BAFS: Bundle Adjustment with Feature Scale Constraints for Enhanced Estimation Accuracy ¹Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Israel Vladimir Ovechkin¹ and Vadim Indelman¹



ECHNION Israel Institute Technology

1. Introduction

- Scale drift is a known problem in monocular SLAM
- Without assuming prior information, camera motion and 3D map can be only estimated up to scale, which drifts over time
- Existing (non-learning) approaches either require loop closures, exploit non-holonomoic constraints or fuse information from other sensors

5. Incorporating Scale Constraint within BA

- Scale measurement likelihood: $\mathbb{P}(s_i^j | S_j, x_i, l_j) \doteq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|2\pi\Sigma_{fs}|}} \exp \left| -\frac{1}{2} \left\| s_i^j f \frac{S_j}{d_i^j} \right\|_{\Sigma_i}^2 \right|$
- Joint posterior pdf:
- Corresponding NLS problem:



 $\mathbb{P}(X,L,S|\mathcal{Z}) \propto \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{P}\left(z_{i}^{j}|x_{i},l_{j}\right) \mathbb{P}\left(s_{i}^{j}|S_{j},x_{i},l_{j}\right)$

2. Contribution

- We formulate novel image feature scale constraints and incorporate these within bundle adjustment (BA)
- Leads to significantly improved estimation accuracy (especially) along the optical axis of the camera in a monocular setup
- Method does not require loop closures

3. Concept

- Key observation: detected feature scale changes consistently across a sequence of images
- Concept leverages the scale invariance property of SIFT detectors
- Detected feature scale can be predicted as a function of camera pose, landmark 3D coordinates and the corresponding 3D environment patch
- To provide more accurate detected feature scales, we increase the resolution of Gaussian kernels within the SIFT detector
- Feature scales are already typically calculated by common feature detectors (e.g., SIFT), thus far - used **only** for image matching
- We propose to exploit this available scale information for improving the

Initialization of virtual landmark size variable S_{i} : Triangulate landmark l_{j} Use current estimates of camera pose $S_j = s_i^j \frac{a_i}{c}$

and landmark coordinates to calculate

6. Factor Graph

Naïve: all scale constraints



Heuristic: scale constraints only for long-track features (\mathbf{X}_1) (\mathbf{X}_2) (Хз)

7. Enhancement of Feature **Scale Measurement Accuracy**

- Estimation accuracy is improved only if feature scale measurements are sufficiently accurate
- Simple method: get higher-accuracy scale measurements by increasing number of layers per octave (finer resolution of the Gaussian kernels)



performance of BA



Our method: incorporates scale information also into BA

4. Scale Constraint

- Denote by S_{i} the corresponding environment patch, or virtual size, centered around landmark l_j
- Scale observation model:











8. Results – KITTI Dataset

Difference between **red** and **green** track: amount of scale constraints.



Error rate along optical axis:

- first 100 frames: 8.6% **5% 1%**
- Last 100 frames: 94.6% | 27.3% | 8.8%

Position error





 d_i^j is the distance along optical axis from the camera pose x_i to landmark l_j

$$d_i^j(x_i, l_j) \doteq z_c, \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_c \\ y_c \\ z_c \end{bmatrix} = R_i l_j + t_i$$

Note d_i^j is not the range. To see why:

 $S_1 = S_2 = S_3 \ s_i^1 < s_i^2 < s_i^3$ Virtual landmark size: Feature scales: Distance along optical axis: $d_1 > d_2 > d_3$





9. Conclusions

Improved accuracy of bundle adjustment and monocular SLAM along optical axis direction, without requiring loop closures:

- Developed and introduced scale constraints within BA
- Feature scale information is already available from feature detector
- Enhanced feature scale measurement

2190

RA-L with ICRA option (RA-L)

