# Day 06

#### Horn's Method and Fiducial Registration Error

#### Issues

- the use of the least-squares criteria assumes
  - identically distributed noise in each point
  - isotropic noise in each point
    - more accurate (although more complicated) algorithms are available if these criteria are not met
      - □ Matei and Meer, IEEE PAMI, 28(10), Oct 2006

 most commonly used noise distribution is the zero-mean Gaussian (or normal) distribution

 $\text{FLE}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ 

- $\mu$  mean (location)
- $\Sigma$  covariance (spread)

- ▶ in 1*D* 
  - $\blacktriangleright \sigma$  standard deviation
  - $\Sigma = \sigma^2$  variance













Suppose we have a tracked pointing stylus with a DRB having 4 fiducial markers.



Because the of measurement errors in the tracking system, the locations of the fiducial markers cannot be measured exactly. The error between the actual and measured marker locations is called the fiducial localization error (FLE).



When the model pointer is registered to the measured pointer, the FLE will lead to some error in the estimated rotation and translation. The residual errors in the fiducial locations after registration is called the fiducial registration error (FRE).



Usually, we are interested in points that are not fiducial locations. Any such point (not used for registration purposes) is called a target. The error between the true target position and registered target position is called the target registration error (TRE).

 Horn's method (and all other ordinary least-squares methods) is optimal when FLE is identical and isotropic



- early methods of studying the behaviour of TRE relied on simulation studies
  - IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, vol. 16, no. 4, Aug. 1997

Given a set of registration points  $\{P\} = \{p_0, p_1, ..., p_{n-1}\}$ , a target point *t*, and an FLE variance  $\sigma^2$ :

I. define noise

$$n_{i} = \mathcal{N}(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{T}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^{2}/3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma^{2}/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma^{2}/3 \end{bmatrix})$$

- 2. repeat 10,000 times
  - create a noise copy  $\{Q\}$  of  $\{P\}$  where  $q_i = p_i + n_i$
  - register  $\{Q\}$  to  $\{P\}$  using Horn's method to obtain the rotation  $R_j$  and translation  $d_j$
  - compute the registered target location

$$t_j = R_j t + d_j$$

compute the squared TRE

TRE 
$$_{j}^{2} = \left\| t_{j} - t \right\|^{2}$$

3. compute the root mean squared (RMS) TRE

TRE <sub>RMS</sub> = 
$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{10,000}} \sum_{j=1}^{10,000} \text{TRE}_{j}^{2}$$

simulations performed for different configurations of markers







Fig. 11. Effect of distance between fiducials on TRE. Each symbol represents the mean theoretical  $\text{TRE}_{\text{TV}}/\text{FLE}_{\text{eff}}$  predicted by numerical simulation for one of the four fiducial configurations shown in Fig. 10. The x-axis is the distance d in that figure. The dotted line is the mean  $\text{TRE}_{\text{TV}}/\text{FLE}_{\text{eff}}$  when the four fiducials are distributed evenly around the circumference of the head (e.g., Case A,  $d = 2\pi R/4 = 157$  mm).

simulation of TRE vs FLE



Fig. 8. Relationship between TRE and FLE. This figure illustrates that TRE is proportional to  $FLE_{eff}$ . This is shown for the cases of three, four, and five fiducials distributed evenly around the circumference of a sphere of radius 100 mm. Each symbol represents the mean theoretical  $TRE_{TV}$  predicted by numerical simulation using a pair of  $FLE_1$  and  $FLE_2$  values formed from the set of localization errors {0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 mm}. All 15 possible pairs were used.

#### simulation of TRE vs number of markers



Fig. 9. Relationship between TRE and the number of fiducials. This figure illustrates that TRE is inversely proportional to the square root of the number of fiducials  $N_f$ . The symbols and error bars represent theoretical TRE<sub>TV</sub>/FLE<sub>eff</sub> values (mean  $\pm$  SD) predicted by numerical simulation. The number of fiducials varies from three (far right) to 30 (far left). The fiducials were distributed evenly around the circumference of a sphere of radius 100 mm.

- summary of results:
  - TRE depends strongly on configuration of markers
  - TRE<sup>2</sup>  $\propto \sigma^2$

TRE<sup>2</sup> 
$$\propto \frac{1}{n}$$

 Fitzpatrick, West, and Maurer Jr performed a statistical analysis of fiducial registration (assuming identical isotropic FLE)

IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, vol. 17, no. 5, Oct 1998

$$\left\langle \text{TRE}^{2}(t) \right\rangle = \frac{\left\langle \text{FLE}^{2} \right\rangle}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{3} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \frac{d_{k}^{2}}{f_{k}^{2}} \right)$$

- t target location
- n number of markers
- $d_k$  distance between the target and the  $k^{th}$  principal axis
- $f_k$  RMS distance between the fiducials and the  $k^{th}$  principal axis

#### TRE for different configurations of markers



#### ► TRE versus FLE



- other interesting results
  - FRE is independent of the marker configuration!

$$\langle \text{FRE}^2 \rangle = \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right) \langle \text{FLE}^2 \rangle$$

if you compute the TRE for the fiducial markers you get

$$\langle \text{FRE}_{i}^{2} \rangle = \langle \text{FLE}^{2} \rangle - \langle \text{TRE}^{2}(p_{i}) \rangle$$

- ▶ i.e., a small FRE implies a large TRE at the marker location!
- FRE is poor indicator of registration quality