Physics-Informed Machine Learning for Real-Time Sensing Systems

Xiyuan Zhang, Xiaohan Fu, Diyan Teng, Chengyu Dong, Keerthivasan Vijayakumar, Jiayun Zhang, Ranak Roy Chowdhury, Junsheng Han, Dezhi Hong, Rashmi Kulkarni, Jingbo Shang, Rajesh Gupta

> University of California, San Diego Qualcomm

Outline

- Motivation
- Method
- Experiments
- Conclusion

Outline

Motivation

- Method
- Experiments
- Conclusion

- Sensors measuring real-life physical processes play a critical role in acquiring data for downstream pattern recognition or decision making
- Challenge: noisy measurements degrade data quality
 - Environmental interference
 - Electrical fluctuation
 - Imprecision of the sensors



Limitation

- Traditional filtering methods
 - rely on prior knowledge of signal characteristics
- Supervised machine learning methods
 - assume availability of ground truth clean data
- Unsupervised machine learning methods
 - make simplified assumptions on noise/signal distributions

Key Observation

- Different variables of sensor data often have correlations that can be characterized by physics equations
 - Motion law: location, acceleration
 - Ohm's law: voltage, current
 - Ideal gas law: pressure, temperature
 - And more!



Key Observation

- Key observation: Such physics-based constraints among measured channels can be used to make the learning process of denoising easier
- Example: Regions with higher noise level in the orientation data map to regions with large misalignment of physics equations



Noisy orientation



Physics Equation Misalignment

Key Contributions

- The first Physics-Informed Learning for denOising Technology (PILOT) that supports practical sensing applications
 - Inertial navigation
 - CO₂ monitoring
 - HVAC control system
- State-of-the-art denoising performance with real-world deployment

Outline

- Motivation
- Method
- Experiments
- Conclusion

Example - Inertial Navigation

- Data collection
 - Camera: position/orientation
 - IMU: angular velocity/acceleration



Example - Inertial Navigation

- Manually add noise to position and orientation
- Conditional denoising autoencoder (4 convolutional layers)
- Reconstruction loss $L_{rec} = ||(\text{Reconstructed } p, q) (p, q)||^2$



Example - Inertial Navigation

- Physics modeling: compute 1st and 2nd order derivatives of reconstructed orientation and positions
- Physics loss $L_{phy} = ||(\text{Derived } w, a) (\text{IMU } w, a)||^2$



General Framework

- Phase 1: reconstruction loss as warm-up phase
- Phase 2: reconstruction loss + physics loss



More Applications

• Inertial navigation

$$g_{1}(a, p, q) = a - R_{q}^{T} \left(\frac{d^{2}p}{dt^{2}} - g_{0}\right)$$

$$g_{2}(w, q) = \frac{dq}{dt} - \frac{1}{2}q \otimes w$$
Inertial Navigation
Angular Velocity w
Orientation q
Acceleration a
Location p

More Applications

Inertial navigation •







 c_t

Cout

Air Outflow

CO2 Sensor

 $n_t q$

More Applications



Outline

- Motivation
- Method
- Experiments
- Conclusion

Datasets

- Inertial navigation: public OxIOD dataset
- CO₂ monitoring: deployment in lab
- HVAC control: deployment on campus



 CO_2 Desk



 $\rm CO_2$ Vent



IMU + Vicon





HVAC ΔQ

HVAC ΔT

Metrics

- Three perspectives to evaluate the performance
 - Reconstruction performance
 - High quality data collected from other sources as approximate ground truth clean data
 - Visualizations
 - Physics alignment: how well the denoised data align with physics
 - Performance of downstream task based on the denoised data

Inertial Navigation

- Reconstruction performance
 - Visualizations (top: best baseline, bottom: PILOT)



Inertial Navigation

• Physics alignment (left: original noisy, middle: best baseline, right: PILOT)

| Model | Acceleration (m/s ²) | | Angular V | Angular Velocity (rad/s) | | |
|----------|----------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Metrics | MSE | MAE | MSE | MAE | | |
| Original | 762.6 | 3.7862 | 2.6219 | 0.2376 | | |
| Gaussian | 363.2 | 3.2295 | 1.6277 | 0.2161 | | |
| DWT | 854.9 | 5.4534 | 2.6034 | 0.2701 | | |
| DnCNN | 312.5 | 8.3830 | 0.3470 | 0.1896 | | |
| TSTNN | 3272.0 | 30.513 | 0.4184 | 0.4836 | | |
| DIP | 2153.6 | 33.938 | 0.3788 | 0.4013 | | |
| N2N | 118.7 | 4.5749 | 0.3565 | 0.1756 | | |
| PILOT | 1.8695 | 0.6372 | 0.0380 | 0.0690 | | |

Angular Velocity from IMU vs 1st-order Derivative from Orientation



Acceleration from IMU vs 2nd-order Derivative from Location

Inertial Navigation

• Downstream performance

| Model | IONet [5] | | | | | RoNIN [19] | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Metrics | vx (m/s) | vy (m/s) | vz (m/s) | mean v (m/s) | ATE (m) | RTE (m) | vx (m/s) | vy (m/s) | vz (m/s) | mean v (m/s) | ATE (m) | RTE (m) |
| Original | 0.0207 | 0.0642 | 0.0093 | 0.0314 | 0.3076 | 0.8194 | 0.0180 | 0.0621 | 0.0090 | 0.0297 | 0.2472 | 0.6337 |
| Gaussian | 0.0249 | 0.0496 | 0.0145 | 0.0297 | 0.6111 | 1.8727 | 0.0242 | 0.0498 | 0.0147 | 0.0296 | 0.5988 | 1.8427 |
| DWT | 0.0266 | 0.0732 | 0.0094 | 0.0364 | 0.3142 | 0.8079 | 0.0243 | 0.0714 | 0.0091 | 0.0349 | 0.2665 | 0.7023 |
| DnCNN | 0.0200 | 0.0235 | 0.0144 | 0.0193 | 0.3001 | 0.7891 | 0.0177 | 0.0213 | 0.0139 | 0.0176 | 0.2476 | 0.6598 |
| TSTNN | 0.2857 | 0.3250 | 0.0935 | 0.2348 | 0.6496 | 1.6575 | 0.2865 | 0.3253 | 0.0938 | 0.2352 | 0.6256 | 1.5794 |
| DIP | 0.1971 | 0.2650 | 0.0105 | 0.1576 | 0.5759 | 1.5108 | 0.1926 | 0.2570 | 0.0101 | 0.1533 | 0.3989 | 1.0358 |
| N2N | 0.0246 | 0.0144 | 0.0183 | 0.0191 | 0.3151 | 0.8317 | 0.0224 | 0.0122 | 0.0182 | 0.0176 | 0.2605 | 0.6956 |
| PILOT | 0.0102 | 0.0095 | 0.0031 | 0.0076 | 0.2998 | 0.7875 | 0.0081 | 0.0078 | 0.0017 | 0.0059 | 0.2413 | 0.6309 |

Example Trajectory 1



Example Trajectory 2

CO₂ Monitoring

• Reconstruction and physics alignment

| Model | Recons (1 | Recons (1 \times 10 ⁶ ppm) | | $\times 10^{6}$ ppm) |
|----------|-----------|---|--------|----------------------|
| Metrics | MSE | MAE | MSE | MAE |
| Original | 1.5654 | 0.0020 | 0.1082 | 0.1908 |
| Gaussian | 0.6265 | 0.0016 | 0.0278 | 0.1019 |
| DWT | 1.5076 | 0.0020 | 0.1045 | 0.1846 |
| DnCNN | 1.5381 | 0.0020 | 0.1064 | 0.1897 |
| TSTNN | 0.0956 | 0.0007 | 0.0027 | 0.0498 |
| DIP | 0.0841 | 0.0006 | 0.0018 | 0.0308 |
| N2N | 0.4396 | 0.0018 | 0.0085 | 0.0789 |
| PILOT | 0.0371 | 0.0004 | 0.0012 | 0.0200 |



| Experiments | |
|--------------|--|
| HVAC Control | |
| | |

Reconstruction and physics alignment

| Model | Reconstr | Reconstruction (K) | | cs (K) |
|----------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|
| Metrics | MSE | MAE | MSE | MAE |
| Original | 0.9479 | 0.8841 | 50.302 | 6.7184 |
| Gaussian | 0.8687 | 0.8782 | 49.528 | 6.7003 |
| DWT | 0.8553 | 0.8689 | 48.782 | 6.6471 |
| DnCNN | 0.3284 | 0.4786 | 50.380 | 6.7241 |
| TSTNN | 2.2980 | 1.1980 | 32.012 | 3.7260 |
| DIP | 3.7336 | 1.5098 | 29.747 | 3.7410 |
| N2N | 1.1830 | 0.9522 | 31.748 | <u>3.6990</u> |
| PILOT | 0.1994 | 0.3454 | 14.081 | 3.1600 |



Ablation Study

- w/o physics loss
- w/o reconstruction loss
- w/o 2-phase training

| Task | Metrics | w/o $l_{\rm phy}$ | w/o $l_{ m rec}$ | w/o pre-train | PILOT |
|--------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|--------|
| | MSE _a | 316.5 | 259.1 | 20.70 | 1.8695 |
| INIC | MAE _a | 8.342 | 8.759 | 2.2930 | 0.6372 |
| 11105 | MSE_{w} | 0.3579 | 0.2845 | 0.1380 | 0.0380 |
| | $\mathrm{MAE}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.1899 | 0.3352 | <u>0.1291</u> | 0.0690 |
| | MSE _{rec} | 0.4641 | 0.0568 | 0.0724 | 0.0371 |
| co | MAE _{rec} | 0.0139 | 0.0051 | 0.0074 | 0.0047 |
| CO_2 | MSE _{phy} | 0.0194 | 0.0021 | 0.0023 | 0.0012 |
| | MAE _{phy} | 0.0781 | 0.0264 | 0.0330 | 0.0200 |
| | MSE _{rec} | 0.3314 | 0.5314 | 0.2686 | 0.1994 |
| HVAC | MAE _{rec} | 0.4709 | 0.6128 | 0.4670 | 0.3454 |
| | MSE _{phy} | 50.22 | 14.69 | 14.469 | 14.081 |
| | MAE _{phy} | 6.713 | 3.263 | <u>3.203</u> | 3.1600 |

Sensitivity Analysis

• Adaptive loss ratio between physics loss and reconstruction loss works the best



• Random noise performs better than zero masking



Edge Deployment - Inertial Navigation

- Use Raspberry Pi 4 as an example edge device
- 8-bit training-aware quantization
- Time efficiency: 4 ms to denoise a 1s-sequence (100 readings)
- Memory efficiency (model size)

| Metrics | Params | Size | Inference Time | CPU Usage |
|------------|--------|--------|----------------|-----------|
| Efficiency | 270K | 284 KB | 4 ms | 25% |

Outline

- Motivation
- Method
- Experiments
- Conclusion

Conclusion

- The first physics-informed sensor denoising algorithm
 - Inertial navigation
 - CO₂ monitoring
 - HVAC control system
- State-of-the-art denoising performance with real-world deployment

