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## Structure from motion

Have: 2D points $p_{i j}$ seen in $m$ images
Assume: points generated from $n$ fixed 3D points $\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{j}}$ and cameras $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$ or $\boldsymbol{p}_{i j} \equiv M_{i} X_{j}$
Want: Cameras $M_{i}$, points $X_{j}$
(Remember)

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{i} & \equiv K_{i}\left[R_{i}, t_{i}\right] \\
\lambda p_{i j} & =M_{i} X_{j}, \lambda \neq 0
\end{aligned}
$$



Known

Unknown

## Is SFM always uniquely solvable?



- Necker cube


## Structure from motion ambiguities

 Let's first find one easy ambiguity$$
\begin{array}{r}
\boldsymbol{p}_{i j} \equiv M_{i} X_{j} \\
3 \times 1
\end{array}
$$

## Structure from motion ambiguities

Let's first find one easy ambiguity

$$
p_{i j} \equiv M_{i} X_{j}
$$

Can pick any arbitrary scaling factor $k$ and adjust the cameras and points

$$
p_{i j} \equiv M_{i} k^{-1} k X_{j}
$$

(Can usually be fixed in practice: just need a number, obtainable from heights of known objects or an IMU)

## Structure from motion ambiguity

Does this diagram change meaning if I use this coordinate system?
${ }_{0}^{\mathrm{L}}{ }^{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{z}}^{\mathrm{y}}$
Versus this coordinate system?


Coordinate system irrelevant! So global R,t also ambiguous

## Structure from motion ambiguities

 Not just limited to scale. Given:$$
p_{i j} \equiv M_{i} X_{j}
$$

Can insert any global transform $\mathbf{H}$

$$
p_{i j} \equiv M_{i} X_{j}=M_{i} H^{-1} H X_{j}
$$

$\mathbf{H}$ is a 3D homography / perspective transform / projective transform

## Similarity/Affine/Perspective

## Given:



$$
\left[\begin{array}{lll}
a & b & c \\
d & e & f \\
g & h & i
\end{array}\right] \quad\left[\begin{array}{lll}
a & b & c \\
d & e & f \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right]
$$

Similarity

$\left[\begin{array}{cc}s \boldsymbol{R} & \boldsymbol{t} \\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right]$

3D: same idea, different dimensions

## Projective ambiguity

With no constraints on cameras matrices and scene, can only reconstruct up to a perspective ambiguity


## Projective ambiguity



Slide credit: S. Lazebnik

## Affine ambiguity

If we have constraints in the form of what lines are parallel, can reduce ambiguity to affine ambiguity.


## Affine ambiguity



## Similarity ambiguity

If we have orthogonality constraints, get up to similarity transform. Really the best we can do. We get this if we have calibrated cameras.


## Similarity ambiguity



## Affine structure from motion

We'll do the math with affine / weak perspective cameras (math is much easier)


Perspective


Weak Perspective

## Recall: orthographic projection

Orthographic camera: things infinitely far away but you have an amazing camera


## Field of view and focal length


wide-angle

standard

telephoto

## Affine Camera

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \boldsymbol{M}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\boldsymbol{A}_{2 D} & \boldsymbol{t}_{2 D} \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{llll}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\boldsymbol{A}_{3 D} & \boldsymbol{t}_{3 D} \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right] \\
& \text { 3x3 Matrix } 3 \times 4 \text { Ortho. 4x4 Matrix } \\
& \text { Affine 2D Proj Affine 3D }
\end{aligned}
$$

Tedious math...

$$
\boldsymbol{M}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} & b_{1} \\
a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & b_{2} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right]
$$

## Affine Camera

So what? Who cares?
Examine the projection

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
u \\
v \\
1
\end{array}\right] \equiv\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} & b_{1} \\
a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & b_{2} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
X \\
Y \\
Z \\
1
\end{array}\right]
$$

Projection becomes linear mapping + translation and doesn't involve homogeneous coordinates!

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
u \\
v
\end{array}\right] \equiv\left[\begin{array}{lll}
a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\
a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
X \\
Y \\
Z
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{l}
b_{1} \\
b_{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

b is projection of origin. Can anyone see why?

## Affine structure from motion

General structure from motion:

Assume M is affine camera:

$$
\underset{2 x}{\boldsymbol{p}_{i j}}=\underset{2 x \times 3 \times 1}{\boldsymbol{A}_{\boldsymbol{i}} \boldsymbol{X}_{j 3}}+\underset{2 \times 1}{\boldsymbol{b}_{\boldsymbol{i}}}
$$

mn 2D points, m cameras, $n$ 3D points up to arbitrary 3D affine (12 DOF)

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Need: } \\
2 m n \geq 8 m+3 n-12 \\
(m=2): n \geq 4 \\
\text { (for all } m!)
\end{gathered}
$$

## One simplifying trick

$$
\begin{gathered}
\boldsymbol{p}_{i j}=\boldsymbol{A}_{i} \boldsymbol{X}_{\boldsymbol{j}}+\boldsymbol{b}_{\boldsymbol{i}} \\
\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}_{i j}}=\boldsymbol{p}_{i j}-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{p}_{i k}=\boldsymbol{A}_{i} \boldsymbol{X}_{j}+\boldsymbol{b}_{i}-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{A}_{i} \boldsymbol{X}_{k}+\boldsymbol{b}_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

Gather terms involving $A_{i}$, push out $b_{i}$

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}_{i j}}=\boldsymbol{A}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{X}_{\boldsymbol{j}}-\underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{X}_{k}})+\underbrace{0}_{\boldsymbol{b}_{\boldsymbol{i}}-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{b}_{i}}
$$

Set origin to mean of 3D points
$\widehat{p_{i j}}=A_{i} X_{j}$
Can do this entirely in terms of $\mathbf{A}$ !

## Affine structure from motion

First, make data measurement matrix consisting of all the points stacked together

C. Tomasi and T. Kanade. Shape and motion from image streams under orthography: A factorization method. IJCV, 9(2):137-154, November 1992.

## Affine structure from motion

Then, write all the equations in one in terms of product of cameras and points.

$$
\begin{gathered}
D=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
\widehat{p_{11}} & \cdots & \widehat{p_{1 n}} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\widehat{p_{m 1}} & \cdots & \widehat{p_{m n}}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}
A_{1} \\
\vdots \\
A_{m}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{lll}
X_{1} & \cdots & X_{n}
\end{array}\right] \\
2 m \times n \\
2 m \times 3
\end{gathered} \quad 3 \times n \quad \begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{D} & \mathbf{S} \\
\text { What's the rank of } \mathbf{D} ? \\
3!
\end{array}
$$

C. Tomasi and T. Kanade. Shape and motion from image streams under orthography: A factorization method. IJCV, 9(2):137-154, November 1992.

## Making Matrices Rank Deficient

Repeat of epipolar geometry class, but important enough to see twice. Given matrix M:


## Affine structure from motion

We'd like to take the measurements and convert them into $\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{S}$


## Affine structure from motion

Do SVD (typically you don't make full $U, \Sigma, V$ )


Truncate to top 3 singular values


## Affine structure from motion

Nearly there apart from this annoying $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{3}$.


## Eliminating the affine ambiguity

Rows $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{i}}$ of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{i}}$ give axes of camera. Can multiply each projection $A_{i}$ with $\mathbf{C}$ to make $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{C}$ that satisfies:


Gives 3 equations per camera, can set $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{C}$ to new camera, and $\mathrm{C}^{-1} \mathrm{~S}$ to new points.
In general, a recipe for eliminating ambiguities

## Reconstruction results
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C. Tomasi and T. Kanade, Shape and motion from image streams under orthography: A factorization method, IJCV 1992

## Dealing with missing data

So far, assume we can see all points in all views In reality, measurement matrix typically looks like this:


Possible solution: find dense blocks, solve in block, fuse. In general, finding these dense blocks is NP-complete

## But cameras aren't affine!

Want: $m$ cameras $M_{i}, n 3 D$ points $X_{j}$
Given: mn 2D points $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{ij}}$

$$
p_{i j} \equiv M_{i} X_{j}=M_{i} H^{-1} H X_{j}
$$

## When is this Possible?

Want: m cameras $M_{i}, n$ 3D points $X_{j}$ Given: mn 2D points $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{ij}}$
$p_{i j} \equiv M_{i} X_{j}=M_{i} H_{\boldsymbol{i}}^{-1} H X_{j}$

2D point (2)
$3 \times 4$ camera matrix (11) why?
$4 \times 4$ homography (15) why?

Need $2 m n \geq 11 m+3 n-15$

$$
(m=2): n \geq 7
$$

( $\mathrm{m}=3$ ): $\mathrm{n} \geq 6$ (doesn't get better after)

$$
(m=1): n \leq 4
$$

## Two Camera Case

For two cameras, we need 7 points. Hmm. What else (in theory) requires 7 points?


Remember: this is up to a projective ambiguity!

## Incremental SFM

Key idea: incrementally add cameras, points


## Incremental SFM

Key idea: incrementally add cameras, points

1. Initialize motion $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$
$=\left[R_{i}, t_{j}\right]$ with
fundamental matrix


## Incremental SFM

Key idea: incrementally add cameras, points

1. Initialize motion $M_{i}$
$=\left[R_{i}, t_{j}\right]$ with fundamental matrix
2. Initialize structure
$\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{j}}$ with triangulation
How could we add another camera?


## Incremental SFM

Key idea: incrementally add cameras, points

1. Solve for camera matrix using visible, known points using calibration


## Incremental SFM

Key idea: incrementally add cameras, points

1. Solve for camera matrix using visible, known points using calibration

Now we can see the fourth point in two cameras.


## Incremental SFM

Key idea: incrementally add cameras, points

1. Solve for camera matrix using visible, known points using calibration
2. Solve for 3 D coordinates of newly visible points using triangulation


## Incremental SFM

Key idea: incrementally add cameras, points
Big problem: don't ever jointly consider all the 3D points and camera.

Leads to final step, called bundle adjustment.


## Bundle Adjustment

Do non-linear minimization over cameras $M_{i}$, points $X_{j}$ to minimize distance between observed points $p_{i j}$ and projections $M_{i} X_{j}$ when they're visible.


## Devil is in the details

High-level idea: $\quad \arg \min _{M_{i}, X_{j}} w_{i j} d\left(M_{i} X_{j}, p_{i j}\right)^{2}$
In practice:

- Have to initialize reasonably well
- Should minimize over K,R,t directly
- Problem is very sparse: $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ almost always zero
- Need to integrate uncertainty information
- Probably want to use a system written by experts


## Representative SFM pipeline


N. Snavely, S. Seitz, and R. Szeliski, Photo tourism: Exploring photo collections in 3D, SIGGRAPH 2006. http://phototour.cs.washington.edu/

## Feature detection

## Detect SIFT features



## Feature detection

## Detect SIFT features



## Feature matching

Match features between each pair of images


## Feature matching

Use RANSAC to estimate fundamental matrix between each pair


## Feature matching

Use RANSAC to estimate fundamental matrix between each pair


## Feature matching

Use RANSAC to estimate fundamental matrix between each pair


## Image connectivity graph


(graph layout produced using the Graphviz toolkit: http://www.graphviz.org/)

## In practice

- Pick a pair of images with lots of inliers (and preferably, good EXIF data)
- Initialize intrinsic parameters (focal length, principal point) from EXIF
- Estimate extrinsic parameters ( $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{t})$ Use triangulation to initialize model points
- While remaining images exist
- Find an image with many feature matches with images in the model
- Run RANSAC on feature matches to register new image to model
- Triangulate new points
- Perform bundle adjustment to re-optimize everything


## The devil is in the details

- Degenerate configurations (homographies)
- Eliminating outliers
- Repetition and symmetry



## The devil is in the details

- Degenerate configurations (homographies)
- Eliminating outliers
- Repetition and symmetry
- Multiple connected components

