

Engineering Notes

ENGINEERING NOTES are short manuscripts describing new developments or important results of a preliminary nature. These Notes should not exceed 2500 words (where a figure or table counts as 200 words). Following informal review by the Editors, they may be published within a few months of the date of receipt. Style requirements are the same as for regular contributions (see inside back cover).

Averaging Quaternions

F. Landis Markley*

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center,
Greenbelt, Maryland 20771

Yang Cheng† and John L. Crassidis‡

University at Buffalo, State University of New York,
Amherst, New York 14260-4400

and

Yaakov Oshman§

Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000 Israel

DOI: 10.2514/1.28949

Introduction

MANY applications require an algorithm that averages quaternions in an optimal manner. For example, when combining the quaternion outputs of multiple star trackers having this output capability, it is desirable to properly average the quaternions without recomputing the attitude from the raw star tracker data. Other applications requiring some sort of optimal quaternion averaging include particle filtering [1] and multiple-model adaptive estimation [2], in which weighted quaternions are used to determine the quaternion estimate.

For spacecraft attitude estimation applications, [1] derives an optimal averaging scheme to compute the average of a set of weighted attitude matrices using the singular value decomposition method [3]. Focusing on a four-dimensional quaternion Gaussian distribution on the unit hypersphere, [4] provides an approach to computing the average quaternion by minimizing a quaternion cost function that is equivalent to the attitude matrix cost function in [1]. Motivated by [1] and extending its results, this Note derives an algorithm that determines an optimal average quaternion from a set of scalar- or matrix-weighted quaternions. Furthermore, a sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the average quaternion and the equivalence of the minimization problem, stated herein, to maximum likelihood estimation are shown.

For the scalar-weighted case, the goal is to find the average of a set of n attitude estimates, \mathbf{q}_i , in quaternion form with associated

weights w_i . The simple procedure

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{\text{simple}} \triangleq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{q}_i \quad (1)$$

has two flaws. The first and most obvious flaw, that $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ is not a unit quaternion, is easily fixed by the ad hoc procedure of dividing $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ by its norm. The second flaw is subtler. It is well known that \mathbf{q} and $-\mathbf{q}$ represent the same rotation, so that the quaternions provide a 2:1 mapping of the rotation group [5]. Thus, changing the sign of any \mathbf{q}_i should not change the average, but it is clear that Eq. (1) does not have this property.

The observation that we really want to average attitudes rather than quaternions, first presented in [1], provides a way to avoid both of these flaws. Following this observation, the average quaternion should minimize a weighted sum of the squared Frobenius norms of attitude matrix differences:

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}} \triangleq \arg \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|A(\mathbf{q}) - A(\mathbf{q}_i)\|_F^2 \quad (2)$$

where \mathbb{S}^3 denotes the unit 3 sphere.

Average Quaternion

Using the definition of the Frobenius norm, the orthogonality of $A(\mathbf{q})$ and $A(\mathbf{q}_i)$, and some properties of the matrix trace (denoted by Tr) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(\mathbf{q}) - A(\mathbf{q}_i)\|_F^2 &= \text{Tr}\{[A(\mathbf{q}) - A(\mathbf{q}_i)]^T [A(\mathbf{q}) - A(\mathbf{q}_i)]\} \\ &= 6 - 2\text{Tr}[A(\mathbf{q})A^T(\mathbf{q}_i)] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This allows us to express Eq. (2) as

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \text{Tr}[A(\mathbf{q})B^T] \quad (4)$$

where

$$B \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i A(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad (5)$$

Equation (4) is in a form found in solving Wahba's problem [6], and so many of the techniques used for solving that problem [7] can be applied to finding the average quaternion. If computational efficiency is important, the well-known QUEST algorithm [8] can be recommended, as will be discussed later. The matrix B is known as the *attitude profile matrix* [9] because it contains all the information on the attitude.

A detailed review of quaternions can be found in [5], but we only need a few results for this Note. We denote the vector and scalar parts of a quaternion by $\mathbf{q} \triangleq [q^T q_4]^T$, which are assumed to obey the normalization condition $\|\mathbf{q}\|^2 + q_4^2 = \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{q} = 1$. The attitude matrix is related to the quaternion by

$$A(\mathbf{q}) = \begin{pmatrix} q_4^2 - \|\mathbf{q}\|^2 \\ 2\mathbf{q} \end{pmatrix} I_{3 \times 3} + 2\mathbf{q} \mathbf{q}^T - 2q_4 [\mathbf{q} \times] \quad (6)$$

where $I_{3 \times 3}$ is a 3×3 identity matrix and $[\mathbf{q} \times]$ is the cross-product matrix defined by

Received 20 November 2006; revision received 26 February 2007; accepted for publication 26 February 2007. Copyright © 2007 by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. All rights reserved. Copies of this paper may be made for personal or internal use, on condition that the copier pay the \$10.00 per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; include the code 0731-5090/07 \$10.00 in correspondence with the CCC.

*Aerospace Engineer, Guidance, Navigation and Control Systems Engineering Branch; Landis.Markley@nasa.gov. Fellow AIAA.

†Research Assistant Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; cheng3@eng.buffalo.edu. Member AIAA.

‡Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; johnc@eng.buffalo.edu. Associate Fellow AIAA.

§Professor, Department of Aerospace Engineering, Holder, Louis and Helen Rogow Chair in Aeronautical Engineering, Member, Technion's Asher Space Research Institute; yaakov.oshman@technion.ac.il. Associate Fellow AIAA.

$$[\varrho \times] \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -q_3 & q_2 \\ q_3 & 0 & -q_1 \\ -q_2 & q_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

Equation (6) can be used to verify the identity

$$\text{Tr}[A(\mathbf{q})B^T] = \mathbf{q}^T K \mathbf{q} \quad (8)$$

where K is the symmetric traceless 4×4 matrix

$$K \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} B + B^T - \text{Tr}(B)I_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{z} \\ \mathbf{z}^T & \text{Tr}(B) \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

with \mathbf{z} being defined by

$$[\mathbf{z} \times] \triangleq B^T - B \quad (10)$$

This is the basis of Davenport's q method [7]. The case at hand admits considerable simplification, however. Substituting Eq. (6) for $A(\mathbf{q}_i)$ into Eq. (5) and then into Eq. (9) gives

$$K \triangleq 4M - w_{\text{tot}} I_{4 \times 4} \quad (11)$$

where

$$w_{\text{tot}} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i$$

$I_{4 \times 4}$ is a 4×4 identity matrix, and M is the 4×4 matrix:

$$M \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{q}_i \mathbf{q}_i^T \quad (12)$$

Thus, the average quaternion can be found by the following maximization procedure:

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \mathbf{q}^T M \mathbf{q} \quad (13)$$

The solution of this maximization problem is well known [10]. The average quaternion is the eigenvector of M corresponding to the maximum eigenvalue. This avoids both of the flaws of Eq. (1). The eigenvector is chosen to have unit norm to avoid the first flaw. The second flaw is obviously avoided because changing the sign of any \mathbf{q}_i does not change the value of M . The averaging procedure only determines $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ up to a sign, which is consistent with the 2:1 nature of the quaternion representation. If the QUEST algorithm is used to find the eigenvector associated with the maximum eigenvalue, then the K matrix in Eq. (11) must be used instead of the M matrix in Eq. (12), because the QUEST algorithm requires a traceless matrix.

A closer look at the attitude error matrix defined by $A(\delta \mathbf{q}_i) \triangleq A(\mathbf{q})A^T(\mathbf{q}_i)$ gives a nice interpretation of the optimization problem. The error quaternion is the product of \mathbf{q} and the inverse of \mathbf{q}_i , which can be written as [5]

$$\delta \mathbf{q}_i \triangleq \mathbf{q} \otimes \mathbf{q}_i^{-1} = [\Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad \mathbf{q}_i]^T \mathbf{q} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\Xi(\mathbf{q}) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} q_4 I_{3 \times 3} + [\varrho \times] \\ -\varrho^T \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

Note for future reference that $[\Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad \mathbf{q}_i]$ is an orthogonal matrix representing a norm-preserving rotation in quaternion space. The vector and scalar parts of the error quaternion are given by

$$\delta \varrho_i = \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i \sin(\delta \phi_i/2) = \Xi^T(\mathbf{q}_i) \mathbf{q} \quad (16a)$$

$$\delta_{q4i} = \cos(\delta \phi_i/2) = \mathbf{q}_i^T \mathbf{q} \quad (16b)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_i$ is the unit Euler axis and $\delta \phi_i$ is the rotation angle of the error. Substituting Eqs. (16) into Eqs. (2) and (3) and using the quaternion

normalization condition shows that the average quaternion is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|\delta \varrho_i\|^2 = \arg \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \sin^2(\delta \phi_i/2) \quad (17)$$

This equation will be used in the sequel for the generalization of the results to nonscalar weights.

The fact that the average quaternion minimizes the weighted sum of the squared lengths of the vector parts of the error quaternions or the weighted sum of the squares of the sines of the half-error angles may be more intuitively pleasing than the argument based on the Frobenius norm. One might think that it would be better to minimize the weighted sum of the squared angle errors themselves, but the sines of the half-error angles have the conceptual advantage of reaching a maximum at the maximum rotation error of π . Of course, by the small-angle approximation of the sine, the difference between these minimizations is negligible for small errors.

Averaging Two Quaternions

The two-quaternion case can be solved in closed form because exact expressions for the eigenvalues of M are available. This matrix has two eigenvectors in the hyperplane spanned by \mathbf{q}_1 and \mathbf{q}_2 with eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(w_1 + w_2 \pm z) \quad (18)$$

where $z \triangleq \sqrt{(w_1 - w_2)^2 + 4w_1 w_2 (\mathbf{q}_1^T \mathbf{q}_2)^2}$. The other two eigenvectors orthogonal to this hyperplane, and each has eigenvector zero. The optimal quaternion average corresponds to the eigenvalue with the upper sign in Eq. (18) and is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \pm \left[\sqrt{\frac{w_1(w_1 - w_2 + z)}{z(w_1 + w_2 + z)}} \mathbf{q}_1 + \text{sign}(\mathbf{q}_1^T \mathbf{q}_2) \sqrt{\frac{w_2(w_2 - w_1 + z)}{z(w_1 + w_2 + z)}} \mathbf{q}_2 \right] \quad (19)$$

The average is well-defined unless $\mathbf{q}_1^T \mathbf{q}_2 = 0$ and $w_1 = w_2$. In this case, the two eigenvalues of Eq. (18) are equal, and so the maximum eigenvalue of M is not unique and any quaternion in the hyperplane spanned by \mathbf{q}_1 and \mathbf{q}_2 is an eigenvector with this eigenvalue. This is the only two-observation case for which the average quaternion is not uniquely defined. Equation (19) can be generalized to more than two observations in the trivial sense that the average quaternion is some linear superposition of the quaternions that are averaged. Easily computable forms for the coefficients in the superposition can only be found for the two-observation case, however.

Uniqueness of the Average Quaternion

Because the average quaternion $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ is the eigenvector associated with the maximum eigenvalue of M , $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ is unique only if the two largest eigenvalues of M are not equal. A sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the average quaternion is shown here. It is assumed that there is a reference frame in which every quaternion estimate \mathbf{q}_i differs from the identity quaternion $\mathbf{q}_{\text{ref}} = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1]^T$ by a rotation of less than $\pi/2$. This section proves that the average quaternion $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ minimizing Eq. (2) is unique with this assumption. This condition for uniqueness is sufficient, but not necessary. The two-observation case provides a counterexample to any claim of necessity.

The angle of rotation between \mathbf{q}_i and \mathbf{q}_{ref} is given by $2 \arccos |q_{4i}|$. When the angle is less than $\pi/2$, $q_{4i}^2 > 1/2$, hence

$$q_{4i}^2 > q_{1i}^2 + q_{2i}^2 + q_{3i}^2 \quad (20)$$

Now consider an attitude quaternion that is orthogonal to the identity quaternion \mathbf{q}_{ref} , given by $\mathbf{q}^\perp = [q_1^\perp \ q_2^\perp \ q_3^\perp \ 0]^T$. Define the gain function $g(\mathbf{q}) \triangleq \mathbf{q}^T M \mathbf{q}$. The gain functions of \mathbf{q}^\perp and \mathbf{q}_{ref} are

$$g(\mathbf{q}^\perp) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \left(q_1^\perp q_{1_i} + q_2^\perp q_{2_i} + q_3^\perp q_{3_i} \right)^2 \quad (21)$$

and

$$g(\mathbf{q}_{\text{ref}}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i q_{4_i}^2 \quad (22)$$

We have

$$g(\mathbf{q}_{\text{ref}}) > g(\mathbf{q}^\perp) \quad (23)$$

because

$$q_{4_i}^2 > \left(q_1^\perp q_{1_i} + q_2^\perp q_{2_i} + q_3^\perp q_{3_i} \right)^2 \quad (24)$$

To prove inequality (24), notice that by the Cauchy inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(q_1^\perp q_{1_i} + q_2^\perp q_{2_i} + q_3^\perp q_{3_i} \right)^2 &\leq \left[\left(q_1^\perp \right)^2 + \left(q_2^\perp \right)^2 + \left(q_3^\perp \right)^2 \right] \\ &\times \left(q_{1_i}^2 + q_{2_i}^2 + q_{3_i}^2 \right) = q_{1_i}^2 + q_{2_i}^2 + q_{3_i}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the fact that \mathbf{q}^\perp has unit norm was used. Inequality (24) then follows upon combining Eqs. (20) and (25).

If the two largest eigenvalues of M are equal, the eigenvectors associated with the maximum eigenvalue span a 2-D subspace. The intersection of this subspace and the orthogonal complement of the identity quaternion (the subspace spanned by all \mathbf{q}^\perp quaternions) cannot be empty. A quaternion \mathbf{q} in that intersection must satisfy $g(\mathbf{q}) = g(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq g(\mathbf{q}_{\text{ref}})$ and $g(\mathbf{q}) < g(\mathbf{q}_{\text{ref}})$ simultaneously. By contradiction, the two largest eigenvalues cannot be equal, hence the average quaternion is unique.

Matrix-Weighted Case

This section expands upon the scalar-weighted case to include general matrix weights. For this case, a matrix-weighted version of the minimization problem in Eq. (17) is assumed:

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}} \triangleq \arg \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^T R_i^{-1} \delta \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^T = \arg \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{q}^T \Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) R_i^{-1} \Xi^T(\mathbf{q}_i) \mathbf{q} \quad (26)$$

where R_i^{-1} is the i th symmetric weighting matrix. In this case, the average quaternion is the eigenvector corresponding to the maximum eigenvalue of the matrix:

$$\mathcal{M} = - \sum_{i=1}^n \Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) R_i^{-1} \Xi^T(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad (27)$$

If $R_i^{-1} = w_i I_{3 \times 3}$, the identities $\Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) \Xi^T(\mathbf{q}_i) = I_{4 \times 4} - \mathbf{q}_i \mathbf{q}_i^T$ and $\Xi^T(\mathbf{q}_i) \Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) = I_{3 \times 3}$ can be used to show that $\mathcal{M} = M - w_{\text{tot}} I_{4 \times 4}$, where M is given by Eq. (12), and that the traceless K matrix for the matrix-weighted case is

$$K = 4\mathcal{M} + \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{-1} \right) I_{4 \times 4} = \sum_{i=1}^n K_i \quad (28)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} K_i &\triangleq -4\Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) R_i^{-1} \Xi^T(\mathbf{q}_i) + \text{Tr} \left(R_i^{-1} \right) I_{4 \times 4} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) & \mathbf{q}_i \end{bmatrix} \tilde{K}_i \begin{bmatrix} \Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) & \mathbf{q}_i \end{bmatrix}^T \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where

$$\tilde{K}_i = 2 \begin{bmatrix} 2\mathcal{F}_i - \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_i) I_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 3}^T & \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_i) \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_i \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(R_i^{-1} \right) I_{3 \times 3} - R_i^{-1} \quad (31)$$

and $\mathbf{0}_{3 \times 1}$ denotes a 3×1 vector of zeros.

The matrix \tilde{K}_i has the same structure as that in Eq. (9), with the corresponding attitude profile matrix given by $\tilde{B}_i = 2\mathcal{F}_i$. Because $\begin{bmatrix} \Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) & \mathbf{q}_i \end{bmatrix}$ is an orthogonal matrix, Eq. (29) shows that K_i and \tilde{K}_i are related by a rotation. Their corresponding attitude profile matrices are related by the same rotation. The attitude profile matrix corresponding to K_i is given by $B_i = \tilde{B}_i A(\mathbf{q}_i)$, as shown in the Appendix, and the attitude profile matrix corresponding to K is given by

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^n B_i = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i A(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad (32)$$

If $R_i^{-1} = w_i I_{3 \times 3}$, Eqs. (28) and (32) reduce to the corresponding quantities for scalar weights.

Relation to Maximum Likelihood Estimation

The relationship of the minimization problem in Eq. (26) to a maximum likelihood estimation problem is now shown. Reference [11] establishes a maximum likelihood problem for attitude matrices, which is related to the averaging problem in this Note. The maximum likelihood estimate of the attitude matrix, denoted \hat{A}_{ML} , is given as

$$\hat{A}_{\text{ML}} \triangleq \arg \min_{A \in \mathbb{SO}^3} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr}[(A_i - A)^T \mathcal{F}_i (A_i - A)] \quad (33)$$

where A_i is the i th given attitude matrix, \mathbb{SO}^3 denotes the (special orthogonal) group of rotation matrices, and the matrix \mathcal{F}_i defined by Eq. (31) is the Fisher information matrix of the small attitude error matrixs, with R_i being the covariance of the small attitude vector errors. Using properties of the matrix trace, we can write

$$J_i(A) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[(A_i - A)^T \mathcal{F}_i (A_i - A)] = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_i) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(A B_i^T) \quad (34)$$

where B_i is the attitude profile matrix defined by Eq. (32). Using $A = A(\mathbf{q})$ and the definition of \mathcal{F}_i gives J_i as a function of the quaternion:

$$\begin{aligned} J_i(\mathbf{q}) &= \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_i) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[A(\mathbf{q}) B_i^T] = \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{Tr}(R_i^{-1}) - \mathbf{q}^T K_i \mathbf{q} \right] \\ &= 2\delta \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^T R_i^{-1} \delta \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^T \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where Eqs. (8) and (29) were used. Using the invariance property of the maximum likelihood estimate [12],

$$\hat{A}_{\text{ML}} = A(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_{\text{ML}}) \quad (36)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_{\text{ML}}$ is the maximum likelihood estimate of the quaternion. Hence, using Eq. (35) in Eq. (33) gives

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_{\text{ML}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^T R_i^{-1} \delta \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^T \quad (37)$$

which is identical with Eq. (26). Thus, we conclude that the average quaternion defined by Eq. (26) is a maximum likelihood estimate.

The error covariance associated with the small-angle attitude errors of the average quaternion is given by

$$\bar{R} = \left\{ \Xi^T(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) R_i^{-1} \Xi^T(\mathbf{q}_i) \right] \Xi(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) \right\}^{-1} \quad (38)$$

For small errors, this matrix is well approximated by

$$\bar{R} \approx \left(\sum_{i=1}^n R_i^{-1} \right)^{-1} \quad (39)$$

Equation (39) can be used to develop three-sigma bounds for the attitude errors between the average and true quaternions.

Conclusions

An algorithm is presented for determining the average norm-preserving quaternion from a set of weighted quaternions. The solution involves performing an eigenvalue/eigenvector decomposition of a matrix composed of the given quaternions and weights. For both the scalar- and matrix-weighted cases, the optimal average quaternion can be determined by the computationally efficient QUEST algorithm. A sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the average quaternion is presented for the scalar-weighted case. In the matrix-weighted case, when the matrix weight is given by the inverse of the covariance of the small attitude vector errors, the average quaternion is shown to be a maximum likelihood estimate. Thus, in this case, the averaging procedure introduced here enjoys the well-known desirable properties of maximum likelihood estimators.

Appendix: Proof of Eq. (32)

This Appendix proves that $B_i = \tilde{B}_i A(\mathbf{q}_i)$. Here, we let unsubscripted \mathbf{q} denote a normalized, but otherwise completely arbitrary, quaternion. Then from Eqs. (8) and (29),

$$\text{Tr} [A(\mathbf{q})B_i^T] = \mathbf{q}^T K_i \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}^T [\Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad \mathbf{q}_i] \tilde{K}_i [\Xi(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad \mathbf{q}_i]^T \mathbf{q} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Using Eq. (14) and the fact that the attitude profile matrix of \tilde{K}_i is \tilde{B}_i gives

$$\text{Tr} [A(\mathbf{q})B_i^T] = \delta \mathbf{q}_i^T \tilde{K}_i \delta \mathbf{q}_i = \text{Tr} [A(\delta \mathbf{q}_i) \tilde{B}_i^T] \quad (\text{A2})$$

It follows from Eq. (14) that $A(\delta \mathbf{q}_i) = A(\mathbf{q} \otimes \mathbf{q}_i^{-1}) = A(\mathbf{q})A^T(\mathbf{q}_i)$, and so

$$\text{Tr} [A(\mathbf{q})B_i^T] = \text{Tr} [A(\mathbf{q})A^T(\mathbf{q}_i) \tilde{B}_i^T] \quad (\text{A3})$$

Because this must be true for any quaternion \mathbf{q} , it follows that

$$B_i = [A^T(\mathbf{q}_i) \tilde{B}_i^T]^T = \tilde{B}_i A(\mathbf{q}_i) \quad (\text{A4})$$

References

- [1] Oshman, Y., and Carmi, A., "Attitude Estimation from Vector Observations Using Genetic-Algorithm-Embedded Quaternion Particle Filter," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, Vol. 29, No. 4, July–Aug. 2006, pp. 879–891.
- [2] Lam, Q., Markley, F. L., and Crassidis, J. L., "Precision Attitude Determination Using a Multiple Model Adaptive Estimation Scheme," 2007 IEEE Aerospace Conference, Inst. of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Paper 7.0903-1439, 2007.
- [3] Markley, F. L., "Attitude Determination Using Vector Observations and the Singular Value Decomposition," *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, Vol. 36, No. 3, July–Sept. 1988, pp. 245–258.
- [4] Psiaki, M. L., "Estimation using Quaternion Probability Densities on the Unit Hypersphere," AAS Malcolm D. Shuster Astronautics Symposium, Grand Island, NY, American Astronautical Society Paper 05-461, June 2005.
- [5] Shuster, M. D., "A Survey of Attitude Representations," *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, Vol. 41, No. 4, 1993, pp. 439–517.
- [6] Wahba, G., "A Least-Squares Estimate of Satellite Attitude," *SIAM Review*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1965, p. 409.
- [7] Markley, F. L., and Mortari, D., "Quaternion Attitude Estimation Using Vector Observations," *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, Vol. 48, Nos. 2–3, 2000, pp. 359–380.
- [8] Shuster, M. D., and Oh, S. D., "Attitude Determination from Vector Observations," *Journal of Guidance and Control*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Jan.–Feb. 1981, pp. 70–77.
- [9] Shuster, M. D., "Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Spacecraft Attitude," *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, Vol. 37, No. 1, Jan.–Mar. 1989, pp. 79–88.
- [10] Lerner, G. M., "Three-Axis Attitude Determination," *Spacecraft Attitude Determination and Control*, edited by J. R. Wertz, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, Holland, The Netherlands, 1978, pp. 426–428.
- [11] Shuster, M. D., "The Generalized Wahba Problem," *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, Vol. 54, No. 2, Apr.–June 2006, pp. 245–259.
- [12] Zehna, P. W., "Invariance of Maximum Likelihood Estimators," *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, Vol. 37, No. 3, June 1966, p. 744.

This article has been cited by:

1. Ryan Martin, David Machuca-Mory, Oy Leuangthong, Jeff B. Boisvert. 2019. Non-stationary Geostatistical Modeling: A Case Study Comparing LVA Estimation Frameworks. *Natural Resources Research* **28**:2, 291-307. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Tobias Werner, David Harrer, Dominik Henrich. Efficient, Precise, and Convenient Calibration of Multi-camera Systems by Robot Automation 669-677. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Shinya FUJITA, Yuji SATO, Toshinori KUWAHARA, Yuji SAKAMOTO, Kazuya YOSHIDA. 2019. Development and Ground Evaluation of Ground-Target Tracking Control of Microsatellite RISESAT. *TRANSACTIONS OF THE JAPAN SOCIETY FOR AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES, AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY JAPAN* **17**:2, 120-126. [[Crossref](#)]
4. A. Uneri, X. Zhang, T. Yi, J. W. Stayman, P. A. Helm, N. Theodore, J. H. Siewerdsen. 2018. Image quality and dose characteristics for an O-arm intraoperative imaging system with model-based image reconstruction. *Medical Physics* **45**:11, 4857-4868. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Jean-Baptiste Renault, Gaëtan Aüllo-Rasser, Mathias Donnez, Sébastien Parratte, Patrick Chabrand. 2018. Articular-surface-based automatic anatomical coordinate systems for the knee bones. *Journal of Biomechanics* **80**, 171-178. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Jason B. Fice, Jean-Sébastien Blouin, Gunter P. Siegmund. 2018. Head postures during naturalistic driving. *Traffic Injury Prevention* **19**:6, 637-643. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Chi Zhang, Amirhossein Taghvaei, Prashant G. Mehta. 2018. Feedback Particle Filter on Riemannian Manifolds and Matrix Lie Groups. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **63**:8, 2465-2480. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Zhenbing Qiu, Huaming Qian. 2018. Modified multiplicative quaternion cubature Kalman filter for attitude estimation. *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing* **32**:8, 1182-1190. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Sebastian P. Kleinschmidt, Bernardo Wagner. Visual Multimodal Odometry: Robust Visual Odometry in Harsh Environments 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Robert. H. Rogne, Torleiv. H. Bryne, Thor. I. Fossen, Tor. A. Johansen. 2018. Redundant MEMS-Based Inertial Navigation Using Nonlinear Observers. *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control* **140**:7, 071001. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Henrique M.T. Menegaz, João Y. Ishihara. 2018. Unscented and square-root unscented Kalman filters for quaternionic systems. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* **26**. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Alberto Crivellaro, Mahdi Rad, Yannick Verdie, Kwang Moo Yi, Pascal Fua, Vincent Lepetit. 2018. Robust 3D Object Tracking from Monocular Images Using Stable Parts. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **40**:6, 1465-1479. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Renato Zanetti, Kyle J. DeMars. 2018. Fully Multiplicative Unscented Kalman Filter for Attitude Estimation. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* **41**:5, 1183-1189. [[Citation](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
14. V. Paradiso, A. Crivellaro, K. Amgarou, N. Blanc de Lanaute, P. Fua, E. Liénard. 2018. A versatile calibration procedure for portable coded aperture gamma cameras and RGB-D sensors. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **886**, 125-133. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Renato Zanetti, Kyle J. DeMars. A Comparison of Linear Attitude Estimators . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
16. Chang-Tai Xiong, Shun-Lei Tang, Ruo-Yu Yang. More Efficient, Adaptive and Stable, A Virtual Fitting System Using Kinect 182-191. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Thomas Konrad, Jan-Jöran Gehrt, Jiaying Lin, René Zweigel, Dirk Abel. 2018. Advanced state estimation for navigation of automated vehicles. *Annual Reviews in Control* **46**, 181-195. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Liu Tao, Du Hongwang. A camera-IMU system extrinsic parameter calibration method 1063-1066. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Adam Chromy. Mutual calibration of sensors for multispectral 3D scanning of surface 199-204. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Tomasz Hachaj, Marcin Piekarczyk, Marek Ogiela. 2017. Human Actions Analysis: Templates Generation, Matching and Visualization Applied to Motion Capture of Highly-Skilled Karate Athletes. *Sensors* **17**:11, 2590. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Young Soo Suh. 2017. Inertial motion tracking using sensor saturation compensation with l_1 norm regularization. *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems* **15**:5, 2001-2012. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Chunshi Fan, Nan Zhang, Xiaoyun Liu, Ziyang Meng. Four-sigma point marginal geometric simplex estimator for gyroless attitude dynamics 5552-5557. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Tibor Stanko, Stefanie Hahmann, Georges-Pierre Bonneau, Nathalie Saguin-Sprynski. 2017. Shape from sensors: Curve networks on surfaces from 3D orientations. *Computers & Graphics* **66**, 74-84. [[Crossref](#)]

24. W. X. Ng, H. K. Chan, W. K. Teo, I. M. Chen. 2017. Capturing the tacit knowledge of the skilled operator to program tool paths and tool orientations for robot belt grinding. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* **91**:5-8, 1599-1618. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Elvis C. S. Chen, Burton Ma, Terry M. Peters. 2017. Contact-less stylus for surgical navigation: registration without digitization. *International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery* **12**:7, 1231-1241. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Martijn J. A. Zeestraten, Ioannis Havoutis, Joao Silverio, Sylvain Calinon, Darwin G. Caldwell. 2017. An Approach for Imitation Learning on Riemannian Manifolds. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* **2**:3, 1240-1247. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Fangjun Qin, Lubin Chang. Velocity integration of strapdown inertial navigation using modified unscented quaternion estimator 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Paul Kremer, Jan Dentler, Somasundar Kannan, Holger Voos. Cooperative localization of unmanned aerial vehicles in ROS — The Atlas node 319-325. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Tuomo Palonen, Heikki Hyyti, Arto Visala. 2017. Augmented Reality in Forest Machine Cabin. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* **50**:1, 5410-5417. [[Crossref](#)]
30. M D Ketcha, T De Silva, A Uneri, M W Jacobson, J Goerres, G Kleinszig, S Vogt, J-P Wolinsky, J H Siewerdsen. 2017. Multi-stage 3D-2D registration for correction of anatomical deformation in image-guided spine surgery. *Physics in Medicine and Biology* **62**:11, 4604-4622. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Yuance Liu, Michael Z. Q. Chen. A novel three-axis visual attitude estimation algorithm with application to quadrotors 5436-5441. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Thomas Schneider, Mingyang Li, Michael Burri, Juan Nieto, Roland Siegwart, Igor Gilitschenski. Visual-inertial self-calibration on informative motion segments 6487-6494. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Andrea Tagliabue, Mina Kamel, Sebastian Verling, Roland Siegwart, Juan Nieto. Collaborative transportation using MAVs via passive force control 5766-5773. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Chi Zhang, Amirhossein Taghvaei, Prashant G. Mehta. Attitude estimation of a wearable motion sensor 4570-4575. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Tianhe Xu, Guobin Chang, Qianxin Wang, Chao Hu. 2017. Analytical 3D rotation estimation using vector measurements with full variance-covariance matrix. *Measurement* **98**, 131-138. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Jessica Magaraggia, Wei Wei, Markus Weiten, Gerhard Kleinszig, Sven Vetter, Jochen Franke, Adrian John, Adrian Egli, Karl Barth, Elli Angelopoulou, Joachim Hornegger. 2017. Design and evaluation of a portable intra-operative unified-planning-and-guidance framework applied to distal radius fracture surgery. *International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery* **12**:1, 77-90. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Seungsu Kim, Robert Haschke, Helge Ritter. 2017. Gaussian Mixture Model for 3-DoF orientations. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* **87**, 28-37. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Sondre Sanden Tørdal, Geir Hovland. 2017. Relative Vessel Motion Tracking using Sensor Fusion, Aruco Markers, and MRU Sensors. *Modeling, Identification and Control: A Norwegian Research Bulletin* **38**:2, 79-93. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Tomasz Hachaj, Marek R. Ogiela, Marcin Piekarczyk, Katarzyna Koptyra. Averaging Three-Dimensional Time-Varying Sequences of Rotations: Application to Preprocessing of Motion Capture Data 17-28. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Benedikt Fasel, Jorg Sporri, Julien Chardonens, Josef Kroll, Erich Muller, Kamiar Aminian. 2017. Joint Inertial Sensor Orientation Drift Reduction for Highly Dynamic Movements. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* 1-1. [[Crossref](#)]
41. John A. Christian, Lylia Benhacine, Jacob Hikes, Christopher D'Souza. 2016. Geometric Calibration of the Orion Optical Navigation Camera using Star Field Images. *The Journal of the Astronautical Sciences* **63**:4, 335-353. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Chi Zhang, Amirhossein Taghvaei, Prashant G. Mehta. Attitude estimation with feedback particle filter 5440-5445. [[Crossref](#)]
43. W. X. Ng, H. K. Chan, W. K. Teo, I. M. Chen. Programming robotic tool-path and tool-orientations for conformance grinding based on human demonstration 1246-1253. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Fangneng Li, Lubin Chang, Baiqing Hu, Kailong Li. 2016. Marginalized Unscented Quaternion Estimator for Integrated INS/GPS. *Journal of Navigation* **69**:05, 1125-1142. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Omer Rajput, Sven-Thomas Antoni, Christoph Otte, Thore Saathoff, Lars Matthaus, Alexander Schlaefer. High accuracy 3D data acquisition using co-registered OCT and kinect 32-37. [[Crossref](#)]

46. Lubin Chang, Jingshu Li, Kailong Li. 2016. Optimization-based alignment for strapdown inertial navigation system: comparison and extension. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems* 52:4, 1697-1713. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Chunshi Fan, Ziyang Meng, Xiaoyun Liu. Multiplicative quaternion extended consensus Kalman filter for attitude and augmented state estimation 8043-8048. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Xiaoyun Liu, Chunshi Fan, Ziyang Meng, Xiaochu Wang, Nan Zhang. Consensus-based quaternion estimation for aggregated spacecraft system with multiple sensors 8236-8240. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Ryan Kennedy, Roland Brockers, Stephan Weiss. Fail-safe visual-inertial navigation for UAVs 98361U. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Zhengshi Yu, John L. Crassidis. 2016. Accelerometer Bias Calibration Using Attitude and Angular Velocity Information. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* 39:4, 741-753. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
51. Sheldon Andrews, Marek Teichmann, Paul G. Kry. 2016. Blended Linear Models for Reduced Compliant Mechanical Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 22:3, 1209-1222. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Silvio Pflugi, Li Liu, Timo M. Ecker, Steffen Schumann, Jennifer Larissa Cullmann, Klaus Siebenrock, Guoyan Zheng. 2016. A cost-effective surgical navigation solution for periacetabular osteotomy (PAO) surgery. *International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery* 11:2, 271-280. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Zhengshi Yu, John L. Crassidis. Accelerometer Bias Calibration Using Attitude and Angular Velocity Information . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
54. Jonas Lang, Thomas Schlegl. Camera-Projector Calibration - Methods, Influencing Factors and Evaluation Using a Robot and Structured-Light 3D Reconstruction 413-427. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Martin Westhoven, Christian Plegge, Timo Henrich, Thomas Alexander. Posture Based Recognition of the Visual Focus of Attention for Adaptive Mobile Information Systems 416-427. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Kailong Li, Baiqing Hu, Lubin Chang, Yang Li. 2016. Comparison of direct navigation mode and indirect navigation mode for integrated SINS/GPS. *Transactions of the Institute of Measurement and Control* 38:1, 3-13. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Xiaochu Wang, Zheng You, Kaichun Zhao. 2016. Inertial/celestial-based fuzzy adaptive unscented Kalman filter with Covariance Intersection algorithm for satellite attitude determination. *Aerospace Science and Technology* 48, 214-222. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Alberto Crivellaro, Mahdi Rad, Yannick Verdie, Kwang Moo Yi, Pascal Fua, Vincent Lepetit. A Novel Representation of Parts for Accurate 3D Object Detection and Tracking in Monocular Images 4391-4399. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Tolga Birdal, Slobodan Ilic. Point Pair Features Based Object Detection and Pose Estimation Revisited 527-535. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Simon Bouvel, Viviane Pasqui, Guillaume Morel. Validation of a new method for bone motion measurement by soft-tissue artifact compensation through spatial interpolation 2611-2616. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Maksuda Lillah, Jeff B. Boisvert. 2015. Inference of locally varying anisotropy fields from diverse data sources. *Computers & Geosciences* 82, 170-182. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Lubin Chang, Kailong Li, Baiqing Hu. 2015. Huber's M-Estimation-Based Process Uncertainty Robust Filter for Integrated INS/GPS. *IEEE Sensors Journal* 15:6, 3367-3374. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Thomas Ainscough, Renato Zanetti, John Christian, Pol D. Spanos. 2015. Q-Method Extended Kalman Filter. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* 38:4, 752-760. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
64. John Enright, Ilija Jovanovic, Brendon Vaz. On-orbit star tracker recalibration: A case study 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Lubin Chang, Jingshu Li, Shengyong Chen. 2015. Initial Alignment by Attitude Estimation for Strapdown Inertial Navigation Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement* 64:3, 784-794. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Viktor Seib, Norman Link, Dietrich Paulus. Pose Estimation and Shape Retrieval with Hough Voting in a Continuous Voting Space 458-469. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Yang Cheng, William D. Banas, John L. Crassidis. Quaternion Data Fusion 439-452. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Francesco Di Renzo, Claudio Calabrese, Fabio Pellacini. 2014. AppIm. *ACM Transactions on Graphics* 33:6, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Fei Liu, Jie Li, Haifu Wang, Chang Liu. 2014. An improved quaternion Gauss-Newton algorithm for attitude determination using magnetometer and accelerometer. *Chinese Journal of Aeronautics* 27:4, 986-993. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Victor Elvira, Alfredo Nazabal-Renteria, Antonio Artes-Rodriguez. A novel feature extraction technique for human activity recognition 177-180. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Lionel Heng, Mathias Burki, Gim Hee Lee, Paul Furgale, Roland Siegwart, Marc Pollefeys. Infrastructure-based calibration of a multi-camera rig 4912-4919. [[Crossref](#)]

72. Filipe Felisberto, Florentino Fdez.-Riverola, António Pereira. 2014. A Ubiquitous and Low-Cost Solution for Movement Monitoring and Accident Detection Based on Sensor Fusion. *Sensors* **14**:5, 8961-8983. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Yuwang Lai, Junhong Liu, Yonghe Ding, Defeng Gu, Dongyun Yi. 2014. Precession-nutation correction for star tracker attitude measurement of STECE satellite. *Chinese Journal of Aeronautics* **27**:1, 117-123. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Lubin Chang, Baiqing Hu, Guobin Chang. 2014. Modified Unscented Quaternion Estimator Based on Quaternion Averaging. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* **37**:1, 305-309. [[Citation](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
75. Richard Linares, Moriba K. Jah, John L. Crassidis, Christopher K. Nebelecky. 2014. Space Object Shape Characterization and Tracking Using Light Curve and Angles Data. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* **37**:1, 13-25. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
76. G. Lu, K. Han, G.N. DeSouza, J. Armer, C.-R. Shyu. 2014. A new algorithm for 3D registration and its application in self-monitoring and early detection of lymphedema. *IRBM* **35**:6, 370. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Conrado S. Miranda, Janito V. Ferreira. 2014. Sensor and Body Frames Rotation Calibration Through Attitude Restriction. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* **47**:3, 7579-7584. [[Crossref](#)]
78. F. Landis Markley, John L. Crassidis. Static Attitude Determination Methods 183-233. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Petre Birtea, Dan Comănescu, Călin-Adrian Popa. 2013. Averaging on Manifolds by Embedding Algorithm. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision* . [[Crossref](#)]
80. Leena Singh, Matthew Fritz, Sagar Bhatt, Nazareth Bedrossian, Timothy Henderson, Bradley Moran. On the Phoenix ADCS-M3D Architecture . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
81. Dimitrios Pylorof, Kostas J. Kyriakopoulos. Nonlinear, Deterministic Sampling Based State Estimation for Highly-Maneuverable Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: a Comparative Development . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
82. Quang M. Lam, John L. Crassidis. A Close Examination of Multiple Model Adaptive Estimation Vs Extended Kalman Filter for Precision Attitude Determination . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
83. Richard Hartley, Jochen Trumpf, Yuchao Dai, Hongdong Li. 2013. Rotation Averaging. *International Journal of Computer Vision* **103**:3, 267-305. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Lubin Chang, Baiqing Hu, Shengyong Chen, Fangjun Qin. 2013. Comments on "Quaternion-Based Method for SINS/SAR Integrated Navigation System". *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems* **49**:2, 1400-1402. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Nicolas Lehment, Moritz Kaiser, Gerhard Rigoll. 2013. Using Segmented 3D Point Clouds for Accurate Likelihood Approximation in Human Pose Tracking. *International Journal of Computer Vision* **101**:3, 482-497. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Young Soo Suh. 2012. A Smoother for Attitude and Position Estimation Using Inertial Sensors With Zero Velocity Intervals. *IEEE Sensors Journal* **12**:5, 1255-1262. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Christopher K. Nebelecky, John L. Crassidis, Adam M. Fosbury, Yang Cheng. 2012. Efficient Covariance Intersection of Attitude Estimates Using a Local-Error Representation. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* **35**:2, 692-696. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
88. Danilo De Lorenzo, Alberto Vaccarella, Ghassan Khreis, Holger Moennich, Giancarlo Ferrigno, Elena De Momi. 2011. Accurate calibration method for 3D freehand ultrasound probe using virtual plane. *Medical Physics* **38**:12, 6710-6720. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Evren Imre, Jean-Yves Guillemaut, Adrian Hilton. Calibration of Nodal and Free-Moving Cameras in Dynamic Scenes for Post-Production 260-267. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Nicolas Padoy, Gregory D. Hager. Human-Machine Collaborative surgery using learned models 5285-5292. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Young Soo Suh, Tri Nhut Do, Young Sik Ro, Hee Jun Kang. A smoother for attitude estimation using inertial and magnetic sensors 743-746. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Christopher Nebelecky. Attitude Data Fusion Using a Modified Rodrigues Parametrization . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
93. Yang Cheng, John L. Crassidis. 2010. Particle Filtering for Attitude Estimation Using a Minimal Local-Error Representation. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* **33**:4, 1305-1310. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
94. Henzeh Leeghim, Yoonhyuk Choi, Belgacem A. Jaroux. 2010. Uncorrelated unscented filtering for spacecraft attitude determination. *Acta Astronautica* **67**:1-2, 135-144. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Weidong Zhou, Guoqiang Ding, Yanling Hao, Guangzhao Cui. Quaternion central divided difference Kalman filtering algorithm and its applications to initial alignment of SINS 1846-1851. [[Crossref](#)]

96. Yang Cheng, John Crassidis. Particle Filtering for Attitude Estimation Using a Minimal Local-Error Representation . [\[Citation\]](#) [\[PDF\]](#) [\[PDF Plus\]](#)
97. Christopher Nebelecky, John Crassidis, William Banas, Yang Cheng, Adam Fosbury. Decentralized Relative Attitude Estimation for Three-Spacecraft Formation Flying Applications . [\[Citation\]](#) [\[PDF\]](#) [\[PDF Plus\]](#)
98. John L. Crassidis, Yang Cheng, Christopher K. Nebelecky, Adam M. Fosbury. 2009. Decentralized Attitude Estimation Using a Quaternion Covariance Intersection Approach. *The Journal of the Astronautical Sciences* **57**:1-2, 113-128. [\[Crossref\]](#)
99. Quang Lam, John Crassidis. Evaluation of a Multiple Model Adaptive Estimation Scheme for Space Vehicle's Enhanced Navigation Solution . [\[Citation\]](#) [\[PDF\]](#) [\[PDF Plus\]](#)