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Abstract: A low-loss CFAR algorithm for Weibull background is discussed. The two parameters (shape and scale) of the background statistics are estimated using a maximum-likelihood algorithm. A CFAR threshold based on parameters estimated in this way exhibits a smaller variance, and hence a smaller CFAR loss, than thresholds based on other estimation algorithms such as moments or order statistics. The analysis covers both complete and censored background sample sets.

1 Introduction

The Weibull probability density function (PDF) is known to represent sea and ground clutter at low grazing angles or at high-resolution situations [1, 2]. The Weibull PDF is a two-parameter distribution, of which the Rayleigh distribution is a special case. In cases of large clutter-to-noise ratio, the clutter PDF dominates the background. This paper deals with such a situation, and assumes that the background can be described by a Weibull PDF

$$f(x) = \frac{C}{B} \left( \frac{x}{B} \right)^{C-1} \exp \left[ - \left( \frac{x}{B} \right)^C \right]$$

where the random variable $x$ is the output of the envelope detector, $B$ is the scale parameter, and $C$ is the shape parameter.

Constant false-alarm rate (CFAR) detectors for Weibull background have been suggested in the past [3–5]. The adaptive threshold was effectively based on the estimation of the scale parameter and the shape parameter, using either moments [3] or order statistics [4, 5]. Both techniques exhibit extensive CFAR loss [5]. It has also been demonstrated that the loss is related to the variance of the estimated parameters [5]. To reduce the variance, and therefore the CFAR loss, a CFAR algorithm in which the parameters are estimated using maximum likelihood, was developed and is described here. The maximum-likelihood likelihood (ML) algorithm is more computational-intensive than the other two approaches; however, modern processors may be able to handle the additional processing. Even if not implemented, the expected performances of the ML algorithm can serve as a comparative reference for the simpler algorithms.

In the following sections we will develop the ML-CFAR algorithm and analyse its performance, beginning with the simple case in which the shape parameter is known, and proceeding to the case in which both parameters are unknown. For that general case we will show that the maximum-likelihood (ML) CFAR threshold is implemented as shown in Fig. 1, by setting the adaptive threshold according to

$$T = \hat{B} \ln \hat{C}$$

(2)

The ML estimates of $B$ and $C$ are obtained [6] from the $M$ background samples

$$\hat{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_M)^T$$

(3)

by solving iteratively for $\hat{C}$ the equation

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^C \ln x_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^C} - \frac{1}{\hat{C}} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \ln x_j$$

(4)

and using this $\hat{C}$, obtain $\hat{B}$ from

$$\hat{B} = \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^C \right)^{1/C}$$

(5)

The coefficient $a$ is a function of the number of reference samples $M$ and the desired probability of false alarm $P_{fa}$, and is independent of the parameters $\hat{B}$ and $\hat{C}$.

The performances of the ML CFAR will be analysed and compared against the performances of the Weber–Haykin algorithm [4], which is based on order statistics [5]. The threshold-determining algorithm and its performances will also be given for the case in which it is desired to censor a given number of the highest-ranked background samples, to gain immunity against interfering targets.

2 ML CFAR for Weibull background with known shape parameter

Our analysis will begin with the more simple case in which the shape parameter is known, and we will show
that \( \alpha \) can be explicitly expressed in terms of \( M, P_{FA} \) and the known \( C \).

### 2.1 Uncensored ML CFAR (known \( C \))

The background is represented by a set of \( M \)-independent identically distributed (IID) samples \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_M \), with a Weibull probability density function (PDF), with a known shape parameter \( C \), and an unknown scale parameter \( B \).

For the special case \( C = 2 \), the PDF becomes Rayleigh, for which it has been shown \([7]\) that the maximum-likelihood estimator of \( B \) is

\[
\hat{B} = \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^2 \right)^{1/2}
\]

and a threshold of the form

\[
T(\hat{\lambda}) = a\hat{B}
\]

yields an optimal detector, which maximises the probability of detection for a given probability of false alarm. Such a detector is called a uniformly most powerful (UMP) test. It has also been shown \([8]\) that the resulting probability of false alarm is given by

\[
P_{FA} = \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{M} \right)^{-M}
\]

In an analogy to this special case \( C = 2 \), we will use the same kind of threshold, with the ML estimate of \( B \), when \( C \) is known but is not necessarily equal to 2. References 9 and 10 show that for such a case the ML estimator is given by

\[
\hat{B} = \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^C \right)^{1/C}
\]

yielding a threshold

\[
T(\hat{x}) = a\hat{B} = \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^C \right)^{1/C}
\]

A false alarm happens when the value in the cell under test (CUT) exceeds the threshold, yielding

\[
P_{FA} = \int_{T}^{\infty} f(x) \, dx
\]

The first term in the integrand is

\[
P(CUT > T) = \int_{T}^{\infty} f(x) \, dx
\]

\[
= \int_{T}^{\infty} \frac{C x^{C-1}}{B^C} \exp \left( -\left( \frac{x}{B} \right)^C \right) \, dx
\]

Substituting \( x = \frac{t}{B} \) yields

\[
= \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{T}{B} \right)^C \right]
\]

Substituting the threshold from eqn. 10 in eqn. 12 we obtain, for the first term in the integrand

\[
P(CUT > T) = \exp \left[ -\frac{\alpha^2}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right)^C \right]
\]

The second term in the integrand of eqn. 11 is the joint PDF of the \( M \) samples, which is

\[
f(\hat{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{M} \frac{C}{B} \left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right)^{C-1} \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right)^C \right]
\]

Inserting eqns. 13 and 14 into eqn. 11 we obtain

\[
P_{FA} = \prod_{j=1}^{M} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{C}{B} \left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right)^{C-1} \exp \left[ -\left( 1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{M} \right) \left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right)^C \right] \, dx_j
\]

Substituting \( y_j = \left( x_j/B \right)^C \) we obtain

\[
P_{FA} = \prod_{j=1}^{M} \int_{0}^{\infty} \exp \left[ -\left( 1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{M} \right) y_j \right] \, dy_j
\]

from which we obtain

\[
P_{FA} = \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{M} \right)^{-M}
\]

Eqn. 17 indicates that the algorithm is indeed CFAR, as the false-alarm probability is independent of \( B \). Using eqn. 17 in eqn. 10 results in a rather simple expression for the threshold

\[
T(\hat{x}) = \left[ \left( \frac{P_{FA}}{M-1} \right)^{1/C} + \left( \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j^C}{M} \right)^{1/C} \right]^{1/C}
\]

### 2.2 Censored ML CFAR (known \( C \))

The presence of interfering targets among the reference cells can drastically degrade the performances of the CFAR detector. To reduce this degradation, Rickard and Dillard \([11]\) proposed to censor the \( M - K \) largest cells. For the case of Rayleigh distributed samples, the maximum-likelihood estimator of \( B \), using the \( K \) smallest cells, was shown by Epstein and Sobel \([12]\) to be

\[
\hat{B} = \left( \frac{1}{K} \left( (M - K)x_0^C + \sum_{j=1}^{K} x_j^C \right) \right)^{1/C}
\]

where

\[
x(1) \leq x(2) \leq \cdots \leq x(4) \leq \cdots \leq x(M)
\]

It has been shown that this estimator has the same distribution as the ML estimator of \( B \) based on \( K \) uncensored reference cells \([12]\). The censored ML estimator for the Rayleigh background and square-law detector was discussed by Ritchey \([13]\).

For the Weibull background we propose to use the ML estimator of \( B \) based on the \( K \) smallest samples out of \( M \) reference samples, which was shown \([9,10]\) to be

\[
\hat{B} = \left( \frac{1}{K} \left( (M - K)x_0^C + \sum_{j=1}^{K} x_j^C \right) \right)^{1/C}
\]

In References 9 and 10 it was also shown that the estimator presented in eqn. 21 has the same distribution as the ML estimator of \( B \) based on \( K \) uncensored cells. If the threshold remains as in eqn. 7, the relation between \( P_{FA} \) and \( \alpha \), given in eqn. 17, will apply after replacing the total number of cells \( M \), by the highest rank used \( K \). Thus, for the censored case we obtain the following relation between \( P_{FA} \) and \( T \):

\[
T(\hat{x}) = \left[ \left( \frac{P_{FA}^{-1/K}}{M-K} \right)^{1/C} + \left( \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{K} x_j^C}{M} \right)^{1/C} \right]^{1/C}
\]

### 2.3 Square-law detector

The analysis has so far assumed a linear detector, but adapting to a square-law detector is straightforward.
Note that if the random variable $x$ is Weibull distributed with the shape parameter $C$, the product of a square-law detector $y = x^2$ is also Weibull, with the shape parameter $C/2$. Hence, for the uncensored case the threshold will become

$$T(\bar{y}) = \left[ (P_{PA}^{1/C} - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{M} y_{j}^{(C/2)} \right]^{2/C}. \tag{23}$$

### 3 ML-CFAR for Weibull background with unknown shape parameter

When both the scale parameter and the shape parameter are unknown, they need to be estimated simultaneously from the reference samples. The adaptive threshold will be based on the estimates of $B$ and $C$. In this section we will derive the maximum-likelihood estimates of $B$ and $C$, prove that the threshold described by eqn. 2 is indeed CFAR, and discuss the relation between the controlling coefficient $\alpha$ and the probability of false alarm $P_{FA}$. Unfortunately, we could not find an analytic expression for that relationship, and the results will be expressed in graphs, produced with the help of Monte-Carlo simulations.

#### 3.1 The ML estimator of the shape and scale parameters

The derivation of the ML estimators for $B$ and $C$ was reported in References 6, 9 and 10. We will repeat this derivation briefly: to obtain the ML estimators, we derive the joint PDF of the $M$ reference cells $f(\bar{y})$, differentiate its logarithm with respect to $B$ and $C$, and equate to zero. The resulting set of equations can be solved iteratively to obtain the ML estimates of $B$ and $C$.

Assuming independence between the reference cells, the joint PDF is

$$f(\bar{y}) = \left( \frac{C}{B^{C}} \right)^{M} \prod_{j=1}^{M} \left[ x_{j}^{(C-1)} \exp \left( -\frac{x_{j}^{C}}{B^{C}} \right) \right] \tag{24}$$

from which we obtain

$$\ln f(\bar{y}) = M \ln C - MC \ln B$$

$$+ (C - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{M} \ln x_{j} - \frac{M}{B^{C}} \sum_{j=1}^{M} x_{j}^{C} \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln f(\bar{y})}{\partial B} = -\frac{MC}{B} + C \sum_{j=1}^{M} \left( \frac{x_{j}^{C}}{B^{C}} \right) \tag{26}$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln f(\bar{y})}{\partial C} = \frac{M}{C} - M \ln B + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \ln x_{j}$$

$$- \frac{M}{C} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \left( \frac{x_{j}^{C}}{B^{C}} \right) \ln \left( \frac{x_{j}}{B} \right) \tag{27}$$

Equating eqn. 26 to zero yields

$$B^{C} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} x_{j}^{C} \tag{28}$$

Equating eqn. 27 to zero and using eqn. 28 yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{x_{j}^{C} \ln x_{j}}{M} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \ln x_{j} = \frac{1}{C} \tag{29}$$

Eqn. 29 can be solved iteratively to yield $C$, which will then be used in eqn. 28 to yield $B$.

We now have to justify the choice of the threshold as described by eqn. 2. We first note from eqn. 12 that when $B$ and $C$ are known exactly, the probability of false alarm is

$$P_{FA} = \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{T}{B} \right)^{C} \right] \tag{30}$$

Hence

$$T = B(-\ln P_{FA})^{1/C} \tag{31}$$

When $B$ and $C$ are not known exactly, and are replaced by their estimated values, which are not error-free, a given threshold yields a larger $P_{FA}$ than predicted by eqn. 30. To compensate for that, we replace $-\ln P_{FA}$ by a parameter $z$, which can be verified to determine the desired $P_{FA}$. The threshold is therefore set according to

$$T = Bz^{1/C} \tag{32}$$

For a large number of reference cells $M$, and relatively high $P_{FA}$, we indeed expect $z$ to be only slightly higher than $-\ln P_{FA}$.

In Appendix A we will prove that the heuristic approach that led to eqn. 32 was justified, and that eqn. 32 yields a CFAR detector. Furthermore, it can also be shown that this is the only possible threshold based on the ML estimators of $B$ and $C$ that maintains CFAR.

Using the simulation technique discussed in Appendix B, we have obtained results for the relationship between $z$ and $P_{FA}$ for two values of $M$ (16 cells and 32 cells). The results are plotted in Fig. 2. We have added the curve of $-\ln P_{FA}$, to which $z$ converges when $M$ tends to infinity. In Fig. 2, each point on the curve corresponding to $M = 32$ was obtained from 100000 trials, and each point on the $M = 16$ curve was obtained from 50000 trials. The curves are obtained using linear interpolation between the points, without smoothing.

#### 3.2 Censored ML-CFAR (unknown $C$)

To provide the ML-CFAR detector with immunity against interfering targets, we resort again to the practice of censoring the highest $M - K$ samples. The improved immunity will be achieved at the expense of decreased estimation accuracy, and therefore increased CFAR loss. The ML estimators for $B$ and $C$ in the censored case were studied in References 6, 9 and 10, and are given by

$$\frac{(M - K)x_{(K)} \ln x_{(K)} + \sum_{j=1}^{K} x_{(j)} \ln x_{(j)}}{(M - K)x_{(K)} + \sum_{j=1}^{K} x_{(j)}^{C}} = \frac{1}{(K)} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \ln x_{(j)} = \frac{1}{C} \tag{33}$$
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Contrary to the case of a known shape parameter, where the relationship between $\alpha$ and $P_{fa}$ depended only on $K$, here we find that $\hat{C}$, and hence the relationship, is a function of both $K$ and $M$. An example of the relationship between $\alpha$ and $P_{fa}$ for $M = 32$ and various $K$s, is given in Fig. 3. This was obtained using the combination of

$$B = \left( \frac{1}{K} \left[ (M-K)\hat{x}_N^0 + \sum_{i=1}^{K} x_i^0 \right] \right)^{1/C} \quad (34)$$

Monte-Carlo simulations and analytic calculations described in Appendix B. Each point is the result of 100,000 trials. The lowest curve corresponds to $K = 32$, and the uppermost curve corresponds to $K = 20$. This indicates that for a given $M$ and $P_{fa}$, decreasing $K$ requires an increase in $\alpha$.

4 Probability of detection and CFAR loss

The probability of detection will be studied for the case of a fluctuating target with Rayleigh PDF. As long as we are dealing with a single pulse case, both Swerling I and Swerling II targets are covered. With this type of target we encounter a difficulty in the cell under test (CUT). The PDF of the target plus the background (which add as vectors) cannot be obtained in a closed form. An attempt to compute $P_D$ directly, using the exact PDF of the CUT, results in a complicated integral which is hard to evaluate numerically. We therefore seek an approximation which is easier to compute. We note that when the signal-to-clutter ratio is high, the contribution of the clutter to the signal in the CUT is small, and the exact PDF of that contribution is not very important. We will therefore assume that the CUT contains the Rayleigh target plus Rayleigh clutter with the same mean energy as the Weibull clutter in the reference cells. This approximation will become exact when the reference cells also exhibit a Rayleigh PDF.

4.1 Known shape parameter

When the shape parameter $C$ is known, the threshold is based on the estimate of the scale parameter, as in eqn. 7. The probability of detection will therefore be

$$P_D = \int_0^\infty P_{\text{CUT} > aB} f_B(b) \, dB \quad (35)$$

where $f_B(b)$ is the PDF of the ML estimator of $B$, given in eqn. 76. The probability of the CUT crossing a threshold $T$ is obviously

$$P_{\text{CUT} > T} = \int_T^\infty f_{\text{CUT}}(y) \, dy \quad (36)$$

As indicated above, we will assume a fluctuating target with Rayleigh PDF, and mean power of $B_T^2$. The clutter in the CUT will be approximated by a Rayleigh PDF with the same mean power as the Weibull clutter in the reference cells. The mean clutter power $B_T^2$ will be related to the scale parameter $B$, as

$$B_T^2 = B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right) \quad (37)$$

Since both target and clutter in the CUT are Rayleigh distributed, the PDF of the CUT will also be Rayleigh distributed

$$f_{\text{CUT}}(y) = \frac{y}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} \exp \left[ \frac{-y^2}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} + B_T^2 \right] \quad (38)$$

Defining a signal-to-clutter ratio (SCR)

$$\text{SCR} = \frac{B_T^2}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} \quad (39)$$

and using it and eqn. 38 in eqn. 36, we will obtain

$$P_{\text{CUT} > aB} = \exp \left[ \frac{-aB_T^2}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} \right] \quad (40)$$

Using eqns. 76 and 40 in eqn. 35 we can find $P_D$

$$P_D = \int_0^\infty \exp \left[ \frac{-a^2}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right) + M \frac{C}{B^2}} \right] \frac{(M-1)!}{M!} \exp \left[ \frac{-M \frac{C}{B^2}}{(M-1)!} \right] \exp \left[ \left( M - 1 \right) \frac{a^2}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right) + M \frac{C}{B^2}} \right] \, dy \quad (41)$$

Substituting

$$z = a \frac{M \frac{C}{B^2}}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right) + M \frac{C}{B^2}} \quad (42)$$

we obtain the result for the probability of detection when $\text{SCR} \gg 1$

$$P_D = \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \int_0^\infty z^{M-1} \exp \left[ \frac{-z}{B^2 \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right) + M \frac{C}{B^2}} \right] \, dz \quad (43)$$

For the special case of Rayleigh clutter (in which $C = 2$) this integral can be solved explicitly, reducing to the well known result

$$P_D = \left[ \frac{1 + a^2}{M \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} \right]^{-M} \quad (44)$$

Eqn. 43 is an approximate expression, because despite the fact that the clutter in the reference cells is Weibull distributed, in the CUT we have assumed it to be Rayleigh distributed (with the same mean power). In order to
check the accuracy of this approximation, we compare the \( P_D \) calculated using eqn. 43 with the Monte-Carlo simulation in which the CUT contained Weibull clutter (and a Rayleigh target). The results are given in Fig. 4, in

\[
\log_{10}(P_D) = \frac{-C}{B} \quad (43)
\]

which the curve represents eqn. 43. The individual points are each obtained from 1000 Monte-Carlo trials. For a low SCR we expect the actual \( P_D \) to be somewhat higher than predicted by eqn. 43. The longer tail of the Weibull PDF of the clutter in the CUT will cause more threshold crossings. This is seen in Fig. 4, where the points are systematically slightly above the curve for low SCR. We thus conclude that the expression in eqn. 43 accurately describes the probability of detection of ML-CFAR, when the background is Weibull distributed with any (known) shape parameter \( C \), the target is Rayleigh fluctuating, and SCR \( \gg 1 \). It is also accurate for any SCR when \( C \to 2 \).

Note that eqn. 43 applies also to the censored case, in which the scale parameter is estimated by eqn. 21. The only change in eqn. 43 will be to replace the number of reference cells \( M \) by the highest rank used – \( K \).

Fig. 5 contains numerical solutions of eqn. 43 for \( P_{FA} = 1 \times 10^{-5} \) and \( M = 16 \) reference cells, for several values of the shape parameter \( C \). As \( C \) gets smaller, the clutter PDF has a longer tail, which forces an increase in the adaptive threshold. This explains part of the correspond-

pring drop in \( P_D \). This effect of \( C \) on \( P_D \) should be observed also in a fixed-threshold (non-CFAR) detector. The other cause for the drop in \( P_D \) as \( C \) decreases, is the reduced accuracy in estimating \( B \). This effect is found only in the CFAR detector. In order to separate the two effects, we will next calculate the dependence on \( C \) of the CFAR loss, rather than the probability of detection.

4.2 CFAR loss (known \( C \))

The CFAR loss is the ratio between the SCR required to achieve a specified \( P_D \) and \( P_{FA} \), and the SCR of the non-CFAR case, in which the clutter level is known and the threshold is a constant, designated as \( \tau_{CFAR} \). In the non-CFAR case (Rayleigh target, Weibull clutter), the following two relationships hold:

\[
P_{FA} = \exp \left( -\left( \frac{t_{\infty}}{B} \right)^2 \right)
\]

\[
P_D = \exp \left( -\left( \frac{t_{\infty}}{B} \right)^2 \right)
\]

from which we obtain the non-CFAR triple relationship between SCR, \( P_{FA} \) and \( P_D \):

\[
SCR = \frac{(\ln (1/P_{FA}))^2}{(\ln (1/P_D)) \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} - 1
\]

When the CFAR detector is employed, we find the SCR for a given \( P_{FA} \), \( P_D \) and \( K \) by first calculating a from the required \( P_{FA} \) using eqn. 17; using that \( a \), eqn. 43 is solved iteratively (using \( K \) in place of \( M \)) for the SCR. The CFAR loss is defined by the quotient

\[
CFAR loss = \frac{SCR_{P_{FA}, P_D, C, K}}{SCR_{P_{FA}, P_D, C}}
\]

Using this procedure we have calculated the CFAR loss as a function of \( C \), for the case of \( K = 16 \), \( P_D = 0.5 \) and \( P_{FA} = 10^{-5} \). The results are presented in Fig. 6. By comparing Figs. 5 and 6 we note, for example, that the increase of 13 dB necessary to maintain \( P_D = 0.5 \) as \( C \) drops from 2 to 0.8 (Fig. 5), is constructed from about 2.4 dB additional CFAR loss (Fig. 6), and a balance of

10.6 dB increase, that would have been required by a fixed-threshold detector.

Another interesting observation from Fig. 6 is the approximation

\[ \text{CFAR loss} C_{1,\text{loa}} \approx \frac{C_2}{C_1} \text{ CFAR loss}(C_2) \]  
(49)

which can also be justified analytically.

Fig. 7 shows the dependence of the CFAR loss on the number of reference cells used. The abscissa is \( M \) in the uncensored case, or \( K \) (out of \( M = 32 \)) in the censored case. The CFAR loss for the ML CFAR is compared to that of Rohling's order statistics (OS) CFAR [14]. A similar comparison for a Rayleigh clutter (\( C = 2 \)) was reported in Reference 15. In Fig. 7 we have added the results for \( C = 0.8 \). In the censored case the losses of the ML CFAR are a function only of \( K \), while the losses of the OS CFAR are a function of both \( K \) and \( M \). Fig. 7 demonstrates that for \( K < 3M/4 \), the CFAR losses of both algorithms are comparable.

4.3 Unknown shape parameter

When both \( B \) and \( C \) are estimated by the maximum-likelihood algorithm, their distribution is not available in a closed form, to allow calculation of the \( P_d \) in a similar way to the procedure described by eqn. 35 for the 'known \( C \)' case. Instead of using an expression such as eqn. 35 we will use an approximation based on \( E(T) \), the expected value of the threshold:

\[ P_d = \int_0^\infty \mu \left( \text{P}(\text{CUT} > T) \right) f(T) dT \approx \mu \left[ \text{P}(\text{CUT} > E(T)) \right] \]  
(50)

The rationale behind this approximation can be explained with the help of Fig. 8, which presents the simulation results of a typical case. The dotted Gaussian-like curve is the PDF of the threshold. The solid line is the probability distribution \( \mu \left( \text{P}(\text{CUT} > T) \right) \), when the CUT contains only clutter, and the dashed line is \( \mu \left( \text{P}(\text{CUT} > T) \right) \) when the CUT contains target plus clutter. The parameters used to generate Fig. 8 were \( C = 2, M = 64, \) \( \text{SCR} = 25 \) dB. Fig. 8 demonstrates that \( \text{P}(\text{CUT} > T) \) for the 'target plus clutter' case is relatively constant over the narrow interval of \( T \) in which its PDF is of any significance. Therefore \( \text{P}(\text{CUT} > T) \) can be replaced by its value at \( E(T) \). The same is not true for the 'clutter only' case. The curve \( \text{P}(\text{CUT} > T) \) in the 'clutter only' case drops rapidly during the relevant interval of values of the threshold \( T \).

With the assumption expressed in eqn. 50, the procedure of calculating \( P_d \) is to determine, by simulations, the expected threshold \( E(T) \) for a given situation \((M, B, C, P_{\alpha})\). With \( E(T) \) available, the probability of detection (assuming again Rayleigh target and Rayleigh clutter in the CUT) is given by

\[ P_d = \exp \left( \frac{-E(T)}{B} \right) \left( 1 + \text{SCR} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right) \]  
(51)

from which we extract the required SCR

\[ \text{SCR} = \frac{E(T)}{B^2 \left( \frac{1}{P_d} \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} - 1 \]  
(52)

In the non-CFAR case we will obtain the same expression, except for replacing \( E(T) \) by the constant threshold \( T_\alpha \). Thus

\[ \text{SCR} = \frac{T_\alpha^2}{B^2 \left( \frac{1}{P_d} \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{2}{C} \right)} - 1 \]  
(53)

The CFAR loss is, therefore, approximately

\[ \text{CFAR loss} = \frac{\text{SCR}}{\text{SCR}_0} \approx \frac{E(T)}{T_\alpha} \]  
(54)

Note that this approach for approximating the CFAR loss was also used by Rohling [14]. We have checked the approximation for an unfavourable case: \( M = 16, P_{\alpha} = 10^{-5}, P_d = 0.5 \) and \( C = 1 \). The required SCR for the non-CFAR case is 19.8 dB, hence the exact CFAR loss is 18 dB. The CFAR loss obtained from the approximation in eqn. 54 was 18.8 dB. Thus for this unfavourable case the error was 0.8 out of 18 dB. Note that the number of Monte-Carlo trials required for the approximation is smaller, because they do not extend beyond finding the average threshold.

4.4 Performance comparison between the ML CFAR and the WH CFAR

The performances of the ML CFAR in the case of unknown \( C \) will be compared to the performances of the Weber–Haykin (WH) algorithm [4, 5]. According to the WH algorithm, the threshold is set using the \( i \)th and \( j \)th
ranked reference cells:

\[ T = x_{i0}^c \hat{\rho} x_{j0} \]  

(55)

As pointed out by Levanon and Shor [5], this threshold is also of the form

\[ T = B x_{i0}^c \]  

(56)

where \( \hat{\beta} = x_{i0} \), and \( \hat{C} \) is the percentile estimator suggested by Dubey [16]. Dubey found that the optimal values for \( i \) and \( j \) are the closest integers to 0.1673 \( M \) and 0.9737 \( M \), respectively. We have used these values in the comparison.

In order to run the comparison we used \( x \) from Fig. 2, but we also needed \( \beta \) for the WH algorithm. \( \beta \) as a function of \( P_{FA} \) for \( M = 16 \) (\( i = 3, j = 16 \)) and \( M = 32 \) (\( i = 5, j = 31 \)) reference cells is given in Fig. 9. The CFAR losses were calculated using the approximation in eqn. 54, which applies also to the WH algorithm. The results for \( M = 16 \) and 32 and for \( C = 1 \) and 2, are presented in Figs. 10 and 11. In these two figures, the solid curve corresponding to the ML CFAR is the lower curve, indicating that its CFAR loss is always smaller than the CFAR loss of the WH CFAR (dashed curve).

4.5 Comparison between ML CFAR and WH CFAR (censored case)

When the highest ranked cells are censored to protect the algorithms from interfering targets, the estimates of the parameters are poorer, causing an increased CFAR loss. The two algorithms were compared also in the censored case, in which the lowest 26 cells out of a total of 32 cells were used. In the WH algorithm this meant \( i = 5 \), and \( j = 26 \). The corresponding \( a \) and \( \beta \) values as functions of the \( P_{FA} \) are presented in Figs. 3 and 12. The CFAR loss curves for \( C = 1 \) and 2 are presented in Fig. 13. Note that the ML CFAR exhibits a smaller loss also in the censored case.

5 Conclusions

We have described a CFAR algorithm for Weibull background, based on a maximum-likelihood estimator of the shape and scale parameters of the Weibull PDF. The
algorithm, exhibits a lower CFAR loss than the Weber-Haykin (WH) algorithm, in which the two parameters are estimated using order statistics. Since the WH algorithm was known to exhibit a lower loss than the moments estimator, we can claim that the maximum-likelihood CFAR for the Weibull background described in this paper, yields the lowest CFAR loss of all the known CFAR algorithms for Weibull background. However, this does not mean that the ML algorithm maximises the probability of detection for a given probability of false alarm.

The loss improvement over the WH algorithm should be weighted against the computational complexity. The iterative solution of eqn. 33 is more difficult to implement than the sorting required by the WH algorithm. The criterion for halting the iterations was a step in \( C \) smaller than 1/20 of the theoretical standard deviation of \( C \). This would entail a CFAR loss increase smaller than 0.05 dB. With that halting criterion, when the initial guess of \( C \) was correct, the average number of iterations was 4.4. When the correct \( C \) was 2 and the first guess was \( C = 1 \), the average number of iterations was 6.9.

It can be shown that the algorithm presented in this paper exhibits a CFAR property for other background distributions, in particular the log-normal distribution. However, its performances in the presence of log-normal background are inferior to the performances of the 'log-\( \ell \)' detector [17], which is a maximum-likelihood CFAR algorithm matched to log-normal background. In fact, every CFAR detector for Weibull background is also CFAR for log-normal background and vice versa.
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7 Appendices
7.1 A test for the CFAR property
The general expression for the \( P_{\text{FA}} \) in the case of Weibull background is given in eqn. 11 and 12, which, when combined, appear as

\[
P_{\text{FA}} = \int_0^\infty \exp \left\{ -\frac{T(\hat{x})}{B} \right\} f_\lambda(\hat{x}) \, d\hat{x}
\]

where the PDF is given in eqn. 14 and rewritten here as

\[
f_\lambda(\hat{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{M} \left( \frac{C}{B} \right)^{C-1} \exp \left\{ -\left( \frac{\hat{x}}{B} \right)^C \right\}
\]

Substituting

\[
y_j = \left( \frac{\hat{x}}{B} \right)^C
\]

we obtain

\[
f_{y_j}(y) = \prod_{j=1}^{M} \exp \left\{ -\gamma_j \right\}
\]

Using eqns. 59 and 60 in eqn. 57 we obtain

\[
P_{\text{FA}} = \int_0^\infty \exp \left\{ -\frac{T(B^{1/y_j})}{B} \right\} \prod_{j=1}^{M} \exp \left\{ -\gamma_j \right\} \, dy_j
\]

where

\[
T(B^{1/y_j}) = T(B_1^{y_j}, \ldots, B_M^{y_j})
\]

For the method to be CFAR, \( P_{\text{FA}} \) should be independent of both \( B \) and \( C \). A necessary and sufficient condition for eqn. 61 to be independent from both \( B \) and \( C \) is to demand that

\[
\frac{T(B^{1/y_j})}{B} = T(y)
\]

or equivalently

\[
T\left( \frac{\hat{x}}{B} \right) = T\left( \frac{\hat{x}}{B} \right)
\]

Before we can apply this test to the threshold suggested in eqn. 32, we also need to prove that the maximum-likelihood estimates of \( B \) and \( C \) obey

\[
\hat{B} = \left( \frac{\hat{x}}{\beta} \right)
\]

\[
\hat{C} = \left( \frac{\hat{x}}{\beta} \right)
\]

To prove eqns. 64 and 65, we note that the likelihood eqns. 26 and 27, after being equated to zero, are both functions of the format

\[
g\left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right) = 0
\]

If the samples \( x_j \) are transformed into \( (x_j/B)^x \), the new solutions of the likelihood equations \( \hat{B} \) and \( \hat{C} \), will satisfy

\[
\left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right)^C = \left( \frac{x_j}{B} \right)^C
\]
or
\[ \gamma C = \hat{C} \]
\[ \beta C \beta = (\hat{\beta})^2 \]
yielding
\[ C = \frac{\hat{C}}{\gamma} \]
\[ \beta = \frac{\hat{\beta}}{\beta^0} \]
which are equivalent to eqns. 65 and 64 respectively.

Having proven eqns. 64 and 65, we are now ready to test whether the threshold
\[ T(x) = \hat{B}(x) \]
has the property required in eqn. 63. Replacing \( \hat{x} \) by \( (\hat{x}/B)^{C} \) in eqn. 72, and using eqns. 64 and 65, we obtain
\[ T \left[ \frac{\hat{x}}{B} \right] = \left( B \right) \left[ \frac{\hat{x}}{B} \right] \left( \frac{\hat{B}(x)^{C}}{B^C} \right) \]
\[ = \left( \frac{\hat{B}(x)^{C}}{B^C} \right) \]
\[ = \left( \frac{T(x)^{C}}{B} \right) \]
QED

7.2 Determining \( P_{FA}(\alpha, M) \) by Monte-Carlo Simulations

An explicit expression for the \( P_{FA} \) is difficult to obtain because it requires a knowledge of the distribution of the ML estimators of \( B \) and \( C \). The asymptotic distribution, known to be normal, can be used, but the result will be accurate only for a large number of reference cells. We therefore relied on simulations to obtain \( P_{FA}(\alpha, M) \).

Straightforward Monte-Carlo simulations will require a huge number of trials if small values of \( P_{FA} \) are to be simulated. Suppose an event with probability \( p \) is simulated, and \( p \) is to be estimated by the number of events over the number of trials. The relative accuracy of such an estimator is
\[ \text{STD}(\hat{p}) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{mp}} \]  
\[ \text{If the desired accuracy is 10\%, the number of trials } m \text{ will have to be 100/p. To evaluate the performances for } P_{FA} = 10^{-5}, \text{ } M = 16 \text{ and } C = 2, \text{ it is seen that 13000 trials are needed in order to achieve 10\% estimation accuracy. This is about three orders of magnitude smaller than the } 10^7 \text{ trials required in a straightforward Monte-Carlo simulation. For the case of unknown shape parameter, the reduction in the number of trials is less dramatic. When } P_{FA} = 10^{-5}, \text{ } M = 16 \text{ and } C = 2 \text{ (unknown to the estimator), the number of Monte-Carlo trials necessary to obtain a 10\% estimation accuracy of the } P_{FA}, \text{ was } 6 \times 10^6. \text{ However, this is still a big improvement over the } 10^7 \text{ trials required in the straightforward approach.} \]