

3D-Algorithms of Composed Pursuit Navigation

Hassan Attarchi^a, Behroz Bidabad^a, Morteza MirMohammad Rezaii^a

^a*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.*

Abstract

The problem of pursuing a moving target is always one of the main topics in navigation. In the literatures, there are two well-known algorithms called Pure Pursuit and Pure Rendezvous navigation in the 3-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^3$. In this paper, these two methods are combined to introduce a novel family of pursuing algorithms called Composed Pursuit Navigation. The Kinematic and geometric properties of this navigation is studied. The trajectories of this new family of algorithms benefit the advantages of two known methods and its prominence is demonstrated in two real examples. Moreover, it is shown that the metric related to the algorithms are given by Matsumoto metrics.

Keywords: Pure Pursuit, Pure Rendezvous, Composed Pursuit, Matsumoto metric.

2010 MSC: 53A17, 70B05

1. Introduction

In 2004, D. Bao, C. Robles and Z. Shen have studied navigation problem in Finsler geometry cf. [1]. One of the topics in navigation is act of guiding a pursuer to reach a moving point. This act has applications in structured footballer robots, rescue robots and also in military equipments. The most current pursuit algorithms for moving targets presented thus far in the literature are Pure Pursuit (or PP) and Pure Rendezvous (or PR) navigation [2]–[5]. Recently, the present authors have studied a novel 2-dimensional

Email addresses: hassan.attarchi@aut.ac.ir (Hassan Attarchi), bidabad@aut.ac.ir (Behroz Bidabad), mmreza@aut.ac.ir (Morteza MirMohammad Rezaii)

pursuit algorithm called Composed Pursuit (CP) algorithm cf. [6]. Our attempt to extend the 2-dimensional CP navigation into the 3-dimensional space, leads to a novel family of pursuit algorithms. In the latest work, one algorithm was introduced in 2-dimensional space and its trajectories were compared with those of PP and PR navigation. In the present work, not only a novel approach is used to produce some methods for pursuing a target in 3-dimensional space but also we introduced a new family of pursuing algorithms based on PP and PR navigation.

Here, the kinematic and geometric properties of CP navigation in 3-dimensional case are studied. In this aim, the kinematic of two well-known algorithms PP and PR navigation are briefly reviewed, in Section 3. Next, the kinematic of 3D-Composed Pursuit navigation is presented as a combination of two well-known navigation PP and PR.

Definition and axioms of a geometry in a space basically depends on the definition of the shortest path in the space. In Euclidean spaces, shortest paths are known as straight lines and in the case of Riemannian spaces they are called geodesics. In optimization they are known as optimized paths. Finsler metrics, as a natural extension of Riemannian and Euclidean metrics, becomes more present in optimization. Particularly, Finsler metrics originated in the study of calculus of variation by P. Finsler in the first quarter of twentieth century, is more reliable in optimization theorem than other two metrics. Recently, one of the present authors has applied the Finsler metric to present a geometric model for optimized path in PP navigation cf. [2]. In [2], it was proved that “*Consider an object moving on the n -dimensional Riemannian landscape (M, h) with the velocity vector field $\omega \in \chi(M)$, where $h(w, w) < 1$. Then the time optimal trajectory of a pursuer under the PP-navigation law is a geodesic of a Matsumoto metric.*”

In the present work, the next goal is finding out the metric related to these algorithms. In Section 5, it is shown that the metrics related to the 3D-Composed Pursuit algorithms are Matsumoto metrics. More precisely the following theorem is proved:

“Theorem 5.1. *The corresponding metrics to the 3D-Composed Pursuit algorithms are Matsumoto metrics.*”

Moreover, the composed pursuit navigation include PP and PR navigation as special cases and we can consider CP navigation as a generalization of PP and PR navigation. In section 6, two real examples are modeled by maple software and the trajectories of three algorithms PP, PR and 3D-CP navigations are compared.

As a further work on the 3D-Composed Pursuit navigation, one can find optimal metric among corresponding Matsumoto metrics of CP algorithms with respect to the cost functions, related to time and accuracy.

2. Preliminaries and Terminology

2.1. Kinematic analysis

Kinematic is a branch of Mechanic which describes motion of objects without considering the masses or the forces that bring about this motion. In a kinematic analysis, position, velocity and acceleration are calculated without considering the causes of the motion. Here, we study the kinematic of trajectories produced when an object pursues another one. We shall refer to the target as T and to the pursuer as P and their velocity vectors as $v_T(t)$ and $v_P(t)$, respectively. If the Cartesian coordinates $(x(t), y(t), z(t))$ is used to model our problem in $\mathbb{R}^3$ then Figure 1 can express our notations in a better manner.




Figure 1: Line of sight and velocity vectors of pursuer and target.

In Figure 1, the ray that starts at the pursuer P and is directed to the target T is called the *line of sight* which is denoted by $\overrightarrow{PT}(t)$. In addition, it is supposed that $\theta_T(t)$ and $\theta_P(t)$ are the angles between $v_T(t)$ and $v_P(t)$ with $\overrightarrow{PT}(t)$, respectively. We denote in the sequel the line of sight vector $\overrightarrow{PT}(t)$ by

the vector valued function $\vec{r} = \vec{r}(t)$ and its length by the real valued function $r = r(t)$, (i.e. $r(t) = |\vec{r}(t)|$).

2.2. Finslerian geometric structure

Recently, Finsler metrics appear very often both on the theory and the applications of differential geometry [7], as well as, optimization and navigation problems. A Finsler fundamental function on the manifold M is a function $F : TM \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with properties: F is C^∞ on TM_0 , F is positively 1-homogeneous on the fiber bundle TM and Hessian F^2 with elements $g_{ij}(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 F^2(x, y)}{\partial y^i \partial y^j}$ is positively defined on TM_0 . For more details, one can refer to [8] and [9].

2.3. A geometric approach to the optimization

In general sense, optimization refers to choosing the best element from some set of available alternatives. If element of this set are any kind of paths, we may hope to be able to consider a metric on the set. In this case, the optimized paths are geodesics of the metric. Hence, if this metric is between one of the well-known metrics as Euclidean, Riemannian and Finslerian, we may establish the geometry related to the metric, in order to better understanding its geometric behavior.

Two well-known Finsler metrics used in modeling of navigation problems are Randers and Matsumoto metrics [1, 9]. Randers metrics are simple navigation's metrics which their geodesics are the optimal paths of a movement on a Riemannian space by influence of an external force. A Matsumoto metrics are a kind of Finsler metrics defined by the following form

$$F = \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha - \beta}$$

where, $\alpha = \sqrt{a_{ij}(x)y^i y^j}$ is a Riemannian metric, and $\beta = b_i(x)y^i$ is a 1-form on M with $\sqrt{a_{ij}b^i b^j} < 1$. The optimal trajectories of Pure Pursuit and Pure Rendezvous algorithms are geodesics of some Matsumoto metrics.

3. A Short Review of Known Algorithms

In this section, we recall the definition of Pure Pursuit and Pure Rendezvous navigation.

In Pure Pursuit navigation, the velocity vector of pursuer $v_p(t)$ is always directed towards the target while in Pure Rendezvous navigation, $v_p(t)$ is directed towards some points in front of the target which are achieved by prediction of the path of target. This prediction forces that the line of sight $\overrightarrow{PT}(t)$ has constant direction during the pursuing process.

If Δt is sufficiently small, then the velocity of pursuer $v_p(t)$ and the velocity of target $v_T(t)$ can be considered (or at least approximately) as constants. It is well-known that, in order P meets T along the line of sight $\overrightarrow{PT}(t)$, $\Delta r(t)$ which it is equal to the difference of displacement vectors of P and T along the line of sight should be negative. This displacement (i.e. $\Delta r(t)$) is formulated as follows, $\Delta r(t) = (|v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) - |v_p(t)| \cos(\theta_P(t)))\Delta t$. Dividing both sides by Δt , as Δt approaches zero, we have:

$$\dot{r}(t) = |v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) - |v_p(t)| \cos(\theta_P(t)). \quad (1)$$

Moreover, for sufficiently small Δt ,

$$\vec{r}(t_0 + \Delta t) = \vec{r}(t_0) + v_T(t_0)\Delta t - v_P(t_0)\Delta t,$$

is true for all $t_0 \geq 0$. From which, we obtain:

$$\dot{\vec{r}}(t_0) = v_T(t_0) - v_P(t_0), \quad (2)$$

where, we have put $\dot{\vec{r}}(t_0) = \frac{d\vec{r}}{dt}|_{t=t_0}$.

In the next part, we present a brief review of PP and PR navigation. One can find more details about these two algorithms in [2]–[5].

3.1. Pure Pursuit navigation

There is a fundamental law in Pure Pursuit navigation which claims that the line of sight $\overrightarrow{PT}(t)$ and the velocity of pursuer $v_p(t)$ are always in the same direction. That means $\theta_P(t) = 0$, and by replacing this equation in Eq. (1), we obtain:

$$\dot{r}(t) = |v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) - |v_p(t)|. \quad (3)$$

Therefore, by means of the inequality $1 = |v_p(t)| > |v_T(t)|$, which is always supposed to be true in pursuit problems, we conclude from Eq. (3) that $\dot{r}(t)$ is negative. Indeed in the Pure Pursuit navigation, the fact $\dot{r}(t) < 0$ asserts that the pursuer will reach the target along the line of sight. The

corresponding differential equation which gives trajectories of this method is given by the following equation, cf. [2]

$$v_P(t) = \frac{\vec{r}(t)}{r(t)}. \quad (4)$$

3.2. Pure Rendezvous navigation

The fundamental law in the Pure Rendezvous navigation claims that, the direction of line of sight $\vec{PT}(t)$ is constant. It is equivalent to the following equation:

$$v_P(t) = v_T(t) + C(t) \frac{\vec{r}(t)}{r(t)}, \quad (5)$$

where, $C(t) := -\frac{v_T(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{v_T(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)}\right)^2 - |v_T(t)|^2 + 1} > 0$ to $|v_P(t)| = 1$ be satisfied. From Eq. (5), it is easy to see that:

$$v_P(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t) > v_T(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t),$$

$$|v_P(t)| \cos(\theta_P(t)) > |v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)).$$

Inserting the last equation in (1), we obtain:

$$\dot{r}(t) < 0.$$

This fact shows that the pursuer meets the target in this algorithm. Moreover, the trajectories of this method are achieved by Eq. (5).

4. Kinematic of 3D-Composed Pursuit Algorithms

In this section we introduce a novel family of pursuit algorithms in navigation problems which are combination of both PP and PR navigation. Here, both algorithms presented in the subsections 3.1 and 3.2 are combined to introduce a family of algorithms which benefit advantages of these two algorithms. We refer to these new algorithms as 3D-Composed Pursuit navigation or simply 3D-CP navigation. In the 3D-CP navigation, the velocity vector of pursuer is a linear combination of the target velocity $v_T(t)$ and line of sight $\vec{PT}(t)$ with non-negative coefficients.

In 3D-CP navigation, the velocity of pursuer $v_P(t)$ at the time t is determined to be in the plane spanned by $\vec{PT}(t)$ and $v_T(t)$. Therefore, the

velocity of pursuer $v_p(t)$ in these algorithms can be written in the following form:

$$\begin{cases} v_p(t) := A(t)v_T(t) + B(t)\vec{r}(t), & \forall t \geq 0, \\ 1 \geq A(t) \geq 0, \quad \frac{1}{r(t)} \geq B(t) > 0, & \forall t \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\vec{r}(t) = \overrightarrow{PT}(t)$ and the coefficients $A(t)$ and $B(t)$ are two smooth non-negative functions which force $v_p(t)$ be unitary vector. Obviously, if $A(t) = 0$ for all t , then by means of Eq. (6) and $|v_p(t)| = 1$ we obtain $B(t) = \frac{1}{r(t)}$. Hence, Eq. (4) yields that the CP algorithm coincides with PP algorithm. Moreover, if $A(t) = 1$ for all t , by means of Eq. (5) the CP algorithm will coincide with PR algorithm. Recalling inequality $|v_T(t)| < |v_p(t)| = 1$ supposed for all pursuing problems, we can prove the following proposition that shows the pursuer will reach the target in 3D-Composed Pursuit algorithms.

Proposition 4.1. *In the kinematic of the 3D-Composed Pursuit navigation, the pursuer converges to the target.*

Proof. To prove this proposition, we have to show that $\dot{r}(t)$ is negative in (1). By definition, we have

$$|v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) = \frac{v_T(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)}, \quad \cos(\theta_P(t)) = \frac{v_P(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)}.$$

Plugging Eq. (6) in the last equation we get

$$\cos(\theta_P(t)) = \frac{(A(t)v_T(t) + B(t)\vec{r}(t)) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)} = \frac{A(t)v_T(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)} + B(t)r(t). \quad (7)$$

Moreover, using Eq. (6) and $|v_p(t)| = 1$, we obtain that

$$r(t)B(t) = -A(t)|v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) + \sqrt{1 - (\sin(\theta_T(t))A(t)|v_T(t)|)^2}.$$

Therefore, by means of (1), (7) and $|v_p(t)| = 1$, we have

$$\dot{r}(t) = |v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) - \cos(\theta_P(t)) = (1 - A(t)) \frac{v_T(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)} - B(t)r(t).$$

From which we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r}(t) &= (1 - A(t)) \frac{v_T(t) \cdot \vec{r}(t)}{r(t)} + A(t)|v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{1 - (\sin(\theta_T(t))A(t)|v_T(t)|)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and finally using the inequality

$$||v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t))| < |\cos(\theta_T(t))| < \sqrt{1 - (\sin(\theta_T(t))A(t)|v_T(t)|)^2}$$

we obtain

$$= |v_T(t)| \cos(\theta_T(t)) - \sqrt{1 - (\sin(\theta_T(t))A(t)|v_T(t)|)^2} < 0$$

this completes the proof. $\square$

5. Geometric viewpoint

In order to obtain the related metrics to the 3D-Composed Pursuit navigation, we use Okubo's technic, cf. [10]. Without loss of generality, by supposing $1 = |v_P(t)| > |v_T(t)|$ in Eq. (2), we obtain

$$1 = |v_P(t)|^2 = \langle v_T(t) - \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t), v_T(t) - \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t) \rangle.$$

From which

$$|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|^2 - 2|v_T(t)||\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)| \cos(\theta(t)) + |v_T(t)|^2 - 1 = 0, \quad (8)$$

where, $\theta(t)$ is the angel between $\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)$ and $v_T(t)$. Solving this equation for $|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|$, it follows:

$$|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)| = |v_T(t)| \cos(\theta(t)) + \sqrt{|v_T(t)|^2 \cos^2(\theta(t)) - |v_T(t)|^2 + 1}. \quad (9)$$

By means of Eq. (8) and using the fact that $|v_T(t)| < 1$, we can easily see that $|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)| \neq 0$. Therefore, by dividing two sides of Eq. (9) by the term

$$|v_T(t)| \cos(\theta(t)) + \sqrt{|v_T(t)|^2 \cos^2(\theta(t)) - |v_T(t)|^2 + 1},$$

we get

$$1 = \frac{|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|}{|v_T(t)| \cos(\theta(t)) + \sqrt{|v_T(t)|^2 \cos^2(\theta(t)) - |v_T(t)|^2 + 1}}.$$

Product right side with $|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|/|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|$, we obtain

$$1 = \frac{|\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|^2}{v_T(t) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t) + \sqrt{(v_T(t) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t))^2 - |v_T(t)|^2 |\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|^2 + |\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)|^2}}.$$

Now, by Okubo's technic the fundamental function F of this algorithm is given by

$$F(x, \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)) = \frac{\langle \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t), \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t) \rangle}{\langle v_T(t), \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t) \rangle + |\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)| \sqrt{|v_T(t)|^2 \cos^2(\theta(t)) - |v_T(t)|^2 + 1}}.$$

where $\langle ., . \rangle$ is the inner Euclidean product in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The function F can be written in the following form

$$F(x, y) = \frac{\langle y, y \rangle}{\omega(y) + H(x, y)|y|},$$

where we have put $y = \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)$,

$$H(x, y) = \sqrt{|v_T(t)|^2 \cos^2(\theta(t)) - |v_T(t)|^2 + 1}$$

and ω is a 1-form given by $\omega(.) = \langle v_T(t), . \rangle$. Okubo technic asserts that the function F obtained in this way is smooth, homogeneous of degree one in y and verifies the convexity property. Hence it is Finsler fundamental function, known in literature as Matsumoto metrics [9]. Thus, we have proved the following theorem

Theorem 5.1. *The corresponding metrics to the 3D-Composed Pursuit navigation are Matsumoto metrics.*

6. Two Examples of 3D-Composed Pursuit Algorithms Modeled by Maple Software

In aim to pursue an unknown target in real world, trajectory of the target is determined by moment to moment observation. Therefore, the path of target is unpredictable if its direction changes frequently. In this Section, a specific algorithm of 3D-Composed Pursuit algorithms is introduced and used to be compared with two other well-known algorithms. This method is chosen in a manner to show that the PP and PR navigation do not have optimal time and accurate trajectories to meet the target. The last two examples in this section prove our claim.

In this specific algorithm, $A(t)$ is fixed in a manner that for a sufficiently grand value of $r(t) = |\overrightarrow{PT}(t)|$ it is approximately 1 and $A(t)$ becomes small enough to approach zero in the hitting moment. This means that the 3D-Composed Pursuit algorithm starts with prediction of the path by help of

$v_T(t)$ and by getting closer to the target this method change smoothly to Pure Pursuit algorithm for more accuracy. Now, we are in a position to determine the coefficients $A(t)$ and $B(t)$. By means of above explanation, we put

$$A(t) := \frac{r(t)}{r(t) + |v_T(t)|}. \quad (10)$$

Next, by using the assumption $|v_P(t)| = 1$ in Eq. (6), the function $B(t)$ becomes:

$$B(t) := -\frac{\vec{\mathbf{r}}(t) \cdot v_T(t)}{r(t) + |v_T(t)|} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\vec{\mathbf{r}}(t) \cdot v_T(t)}{r(t) + |v_T(t)|}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{r(t)|v_T(t)|}{r(t) + |v_T(t)|}\right)^2} + 1. \quad (11)$$

Finally, the trajectories of PP, PR and the current introduced 3D-CP navigation are compared in two real examples. These two examples are chosen in a manner that in Example 1, the target passes through a predictable path (i.e. the direction of $v_T(t)$ does not change or changes slightly) but in Example 2 the path of target is assumed to be unpredictable (i.e. the direction of $v_T(t)$ changes frequently).

6.1. Example 1

Assume that there is a target moving along the parametric curve $(\frac{t}{2} - 5, \frac{t}{2} - 5, 5)$. Therefore, the velocity vector $v_T(t)$ and the line of sight $\vec{\mathbf{r}}(t)$ are given by

$$v_T(t) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0), \quad \vec{\mathbf{r}}(t) = (\frac{t}{2} - 5 - x(t), \frac{t}{2} - 5 - y(t), 5 - z(t)),$$

where $(x(t), y(t), z(t))$ is the parametric trajectory of pursuer. To find the trajectory of pursuer in the 3D-Composed Pursuit algorithm given by Eq. (10) and (11), we have to solve Eq. (6). It yields to the following system of first order differential equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \frac{1}{2}A(t) + \frac{B(t)}{r(t)}(\frac{t}{2} - 5 - x(t)), \\ \dot{y}(t) = \frac{1}{2}A(t) + \frac{B(t)}{r(t)}(\frac{t}{2} - 5 - y(t)), \\ \dot{z}(t) = \frac{B(t)}{r(t)}(5 - z(t)). \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Here, the coefficients $A(t)$ and $B(t)$ are determined by $v_T(t)$, $\vec{r}(t)$ and $r(t) = |\vec{r}(t)|$ in Eqs. (10) and (11). Therefore, we are able to solve Eq. (12) with the initial condition $(x(0), y(0), z(0)) = (0, 0, 0)$. Similarly, trajectories of Pure Pursuit and Pure Rendezvous navigation are achieved by solving the system of first order differential equations (4) and (5), respectively, with same initial conditions. These equations are solved with Maple software and their trajectories in PP, PR and CP navigations are sketched in Figure 2. The wasting time for meeting the target in PP, PR and CP navigations are $7.55Sec.$, $5.83Sec.$ and $6.30Sec.$, respectively.

In this example and the following one, the path of target is shown by black curve. Moreover, the trajectories of PP, PR and 3D-CP algorithms are denoted by Blue, Green and Red curves, respectively.




Figure 2: Comparing trajectories of pursuer in PP, PR and CP navigations.

This shows the advantage of CP navigation with respect to the PP navigation, when the target's path is predictable.

6.2. Example 2

In this example, we assume that the path of target is the helix $(2 \cos(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}t), 2 \sin(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}t), \frac{t}{2} + 5)$. The trajectories of these three algorithms are sketched by maple in Figure 3. Here, we use same notation as the Example 1 for presenting the paths. The wasting time for meeting the target in PP, PR and CP navigations are $18.98Sec.$, $22.15Sec.$ and $18.09Sec.$, respectively.




Figure 3: Comparing trajectories of pursuer in PP, PR and CP navigations.

This example shows the prominence of the $3D$ -CP navigation in comparison with respect to the algorithms of PP and PR navigation.

6.3. Summarizing

Comparing time and trajectories of these three methods shows that the Composed Pursuit is advantageous with respect to the PP and PR navigation for these two examples.

References

- [1] D. Bao, C. Robles and Z. Shen, Zermelo Navigation on Riemannian Manifolds, J. Differential Geometry, 66 (2004) 391-449.

- [2] B. Bidabad, M. Rafie-Rad, Pure pursuit navigation on Riemannian manifolds, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 10 (2008) 1265-1269.
- [3] S. Kolski, Mobile Robots Perception Navigation (Chapter 21: A Pursuit-Rendezvous Approach for Robotic Tracking, edited by: F. Belkhouche, B. Belkhouche), Published by the Advanced Robotic Systems International and pro literature Verlag, 2007.
- [4] M. Rafie-Rad, Time-optimal solutions of Parallel navigation and Finsler geodesics, *Time-optimal solutions of Parallel navigation and Finsler geodesics*, 11 (2010) 3809-3814.
- [5] N. A. Shneydor, *Missile Guidance and Pursuit: Kinematics, Dynamics and Control*, Horwood Publishing Chichester, 1998.
- [6] H. Attarchi, B. Bidabad, M.M. Rezaii, A novel navigation method for pursuing a moving target, *Iranian Journal of Science & Technology, Transaction A*, 34 (2010) 313-320.
- [7] P. L. Antonelli, A. Bona, M. Slawinski, Seismic rays as Finsler geodesics, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 4 (2003) 711-722.
- [8] D. Bao, S. S. Chern, Z. Shen, *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [9] M. Matsumoto, A slope of a mountain is a Finsler surface with respect to a time measure, *J. Math. Kyoto. Univ.*, 29 (1980) 17-25.
- [10] P. L. Antonelli, R. S. Ingarden, M. Matsumoto, *The Theory of Sprays and Finsler Spaces with Applications in Physics and Biology*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993.