with maintaining roughly 20° separation between receivers and alternating which of the three receivers is in the middle.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we generalized the theory behind monostatic stereo processing and interferometric processing of SAR images, in order to develop three-dimensional surface reconstruction algorithms for multistatic SAR systems. As in earlier treatments of interferometric processing, estimation of surface heights from a pair of bistatic SAR images on a pixel-by-pixel basis is highly sensitive to the SNR and scintillation of individual scattering centers. While stereo SAR is more robust with respect to SNR, it relies heavily on the assumption that scatterers will be observable by multiple synthetic apertures. In an attempt to capture this effect, we proposed a height estimate quality metric, dependent on both geometric diversity and image decorrelation. Future work will necessarily involve further development of this performance prediction theory, and development of algorithms for accurate and efficient sub-image shift estimation. One might also further study the effect of signal-to-noise ratio and resolution on stereo and interferometric height estimation accuracy.

Appendix

Derivation of the Cramér-Rao lower bounds on the variance of 3-D scatterer position estimates from bistatic stereo SAR data

The method for computing a CRLB, as detailed in [24], is as follows. First, one must construct the Fisher's information (FI) matrix for the given parametric model and noise distribution. A FI matrix is square with number of rows equal to the number of parameters in the model. The elements of this matrix are defined as

$$F_{pq} = E\left\{ \left(\frac{\partial \log p(Y|\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_p}\right)^T \left(\frac{\partial \log p(Y|\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_q}\right) \right\}$$
(32)

where $E\{\cdot\}$ represents the expected value, $\theta_p \in \Theta$ is the *p*th model parameter, and $\log(p(Y|\underline{\Theta}))$ is the log-likelihood function of the observed random signal Y given the parameter vector $\underline{\Theta}$. Once the FI matrix has been constructed, the CRLB is found as the inverse of the FI matrix. The diagonal entries of the CRLB are the minimum achievable variances for any unbiased estimator of these parameters under the given noise conditions. By using the CRLB, one can predict the efficacy of a parametric model under noisy conditions, and in our case at a given resolution.

The simulated bistatic SAR images used in the Monte Carlo simulations of Section IV-C are well approximated by [21]

$$S_{i}(x, y; A_{i}, \psi_{i}, x_{i}, y_{i}) = A_{i}e^{j\psi_{i}} \frac{\sin\left[\frac{2\pi B_{x}}{c}\left((x - x_{i})\cos\bar{\phi}_{bi} + (y - y_{i})\sin\bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]}{\sin\left[\frac{2\pi B_{x}}{cN_{x}}\left((x - x_{i})\cos\bar{\phi}_{bi} + (y - y_{i})\sin\bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]} \\ \cdot \frac{\sin\left[\frac{2\pi B_{y}}{c}\left((x - x_{i})\sin\bar{\phi}_{bi} - (y - y_{i})\cos\bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]}{\sin\left[\frac{2\pi B_{y}}{cN_{y}}\left((x - x_{i})\sin\bar{\phi}_{bi} - (y - y_{i})\cos\bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]} + w_{i}(x, y), \\ i = 1, 2$$
(33)

where $\bar{\phi}_{bi}$ is the bistatic SAR look angle of the *i*th receiver, and $w_i(x, y)$ is circular white Gaussian noise with zero mean and variance σ^2 . The laid over position of a scatterer, with 3-D location (x_m, y_m, z_m) , in the *i*th image is $[x_i \quad y_i]^T = P_i Q_i [x_m \quad y_m \quad z_m]^T$. The image is assumed to be supported by spatial frequency data in x and y with N_x and N_y samples over bandwidths B_x and B_y , respectively. At high SNR, a Rician distribution [26] is well approximated by a Gaussian. This allows approximation of the amplitude of (33) with

$$S_{i}(x, y; A_{i}, x_{i}, y_{i}) = A_{i} \left| \frac{\sin \left[\frac{2\pi B_{x}}{c} \left((x - x_{i})\cos \bar{\phi}_{bi} + (y - y_{i})\sin \bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]}{\sin \left[\frac{2\pi B_{x}}{cN_{x}} \left((x - x_{i})\cos \bar{\phi}_{bi} + (y - y_{i})\sin \bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]} \\ \cdot \frac{\sin \left[\frac{2\pi B_{y}}{c} \left((x - x_{i})\sin \bar{\phi}_{bi} - (y - y_{i})\cos \bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]}{\sin \left[\frac{2\pi B_{y}}{cN_{y}} \left((x - x_{i})\sin \bar{\phi}_{bi} - (y - y_{i})\cos \bar{\phi}_{bi}\right)\right]}\right|} + v_{i}(x, y),$$

$$i = 1, 2$$
(34)

where $v_i(x, y)$ is assumed to be white Gaussian with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2/2$.

We now wish to compute a lower bound on the variance of estimates of the parameters $\theta_p \in \underline{\Theta} = \{A_1, A_2, x_m, y_m, z_m\}$ from the aggregate data set $y = [S_1(x, y; A_1, x_1, y_1) \quad S_2(x, y; A_2, x_2, y_2)]$. For convenience, we define the dummy variable $s(\underline{\Theta}) = y - [v_1(x, y) \quad v_2(x, y)]$, and we reform t the data such that y and $s(\underline{\Theta})$ are one-dimensional vectors of length $N = N_x N_y$. Thus, the likelihood function for y is

$$p(y|\underline{\Theta}) = \frac{1}{\left(\pi\sigma^2\right)^{N/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y-s(\underline{\Theta}))^T(y-s(\underline{\Theta}))}{\sigma^2}\right),\tag{35}$$

and the log-likelihood function is

$$\log p(y|\underline{\Theta}) = -\frac{N}{2} \log \left(\pi\sigma^2\right) - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} (y - s(\underline{\Theta}))^T (y - s(\underline{\Theta}))$$
(36)

where y is a noisy realization of the signal with mean $s(\underline{\Theta})$ and variance of $\sigma^2/2$ on each frequency sample. Taking the derivatives of our log-likelihood function with respect to $\theta_p \in \underline{\Theta} = \{A_1, A_2, x_m, y_m, z_m\}$ yields

$$\frac{\partial \log p(y|\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_p} = \frac{2}{\sigma^2} (y - s(\underline{\Theta}))^T \left(\frac{\partial s(\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_p}\right)$$
(37)

which can be computed for each element of $\underline{\Theta}$. Next, we compute each entry of the Fisher matrix

$$F_{pq} = E\left\{\left(\frac{\partial \log p(y|\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_p}\right)^T \left(\frac{\partial \log p(y|\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_q}\right)\right\}$$
$$= \frac{4}{\sigma^4} \left(\frac{\partial s(\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_p}\right)^T E\left\{(y - s(\underline{\Theta}))(y - s(\underline{\Theta}))^T\right\} \left(\frac{\partial s(\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_q}\right)$$
$$= \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{\partial s(\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_p}\right)^T \left(\frac{\partial s(\underline{\Theta})}{\partial \theta_q}\right). \tag{38}$$

The derivatives for the model of equation (34) with respect to $\theta_p \in \underline{\Theta} = \{A_1, A_2, x_m, y_m, z_m\}$ may be computed analytically or numerically. Finally, the CRLB of our parameter set is defined to be the inverse of the Fisher matrix, $C_{\underline{\Theta}} = F^{-1}$; the lower bound on the variance of each parameter is given by the corresponding diagonal element of F^{-1} , such that $\operatorname{var}(\theta_{ii}) \geq [C_{\underline{\Theta}}]_{ii}$.

References

- [1] L. Cazzani et al. A ground based parasitic SAR experiment. IEEE IGARSS, 3:1525–1527, 1999.
- [2] H.M. Jones. Predicted properties of bistatic satellite images. *IEEE National Radar Conference*, pages 286–291, Apr 1993.
- G.P. Cardillo. On the use of the gradient to determine bistatic SAR resolution. Antennas and Propagation Society International Symposium, 2:1032–1035, May 1990.
- [4] Y. Wu and D.C. Munson. Wide-angle ISAR passive imaging using smoothed pseudo Wigner-Ville distribution. IEEE Radar Conference Proceedings, pages 363–368, 2001.
- [5] J. Detlefsen. Application of multistatic radar principles to short-range imaging. *IEE Proceedings*, 133(7):658–663, Dec 1986.
- [6] C. Mikhail, K. Kurt and N. David. Bistatic synthetic aperture radar with non-cooperative LEOS based transmitter. IEEE 2000 International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium Proceedings, 2:861–862, 2000.
- [7] A.M. Horne and G. Yates. Bistatic synthetic aperture radar. *IEE Radar 2002*, pages 6–10, Oct 2002.
- [8] M. Lowe. Algorithms for high resolution bistatic SAR. *IEE Radar 2002*, pages 512–515, Oct 2002.
- [9] O. Arikan and D.C. Munson. A Tomographic Formulation of Bistatic Synthetic Aperture Radar. Proc. ComCon '88, page 418, October 1988.
- [10] A.D.M. Garvin and M.R. Inggs. Use of Synthetic Aperture and Stepped-Frequency Continuous Wave Processing to Obtain Radar Images. South African Symposium on Communications and Signal Processing 1991, pages 32–35, 1991.
- M. Soumekh. Bistatic Synthetic Aperture Radar Inversion with Application in Dynamic Object Imaging. *IEEE Transactions* on Signal Processing, 39:2044–2055, September 1991.
- [12] B.D. Rigling and R.L. Moses. Polar Format Algorithm for Bistatic SAR. Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems, June 2002.
- M. Soumekh. Multistatic echo imaging in remote sensing and diagnostic medicine. Sixth Multidimensional Signal Processing Workshop, page 200, 1989.
- [14] L.C. Graham. Synthetic interferometer radar for topographic mapping. Proc. IEEE, 62:763-768, 1974.
- [15] H. Zebker and R. Goldstein. Topographic mapping from interferometric SAR observations. J. Geophys. Res., 91:4993–4999, 1986.
- [16] A.K. Gabriel and R.M. Goldstein. Crossed orbit interferometry: Theory and experimental results from SIR-B. Int. J. Remote Sensing, 9:857–872, 1988.
- [17] M.D. Desai. Spotlight mode SAR stereo technique for height computation. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 6:1400–1411, 1997.
- [18] C.V. Jakowatz Jr., D.E. Wahl and P.A. Thompson. Three-dimensional SAR imaging using cross-track coherent stereo collections. *Thirty-First Asilomar Conf. on Signals, Systems & Computers*, 2:1199–1203, 1997.
- [19] W.G. Carrara, R.S. Goodman and R.M. Majewski. Spotlight Synthetic Aperture Radar: Signal Processing Algorithms. Artech House, Norwood, MA, 1995.
- [20] C.V. Jakowatz, D.E. Wahl and P.H. Eichel. Spotlight-Mode Synthetic Aperture Radar: A Signal Processing Approach. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA, 1996.
- [21] B. Rigling. Signal Processing Strategies for Bistatic Synthetic Aperture Radar. PhD thesis, Ohio State University, 2003.
- [22] B.D. Rigling and R.L. Moses. Motion Measurement Errors and Autofocus in Bistatic SAR. Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Image Processing 2003.

- [23] G. Minkler and J. Minkler. CFAR : the principles of automatic radar detection in clutter. Magellan Book Co., Baltimore, MD, 1990.
- [24] H.L. Van Trees. Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory Part I. Wiley, New York, NY, 1968.
- [25] H.A. Zebker and J. Villasenor. Decorrelation in Interferometric Radar Echoes. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 30:950–959, September 1992.
- [26] H. Stark and J.W. Woods. Probability, Random Processes, and Estimation Theory for Engineers. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 1994.