



THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

**Towards an estimation framework
for some problems in computer vision**

Darren J. Gawley

School of Computer Science
The University of Adelaide

Cooperative Research Centre for Sensor
Signal and Information Processing

September 2004

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE FACULTY OF
ENGINEERING, COMPUTER AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with fundamental algorithms for estimating parameters of geometric models that are particularly relevant to computer vision. A general framework is considered which accommodates several important problems involving estimation in a maximum likelihood setting. By considering a special form of a commonly used cost function, a new, iterative, estimation method is evolved. This method is subsequently expanded to enable incorporation of a so-called ancillary constraint. An important feature of these methods is that they can serve as a basis for conducting theoretical comparison of various estimation approaches.

Two specific applications are considered: conic fitting, and estimation of the fundamental matrix (a matrix arising in stereo vision). In the case of conic fitting, unconstrained methods are first treated. The problem of producing ellipse-specific estimates is subsequently tackled. For the problem of estimating the fundamental matrix, the new constrained method is applied to generate an estimate which satisfies the necessary rank-two constraint. Other constrained and unconstrained methods are compared within this context. For both of these example problems, the unconstrained and constrained methods are shown to perform with high accuracy and efficiency.

The value of incorporating covariance information characterising the uncertainty of measured image point locations within the estimation process is also explored. Covariance matrices associated with data points are modelled, then an empirical study is made of the conditions under which covariance information enables generation of improved parameter estimates. Under the assumption that covariance information is, in itself, subject to estimation error, tests are undertaken to determine the effect of imprecise information upon the quality of parameter estimates. Finally, these results are carried over to experiments to assess the value of covariance information in estimating the fundamental matrix from real images. The use of such information is shown to be of potential benefit when the measurement process of image features is considered.

DECLARATION

This thesis contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University or other tertiary institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by any other person, except where due reference is made in the text.

I give consent for this thesis, when deposited in the University library, to be available for loan and photocopying.

Darren J. Gawley
September 2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would primarily like to thank Mike Brooks and Wojciech Chojnacki for their excellent supervision, help, advice, and guidance during the course of my candidature. Additionally, my thanks also goes to the other members of the Computer Vision group – Anton van den Hengel, John Bastian, Rhys Hill, Daniel Pooley and Tony Scoleri – for many interesting discussions and shared experiences.

I would also like to acknowledge the Cooperative Research Centre for Sensor Signal and Information Processing, and the people therein, for all the great advice and support they have provided.

PUBLICATIONS

In undertaking research which contributes to this thesis, a number of papers were published.

- [1] W. Chojnacki, M. J. Brooks, A. van den Hengel, and D. Gawley. On the fitting of surfaces to data with covariances. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 22(11):1294-1303, 2000.
- [2] M. J. Brooks, W. Chojnacki, D. Gawley, and A. van den Hengel. Is covariance information useful in estimating vision parameters? In S. F. El-Hakim and A. Gruen, editors, *Videometrics and Optical Methods for 3-D Shape Measurement*, San Jose, California, USA, Jan. 2001, volume 4309 of Proceedings of SPIE, pp. 195-203, 2001.
- [3] M. J. Brooks, W. Chojnacki, D. Gawley, and A. van den Hengel. What value covariance information in estimating vision parameters? In Proceedings, *Eighth IEEE International Conference of Computer Vision*, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, July 2001, vol. 1, pp. 302-308. IEEE Computer Society.
- [4] W. Chojnacki, M. J. Brooks, A. van den Hengel, and D. Gawley. A fast MLE-based method for estimating the fundamental matrix. In B. Mercer, editor, Proceedings of the *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP-01)*, Thessaloniki, Greece, 7-10 October, 2001, vol 2, pp. 189-192. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.
- [5] W. Chojnacki, M. J. Brooks, A. van den Hengel, and D. Gawley. From FNS to HEIV: A link between two vision parameter estimation methods. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 26(2):264-268, 2004.
- [6] W. Chojnacki, M. J. Brooks, A. van den Hengel, and D. Gawley. A new constrained parameter estimator for computer vision applications. *Image and Vision Computing*, 22(2):85-91, 2004.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	x
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Preface	1
1.2 Outline of contribution	2
Chapter 2: Problem Formulation	5
2.1 Parametric model	5
2.2 Specialisations	6
2.3 Example problem: (simple) parabola estimation	8
2.4 Least squares fitting	9
2.4.1 Total least squares	10
2.4.2 Finding the TLS estimate	12
2.4.3 Generalised TLS	15
2.4.4 Orthogonality and optimality	15
2.5 Maximum likelihood	17
2.5.1 ML cost function	17
2.5.2 Nuisance parameters	19
2.6 Sampson's approximation	20
2.6.1 Derivation of a reduced cost function	21
2.6.2 Alternative derivation of the approximated ML cost function	23
Chapter 3: Cost Function Minimisation	25
3.1 General methods	25
3.1.1 Direct search	26
3.1.2 Gradient-based methods	26
3.1.3 Least squares	28
3.2 AML Specific methods	30

3.2.1	Eigenfit: Taubin's meta-approximation	31
3.2.2	Iteratively re-weighted least squares	32
3.2.3	Fundamental numerical scheme	33
3.2.4	Iterative issues	35
3.2.5	Bias in IRWLS estimator	37
3.3	Incorporating the ancillary constraint	37
3.3.1	Reparameterisation	38
3.3.2	Post-correction	38
3.4	Direct constrained estimation	38
3.4.1	Preliminary method	40
3.4.2	Revised method	41
3.5	Summary	43
Chapter 4:	Application I: Conic Fitting	45
4.1	Problem form	47
4.2	Unconstrained estimation	48
4.2.1	Applying algebraic least squares	48
4.2.2	Geometric interpretation for bias in algebraic methods	51
4.2.3	Estimation methods	52
4.3	Conic fitting experiments	53
4.3.1	Error measures	53
4.3.2	Minimising the AML cost function	54
4.3.3	Comparing LM-A to FNS	59
4.4	Ellipse fitting	63
4.4.1	Ellipse gold standard	63
4.4.2	Finding the closest point	64
4.5	Algebraic constrained ellipse fitting	66
4.5.1	Finding the Fitzgibbon estimate	66
4.5.2	Numerical considerations	67
4.6	Applying an ellipse-specific correction	69
4.7	Seeding the gold standard method	71

Chapter 5:	Application II: fundamental matrix estimation	74
5.1	Epipolar geometry and the fundamental matrix	74
5.2	Non-iterative methods	76
5.2.1	The eight-point algorithm	76
5.2.2	Taubin's method	79
5.2.3	Invariant Fitting	79
5.3	Iterative methods	79
5.3.1	Cost functions	80
5.3.2	Gold standard method	81
5.4	Experiments part I: Unconstrained estimation	82
5.4.1	Experimental setup	82
5.4.2	Experiments	83
5.5	Rationalisation of Hartley normalisation	85
5.6	Incorporating the rank-two constraint	89
5.6.1	Post correction	89
5.6.2	Parameterisation	90
5.6.3	CFNS	91
5.7	Experiments part II: Constrained estimation	91
Chapter 6:	Covariance matrices	96
6.1	Covariance matrices	96
6.1.1	Single data point	96
6.1.2	Collection of data	99
6.2	Experimental setup	99
6.2.1	Estimation methods	100
6.2.2	Generating true and perturbed data	100
6.3	Experiments with synthetic data	101
6.3.1	Varying the spread of covariances	103
6.3.2	Partially correct covariances	104
6.4	Considering real images	105
6.4.1	Covariance information from image gradients	106
6.4.2	Harris corners	109
6.4.3	Real images	111

Chapter 7: Conclusion	115
7.1 Summary	115
7.2 Future work	118
Bibliography	120

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	A <i>consistent</i> point lying on the manifold of all consistent points for a given θ . The ellipse represents a level-set of the p.d.f. of the perturbations dictated by the particular covariance matrix	8
2.2	A consistency manifold corresponding to $\theta = [1, 2, -3, 4]$, with sample true points and noisy data points	9
2.3	Ordinary least squares errors (left), and orthogonal distance errors (right). The errors in the OLS case are dependent on the position and orientation of the model. They become particularly unstable as the line tends to parallel with the y -axis	13
2.4	Minimising J_{ML} as a two stage process	19
2.5	Sampson's approximated distance d_2 and the true ML distance d_1	20
3.1	Correcting an unconstrained estimate. A 'slice' of the J_{AML} surface is shown superimposed with the curve $\psi(\theta) = 0$. Even though θ_2 may be close to the unconstrained minimiser $\hat{\theta}^u$ it has a higher cost function value than θ_1 which is a preferable choice	39
4.1	Several ellipses estimated from a set of points	46
4.2	An example of an ellipse, parabola, and hyperbola which have been estimated given the same sample set of data points	47
4.3	Above: A set of data points and associated TLS estimate is shown on the left. The points were transformed by applying a translation of $[170, 5]^T$, a rotation of 35° , and scaling by a factor of 1.6. A newly estimated TLS estimate is shown, along with the same transformations applied to the original estimate. Below: The Bookstein method is used in place of TLS and the newly estimated ellipse coincides with the transformed original .	50
4.4	Bookstein geometry	52

4.5	An example of an underlying ‘true’ ellipse with 30 true data points distributed along its arc length. Data set A (left) and B(right)	55
4.6	Above: noisy data for data set A, with $\sigma = 5.0$ pixels (left), and $\sigma = 10$ pixels (right). Below: noisy data for data set ‘B’ with $\sigma = 10$ pixels	55
4.7	Examples of convergence of FNS for $\sigma = 7.0$ using data set A. On occasion, early iterations see an initial increase in the value of J_{AML}	56
4.8	Individual FNS iterations shown for set A (left), and set B (right)	57
4.9	Average number of iterations required for convergence of FNS for increasing noise	58
4.10	Using data set B and adding noise of $\sigma = 10$. The top graphs show convergence when FNS was seeded with BOOK. The bottom graphs show the improvement in convergence when FNS was seeded with TAU	60
4.11	A histogram of J_{AML} values for FNS, LM-A, and TLS estimators for 200 trials, where $\sigma = 7.0$. The average value is shown as a legend for each histogram	61
4.12	Histograms of the percentage difference between LM-A and FNS estimates for each of 200 trials. The noise level was taken as $\sigma = 10.0$ and data set A (upper) and B (lower) were both used. A positive value indicates that the FNS estimate has a lower value of J_{AML} than LM-A	61
4.13	Slices of J_{AML} generated for $\sigma = 7.0$	62
4.14	Geometric parameterisation of an ellipse	64
4.15	The Fitzgibbon method fits an ellipse to data, no matter how “un-elliptical” are the given data points	68
4.16	Examples of cases where the FNS method produces a hyperbola as its estimate. The COR estimate is shown, along with the underlying ideal ellipse along which the idea data points were generated	73
5.1	Epipolar geometry	75
5.2	Synthetic stereo data generated from configurations A (top) and B (bottom). Left and right image data points, and their correspondences, are shown. Additionally, the position of epipoles is shown for reference (as an asterix)	83
5.3	Average number of iterations required to compute FNS estimates	85

5.4	Slices of J_{AML} generated for $\sigma = 10.0$ for configuration A (above) and configuration B (below). The bounding estimate is HRT as the TLS estimates were too poor	86
5.5	Values of J_{AML} for various estimates under increasing levels of noise . . .	87
5.6	Histograms showing the J_{AML} values for 200 repeated estimates computed using different methods. Not shown are the values for TLS, as they are off the scale	87
5.7	This figure shows two copies of a zoomed in portion of one image in a stereo pair. For the left image, an unconstrained fundamental matrix has been estimated from manually matched data points, and epipolar lines rendered. A fundamental matrix satisfying the rank-two constraint was used for the right image. The unconstrained estimate can still be used to compute epipolar lines, however they do not intersect at a common point (the epipole)	89
5.8	Average values of the (ancillary) constraint function for increasing noise (left). Average J_{AML} values for the estimates (right)	93
5.9	Histogram of J_{AML} values for estimates satisfying the constraint	94
5.10	Histogram of reprojection to truth error values for estimates satisfying the constraint	95
5.11	Left epipoles for various estimates. Epipoles associated with synthetic underlying true data are shown for reference	95
6.1	The level sets of a bivariate Gaussian p.d.f., characterised by a specific covariance matrix, are ellipses	98
6.2	Different types of noise models: (a) isotropic homogeneous, (b) isotropic inhomogeneous, (c) anisotropic homogeneous, (d) anisotropic inhomogeneous	99
6.3	Average values of epipolar error for estimates produces with various methods	103
6.4	Errors in estimates for varying spread of covariance parameters	107
6.5	Average estimation error for increasing average error in covariance matrices	108
6.6	Ellipses representing covariance matrices for various image points	109

6.7	The office, grid, and library stereo image pairs	112
6.8	Covariance matrices of form Λ^1	113
6.9	Covariance matrices of form Λ^2	114

NOTATION

$\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$: column vector of length p
$\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$: $n \times m$ dimensional matrix
\mathbf{I}_p, \mathbf{I}	: $p \times p$ identity matrix (generally p is inferred from context)
\mathbf{A}^\top	: transpose of \mathbf{A}
\mathbf{A}^{-1}	: inverse of \mathbf{A}
\mathbf{A}^-	: Moore-Penrose inverse of \mathbf{A}
$ \mathbf{A} $: determinant of \mathbf{A}
$\ \mathbf{A}\ _F$: Frobenius norm of \mathbf{A}
$\text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$: rank of \mathbf{A}
$\text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$: $n \times n$ matrix with $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ along the diagonal and zeros elsewhere
$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$: trace of matrix \mathbf{A}
$\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})$: vectorisation of \mathbf{A}
$\partial_{\mathbf{x}} J$: gradient row vector $[\frac{\partial J}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial J}{\partial x_n}]$
$\partial_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}^2 J$: Hessian matrix of J , $[\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$.
\mathbf{H}_J	: alternative notation for the Hessian matrix of $J(\cdot)$
$p(X)$: probability of event X
$E[\mathbf{x}]$: expected value of the random variable \mathbf{x}
$\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$: Kronecker product of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B}