Preventing the Impact of False Negatives on Vehicle Object Detection in Autonomous Driving A Thorough Analysis of Calibration, Thresholding, and Fusion Methods

Amir Hassanpour
College of Computer Science and Engineering, Tabriz Engineering University
Kareem Nal Farsi
School of Computing Science and Engineering, Dhofar University

Abstract

The surge in the development and deployment of autonomous vehicles (AVs) in recent years has been underpinned by their ability to effectively use sensors and algorithms to understand and navigate their surroundings. One of the foundational components of this system is object detection, which identifies other vehicles, pedestrians, and obstacles. However, a persistent challenge with these systems is the occurrence of false negatives — scenarios where the system overlooks real objects. This not only undermines the reliability of AVs but can also lead to potential safety hazards. Our research undertook a comprehensive study of methodologies aimed at minimizing the impact of these false negatives. Calibration emerged as a prime solution. Through calibration, we can adjust the system's predictions to align more closely with real-world probabilities. Techniques such as Platt Scaling and Isotonic Regression were evaluated in depth. Their purpose is to finetune the outputs of the detection algorithms, thereby providing more accurate probabilities of object presence. Another pivotal strategy we delved into is thresholding. Here, specific limits or boundaries are set, determining when an object is considered detected by the system. The setting of these boundaries is critical, as they can influence the rate of false detections. Our exploration spanned various techniques of thresholding, especially focusing on their applicability in diverse driving environments, from congested urban settings to open highways. We investigated sensor fusion methods. Given that AVs utilize a myriad of sensors — from cameras to LIDAR — effectively combining their outputs can lead to enhanced detection accuracy. We evaluated methodologies for integrating this multifaceted data. Implementing a combination of these techniques can substantially boost the reliability and safety of autonomous driving systems. The road ahead necessitates continuous refinement of these strategies, adapting to evolving real-world conditions and technological advancements.

Introduction

Vehicle object detection in autonomous driving refers to the real-time identification and location of vehicles within the surrounding environment of an autonomous vehicle (AV) [1]–[3]. It is an essential component of the overall perception system, the eyes and ears of an autonomous vehicle [4]. The perception system in autonomous vehicles (AV) employs cameras as a critical component to capture the visual scene around the car. Cameras in an AV are designed to record visual information in a way that mimics human vision, capturing color, shape, and relative position of objects. These cameras can detect other vehicles, pedestrians, road signs, and markings, and also recognize various lighting conditions. Advanced image processing techniques analyze the camera data to identify objects and interpret their movement, thereby allowing the vehicle to react and make decisions accordingly [5]–[7]. High-definition cameras can even provide a detailed view of the road, recognizing minute features that might be essential for navigation [8].

LiDAR, or Light Detection and Ranging, is another vital technology in the perception system of AVs, which serves to measure distances and create a 3D representation of the surrounding area. By emitting laser beams and measuring the time it takes for the light to bounce back after hitting an object, LiDAR can calculate the distance with high accuracy. By sweeping the laser beams across the surrounding landscape, a 3D point cloud is formed, representing objects and obstacles around the vehicle. This allows the AV to understand the structure of the environment in great detail, including the shape and size of nearby vehicles, buildings, trees, and even smaller objects like bicycles or pedestrians. The data obtained from LiDAR sensors is often fused with camera information, which adds depth and richness to the overall perception of the environment.

Radar technology complements the camera and LiDAR systems by using radio waves to detect the speed, direction, and distance of objects. While LiDAR provides high-resolution distance measurements, radar is especially valuable in determining the velocity of moving objects. This technology sends out radio waves that reflect off surfaces, and by analyzing the frequency shift of the returning waves, it can gauge the speed of an object relative to the vehicle. Radar is less affected by weather conditions such as rain or fog, compared to cameras and LiDAR, making it a robust component in the AV's perception system. The integration of radar with other sensors provides a more well-rounded understanding of the environment, enabling the vehicle to navigate and respond to dynamic traffic situations with heightened precision and safety [9]. The object detection process often begins with preprocessing, where raw sensor data is converted into a more manageable form [10]–[12]. This can include noise reduction, filtering, and data fusion, where data from different sensors is combined to create a unified image of the surroundings. The fused data are often richer and provide more accurate information than data from a single sensor.

Next, the data is often fed into a deep learning model designed to recognize different types of objects [13]. Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) are frequently used for this purpose. CNNs have multiple layers that process the input data, recognizing patterns and features that are indicative of specific objects [14]. For vehicle detection, the CNN may be trained on thousands or even millions of images of vehicles, enabling it to recognize vehicles in a wide variety of shapes, sizes, and orientations. However, detecting vehicles is not as simple as recognizing their appearance. The AV must also determine the location, speed, and direction of the detected vehicles, as well as predict their future movements [15]. To do this, the object detection system may also employ tracking algorithms, such as the Kalman Filter or Particle Filter [16], which estimate the state of a detected object over time [17]. These filters consider both the current sensor data and previous state estimates to predict an object's future state [18]–[20].

In addition to the challenges of real-time processing and the need for high accuracy, vehicle object detection in autonomous driving must also contend with a constantly changing environment. Weather conditions, lighting, other vehicles, and even the condition of the road can change rapidly, and the detection system must be able to adapt to these changes. One way to address these challenges is through sensor fusion, where data from different types of sensors are combined. By utilizing the strengths of each sensor type, the fused data can be more robust to variations in environmental conditions [21]–[23]. For example, while cameras may struggle in low-light conditions, radar and LiDAR can still provide valuable data [24]. Likewise, while LiDAR may be affected by rain or fog, cameras and radar might be less affected.

Additionally, the development of high-definition maps that include detailed information about the road, such as lane markings, traffic signs, and other static objects, can enhance the vehicle's understanding of its surroundings. These maps can be used in conjunction with real-time sensor data to provide a more comprehensive picture of the environment. However, the use of deep learning and other complex algorithms in vehicle object detection also raises concerns about interpretability and safety. The "black box" nature of deep learning models can make it difficult to understand how and why they are making specific predictions, which is a significant concern in safety-critical applications like autonomous driving [25].

Incorrect detections in object recognition systems can lead to two types of errors: false positives and false negatives. False positives refer to the erroneous detection of objects that are not actually present. This can create confusion, as the system may react to an object that does not exist, leading to unnecessary actions or responses. In certain applications, such as advertising algorithms or entertainment, these can be relatively harmless. However, in safety-critical systems like autonomous vehicles or industrial automation, false positives can lead to inefficiencies and minor safety concerns [26].

False negatives, on the other hand, represent a failure to detect objects that are actually present in the environment. This type of error can be more dangerous and have serious consequences, particularly in safety-critical applications. When a system fails to recognize an object that is indeed there, it may lead to a complete disregard for potential obstacles or threats. For example, in autonomous driving, a failure to detect another vehicle, pedestrian, or obstruction could lead directly to collisions or other accidents, posing significant risks to human life and property [27].

The underlying reasons for these incorrect detections can vary widely. It may stem from poor algorithm design, low-quality sensor data, environmental conditions such as lighting or weather, or the limitations of the machine learning model being used [28]–[30].

. These factors can combine in complex ways, leading to situations where the system is unable to accurately perceive its surroundings. Addressing these root causes often requires a deep understanding of both the technical aspects of the system and the specific environmental factors that may be at play [31]. To mitigate the risks associated with false negatives and false positives, robust testing and validation are essential. This includes using diverse data sets for training and validation that cover a wide array of scenarios, conditions, and object types. Regularly updating and tuning the algorithms to account for new data and environmental changes is also crucial. Moreover, incorporating redundancy through multiple sensors and utilizing sensor fusion techniques can increase the robustness of the system, making it less prone to these types of errors [32].

Additionally, it's worth considering the balance between false positives and false negatives, as the severity of the consequences associated with each type of error can differ depending on the specific application. In medical diagnosis, for example, a false negative (failing to detect a disease) might have more serious implications than a false positive (erroneously detecting a disease). Similarly, in security applications, a false positive might be considered more tolerable than a false negative [33]–[35]. Thus, tuning the system to minimize one type of error over the other might be appropriate depending on the context and the potential impacts of each type of incorrect detection [36].

Calibration

Calibration in the context of detection models refers to the process of ensuring that the predicted probabilities align closely with the true underlying probabilities of the event or object being detected. Essentially, this means that if a calibrated model states there is a 70% chance of an object being present, this prediction should ideally reflect the true likelihood of the object's presence. Without proper calibration, a model may provide overconfident or underconfident predictions that could mislead the user or system relying on those probabilities. This can lead to suboptimal decision-making and reduced effectiveness of the model, especially in critical applications where precise probability estimates are paramount [37].

Calibrating a detection model usually involves techniques that adjust the model's predictions to make them more reflective of the true probabilities. This can be done through a validation set, where true outcomes are known, and the model's predictions are compared to these outcomes. Techniques like Platt scaling, isotonic regression, or beta calibration can be employed depending on the nature of the problem and the model. By adjusting the model’s outputs using these techniques, the model's predictions become more consistent with the actual observed frequencies. This is particularly important in domains like medicine, finance, or autonomous driving, where the consequences of misinterpretation of the model's output can be significant [38].

Despite the importance of calibration, it can be a challenging task to perform, especially for complex models like deep neural networks. The reason for this complexity often stems from the model architecture, the nature of the data, or both. For instance, models trained with maximum likelihood estimation might become miscalibrated, particularly when dealing with class imbalance or when the training and validation data distributions differ. Additionally, the process of calibration might need to be performed separately for different segments of the population if the model's behavior varies across these segments. This could further add to the complexity and demands careful consideration of the specific application and potential biases in the data. Therefore, achieving perfect calibration can be an intricate and nuanced process, requiring extensive expertise and continuous monitoring of the model's performance [39].

Platt Scaling is a popular method used for the calibration of probabilistic models, specifically for binary classification problems. The method applies logistic regression to the model's output scores, transforming them into probabilities. It assumes that the relationship between the predicted scores and the true probabilities follows a sigmoid function. By fitting the sigmoid function to the validation data, Platt Scaling adjusts the model's outputs to make them closer to the true underlying probabilities. This method is particularly effective when the model's raw outputs tend to be extreme or overconfident, as it can smooth the predictions and make them better aligned with actual occurrence rates [40].

Isotonic Regression, on the other hand, is a non-parametric method that fits a non-decreasing function to the model's outputs. Unlike Platt Scaling, which assumes a specific functional form (i.e., the sigmoid function), Isotonic Regression makes no such assumptions and provides a more flexible approach to calibration [41]–[43]. It sorts the predicted scores and then fits a stepwise constant non-decreasing function to the true probabilities, thus preserving the order of the predictions. This approach allows for a more complex relationship between the model's raw outputs and the true probabilities, and it can capture patterns that are missed by Platt Scaling. However, Isotonic Regression might lead to overfitting if the validation dataset is small, and it requires careful tuning and validation to avoid this pitfall [44].

Beta Calibration represents an even more flexible approach, generalizing Platt Scaling by using a beta distribution to model the relationship between the model's outputs and the true probabilities. The beta distribution's flexibility allows Beta Calibration to model different shapes of the calibration curve, accommodating various types of miscalibration. It can be seen as a more sophisticated version of Platt Scaling that is able to adapt to a wider range of miscalibration patterns. By fitting the parameters of the beta distribution to the validation data, Beta Calibration ensures that the transformed predictions accurately reflect the underlying occurrence rates. While this method provides additional flexibility, it can also be more complex to implement and may require more careful tuning to avoid overfitting or other potential issues. All three methods, Platt Scaling, Isotonic Regression, and Beta Calibration, serve the common goal of aligning the model's predictions with true probabilities, but they differ in their assumptions, complexity, and suitability for different types of miscalibration [45]. Calibration of detection models, by ensuring that the predicted probabilities align closely with the true underlying probabilities, has several benefits, two of which are the help in assigning true probabilities to detections and aiding in thresholding decisions [46].

The process of assigning true probabilities to detections is essential in various applications, especially when the probabilities are used for decision-making. By adjusting the model's predictions to accurately reflect the real likelihood of occurrence, calibration allows for more informed and accurate decisions based on those probabilities. This can lead to improved performance in critical areas such as healthcare, finance, or safety systems, where overconfident or underconfident predictions could have significant consequences. The accurate assignment of probabilities allows decision-makers to better understand the uncertainties and risks associated with different choices, leading to more optimal decisions [47]–[49].

Aiding in thresholding decisions is another critical benefit of calibration. In many classification tasks, a decision threshold must be set to determine the class labels based on the predicted probabilities. This threshold is often chosen based on the specific needs and priorities of the application, such as minimizing false positives or maximizing true positives [50]. Calibration ensures that the model's predicted probabilities are meaningful and reliable, allowing for more effective thresholding decisions. For instance, a calibrated model allows users to set a threshold that reflects a specific tolerance for risk or error rate, knowing that the model's probabilities accurately represent those risks. This not only improves the model's overall performance but also allows for more nuanced and context-sensitive decision-making, tailored to the specific goals and constraints of the application. Therefore, calibration acts as a vital tool for both enhancing the integrity of the model's predictions and enabling more sophisticated and effective decision-making strategies based on those predictions [51].

Thresholding

Setting a threshold in the context of detection systems is a critical decision-making criterion that enables the distinction between a real event and a false or random one. It represents a boundary that a certain parameter or set of parameters must surpass in order for the event to be recognized as significant [52]–[54]. For example, in a medical diagnostic system, the threshold might be a specific concentration of a biomarker in a blood sample. If the concentration is above this threshold, the diagnosis could be positive; if below, it could be negative. In the context of safety, setting this threshold at an appropriate level is crucial, as an incorrect threshold can lead to false positives, where the system erroneously identifies an issue, or false negatives, where the system fails to recognize an actual problem [55].

In certain scenarios, particularly where human life or valuable assets are at risk, setting a lower threshold might be advantageous. A lower threshold means that the system is more sensitive to potential issues, so it might recognize a problem even when the signals are weak or the indicators are not very clear. This approach would reduce false negatives, thereby enhancing the ability of the system to catch potential issues early on. For instance, in a fire detection system in a densely populated building, setting a lower threshold for smoke or heat detection can result in earlier alerts, even when the fire is still in its nascent stage. The benefits here are obvious; earlier detection allows more time for evacuation and response, potentially saving lives and minimizing property damage [56].

However, it's important to recognize that setting a lower threshold is not without its challenges and drawbacks. A system with a low threshold might become too sensitive, leading to a higher rate of false positives, where the system triggers an alert when there's actually no problem. This can cause unnecessary alarms, create confusion, waste resources, and eventually may lead to a lack of trust in the system [57]. In the medical field, for instance, a lower threshold in certain tests could lead to overdiagnosis, subjecting patients to unnecessary treatments and anxiety. Balancing the need to reduce false negatives against the risk of increasing false positives requires a thorough understanding of the specific context and a careful consideration of the risks and benefits. This balance often necessitates a deep understanding of the statistical characteristics of the detection system, including its sensitivity, specificity, and the overall risk profile of the environment in which it operates [58]–[60].

Fixed Thresholding is a method that uses a constant value, typically determined based on a validation dataset. It's a straightforward approach that applies the same threshold across all situations, regardless of variations in conditions or context. This method has the advantage of simplicity, making it easier to implement and understand. For instance, in an industrial quality control setting, a fixed threshold might be used to decide whether a manufactured part meets quality standards based on measurements like weight or dimensions [61]–[63]. However, the major drawback of fixed thresholding is its inflexibility, which may not be suitable for scenarios where the situation is dynamic or where different contexts demand different levels of sensitivity. If a system faces a wide range of conditions, using a fixed threshold may result in a suboptimal performance [64].

Dynamic Thresholding, on the other hand, changes the threshold based on the driving context or other situational factors. This method allows the system to adapt to different conditions, making it more versatile and potentially more effective. For example, in an autonomous driving system, dynamic thresholding might be applied to set a lower threshold for obstacle detection in crowded areas, where the risk of collision is higher, and a higher threshold in less crowded areas. This adaptability enables the system to be more sensitive where sensitivity is required and more selective where false positives would be particularly problematic [65]. Although this method allows for more nuanced and context-aware decision-making, it can be more complex to implement, requiring a robust understanding of the relationships between context, risk, and appropriate threshold levels [66].

Cost-based Thresholding involves assigning costs to false positives and false negatives and then optimizing the threshold to minimize the overall cost. This method introduces an explicit way to balance the trade-offs between false positives and false negatives by considering the actual costs associated with each type of error. In healthcare, for example, the cost of a false positive might include unnecessary treatments and patient anxiety, while the cost of a false negative could include delayed treatment and worsening illness. By quantifying these costs, the system can be tuned to strike an optimal balance, reflecting the real-world consequences of different types of errors. This can lead to more rational and economically efficient decision-making. However, accurately assigning and quantifying these costs can be highly challenging, as it requires a detailed understanding of the specific implications of errors in a particular context, including potential indirect and long-term effects [67]–[69]. Furthermore, this method might involve complex mathematical modeling and optimization, adding to the implementation challenges [70].

The ability to fine-tune the balance between false positives and false negatives is one of the most critical benefits of implementing methods like fixed, dynamic, or cost-based thresholding. This flexibility facilitates more precise control over the detection system, allowing it to be tailored to the specific needs and risks of a given application. False positives and false negatives each carry their own costs and implications, and the optimal balance between them can vary widely across different scenarios. For example, in a security system, reducing false negatives might be prioritized to minimize the risk of missing a real threat, even if that means tolerating a higher rate of false positives. Conversely, in a medical screening context, where false positives can lead to unnecessary treatments and anxiety, the balance might be shifted in the opposite direction. This fine-tuning enables more nuanced decision-making, reflecting the complexities and trade-offs inherent in many detection problems [71]–[73].

The adaptability of thresholding to various driving scenarios adds a layer of versatility to these methods, making them suitable for a wide range of applications. Particularly in dynamic or complex environments, where conditions and risks may change frequently or unpredictably, the ability to adapt the thresholding strategy can be vital. In the context of autonomous driving, for example, the system might encounter numerous different scenarios, such as city traffic, open highways, pedestrian zones, or varying weather conditions. Each of these scenarios presents a unique set of risks and demands, and a one-size-fits-all threshold might not be appropriate. By employing methods like dynamic or cost-based thresholding, the system can adapt to these varying conditions, adjusting its sensitivity and specificity to align with the particular demands of each scenario. This adaptability enhances the system's robustness and effectiveness, helping it navigate the myriad challenges and uncertainties it may face. It also allows for more tailored and context-aware responses, potentially leading to better outcomes and a more efficient use of resources. However, it must be noted that this adaptability also brings increased complexity and a requirement for thorough validation and testing to ensure that the system performs well across the full spectrum of scenarios it might encounter [74].

Fusion Methods

Autonomous Vehicles (AVs) rely heavily on an array of sensors including cameras, LIDAR, and radar to perceive their surroundings and navigate through complex environments. Each of these sensors has its unique advantages and limitations, making them suitable for specific tasks. Cameras, for instance, can provide rich visual information, including colors, shapes, and textures, enabling the vehicle to detect traffic lights, signs, and lane markings. However, they might struggle under poor lighting conditions or in distinguishing objects at a distance. LIDAR, on the other hand, is exceptional at creating detailed three-dimensional maps of the surroundings, measuring distances with high precision, but can be affected by weather conditions like rain or fog, and is generally more expensive [75].

Fusion methods in the context of AVs refer to the process of combining the information gathered from different types of sensors, allowing the vehicle to make more accurate and robust decisions. Through this integration, the strengths of one sensor can compensate for the weaknesses of another. For example, while a camera might struggle to accurately gauge distances or perceive depth, the LIDAR system can fill this gap, providing precise distance measurements. Similarly, radar, which uses radio waves to detect objects, can perform effectively in adverse weather conditions, compensating for LIDAR's shortcomings in such scenarios. Fusion algorithms take into account the data from all these sensors, intelligently weighing their importance based on the situation, to create a comprehensive understanding of the vehicle's surroundings [76].

The development and implementation of sensor fusion techniques in AVs is a complex task that requires deep understanding of each sensor's characteristics, the environmental context, and the vehicle's requirements at any given moment. Real-time processing is crucial, as delays in decision-making can lead to unsafe driving conditions. Machine learning, statistical methods, and complex algorithms are typically employed to manage the vast amounts of data and derive meaningful insights from them [77]–[79]. These fusion methods pave the way for higher levels of automation and safety in autonomous driving, offering a more seamless and reliable navigation experience. By leveraging the unique strengths of each sensor type, and mitigating their individual weaknesses through intelligent fusion, AVs are positioned to function more effectively and responsively in the diverse and dynamic conditions they encounter on the road [80]. Early Fusion, Late Fusion, and Hierarchical Fusion are distinct methods used in the sensor data integration process, particularly in the context of Autonomous Vehicles (AVs).

Early Fusion is a method that emphasizes combining the raw data collected from multiple sensors like cameras, LIDAR, and radar before any significant processing occurs. This fusion at an initial stage ensures that the raw information from each sensor is available for analysis together, which can result in richer representations and more nuanced insights. Early Fusion can make it easier to detect correlations between different types of data and leverage these connections for improved decision-making. However, this method may require substantial computational resources, as it involves handling vast amounts of unfiltered, high-dimensional data. Additionally, the integration of different types of raw data at such an early stage can pose challenges in alignment and synchronization [81].

Late Fusion, conversely, focuses on merging the outputs or detections of individual sensor-based models after they have undergone specific processing. In this approach, each sensor's data is handled independently through tailored models, and their resulting detections or features are combined later in the process. This method has the advantage of being more computationally efficient, as the data is reduced to relevant features before fusion. Moreover, handling each sensor's data individually allows for specialized processing that caters to the unique characteristics and strengths of each sensor type. However, Late Fusion might miss out on some of the potential correlations between different sensor data that could be captured in the early stages of processing.

Hierarchical Fusion represents a more sophisticated approach, seeking to combine the strengths of both Early and Late Fusion. This method involves a combination of the two, where some features are fused early on in the processing pipeline, while others are combined later. By selectively applying Early and Late Fusion techniques at different stages, Hierarchical Fusion offers a more flexible and potentially more effective solution [82]–[84]. This approach allows for the capture of intricate correlations in the raw data, while also benefiting from the efficiency and specialization of Late Fusion. Implementing Hierarchical Fusion requires a deep understanding of the nature of the sensor data and the specific requirements of the task at hand, as it involves carefully orchestrated integration across multiple stages of the processing pipeline. This method represents an attempt to balance the depth of analysis with computational efficiency, aiming to harness the full potential of multisensor data for decision-making in Avs [85]–[87].

The integration of data from various sensors through fusion methods in Autonomous Vehicles (AVs) offers substantial benefits, primarily focusing on enhancing the accuracy, reliability, and robustness of the system [88].

One of the main advantages of employing sensor fusion is the ability to combine the strengths of various sensors. Different sensors such as cameras, LIDAR, and radar each have unique characteristics that enable them to excel in specific areas. By fusing their data, the strengths of one sensor can complement the weaknesses of another, leading to a more comprehensive and accurate perception of the environment. For example, the rich visual information from cameras can be paired with the precise distance measurements of LIDAR, while radar can provide reliable data in adverse weather conditions. This collaboration between different sensor types contributes to a more robust and resilient system that can adapt to a wide range of scenarios and conditions [89].

Another significant benefit of sensor fusion is the reduction in the chances of false negatives, as multiple sources validate each detection. False negatives, where an object or obstacle is present but not detected, can lead to serious safety concerns in autonomous driving. By integrating data from various sensors, the likelihood of overlooking an object is reduced, as the detection by one sensor can be validated and corroborated by others. This multiplicity of viewpoints ensures that even if one sensor fails to detect an object due to its limitations or environmental factors, others might still recognize it. This validation through multiple channels enhances the reliability of the detection process, reducing the risk of errors that could lead to unsafe driving decisions [90].

Through these benefits, sensor fusion not only contributes to the overall effectiveness of AVs but also builds trust in autonomous technology. By providing a more nuanced understanding of the environment and reducing the risks associated with false negatives, sensor fusion plays a pivotal role in advancing the development and acceptance of autonomous driving. It ensures that the vehicle's decision-making process is informed by diverse and complementary data, resulting in decisions that are more informed, accurate, and safety-conscious [84], [91], [92]. This holistic approach to data integration underscores the complexity and sophistication of modern AVs, reflecting the ongoing innovation in this dynamic and rapidly evolving field [93]–[95].

Recommendations and Conclusion

Regular calibration is an essential practice in the management and maintenance of computational models, particularly those involved in complex systems such as autonomous vehicles, industrial automation, or medical diagnostics. Ensuring that models are periodically recalibrated, especially when there are software or hardware updates, helps in maintaining the accuracy and efficacy of the system. Changes in software algorithms or hardware configurations might cause subtle shifts in how data is processed or interpreted. This could lead to inaccuracies or discrepancies in the model's output, which, in turn, might result in incorrect decisions or actions. Regular calibration ensures that the system continues to operate as intended, reflecting the real-world situation and aligning with the desired outcomes. This practice is vital not only for the system's reliability but also for its safety, particularly in applications where errors can have significant consequences [96].

Situational Thresholding is a sophisticated technique that recognizes the variable nature of real-world scenarios. Traditional thresholding techniques, where a fixed value is used to make decisions, often fail to adapt to the changing conditions. Implementing dynamic thresholding, where the threshold changes based on the context, allows a system to adapt to different situations. For example, in an image recognition system, lighting conditions might vary, and a fixed threshold may not work optimally in all cases. By adjusting the threshold according to the context, the system can maintain its performance across varying scenarios. Dynamic thresholds can be set using algorithms that analyze the current environment and adapt the threshold values accordingly, offering a more flexible and robust approach compared to static methods [97].

Multi-sensor Redundancy is a concept that revolves around utilizing more than one sensor modality and applying fusion methods to combine their outputs. This practice is commonly employed in fields like robotics, aerospace, and automotive technologies, where reliability and precision are paramount. The principle behind multi-sensor redundancy is that if one sensor misses an object or fails, others might detect it. This redundancy ensures a higher level of accuracy and fault tolerance. For instance, an autonomous vehicle might use cameras, radar, and LiDAR sensors simultaneously. Each of these sensors has unique characteristics, and their combined data can provide a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of the surroundings [98].

Fusion methods applied in Multi-sensor Redundancy play a critical role in ensuring that the data from different sensors are appropriately integrated. These methods must consider the different characteristics, accuracies, and error models of the sensors involved. Fusion can be done at various levels, including data level, feature level, and decision level, each having its own complexities and considerations. Data-level fusion, for example, requires synchronization and alignment of data from different sensors, while decision-level fusion might involve voting mechanisms or other ways to reconcile potentially conflicting information. The design of these fusion methods needs careful consideration of the underlying physics, the mathematical models of the sensors, and the specific requirements of the application [99]

The synergy of Regular Calibration, Situational Thresholding, and Multi-sensor Redundancy leads to more robust and resilient systems. Regular Calibration ensures that the models remain aligned with the real world, while Situational Thresholding allows them to adapt to changing contexts. Multi-sensor Redundancy, supported by well-designed fusion methods, provides a fail-safe mechanism, enhancing the overall reliability of the system. Together, these practices form a solid foundation for building complex systems that can operate effectively in the intricate and dynamic environment of the real world [100]–[102].

While no method can entirely eliminate the possibility of false negatives, particularly in complex systems like autonomous driving, the integrated approach involving calibration, smart thresholding, and sensor fusion presents a potent strategy to mitigate their occurrence, thereby enhancing the overall safety and reliability of the system [103].

Calibration in autonomous driving is of paramount importance as it ensures that the system is tuned and aligned according to the latest hardware and software configurations. Given the rapid advancements and iterative nature of technology in this field, periodic recalibration helps in maintaining the accuracy of the models and algorithms used for decision-making. For example, changes in sensor sensitivity or updates in object recognition algorithms may lead to a vehicle misinterpreting its environment. Regular calibration helps to align the system with the real-world conditions, substantially reducing the risk of false negatives, where a potential hazard is not detected [104], [105].

Smart Thresholding, or dynamic thresholding, adds another layer of sophistication to the autonomous driving system. Unlike static thresholds that may perform inconsistently across varying conditions, smart thresholding dynamically adjusts the decision boundaries based on the context. In the realm of autonomous driving, this could relate to different weather conditions, lighting, or road types. For instance, the threshold for detecting an object on a rainy night might be different from that on a sunny day. Implementing smart thresholding enables the system to adapt to these varying conditions, thereby reducing the likelihood of false negatives, where a real object is classified as non-existent.

Sensor Fusion plays a critical role in enhancing the robustness of the system by utilizing multiple sensor modalities and applying techniques to combine their data. In autonomous driving, this might involve using cameras, radars, LiDAR, and other sensors, each offering a unique perspective on the environment. The premise is that if one sensor fails to detect an object, others might still recognize it. For instance, while a camera might struggle in low-light conditions, a radar might still detect the object. Sensor fusion algorithms must manage this diverse information, reconciling potential conflicts, and deriving a coherent understanding of the surroundings. This multi-sensor approach significantly diminishes the risk of false negatives, providing a more comprehensive view of the environment [106]–[108]. The integrated approach of calibration, smart thresholding, and sensor fusion represents a holistic strategy to tackle the challenge of false negatives in autonomous driving. By ensuring that the system is accurately aligned with the real world, dynamically adaptable to changing conditions, and resilient to individual sensor failures, this combination contributes to a safer and more reliable autonomous driving experience. Moreover, the synergy of these techniques exemplifies the complexity and the multi-disciplinary nature of autonomous driving systems, demanding expertise in areas like control systems, signal processing, machine learning, and software engineering, all working in unison to navigate the intricate and unpredictable scenarios encountered on the roads.

[1] J. Pisarov L. and G. Mester, “The use of autonomous vehicles in transportation,” *Tehnika*, vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 171–177, 2021.

[2] P. Czech, “Autonomous vehicles: basic issues,” *Sci. J. Sil. Univ. Technol. Ser. Transp.*, vol. 100, pp. 15–22, Sep. 2018.

[3] Y. Ma, Z. Wang, H. Yang, and L. Yang, "Artificial intelligence applications in the development of autonomous vehicles: a survey," *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 315–329, Mar. 2020.

[4] A. Khosravian, A. Amirkhani, H. Kashiani, and M. Masih-Tehrani, "Generalizing state-of-the-art object detectors for autonomous vehicles in unseen environments," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 183, p. 115417, Nov. 2021.

[5] S. Kato *et al.*, "Autoware on Board: Enabling Autonomous Vehicles with Embedded Systems," in *2018 ACM/IEEE 9th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPS)*, 2018, pp. 287–296.

[6] J. L. F. Pereira and R. J. F. Rossetti, "An integrated architecture for autonomous vehicles simulation," in *Proceedings of the 27th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, Trento, Italy, 2012, pp. 286–292.

[7] V. Ilkova and A. Ilka, "Legal aspects of autonomous vehicles — An overview," in *2017 21st International Conference on Process Control (PC)*, Strbske Pleso, Slovakia, 2017, pp. 428–433.

[8] V. S. R. Kosuru and A. K. Venkitaraman, "CONCEPTUAL DESIGN PHASE OF FMEA PROCESS FOR AUTOMOTIVE ELECTRONIC CONTROL UNITS," *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 1474–1480, 2022.

[9] V. S. R. Kosuru and A. K. Venkitaraman, "Evaluation of Safety Cases in The Domain of Automotive Engineering," *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, vol. 7, no. 9, pp. 493–497, 2022.

[10] A. Martinho, N. Herber, M. Kroesen, and C. Chorus, "Ethical issues in focus by the autonomous vehicles industry," *Transp. Rev.*, 2021.

[11] W. Nelson, "Continuous-curvature paths for autonomous vehicles," in *Proceedings, 1989 International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 1989, pp. 1260–1264 vol.3.

[12] H.-P. Schöner, "Simulation in development and testing of autonomous vehicles," in *18. Internationales Stuttgarter Symposium*, 2018, pp. 1083–1095.

[13] Y. Liang, "Structural Vibration Signal Denoising Using Stacking Ensemble of Hybrid CNN-RNN. Advances in Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. 2022; 3 (2): 65." 2006.

[14] A. Chavez, D. Koutentakis, Y. Liang, S. Tripathy, and J. Yun, "Identify statistical similarities and differences between the deadliest cancer types through gene expression," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.07847*, 2019.

[15] G. Li, Z. Ji, and X. Qu, "Stepwise Domain Adaptation (SDA) for Object Detection in Autonomous Vehicles Using an Adaptive CenterNet," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 17729–17743, Oct. 2022.

[16] S. Jahandari and D. Materassi, "Sufficient and necessary graphical conditions for miso identification in networks with observational data," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 5932–5947, 2021.

[17] X. Wu, Z. Bai, J. Jia, and Y. Liang, "A Multi-Variate Triple-Regression Forecasting Algorithm for Long-Term Customized Allergy Season Prediction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04557*, 2020.

[18] B. Friedrich, "The Effect of Autonomous Vehicles on Traffic," in *Autonomous Driving: Technical, Legal and Social Aspects*, M. Maurer, J. C. Gerdes, B. Lenz, and H. Winner, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016, pp. 317–334.

[19] D. Rojas Rueda and M. J. Nieuwenhuijsen, "Autonomous vehicles and public health," *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, 2020.

[20] J. Janai, F. Güney, A. Behl, and A. Geiger, "Computer Vision for Autonomous Vehicles: Problems, Datasets and State of the Art," *Foundations and Trends® in Computer Graphics and Vision*, vol. 12, no. 1–3, pp. 1–308, 2020.

[21] C. Wu, A. M. Bayen, and A. Mehta, "Stabilizing Traffic with Autonomous Vehicles," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2018, pp. 6012–6018.

[22] C. Zhao, L. Li, X. Pei, Z. Li, F.-Y. Wang, and X. Wu, "A comparative study of state-of-the-art driving strategies for autonomous vehicles," *Accid. Anal. Prev.*, vol. 150, p. 105937, Feb. 2021.
[23] A. Broggi, P. Medici, P. Zani, and A. Coati, "Autonomous vehicles control in the VisLab intercontinental autonomous challenge," *Annu. Rev. Control*, 2012.
[24] Z. Bai, R. Yang, and Y. Liang, "Mental task classification using electroencephalogram signal," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03023*, 2019.
[25] A. A. A. Ahmed, A. Aljabouh, P. K. Donepudi, and M. S. Choi, "Detecting fake news using machine learning: A systematic literature review," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04458*, 2021.
[26] A. Daniel and K. Subburathinam, "Procuring cooperative intelligence in autonomous vehicles for object detection through data fusion approach," *IET Intel. Transport Syst.*, 2020.
[27] A. Duracz *et al.*, "Advanced hazard analysis and risk assessment in the ISO 26262 functional safety standard using rigorous simulation," 2020, pp. 108–126.
[28] M. Martínez-Díaz and F. Soriguera, "Autonomous vehicles: theoretical and practical challenges," *Transportation Research Procedia*, vol. 33, pp. 275–282, Jan. 2018.
[29] F. Duarte and C. Ratti, "The Impact of Autonomous Vehicles on Cities: A Review," *Journal of Urban Technology*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 3–18, Oct. 2018.
[30] D. J. Fagnant and K. Kockelman, "Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles: opportunities, barriers and policy recommendations," *Transp. Res. Part A: Policy Pract.*, vol. 77, pp. 167–181, Jul. 2015.
[31] A. K. Venkitaraman and V. S. R. Kosuru, "A review on autonomous electric vehicle communication networks-progress, methods and challenges," *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 013–024, 2022.
[32] A. Aljarbouh and B. Caillaud, "On the regularization of chattering executions in real time simulation of hybrid systems," 2015, p. 49.
[33] P. Davidson and A. Spinoulas, "Autonomous vehicles: what could this mean for the future of transport," *Australian Institute of Traffic*, 2015.
[34] V. V. Dixit, S. Chand, and D. J. Nair, "Autonomous Vehicles: Disengagements, Accidents and Reaction Times," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, no. 12, p. e0168054, Dec. 2016.
[35] A. Reschka, "Safety Concept for Autonomous Vehicles," in *Autonomous Driving: Technical, Legal and Social Aspects*, M. Maurer, J. C. Gerdes, B. Lenz, and H. Winner, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016, pp. 473–496.
[36] A. J. Albarakati *et al.*, "Real-time energy management for DC microgrids using artificial intelligence," *Energies*, vol. 14, no. 17, p. 5307, 2021.
[37] D. Nelson-Gruel, Y. Chamaillard, and A. Aljarbouh, "Modeling and estimation of the pollutants emissions in the Compression Ignition diesel engine," 2016, pp. 317–322.
[38] J. Lu, H. Sibai, E. Fabry, and D. Forsyth, "NO Need to Worry about Adversarial Examples in Object Detection in Autonomous Vehicles," *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 12-Jul-2017.
[39] A. Aljarbouh and B. Caillaud, "Robust simulation for hybrid systems: chattering path avoidance," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.07818*, 2015.
[40] V. S. R. Kosuru, A. K. Venkitaraman, V. D. Chaudhari, N. Garg, A. Rao, and A. Deepak, "Automatic Identification of Vehicles in Traffic using Smart Cameras," 2022, pp. 1009–1014.
[41] J. Wang, L. Zhang, Y. Huang, and J. Zhao, "Safety of Autonomous Vehicles," *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, vol. 2020, Oct. 2020.
[42] S. Kato, E. Takeuchi, Y. Ishiguro, Y. Ninomiya, K. Takeda, and T. Hamada, "An Open Approach to Autonomous Vehicles," *IEEE Micro*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 60–68, Nov. 2015.
[43] W. Schwarting and J. Alonso-Mora, "Planning and decision-making for autonomous vehicles," *, and Autonomous …*, 2018.
[44] I. Trifonov, A. Aljarbouh, and A. Beketaeva, "Evaluating the effectiveness of turbulence models in the simulation of two-phases combustion," *International Review on Modelling and Simulations*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 291–300, 2021.
[45] A. Aljarbouh *et al.*, "Application of the K-medians Clustering Algorithm for Test Analysis in E-learning," in *Proceedings of the Computational Methods in Systems and Software*, Springer, 2022, pp. 249–256.

[46] A. Aljarbouh, A. Duracz, Y. Zeng, B. Caillaud, and W. Taha, “Chattering-free simulation for hybrid dynamical systems,” *HAL*, vol. 2016, 2016.
[47] S. D. Pendleton *et al.*, “Perception, Planning, Control, and Coordination for Autonomous Vehicles,” *Machines*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 6, Feb. 2017.
[48] J.-F. Bonnefon, A. Shariff, and I. Rahwan, “The social dilemma of autonomous vehicles,” *Science*, vol. 352, no. 6293, pp. 1573–1576, Jun. 2016.
[49] W. Huang, K. Wang, Y. Lv, and F. Zhu, “Autonomous vehicles testing methods review,” in *2016 IEEE 19th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, 2016, pp. 163–168.
[50] S. Jahandari and D. Materassi, “Optimal selection of observations for identification of multiple modules in dynamic networks,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 4703–4716, 2022.
[51] R. Jabeur, Y. Boujoudar, M. Azeroual, A. Aljarbouh, and N. Ouaaline, “Microgrid energy management system for smart home using multi-agent system,” *Int. J. Elect. Computer Syst. Eng.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 1153–1160, 2022.
[52] M. Kuderer, S. Gulati, and W. Burgard, “Learning driving styles for autonomous vehicles from demonstration,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2015, pp. 2641–2646.
[53] F. Favarò, S. Eurich, and N. Nader, “Autonomous vehicles’ disengagements: Trends, triggers, and regulatory limitations,” *Accid. Anal. Prev.*, vol. 110, pp. 136–148, Jan. 2018.
[54] R. Krueger, T. H. Rashidi, and J. M. Rose, “Preferences for shared autonomous vehicles,” *Transp. Res. Part C: Emerg. Technol.*, 2016.
[55] A. Aljarbouh and B. Caillaud, “Chattering-free simulation of hybrid dynamical systems with the functional mock-up interface 2.0,” 2016, vol. 124, pp. 95–105.
[56] V. S. R. Kosuru and A. K. Venkitaraman, “Preventing the False Negatives of Vehicle Object Detection in Autonomous Driving Control Using Clear Object Filter Technique,” 2022, pp. 1–6.
[57] A. Aljarbouh, “Selection of the optimal set of versions of N-version software using the ant colony optimization,” 2021, vol. 2094, p. 032026.
[58] A. Rasouli and J. K. Tsotsos, “Autonomous Vehicles That Interact With Pedestrians: A Survey of Theory and Practice,” *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 900–918, Mar. 2020.
[59] P. Kopelias, E. Demiridi, and K. Vogiatzis, “Connected & autonomous vehicles–Environmental impacts–A review,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020.
[60] P. A. Hancock, “Some pitfalls in the promises of automated and autonomous vehicles,” *Ergonomics*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 479–495, Apr. 2019.
[61] J. Meyer, H. Becker, P. M. Bösch, and K. W. Axhausen, “Autonomous vehicles: The next jump in accessibilities?,” *Research in Transportation Economics*, vol. 62, pp. 80–91, Jun. 2017.
[62] P. A. Hancock, I. Nourbakhsh, and J. Stewart, “On the future of transportation in an era of automated and autonomous vehicles,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 116, no. 16, pp. 7684–7691, Apr. 2019.
[63] S. Campbell *et al.*, “Sensor Technology in Autonomous Vehicles : A review,” in *2018 29th Irish Signals and Systems Conference (ISSC)*, 2018, pp. 1–4.
[64] I. Pozharkova, A. Aljarbouh, S. H. Azizam, A. P. Mohamed, F. Rabbi, and R. Tsarev, “A simulation modeling method for cooling building structures by fire robots,” 2022, pp. 504–511.
[65] S. Jahandari, “Graph-theoretic Identification of Dynamic Networks.” University of Minnesota, 2022.
[66] A. Aljarbouh, Y. Zeng, A. Duracz, B. Caillaud, and W. Taha, “Chattering-free simulation for hybrid dynamical systems semantics and prototype implementation,” 2016, pp. 412–422.
[67] F. Douma and S. A. Palodichuk, “Criminal liability issues created by autonomous vehicles,” *Santa Clara Law Rev.*, 2012.
[68] H. A. Ignatious and M. Khan, “An overview of sensors in Autonomous Vehicles,” *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, 2022.

[69] S. Royo and M. Ballesta-Garcia, "An overview of lidar imaging systems for autonomous vehicles," *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. E Appl. Sci.*, 2019.
[70] A. K. Venkitaraman and V. S. R. Kosuru, "Electric Vehicle Charging Network Optimization using Multi-Variable Linear Programming and Bayesian Principles," 2022, pp. 1–5.
[71] J. C. Gerdes and S. M. Thornton, "Implementable Ethics for Autonomous Vehicles," in *Autonomes Fahren: Technische, rechtliche und gesellschaftliche Aspekte*, M. Maurer, J. C. Gerdes, B. Lenz, and H. Winner, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015, pp. 87–102.
[72] M. V. Rajasekhar and A. K. Jaswal, "Autonomous vehicles: The future of automobiles," in *2015 IEEE International Transportation Electrification Conference (ITEC)*, 2015, pp. 1–6.
[73] S. A. Bagloee, M. Tavana, M. Asadi, and T. Oliver, "Autonomous vehicles: challenges, opportunities, and future implications for transportation policies," *Journal of Modern Transportation*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 284–303, Dec. 2016.
[74] M. Azeroual, Y. Boujoudar, A. Aljarbouh, H. El Moussaoui, and H. El Markhi, "A multi-agent-based for fault location in distribution networks with wind power generator," *Wind Engineering*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 700–711, 2022.
[75] V. S. R. Kosuru and A. K. Venkitaraman, "Developing a deep Q-learning and neural network framework for trajectory planning," *European Journal of Engineering and Technology Research*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 148–157, 2022.
[76] A. Aljarbouh, "Accelerated Simulation of Hybrid Systems: Method combining static analysis and run-time execution analysis.(Simulation Accélérée des Systèmes Hybrides: méthode combinant analyse statique et analyse à l'exécution)." University of Rennes 1, France, 2017.
[77] S. Pettigrew, C. Worrall, Z. Talati, and L. Fritschi, "Dimensions of attitudes to autonomous vehicles," *Urban, Planning and*, 2019.
[78] M. Clamann, M. Aubert, and M. L. Cummings, "Evaluation of vehicle-to-pedestrian communication displays for autonomous vehicles," trid.trb.org, 17–02119, 2017.
[79] A. Nunes, B. Reimer, and J. F. Coughlin, "People must retain control of autonomous vehicles," pp. 169–171, Apr. 2018.
[80] I. Haq *et al.*, "Machine Vision Approach for Diagnosing Tuberculosis (TB) Based on Computerized Tomography (CT) Scan Images," *Symmetry* , vol. 14, no. 10, p. 1997, 2022.
[81] J. A. Albarakati *et al.*, "Multi-Agent-Based Fault Location and Cyber-Attack Detection in Distribution System," *Energies*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 224, 2022.
[82] A. Talebpour and H. S. Mahmassani, "Influence of connected and autonomous vehicles on traffic flow stability and throughput," *Transp. Res. Part C: Emerg. Technol.*, vol. 71, pp. 143–163, Oct. 2016.
[83] M. Likhachev and D. Ferguson, "Planning Long Dynamically Feasible Maneuvers for Autonomous Vehicles," *Int. J. Rob. Res.*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 933–945, Aug. 2009.
[84] J. Lee, D. Lee, Y. Park, S. Lee, and T. Ha, "Autonomous vehicles can be shared, but a feeling of ownership is important: Examination of the influential factors for intention to use autonomous vehicles," *Transp. Res. Part C: Emerg. Technol.*, vol. 107, pp. 411–422, Oct. 2019.
[85] W. Schwarting, A. Pierson, J. Alonso-Mora, S. Karaman, and D. Rus, "Social behavior for autonomous vehicles," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 116, no. 50, pp. 24972–24978, Dec. 2019.
[86] L. Li, W.-L. Huang, Y. Liu, N.-N. Zheng, and F.-Y. Wang, "Intelligence Testing for Autonomous Vehicles: A New Approach," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 158–166, Jun. 2016.
[87] Y. Wiseman, "Autonomous Vehicles," in *Research Anthology on Cross-Disciplinary Designs and Applications of Automation*, IGI Global, 2022, pp. 878–889.
[88] V. S. Rahul, "Kosuru; Venkitaraman, AK Integrated framework to identify fault in human-machine interaction systems," *Int. Res. J. Mod. Eng. Technol. Sci*, 2022.
[89] A. Aljarbouh, "Accelerated simulation of hybrid systems: method combining static analysis and run-time execution analysis." Rennes 1, 2017.

[90] A. Aljarbouh, M. Fayaz, and M. S. Qureshi, “Non-Standard Analysis for Regularization of Geometric-Zeno Behaviour in Hybrid Systems,” *Systems*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 15, 2020.
[91] L. M. Hulse, H. Xie, and E. R. Galea, “Perceptions of autonomous vehicles: Relationships with road users, risk, gender and age,” *Saf. Sci.*, vol. 102, pp. 1–13, Feb. 2018.
[92] Y. Wiseman and I. Grinberg, “Autonomous vehicles should not collide carelessly,” *Advanced Science and Technology Letters*. u.cs.biu.ac.il, 2016.
[93] G. E. Marchant and R. A. Lindor, “The coming collision between autonomous vehicles and the liability system,” *Santa Clara Law Rev.*, 2012.
[94] M. N. Ahangar, Q. Z. Ahmed, F. A. Khan, and M. Hafeez, “A Survey of Autonomous Vehicles: Enabling Communication Technologies and Challenges,” *Sensors* , vol. 21, no. 3, Jan. 2021.
[95] W. Wachenfeld and H. Winner, “The Release of Autonomous Vehicles,” in *Autonomous Driving: Technical, Legal and Social Aspects*, M. Maurer, J. C. Gerdes, B. Lenz, and H. Winner, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016, pp. 425–449.
[96] A. J. Albarakati *et al.*, “Microgrid energy management and monitoring systems: A comprehensive review,” *Frontiers in Energy Research*, vol. 10, p. 1097858, 2022.
[97] A. Aljarbouh, “Non-standard zeno-free simulation semantics for hybrid dynamical systems,” 2019, pp. 16–31.
[98] A. Aljarbouh, M. S. Ahmed, M. Vaquera, and B. D. Dirting, “Intellectualization of information processing systems for monitoring complex objects and systems,” *Современные инновации, системы и технологии*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 9–17, 2022.
[99] V. Rutskiy *et al.*, “Prospects for the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Combat Fraud in Bank Payments,” in *Proceedings of the Computational Methods in Systems and Software*, Springer, 2022, pp. 959–971.
[100] D. J. Yeong, G. Velasco-Hernandez, J. Barry, and J. Walsh, “Sensor and Sensor Fusion Technology in Autonomous Vehicles: A Review,” *Sensors* , vol. 21, no. 6, Mar. 2021.
[101] S. Shah, D. Dey, C. Lovett, and A. Kapoor, “AirSim: High-Fidelity Visual and Physical Simulation for Autonomous Vehicles,” in *Field and Service Robotics*, 2018, pp. 621–635.
[102] D. J. Glancy, “Privacy in autonomous vehicles,” *Santa Clara Law Rev.*, 2012.
[103] R. Sell, A. Rassõlkin, R. Wang, and T. Otto, “Integration of autonomous vehicles and Industry 4.0,” *Proc. Eston. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 68, no. 4, p. 389, 2019.
[104] R. Ravindran, M. J. Santora, and M. M. Jamali, “Multi-object detection and tracking, based on DNN, for autonomous vehicles: A review,” *IEEE Sens. J.*, 2020.
[105] C. Michaelis *et al.*, “Benchmarking Robustness in Object Detection: Autonomous Driving when Winter is Coming,” *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 17-Jul-2019.
[106] T. G. R. Reid *et al.*, “Localization Requirements for Autonomous Vehicles,” *arXiv [cs.RO]*, 03-Jun-2019.
[107] F. M. Favarò, N. Nader, S. O. Eurich, M. Tripp, and N. Varadaraju, “Examining accident reports involving autonomous vehicles in California,” *PLoS One*, vol. 12, no. 9, p. e0184952, Sep. 2017.
[108] Committee on Autonomous Vehicles in Support of Naval Operations, Naval Studies Board, Division on Engineering and Physical Sciences, National Research Council, and National Academy of Sciences, *Autonomous vehicles in support of naval operations*. Washington, D.C., DC: National Academies Press, 2005.