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## Shape Matching in Point-set Registration



Human skull


Chimpanzee skull


Baboon skull
$\diamond$ Registration of point sets is an important data analytic task
$\diamond$ Shapes contain semantic meanings of topology and geometry
$\diamond$ Deformation Nonrigid, nonlinear mapping

## Applications

- 3-D scanners: data points from multiple views are fused together via registration to overcome acquisition limitations [Lempitsky and Boykov, 2007].
- Radiation therapy guided by medical imaging: accurate registration is critical to precise target localization and accurate dose estimation [Simon et al., 2015].
- Label propagation: semi-automatic segmentation [Heckemann et al., 2006].


## Generic Registration Model

Domain point set $A \quad$ Codomain point set $B$.

$$
\inf _{f \in F} D(f, A, B)
$$

- F: model family, feasibility/regularization conditions
- D: measure of model-data fitting

We will specify our conditions for $F$ and choice of $D$

## Uncertainty in Point Correspondance



A single point in $A$ may have multiple matching canidates in $B$

## Global View in Matrix form

$$
\Delta(f)=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
\delta_{1,1} & \delta_{1,2} & \cdots & \delta_{1, n} \\
\delta_{2,1} & \delta_{2,2} & \cdots & \delta_{2,3} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\delta_{n, 1} & \delta_{n, 1} & \cdots & \delta_{n, n}
\end{array}\right), \quad \begin{aligned}
& \delta_{i, j}=\delta\left(b_{i}=f\left(a_{j}\right)\right) \\
& \delta_{i j} \in[0,1]
\end{aligned}
$$

- $\Delta$ is a permutation matrix with ideal, combinatorial setting
- $\Delta$ is doublely stochastic in the present work in order to account for uncertainty


## Ideal Case



Ideal point-set registration: corresponding points in same color

$$
\Delta=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

Ideal mapping among $O(n!)$ permutations

## Spectral Noise in Cryo-Electron Microscopy


[Terwilliger et al., 2018]

## Stochastic Mappings

In the presence of Gaussian noise in point sets, $\Delta$ becomes doubly stochastic

$$
\Delta=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
.7 & .2 & .1 & \cdots & 0 \\
.2 & .8 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
.1 & .0 & .8 & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & .8 & .1 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & .1 & .8
\end{array}\right)
$$

$-\operatorname{nnz}(\Delta)$ is up to $n^{2}$, instead of $n$

- the space of doubly stochastic mappings is BIG
+ the feasible mappings are limited by shapes \& deformation types


## Deformation

Point set $B$ over a deformed lattice from a. rectangular grid. Deformation: non-rigid, non-linear transformation

## Deformation Family



Desirable properties (regularization conditions)

- symmetric registration: $B=f(A) \quad A=f^{-1}(B)$
- neighborhood preserving
- not sensitive to noise in data


## Data Fitting Measure: GH Distance

Among the Gromov-Wasserstein distance family, ${ }^{1}$ we focus on $L_{2}$-Gromov-Hausdorff $\left(\mathrm{GH}_{2}\right)$ distance
$d_{\mathrm{GH}_{2}}(A, B)=\inf _{f}\left\|d_{A}\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)-d_{B}\left(f(a), f\left(a^{\prime}\right)\right)\right\|_{2}$ where $f$ is isometric

- $\left\|d_{A}\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)-d_{B}\left(f(a), f\left(a^{\prime}\right)\right)\right\|_{2}$ is a functional in $f$
- " $d_{\mathrm{GH}}(A, B)=0 "$ " $\left(A, d_{A}\right)$ and $\left(B, d_{B}\right)$ are isometric"
- $d_{\mathrm{GH}}(A, B)$ is invariant to isometric mappings between $A$ and $B$; a critical extension, distinction from Hausdorff set distance

[^0]
## GH Distance: Applications \& Advances

- Used for shape matching ${ }^{2}$
- Connections to Heat Kernel Signature, intrinsic, foundation to mulitiscale methods. ${ }^{3} 2$
- Lower bounds present appoximations by constrained linear programs ${ }^{2}$
- Choices of point distances $d_{A}, d_{B}$ and their related intrinsic similarity are well understood ${ }^{2}$

[^1]
## Limitations/Gaps in Related Existing Work

- Computational complexity is prohibitively high for solving large linear programs in $|A| \cdot|B|=O\left(n^{2}\right)$ variables with $|A|+|B|=O(n)$ constraints, with black-box solvers. ${ }^{4}$
- Effect of noise in data on shape matching and registration is unknown, unreported or not analyzed

[^2]
## Contributions

$\triangleright$ Establish a theoretical foundation for the use of Gromov-Hausdorff (GH) distance for point set registration with bi-Lipschitz deformation maps perturbed by Gaussian noise.
$\triangleright$ Introduce a highly efficient iterative algorithm for point set matching with guaranteed convergence to a local minimum.
$\triangleright$ Present a compressive stochastic registration framework, equipped with an efficient initialization scheme using multi-scale shape descriptors

The framework is adaptive to application and readily accepts prior information.

## Chosen Deformation Family

By the desirable properties of (1) symmetric registration, (2) neighbor preservance and (3) insensitivity to noise, we model deformation $f$ as surjective, Bi-Lipschitz

The Bi-Lipschitz condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall x \quad \exists r, r^{\prime}>0 \quad y \in N\left(x, r^{\prime}\right) \Longleftrightarrow f(y) \in N(f(x), r) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

This condition imples homeomorphism of $f, f^{-1}$.

## Likelihood of Bi-Lipschitz Functions

Given observed data $A, B$, the likelihood distribution of Bi-Lipschitz functions is

$$
P(f \mid A, B) \triangleq P(\mathrm{f} \text { is bi-Lipschitz } \mid A, B)
$$

To estimate the feasibility likelihood of $f$, we must consider

- the complexity for integrating over feasible locations
- the effect of noise on the feasibility criteria


## Bi-Lipschitz condition

$$
\forall x \quad \exists r, r^{\prime}>0 \quad y \in N\left(x, r^{\prime}\right) \Longleftrightarrow f(y) \in N(f(x), r)
$$


$N(f(x), r)$ :Neighborhood of $y=f(x)$ with radius $r$ and deformation upper and lower bounds $r K$ and $r / K$, respectively. 19/39

## Under Gaussian Noise

Determine when points are likely from some neighborhood.

(a) The neighborhood of $x$ perturbed by (b) A 2-point probabilitistically noise. equivalent noise model.

## Log Likelihood by Aggregated Two-Point Feasibilities

$P(f \mid A, B) \triangleq P(f$ is homeomorphic $\mid A, B) \propto \int_{(U, V) \in \delta_{f}^{n}} \mu(U) \mu(V)$

$$
\approx \prod_{a_{j}, a_{1}, f\left(a_{j}\right), f\left(a_{1}\right)} \int_{\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, v_{1}, v_{2}\right) \in \delta_{f}^{2}\left(a_{j}, a_{1}, f\left(a_{j}\right), f\left(a_{1}\right)\right)} \mu\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \mu\left(v_{1}, v_{2}\right)
$$

$$
\log P(f \mid A, B) \approx \sum_{a_{j}, a_{l}, f\left(a_{j}\right), f\left(a_{l}\right)} D\left(d\left(a_{j}, a_{l}\right), d\left(f\left(a_{j}\right), f\left(a_{l}\right)\right)\right)
$$

where

$$
D\left(d\left(a_{j}, a_{l}\right), d\left(f\left(a_{j}\right), f\left(a_{l}\right)\right)\right) \triangleq \log \int_{\delta_{f}^{2}} \mu\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \mu\left(v_{1}, v_{2}\right)
$$

## Properties of Elementary 2-Point Likelihood

$D\left(d\left(a_{j}, a_{l}\right), d\left(f\left(a_{j}\right), f\left(a_{l}\right)\right)\right)$ a function of point distance
by the radial neighborhood symmetry and the Bi-Lipschitz condition on $f$


Two-point likelihood (exponentiated) as a function of $d\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)$ and $d\left(b, b^{\prime}\right)$ (Lipschitz K not bounded)

## $L_{2}$ GH Auxiliary Function

By the properties of 2-point likelihood $D\left(d\left(a, a^{\prime}\right), d\left(b, b^{\prime}\right)\right)$

- It is largest when $d\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)$ and $d\left(b, b^{\prime}\right)$ are nearly equal.
- It is bounded by the bi-Lipschitz condition,

$$
d\left(f(a), f\left(a^{\prime}\right)\right) \in \Theta\left(d\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)\right)
$$

We substitute

$$
\arg \max _{f} \sum_{j, l} D\left(d\left(a_{j}, a_{l}\right), d\left(b_{i}=f\left(a_{j}\right), b_{k}=f\left(a_{l}\right)\right)\right)
$$

by the $L_{2}-G H$

$$
\arg \min _{f} \sum_{j, l}\left\|d\left(a_{j}, a_{l}\right)-d\left(b_{i}=f\left(a_{j}\right), b_{k}=f\left(a_{l}\right)\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}
$$

## Quadratic Program with Linear Constraints

$$
\underset{\Delta}{\arg \min }\left\|\Delta d(A) \Delta^{T}-d(B)\right\|_{F}^{2}-\sum_{i, j} \log P\left(f\left(a_{j}\right)=b_{i}\right) \Delta_{i, j}
$$

$\Delta$ doubly stochastic.
for $\Delta_{i, j}=\delta\left(f\left(a_{j}\right)=b_{i}\right)$ and priors $P\left(f\left(a_{j}\right)=b_{i}\right)$.

- Integer program relaxation
- Non-convex
- Linearly constrained
- Quadratic in matching function (of size $n^{2}$ )


## Stochastic Matching Algorithm

Alternating optimization of Lagrangian following variable splitting

$$
\underset{y, x}{\arg \min } \quad y^{T} G y+\sum_{i, j} \log \left(P\left(f\left(a_{j}\right)=b_{i}\right)\right) \cdot y_{(i, j)}+\iota(x)
$$

y is doubly stochastic.
$y=x$ ties constraint and objective variables
$\iota(\cdot)$ is infinite where $P\left(f\left(a_{j}\right)=b_{i}\right)=0$ and $x_{(i, j)}>1, x_{(i, j)}<0$.

The Quadratic function

$$
G=d(A)^{2} \otimes I_{n} \quad-2 \cdot d(A) \otimes d(B)=
$$

## Convergence \& Complexity

Guarantee convergence to local minimum. ${ }^{5}$
Efficient use of problem structure:

1. Quadratic form of size $n^{2} \times n^{2}$ admits special structure.
2. Solution to large system via block LU decomposition.
3. Supported by eigen-decomposition of distance matrices and LU of Schur complement.
Yields efficient computation:
4. Initialization requires $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{3}\right)$.
5. Each iteration requires $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{3}\right)$.

## Compressive Stochastic Registration Framework

Initialization: $A_{0}=A$, initial map $f_{0}$

1. Locate an auxilary map $f_{k}$ in compressive form, $f_{k}: A_{k} \subset \Omega_{1} \rightarrow B \subset \Omega_{2}$
2. Remove outlier point pairings
3. Transform points, $A_{k+1} \leftarrow f_{k}\left(A_{k}\right)$

Obtain decompressed registration $f$ from $f_{k}$.

## Configuration Initialization: $f_{0}$

The configuration is initialized using Log-Cartesian feature, a multi-scale variant of Shape Context. ${ }^{6}$

(a) A 3-level grid used in creating the Log-Cartesian feature.

(b) Concatenated output grids which define histogram bins the Log-Cartesian feature.

[^3]
## Data Description \& Experiment Setup

- Respiratory motion data set of five patients at 14 amplitude binned respiratory phases ${ }^{7}$.
- Ground truth deformation is obtained by manual alignment of XCAT models to MRI data.
- For the experiments synthetic additive Gaussian displacements were added with variance set to a percentage of the true displacement magnitude.

[^4]
## Comparisons

- Our Compressive Stochastic Registration
- Iterative Closest Point ${ }^{8}$
- Coherent Point Drift ${ }^{9}$


[^5]
## More Comparison Results


(a) Plots of error percentiles for Patient (b) Plots of error percentiles for Patient M001.

## More Comparison Results


(a) Plots of error percentiles for Patient M022.
(b) Plots of error percentiles for Patient M023.

## Recap

1. Analysis of noise in registration of functions under bi-Lipschitz transformations
2. Exploitive iterative algorithm with garaunteed convergence
3. Compressive Registration Framework
4. Efficient Log-Cartesian Shape feature

## Questions?
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