

# Latent RANSAC

## Supplementary Material

Simon Korman  
Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel

Roe Litman  
General Motors, Israel

### 1. Parameter selection

The parameters of our methods were fixed for all experiments in the main paper and the ones presented here. These values were empirically selected on synthetic data (disjoint from other experiments), in a procedure detailed below

#### 1.1. LR tolerance for inliers

We wish to verify that the collision tolerance in the latent space depends linearly on the inlier noise, much like its RANSAC counterpart. This, in turn, allows us to verify that we will not miss true collisions (prevent false negatives) that may fall too far in the latent domain. A synthetic experiment is performed on several randomly generated “ground-truth” models, each with a set noisy inliers. We then pick a minimal subset of inliers, and assess the resulting “hypothesis”, specifically the  $\ell_\infty$  distance from the ground-truth which is used by the Random-Grids. Figure 1 presents the median and 90 percentile of these measurements for different noise levels, for each of the three model types we present in the paper.

**Embedding ratio for  $SE(3)$ .** As mentioned in the paper, for both PnP and rigid-3d estimation problems, we parameterize the special Euclidean group  $SE(3)$  as a concatenation of two 3-tuples - one for rotation and one for translation. Figure 1 shows values separately for each of the two tuples. We chose a fixed tolerance ratio between rotation and translation for embedding based on the ratio of the inlier for median distance (solid lines in Figure 1). The following values were used in all of our experiments:  $1.47 \frac{rad}{cm}$  for PnP, and  $3.6 \frac{rad}{cm}$  for rigid 3D.

#### 1.2. Latent tolerance vs. RANSAC tolerance

The previous experiment showed that, much like with RANSAC, the LR tolerance grows linearly with the inlier noise. Hence, there exists a ratio between RANSAC tolerance and that of LR. While this could be done using only inliers (in a synthetic setup, as in the previous experiment), we prefer to see the affect of the tolerance on the outliers as well as part of the complete RANSAC estimation pipeline.

Figure 2 depicts the performance of LR in terms of runtime and success rate, as a function of the tolerance value. We measure the tolerance w.r.t. the (fixed) value we used for RANSAC tolerance in all our runs. The chosen ratios (LR-threshold divided by RANSAC-threshold) are 8.75 for Homography, 1.75 for PnP and 1.74 for Rigid-3D.

### 2. Hash table implementation details

The hashing scheme presented in Section 2.2 in the paper can result in an integer  $\tau_v$  with a very large number of bits (e.g. over 32), which implies prohibitive memory allocation costs. A common workaround in the hashing literature is to map the result into a smaller range of size  $2^b$  which can be described by vectors of  $b$  bits. This can be done using any off-the-shelf standard hash function. In our case we simply take the original large number modulo a large prime number with  $b$  bits. Note that since any such ‘range shrinking’ hash function is in particular an injective function, it can not eliminate any original collisions. Taking a small number of bits  $b$  saves in memory, while potentially introducing false collisions (that are quickly discarded by a constant time test in the latent space). We take the size of the small range to be 10% of  $n = 5 \times 10^6$ , which is the maximal number of iterations allowed. In such a case, for a well behaved hash function, the expected number of false collisions is a small constant fraction of  $n$ .

### 3. Additional results

In this section we provide detailed results which extend those presented in the paper (for completeness we recite the summarized results (Tables 1 and 2 from the paper).

For homography estimation (extending Section 3.1 of the paper), we provide here our results on the dataset by Mikolajczyk *et al.* [3], being a golden standard evaluation benchmark for homography estimation. We use all possible ordered pairs of the ‘viewpoint’ sequences (each including 6 images): ‘graffiti-5’, ‘graffiti-4’, ‘bark’, ‘wall’ and ‘graffiti’.

Note that the estimation benchmark we put together (described in the paper) using the Zurich Buildings data-set




Figure 1. **Embedding  $l_\infty$  distance for noisy inliers.** For each of the three domains, we show the median (solid) and 90% (dotted)  $l_\infty$  distance between two inlier hypothesis, as a function of the inlier noise. As can be seen, the embedding distance grows linearly with the noise level, which is a desirable property, observable also in RANSAC tolerance. The resulting incline can be used to select LR tolerance. For PnP and rigid 3D we present the distance for rotation (blue) and translation (red) separately, allowing us to select embedding ratios for the two into the same space.

(ZuBuD) [4] is much larger (1878 vs. 73 pairs) and is much more challenging in terms of inlier rates. See Figure 3 for the cumulative inlier rate distribution in comparison to the other data-sets used in the paper.

For PnP estimation we extend Section 3.2 of the paper by adding a second sequence from the PoseNet data-set, the ‘Street’ scene that includes 2907 instances. The cumulative inlier rate distribution of Figure 3 shows that it is much more challenging compared to the ‘Old Hospital’ scene presented in the paper.

For each of the 4 data-sets, we provide summarizing ta-




Figure 2. **Robustness of the LR tolerance.** For each of the three domains, we present the ratio between the (fixed) RANSAC tolerance and that of LR. Above a certain value the performance of LR is steady for PnP and rigid 3D, while a slight rise in runtime is evident for 2D homography

bles in Section 3.1, detailed component invocation and runtime analysis in Section 3.2 and finally - some detailed qualitative examples in Section 3.3.




Figure 3. **Inlier rate cumulative distribution (CDF)** of the real data sets we use. The Mikolajczyk data-set [3] added here (compared to Figure 5 of the paper) can be seen to be much less challenging in terms the distribution of inlier rates.

### 3.1. Summarizing tables

The following four tables provide summary results for each of the four tested data-sets, organized by ranges of inlier rates. For each inlier-rate range, we specify the number of instances, provide average and 95th percentile of runtime (in milliseconds), as well as average success rates (which are as a percentage of the optimal inlier rate).

Overall, LR performs in par with the other methods, but excels especially in the more challenging lower inlier rate cases. These data-sets include many such hard examples and hence the impact on the runtime and accuracy measured on the entire data-set can be very significant.

		inlier rate range (in %)			
measure	method	0-10	10-20	20-40	40-100
<b>runtime</b> avg. (95%) (milliseconds)	RANSAC	1,490 (6,594)	35 (97)	5 (10)	<b>6 (9)</b>
	SPRT	<b>1,129</b> (4,659)	<b>23 (62)</b>	<b>4 (7)</b>	<b>6 (9)</b>
	LR	1,209 ( <b>4,626</b> )	32 (85)	7 (11)	9 (12)
<b>success</b>	RANSAC	<b>93.39%</b>	95.53%	96.28%	97.33%
	SPRT	88.57%	95.71%	96.27%	97.48%
	LR	93.07%	<b>95.88%</b>	<b>96.55%</b>	<b>97.59%</b>
<b># of instances</b>		234	378	655	611

Table 1. 2D Homography fitting on Zurich Buildings [4]. Best results are shown in bold. See text for further details.

		inlier rate range (in %)			
measure	method	0-10	10-20	20-40	40-100
<b>runtime</b> avg. (95%) (milliseconds)	RANSAC	4.2e4 (1.7e5)	2,336 (5,347)	190 (471)	41 (71)
	SPRT	2,760 (1.7e4)	40 ( <b>71</b> )	15 (20)	<b>12</b> (16)
	LR	<b>913 (4,403)</b>	<b>39</b> (72)	<b>14 (18)</b>	<b>12 (15)</b>
<b>success</b>	RANSAC	<b>95.54%</b>	98.13%	99.38%	99.12%
	SPRT	91.94%	<b>98.23%</b>	<b>99.40%</b>	<b>99.17%</b>
	LR	94.73%	98.14%	99.39%	99.11%
<b># of instances</b>		29	27	91	35

Table 2. PnP fitting on the OldHospital scene from PoseNet [2]. Best results are shown in bold. See text for further details.

		inlier rate range (in %)			
measure	method	0-10	10-20	20-40	40-100
<b>runtime</b> avg. (95%) (milliseconds)	RANSAC	3,324 (8,433)	36 (81)	6 (7)	<b>14 (22)</b>
	SPRT	2,395 (4,661)	<b>21 (46)</b>	<b>5 (7)</b>	<b>14 (22)</b>
	LR	<b>2,063 (4,631)</b>	28 (60)	8 (10)	17 (25)
<b>success</b>	RANSAC	<b>91.45%</b>	97.85%	99.11%	<b>99.41%</b>
	SPRT	61.86%	98.02%	99.30%	<b>99.41%</b>
	LR	90.32%	<b>98.04%</b>	<b>99.33%</b>	99.40%
<b># of instances</b>		4	7	9	53

Table 3. Homography fitting on the Viewpoint sequences from the Mikolajczyk data-set [3]. Best results are shown in bold. See text for further details.

### 3.2. Additional empirical runtime analysis

In the right column of Figure 4 we reiterate the runtime breakdown presented in Figure 6 in the paper, for PnP estimation (on the ‘Old Hospital’ and ‘Street’ scenes of the

		inlier rate range (in %)		
measure	method	0-4	4-6	6-100
<b>runtime</b> avg. (95%) (milliseconds)	RANSAC	8.6e4 (1.6e5)	2.9e4 (5.9e4)	4.2e3 (1.3e4)
	SPRT	2.4e4 (5.1e4)	1.4e3 (2.7e3)	<b>1.2e2</b> (3.7e2)
	LR	<b>2.3e3 (4.2e3)</b>	<b>8.8e2 (1.6e3)</b>	1.0e2 ( <b>2.9e2</b> )
<b>success</b>	RANSAC	<b>95.37%</b>	95.67%	98.83%
	SPRT	60.69%	<b>95.87%</b>	<b>98.84%</b>
	LR	89.89%	90.72%	97.95%
<b># of instances</b>		844	1037	1026

Table 4. PnP fitting on the Street scene from PoseNet [2]. Best results are shown in bold. See text for further details.

PoseNet [2] dataset) and for homography estimation (on Mikolajczyk [3] and ZuBuD [4] data-sets). We also provide two additional views: In the left column, we show the (log<sub>10</sub> of the) average number of invocations per module, while in the middle column we show the relative module runtimes (i.e. as a fraction of the total runtime).

The left column (number of activations) emphasizes the fact that in the case of Latent-RANSAC each fitted model is then hashed (hence the equal number of fitting and hashing activations), while few hypotheses need to be verified (following a collision) compared to the other methods (notice the log<sub>10</sub> x-scale). Looking at the *relative* time per module (middle column), it is evident that Latent-RANSAC spends only a small fraction of its time on model verification in comparison with the other methods, while it needs to handle hypothesis hashing, which is much less time consuming. Notice also that LR requires a longer initialization time to set up the hash tables.

### 3.3. Qualitative examples

In tables 9, 10, 11 and 12 we collected several representative examples for each of the ‘Old Hospital’ and ‘Street’ scenes from the PoseNet dataset [2], the Mikolajczyk [3] and Zurich Buildings (ZuBuD) [4] dataset, respectively. All results are specified in median ± std format, over 10, 2, 100 and 10 iterations per instance, for each of the data-set respectively.




Figure 4. **Details on sub-module invocations and runtimes:** The presented values are averages (per single run) over the entire data. Each row corresponds to a different dataset - The top two rows relate to the ‘Old Hospital’ and ‘Street’ scenes from the PoseNet dataset [2], which we use for PnP estimation. The bottom two rows relate to the Mikolajczyk [3] and Zurich Buildings (ZuBuD) [4] dataset, which we use for Homography estimation. Each column gives a different kind of information; **left**  $\log_{10}$  of the number of times each module was invoked per single run. **middle:** module runtime as a fraction of total time. **bottom:** average runtime of each module.

<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>Street image 2 frame 535</b> #matches: 8345 	inlier rate (%)	2.5±0.1	0.0±0.0	2.4±0.2
	Sampson err.	0.8±0.2	3.1±0.0	0.5±0.0
	#samples	306037±24889	500000±0	467546±30370
	#fitting	306037±24889	500000±0	467546±30370
	#verification	783585±64107	12812862±1737	4767±420
	runtime [sec]	293.192±30.115	41.311±0.848	6.020±1.096
<b>Street image 1 frame 231</b> #matches: 4797 	inlier rate (%)	2.9±0.1	0.0±0.0	2.8±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.3±0.2	3.1±0.0	0.4±0.0
	#samples	187160±10964	500000±0	323861±30751
	#fitting	187160±10964	500000±0	323861±30751
	#verification	483498±28250	12911343±3440	3623±598
	runtime [sec]	105.653±9.589	41.944±0.746	3.647±0.642
<b>Street image 2 frame 323</b> #matches: 5796 	inlier rate (%)	2.9±0.1	0.0±0.0	2.8±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.2±0.0	3.1±0.0	0.4±0.0
	#samples	195970±19780	500000±0	326970±47173
	#fitting	195970±19780	500000±0	326970±47173
	#verification	508034±51175	12969247±1982	3918±846
	runtime [sec]	125.608±15.425	41.823±0.331	3.929±0.628
<b>Street image 2 frame 1212</b> #matches: 7518 	inlier rate (%)	3.2±0.1	3.2±1.7	3.1±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.7±0.0	0.4±1.4	0.4±0.0
	#samples	142419±8773	4181223±1707519	219329±31236
	#fitting	142419±8773	4181223±1707519	219329±31236
	#verification	380804±23487	11175766±4563988	3136±739
	runtime [sec]	129.371±9.946	38.178±15.573	2.951±0.609
<b>Street image 2 frame 94</b> #matches: 1747 	inlier rate (%)	3.3±0.2	3.2±1.7	3.1±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.5±0.0	0.4±1.4	0.4±0.0
	#samples	129519±21199	3492047±1685548	244691±37878
	#fitting	129519±21199	3492047±1685548	244691±37878
	#verification	325452±53201	8783411±4240297	2018±436
	runtime [sec]	24.603±3.649	27.864±13.291	2.171±0.252
<b>Street image 2 frame 880</b> #matches: 6683 	inlier rate (%)	3.5±0.1	3.5±0.1	3.4±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.3±0.5	0.3±0.2	0.7±0.2
	#samples	108629±5369	402561±154146	171161±12160
	#fitting	108629±5369	402561±154146	171161±12160
	#verification	303855±14732	1126568±431003	3618±476
	runtime [sec]	88.889±7.535	3.989±1.257	2.519±0.389
<b>Street image 2 frame 2392</b> #matches: 2954 	inlier rate (%)	3.5±0.2	3.5±0.1	3.3±0.2
	Sampson err.	0.7±0.1	0.4±0.1	0.5±0.0
	#samples	111756±13065	300486±91916	184796±23830
	#fitting	111756±13065	300486±91916	184796±23830
	#verification	286412±33513	769610±235189	1523±278
	runtime [sec]	35.420±5.480	2.908±0.657	1.850±0.378
<b>Street image 2 frame 628</b> #matches: 4789 	inlier rate (%)	3.8±0.1	3.9±0.1	3.6±0.2
	Sampson err.	0.8±0.0	0.5±0.0	0.4±0.0
	#samples	82497±4777	182585±15613	135563±21892
	#fitting	82497±4777	182585±15613	135563±21892
	#verification	217991±12614	483672±41081	1520±361
	runtime [sec]	45.438±5.229	1.987±0.148	1.522±0.258

Table 5. STREET SUBSET on pnp dataset.






<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>Street image 2 frame 11</b> #matches: 3067 	inlier rate (%)	3.4±0.3	3.5±1.2	2.9±0.2
	Sampson err.	0.7±0.2	0.4±0.9	0.5±0.1
	#samples	127107±24168	1554596±1303455	272706±45448
	#fitting	127107±24168	1554596±1303455	272706±45448
	#verification	320979±60997	3919077±3288015	2204±556
	runtime [sec]	39.850±7.647	12.853±10.419	2.448±0.541
<b>Street image 2 frame 1666</b> #matches: 7010 	inlier rate (%)	4.2±0.0	4.2±0.0	4.1±0.3
	Sampson err.	2.3±0.1	2.2±0.1	1.5±0.5
	#samples	65015±492	135570±9172	93418±30836
	#fitting	65015±492	135570±9172	93418±30836
	#verification	172052±1366	359514±24156	846±465
	runtime [sec]	54.031±4.484	1.278±0.106	1.161±0.467
<b>Street image 2 frame 1125</b> #matches: 5643 	inlier rate (%)	4.0±0.2	4.1±0.2	3.3±0.2
	Sampson err.	2.8±1.3	0.5±0.8	0.4±0.2
	#samples	81631±10960	204675±41212	190577±23379
	#fitting	81631±10960	204675±41212	190577±23379
	#verification	212994±28781	533496±107449	2597±467
	runtime [sec]	51.271±6.048	2.254±0.375	2.158±0.423
<b>Street image 2 frame 240</b> #matches: 5883 	inlier rate (%)	4.2±0.0	4.2±0.0	4.2±0.0
	Sampson err.	2.2±0.0	2.8±0.0	2.5±0.0
	#samples	60704±495	126088±9888	84986±533
	#fitting	60704±495	126088±9888	84986±533
	#verification	158126±1164	327457±25629	518±19
	runtime [sec]	41.052±1.998	1.164±0.083	0.875±0.097
<b>Street image 2 frame 1680</b> #matches: 7313 	inlier rate (%)	4.5±0.0	4.5±0.0	4.5±0.0
	Sampson err.	0.9±0.0	0.7±0.0	0.4±0.0
	#samples	52444±573	103368±8042	73422±733
	#fitting	52444±573	103368±8042	73422±733
	#verification	139939±1494	275663±21392	510±20
	runtime [sec]	46.688±4.115	0.934±0.092	0.862±0.083
<b>Street image 2 frame 638</b> #matches: 2435 	inlier rate (%)	4.3±0.1	4.3±0.1	3.8±0.4
	Sampson err.	0.8±0.1	0.5±0.0	0.5±0.0
	#samples	58203±5124	133526±12030	147731±50759
	#fitting	58203±5124	133526±12030	147731±50759
	#verification	147051±13042	337307±30361	889±429
	runtime [sec]	14.777±1.767	1.172±0.113	1.058±0.546
<b>Street image 2 frame 2258</b> #matches: 8043 	inlier rate (%)	4.7±0.0	4.7±0.0	4.7±0.0
	Sampson err.	1.6±0.0	1.5±0.0	1.5±0.0
	#samples	45057±152	86100±6798	63080±6191
	#fitting	45057±152	86100±6798	63080±6191
	#verification	114502±512	218806±17224	366±55
	runtime [sec]	41.804±2.848	0.776±0.057	0.670±0.090
<b>Street image 2 frame 1390</b> #matches: 3910 	inlier rate (%)	4.6±0.1	4.6±0.1	4.4±0.2
	Sampson err.	0.3±0.0	0.4±0.1	0.4±0.0
	#samples	46777±3889	90591±9725	79851±10445
	#fitting	46777±3889	90591±9725	79851±10445
	#verification	125606±10455	242952±26149	1082±218
	runtime [sec]	20.304±2.659	1.071±0.115	0.790±0.182

Table 6. STREET SUBSET on pnp dataset.



<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>Street image 2 frame 604</b> #matches: 3757 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	4.8±0.1 2.4±0.0 41841±1644 41841±1644 109549±4361 17.572±1.286	4.9±0.1 2.7±0.0 74948±3271 74948±3271 196167±8754 0.638±0.027	4.8±0.1 2.8±0.0 62711±32819 62711±32819 355±289 0.677±0.363
<b>Street image 2 frame 258</b> #matches: 2127 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	4.7±0.3 0.6±0.0 47020±9372 47020±9372 121312±24211 10.804±2.424	4.7±0.2 0.3±0.0 79779±19126 79779±19126 205828±49464 0.707±0.175	4.0±0.3 0.4±0.0 102716±20137 102716±20137 751±216 0.941±0.289
<b>Street image 1 frame 155</b> #matches: 8064 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	4.8±0.1 0.8±0.3 42093±3754 42093±3754 109315±9719 40.997±4.340	4.8±0.2 0.3±0.3 81062±8369 81062±8369 210591±21876 0.703±0.085	4.7±0.2 0.4±0.3 63576±8158 63576±8158 414±86 0.652±0.112
<b>Street image 2 frame 2439</b> #matches: 6287 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	5.3±0.0 2.0±0.0 30698±217 30698±217 75692±518 21.293±1.446	5.3±0.0 2.0±0.1 52672±3010 52672±3010 130108±7439 0.440±0.020	5.3±0.0 2.0±0.0 43365±9916 43365±9916 143±33 0.407±0.122
<b>Street image 2 frame 1908</b> #matches: 5187 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	6.0±0.0 2.7±0.0 21147±231 21147±231 55818±700 12.741±1.143	6.0±0.0 2.7±0.0 34980±1817 34980±1817 92217±4813 0.305±0.014	6.0±0.0 2.5±0.0 29465±2816 29465±2816 156±37 0.318±0.049
<b>Street image 2 frame 1236</b> #matches: 4241 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	6.9±0.0 2.3±0.0 14243±169 14243±169 39898±453 7.227±0.598	6.9±0.0 1.6±0.0 22629±1736 22629±1736 63106±4902 0.200±0.010	6.9±0.0 0.0±0.0 20253±570 20253±570 161±16 0.229±0.032
<b>Street image 2 frame 1179</b> #matches: 5501 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	8.4±0.1 0.4±0.0 7718±216 7718±216 21428±636 5.225±0.389	8.4±0.1 0.2±0.0 11311±599 11311±599 31689±1670 0.112±0.013	8.4±0.1 1.4±0.0 10841±548 10841±548 79±11 0.126±0.019
<b>Street image 2 frame 1532</b> #matches: 6711 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	8.6±0.1 2.2±0.1 7241±128 7241±128 19629±436 6.057±0.340	8.6±0.0 1.9±0.0 10261±874 10261±874 27720±2378 0.090±0.003	8.6±0.0 0.8±0.0 10351±1907 10351±1907 30±10 0.115±0.024

Table 7. STREET SUBSET on pnp dataset.







<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>Street image 2 frame 2145</b> #matches: 5395 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	9.1±0.2 0.3±0.0 6179±304 6179±304 16636±863 3.920±0.275	9.1±0.1 0.3±0.0 8892±424 8892±424 23917±1179 0.078±0.006	9.1±0.1 0.3±0.0 8651±304 8651±304 33±6 0.096±0.010
<b>Street image 2 frame 1153</b> #matches: 4088 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	12.2±0.0 1.1±0.0 2559±11 2559±11 6758±58 1.223±0.113	12.2±0.0 1.7±0.0 3346±267 3346±267 8758±684 0.028±0.002	12.2±0.0 2.8±0.0 3605±9 3605±9 11±3 0.037±0.006
<b>Street image 2 frame 1806</b> #matches: 8868 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	13.5±0.0 1.6±0.0 1884±6 1884±6 4588±34 1.888±0.116	13.5±0.0 1.8±0.0 2391±109 2391±109 5887±321 0.031±0.003	13.5±0.0 2.1±0.0 2632±240 2632±240 8±5 0.038±0.007
<b>Street image 2 frame 972</b> #matches: 4606 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	15.1±0.0 1.1±0.0 1338±11 1338±11 3467±68 0.719±0.054	15.1±0.0 2.2±0.0 1510±133 1510±133 3949±313 0.021±0.003	15.1±0.0 2.5±0.0 1874±14 1874±14 5±2 0.028±0.003
<b>Street image 1 frame 16</b> #matches: 4742 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	16.4±0.0 1.7±0.0 1036±3 1036±3 2554±42 0.533±0.050	16.4±0.0 2.4±0.0 1184±102 1184±102 2975±226 0.016±0.002	16.4±0.0 2.1±0.0 1454±19 1454±19 6±3 0.022±0.003
<b>Street image 2 frame 2022</b> #matches: 5155 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	18.1±0.1 0.9±0.0 780±10 780±10 1999±38 0.461±0.033	18.1±0.2 0.9±0.0 951±47 951±47 2460±133 0.016±0.003	18.1±0.1 1.1±0.0 1088±28 1088±28 7±3 0.021±0.005

Table 8. STREET SUBSET on pnp dataset.











<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>OldHospital seq 8 frame 12</b> #matches: 9917 	inlier rate (%)	2.9±0.1	0.0±0.0	2.9±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.5±0.1	3.1±0.0	0.4±0.1
	#samples	190937±11435	5000000±0	256422±34273
	#fitting	190937±11435	5000000±0	256422±34273
	#verification	625489±37275	16368915±1753	10876±2160
	runtime [sec]	270.965±20.834	49.785±2.298	6.854±1.331
	<b>OldHospital seq 8 frame 11</b> #matches: 9141 	inlier rate (%)	3.4±0.1	3.3±1.1
Sampson err.		0.2±0.0	0.2±0.9	0.2±0.0
#samples		121599±10152	1474533±1367665	185116±25802
#fitting		121599±10152	1474533±1367665	185116±25802
#verification		396913±33382	4816358±4466653	6797±1386
runtime [sec]		159.486±12.493	14.436±13.681	4.218±0.800
<b>OldHospital seq 4 frame 13</b> #matches: 6453 		inlier rate (%)	3.9±0.1	3.9±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.4±0.1	0.4±0.0	0.4±0.1
	#samples	79639±5514	198060±53450	112847±20268
	#fitting	79639±5514	198060±53450	112847±20268
	#verification	260535±17996	647721±174581	3446±914
	runtime [sec]	71.379±6.032	2.139±0.606	1.851±0.448
	<b>OldHospital seq 4 frame 14</b> #matches: 6844 	inlier rate (%)	4.0±0.2	3.9±0.1
Sampson err.		0.5±0.0	0.5±0.0	0.5±0.0
#samples		78912±11047	190539±42492	117709±31943
#fitting		78912±11047	190539±42492	117709±31943
#verification		258933±36148	624737±139455	3606±1639
runtime [sec]		74.721±11.198	2.147±0.422	1.989±0.749
<b>OldHospital seq 4 frame 16</b> #matches: 6915 		inlier rate (%)	5.5±0.1	5.5±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.6±0.0	0.6±0.0	0.6±0.0
	#samples	28518±1020	49230±3542	39766±1828
	#fitting	28518±1020	49230±3542	39766±1828
	#verification	93563±3341	161974±11598	664±69
	runtime [sec]	28.043±1.073	0.523±0.048	0.499±0.036
	<b>OldHospital seq 8 frame 7</b> #matches: 8608 	inlier rate (%)	9.9±0.1	9.9±0.1
Sampson err.		0.2±0.0	0.2±0.0	0.2±0.0
#samples		4729±106	6479±544	6552±110
#fitting		4729±106	6479±544	6552±110
#verification		15476±332	21121±1802	35±6
runtime [sec]		5.785±0.229	0.078±0.006	0.077±0.007
<b>OldHospital seq 4 frame 46</b> #matches: 8240 		inlier rate (%)	18.7±0.2	18.7±0.2
	Sampson err.	0.4±0.0	0.4±0.0	0.4±0.0
	#samples	703±24	850±71	983±81
	#fitting	703±24	850±71	983±81
	#verification	2330±80	2825±253	6±3
	runtime [sec]	0.869±0.041	0.025±0.005	0.024±0.006
	<b>OldHospital seq 8 frame 99</b> #matches: 5182 	inlier rate (%)	67.1±0.0	67.1±0.1
Sampson err.		0.1±0.0	0.1±0.0	0.1±0.0
#samples		13±0	14±1	19±3
#fitting		13±0	14±1	19±3
#verification		43±3	47±4	4±2
runtime [sec]		0.018±0.004	0.011±0.005	0.011±0.002

Table 9. Homography estimation on OldHospital scene from PoseNet [2].

<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>Street image 1 frame 116</b> #matches: 9685 	inlier rate (%)	2.3±0.0	0.0±0.0	2.2±0.2
	Sampson err.	0.6±0.2	3.1±0.0	0.6±0.1
	#samples	401039±11679	5000000±0	496675±672
	#fitting	401039±11679	5000000±0	496675±672
	#verification	1009308±28697	12573043±6628	4885±291
	runtime [sec]	489.618±12.470	50.370±9.862	6.918±0.305
<b>Street image 1 frame 114</b> #matches: 10316 	inlier rate (%)	2.3±0.0	0.0±0.0	2.1±0.0
	Sampson err.	0.7±0.0	3.1±0.0	0.5±0.1
	#samples	382183±10283	5000000±0	496384±467
	#fitting	382183±10283	5000000±0	496384±467
	#verification	962421±27524	12592970±20	4808±65
	runtime [sec]	498.683±16.713	56.789±1.455	7.193±0.122
<b>Street image 2 frame 627</b> #matches: 5358 	inlier rate (%)	3.5±0.1	3.5±0.0	3.3±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.3±0.0	0.3±0.0	0.6±0.0
	#samples	107958±13405	262518±28080	202990±11599
	#fitting	107958±13405	262518±28080	202990±11599
	#verification	278493±35150	675917±72078	1826±162
	runtime [sec]	71.865±9.081	3.371±0.401	2.392±0.140
<b>Street image 2 frame 2154</b> #matches: 4313 	inlier rate (%)	3.8±0.0	3.8±0.0	3.8±0.0
	Sampson err.	1.2±0.0	2.4±0.0	2.3±0.0
	#samples	86845±0	208184±54279	120471±1573
	#fitting	86845±0	208184±54279	120471±1573
	#verification	225467±394	541280±141451	793±16
	runtime [sec]	40.972±7.438	2.504±0.475	1.289±0.055
<b>Street image 2 frame 2061</b> #matches: 4423 	inlier rate (%)	4.7±0.0	4.7±0.0	4.7±0.0
	Sampson err.	2.5±0.0	0.9±0.0	0.9±0.0
	#samples	45886±473	89092±3214	63312±651
	#fitting	45886±473	89092±3214	63312±651
	#verification	118623±1136	230151±7868	292±8
	runtime [sec]	24.092±2.474	0.894±0.128	0.634±0.043
<b>Street image 2 frame 2138</b> #matches: 5056 	inlier rate (%)	6.9±0.0	6.9±0.0	6.9±0.0
	Sampson err.	1.1±0.0	2.3±0.0	2.3±0.0
	#samples	13993±170	22306±297	19423±235
	#fitting	13993±170	22306±297	19423±235
	#verification	37579±440	59905±802	103±4
	runtime [sec]	8.137±1.451	0.226±0.061	0.210±0.027
<b>Street image 2 frame 1584</b> #matches: 5859 	inlier rate (%)	15.7±0.0	15.7±0.0	15.7±0.0
	Sampson err.	0.6±0.0	2.3±0.0	2.1±0.0
	#samples	1197±3	1508±3	1671±4
	#fitting	1197±3	1508±3	1671±4
	#verification	2973±26	3723±58	5±3
	runtime [sec]	0.776±0.121	0.023±0.004	0.025±0.007
<b>Street image 2 frame 2116</b> #matches: 4381 	inlier rate (%)	32.3±0.1	32.4±0.1	32.4±0.1
	Sampson err.	0.4±0.0	2.8±0.0	2.7±0.0
	#samples	144±14	145±5	188±1
	#fitting	144±14	145±5	188±1
	#verification	405±30	393±24	5±2
	runtime [sec]	0.096±0.023	0.015±0.004	0.018±0.005

Table 10. PnP estimation on Street scene from PoseNet [2].









<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>graffiti viewpoint views 2 6</b> #matches: 662 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	2.3±0.5 15.0±313.8 5000006±10 488523±653 488523±653 8.131±0.409	0.0±0.0 1056.0±0.0 5000006±12 488566±621 488566±621 4.372±0.166	2.0±0.5 32.1±298.7 5000007±7 488503±771 38333±530 4.298±0.157
<b>graffiti viewpoint views 1 5</b> #matches: 586 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	3.9±0.3 7.0±10.1 2529197±607021 247761±59429 247761±59429 4.053±0.922	3.8±1.9 7.6±523.4 4833036±566999 473514±55468 473514±55468 4.234±0.468	3.9±0.2 7.0±7.4 3540872±482973 346584±47182 17316±3438 2.924±0.440
<b>graffiti 5 viewpoint views 2 6</b> #matches: 641 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	6.7±0.2 3.4±0.9 260050±105907 25276±10239 25276±10239 0.420±0.168	6.7±0.3 3.4±1.1 293066±121956 28427±11742 28427±11742 0.259±0.105	6.7±0.3 3.4±2.1 364065±146559 35331±14200 843±670 0.297±0.125
<b>wall viewpoint views 1 6</b> #matches: 722 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	8.0±0.2 3.1±0.7 121882±15614 12186±1568 12186±1568 0.213±0.032	8.0±0.0 3.1±0.1 131513±5968 13108±624 13108±624 0.117±0.009	8.0±0.0 3.3±0.2 170633±3328 17020±366 474±31 0.144±0.009
<b>graffiti viewpoint views 2 5</b> #matches: 688 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	10.3±0.3 2.2±1.3 43873±6035 4590±634 4590±634 0.079±0.012	10.3±0.2 2.2±0.6 45345±3377 4716±357 4716±357 0.044±0.004	10.3±0.2 2.2±0.7 61412±4514 6365±467 81±14 0.056±0.005
<b>graffiti 5 viewpoint views 3 6</b> #matches: 724 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	10.9±0.2 3.4±0.5 34802±4220 3867±487 3867±487 0.067±0.009	10.9±0.1 3.4±0.4 35550±1224 3977±157 3977±157 0.036±0.003	10.9±0.1 3.4±0.5 48720±1671 5410±189 50±8 0.047±0.004
<b>bark Z R views 1 6</b> #matches: 726 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	14.6±0.0 7.0±0.2 10647±164 999±31 999±31 0.019±0.002	14.6±0.0 7.0±0.2 11291±1041 1055±102 1055±102 0.011±0.001	14.6±0.0 7.0±0.2 14903±99 1391±44 11±3 0.016±0.001
<b>graffiti 4 viewpoint views 1 4</b> #matches: 1117 	inlier rate (%) Sampson err. #samples #fitting #verification runtime [sec]	59.6±0.0 0.8±0.5 36±2 12±3 12±3 0.009±0.003	59.6±0.0 0.8±0.6 38±3 13±3 13±3 0.010±0.003	59.6±0.0 0.8±0.5 50±8 18±4 3±2 0.012±0.002

Table 11. Homography estimation on the Viewpoint sequences of Mikolajczyk data-set [3].

<i>image pair</i>	<i>measure</i>	USAC	SPRT	LR
<b>object 155 views 1 3</b> #matches: 537 	inlier rate (%)	2.0±0.1	0.0±0.0	2.0±0.2
	Sampson err.	537.0±371.6	1056.0±0.0	141.9±95.9
	#samples	5000012±6	5000007±10	5000005±6
	#fitting	485267±605	485723±696	485388±653
	#verification	485267±605	485723±696	53017±584
	runtime [sec]	7.668±0.719	4.027±0.332	4.198±0.304
<b>object 116 views 4 5</b> #matches: 588 	inlier rate (%)	3.1±0.3	0.0±0.0	3.1±0.4
	Sampson err.	16.8±18.3	1056.0±0.0	19.5±19.6
	#samples	5000002±99271	5000003±5	5000009±26
	#fitting	710936±13857	711802±850	711487±541
	#verification	710936±13857	711802±850	69490±379
	runtime [sec]	10.731±1.330	5.743±0.417	6.045±0.454
<b>object 24 views 1 5</b> #matches: 516 	inlier rate (%)	4.2±0.3	4.5±0.3	4.4±0.4
	Sampson err.	54.7±108.9	35.2±23.8	48.7±84.7
	#samples	2436982±766168	2775656±1308085	3088939±1194400
	#fitting	257719±81008	293699±138493	326644±126262
	#verification	257719±81008	293699±138493	26538±13660
	runtime [sec]	3.649±1.337	2.425±1.303	2.798±1.159
<b>object 109 views 2 5</b> #matches: 523 	inlier rate (%)	5.0±0.2	5.0±0.2	5.0±0.1
	Sampson err.	65.1±31.0	53.0±23.4	26.2±28.6
	#samples	972392±150149	1256870±308441	1329033±412427
	#fitting	104526±15924	134885±32910	142500±44333
	#verification	104526±15924	134885±32910	8988±4384
	runtime [sec]	1.555±0.376	1.181±0.301	1.176±0.450
<b>object 122 views 4 5</b> #matches: 442 	inlier rate (%)	7.6±0.2	7.7±0.4	7.7±0.3
	Sampson err.	47.0±23.2	47.4±24.6	43.1±25.5
	#samples	181624±24310	202088±28949	218094±34407
	#fitting	28236±3788	31074±4427	33746±5316
	#verification	28236±3788	31074±4427	3176±698
	runtime [sec]	0.365±0.057	0.253±0.058	0.272±0.054
<b>object 116 views 2 5</b> #matches: 407 	inlier rate (%)	14.0±0.1	14.0±0.1	14.0±0.0
	Sampson err.	3.1±0.7	3.1±0.8	3.1±0.3
	#samples	13134±285	13267±547	18388±8
	#fitting	1643±51	1680±62	2283±32
	#verification	1643±51	1680±62	36±5
	runtime [sec]	0.021±0.002	0.015±0.001	0.020±0.003
<b>object 69 views 1 3</b> #matches: 316 	inlier rate (%)	33.2±0.0	33.2±0.0	33.2±0.0
	Sampson err.	5.1±0.0	5.1±0.0	5.1±0.3
	#samples	396±4	396±9	554±133
	#fitting	74±10	81±5	111±18
	#verification	74±10	81±5	4±2
	runtime [sec]	0.002±0.000	0.002±0.000	0.005±0.000
<b>object 167 views 3 5</b> #matches: 949 	inlier rate (%)	85.8±0.0	85.8±0.0	85.8±0.0
	Sampson err.	2.4±0.3	2.4±0.2	2.4±0.0
	#samples	6±0	7±1	9±1
	#fitting	5±1	5±1	8±1
	#verification	5±1	5±1	4±1
	runtime [sec]	0.013±0.004	0.012±0.001	0.015±0.001

Table 12. Homography estimation on Zurich Buildings [4].

## References

- [1] S. Choi, Q.-Y. Zhou, and V. Koltun. Robust reconstruction of indoor scenes. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2015. [2](#)
- [2] A. Kendall, M. Grimes, and R. Cipolla. PoseNet: A convolutional network for real-time 6-dof camera re-localization. In *Computer Vision (ICCV), 2015 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 2938–2946. IEEE, 2015. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [9](#), [10](#)
- [3] K. Mikolajczyk and C. Schmid. Scale & affine invariant interest point detectors. *International journal of computer vision*, 60(1):63–86, 2004. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [11](#)
- [4] H. Shao, T. Svoboda, and L. Van Gool. Zubud - zurich buildings database for image based recognition. *Computer Vision Lab, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Switzerland, Tech. Rep*, 260:20, 2003. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [12](#)