

## Exercises

Find  $\frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R}$  using left and right perturbations

Right Perturbation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{(Exp(\phi^\wedge))^{-1}p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{exp(\phi^\wedge)^{-1}R^{-1}p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{exp(-\phi^\wedge)R^{-1}p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 &\approx \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{(I - \phi^\wedge)R^{-1}p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{-\phi^\wedge R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{(R^{-1}p)^\wedge \phi}{\phi} \\
 &= (R^{-1}p)^\wedge
 \end{aligned}$$

Left Perturbation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{(exp(\phi^\wedge)R)^{-1}p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 \frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R^{-1}exp(\phi^\wedge)^{-1}p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 \frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R^{-1}exp(-\phi^\wedge)p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 \frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R} &\approx \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R^{-1}(I - \phi^\wedge)p - R^{-1}p}{\phi} \\
 \frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{-R^{-1}\phi^\wedge p}{\phi} \\
 \frac{\partial R^{-1}p}{\partial R} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R^{-1}p^\wedge \phi}{\phi} \\
 &= R^{-1}p^\wedge
 \end{aligned}$$

Find  $\frac{\partial R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\partial R_2}$  using left and right perturbations

I'm not sure about  $\lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{-\phi^\wedge}{\phi}$

- Right Perturbation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\partial R_2} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 (R_2 \exp(\phi^\wedge))^{-1} - R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\phi} \\
&= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 \exp(-\phi^\wedge) R_2^{-1} - R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\phi} \\
&= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 R_2^T R_2 \exp(-\phi^\wedge) R_2^T - R_1 R_2^T}{\phi} \\
&= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 R_2^T \exp(-R_2 \phi^\wedge) - R_1 R_2^T}{\phi} \\
&\approx \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 R_2^T (I - R_2 \phi^\wedge) - R_1 R_2^T}{\phi} \\
&= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{-R_1 \phi^\wedge}{\phi} \\
&= -R_1
\end{aligned}$$

Left Perturbation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\partial R_2} &= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 (\exp(\phi^\wedge) R_2)^{-1} - R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\phi} \\
&= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 R_2^{-1} \exp(-\phi^\wedge) - R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\phi} \\
&= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_1 R_2^{-1} (I - \phi^\wedge) - R_1 R_2^{-1}}{\phi} \\
&= \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \frac{-R_1 R_2^{-1} \phi^\wedge}{\phi} \\
&= -R_1 R_2^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

### Programming Exercise

```

//
// Created by xiang on 22-12-29. Modified by Rico 2024-12-19
//

#include <gflags/gflags.h>
#include <glog/logging.h>

#include "common/eigen_types.h"
#include "common/math_utils.h"
#include "tools/ui/pangolin_window.h"

///
/// flags

```

```

DEFINE_double(angular_velocity, 10.0, "    ");
DEFINE_double(linear_velocity, 5.0, "    m/s");
DEFINE_bool(use_quaternion, false, "    ");

int main(int argc, char** argv) {
    google::InitGoogleLogging(argv[0]);
    FLAGS_stderrthreshold = google::INFO;
    FLAGS_colorlogtostderr = true;
    google::ParseCommandLineFlags(&argc, &argv, true);

    ///
    sad::ui::PangolinWindow ui;
    if (ui.Init() == false) {
        return -1;
    }

    double angular_velocity_rad = FLAGS_angular_velocity * sad::math::kDEG2RAD; //
    double z_acc = -0.1;
    SE3 pose; // TWB
    Vec3d omega(0, 0, angular_velocity_rad); //
    Vec3d v_body(FLAGS_linear_velocity, 0, 0); //
    const double dt = 0.05; //

    while (ui.ShouldQuit() == false) {
        //
        Vec3d v_world = pose.so3() * v_body;
        pose.translation() += v_world * dt;

        //
        if (FLAGS_use_quaternion) {
            // theta is halved in the quaternion world
            Quatd q = pose.unit_quaternion() * Quatd(1, 0.5 * omega[0] * dt, 0.5 * omega[1]
            // Quatd q = pose.unit_quaternion() * Quatd(std::cos(0.5 * angular_velocity_rad
            q.normalize());
            // auto& quat = q;
            // std::cout << "====Quaternion coefficients: "
            // << "w = " << quat.w() << ", "
            // << "x = " << quat.x() << ", "
            // << "y = " << quat.y() << ", "
            // << "z = " << quat.z() << std::endl;
            pose.so3() = S03(q);
        } else {
            pose.so3() = pose.so3() * S03::exp(omega * dt);
        }
        v_body += Vec3d(0, 0, z_acc * dt);
    }
}

```

```

        LOG(INFO) << "pose: " << pose.translation().transpose();
        ui.UpdateNavState(sad::NavStated(0, pose, v_world));

        usleep(dt * 1e6);
    }

    ui.Quit();
    return 0;
}

```

## Below is from my blogpost

### Gauss-Newton Optimization

In Gauss Newton, we specifically look at minimizing a least squares problem. Assume we have a:

- scalar-valued cost function  $c(x)$ ,
- vector-valued function:  $f(x)$ ,  $[\mathbf{m}, 1]$
- Jacobian  $J_0$  at  $x_0$  is consequently  $[\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}]$
- Hessian  $H$  is  $D^2c(x)$ . It's approximated as  $J^T J$

$$c(x) = |f(x)|^2$$

$$x^* = \operatorname{argmin}(|f(x)|^2)$$

First order Taylor Expansion:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \operatorname{argmin}_{\Delta x} (|f(x_0 + \Delta x)|^2) \\
 &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\Delta x} [(f(x_0) + J_0 \Delta x)^T (f(x_0) + J_0 \Delta x)] \\
 &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\Delta x} [f(x_0)^T f(x_0) + f(x_0)^T J_0 \Delta x + (J_0 \Delta x)^T f(x_0) + (J_0 \Delta x)^T (J_0 \Delta x)] \\
 &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\Delta x} [f(x_0)^T f(x_0) + 2f(x_0)^T J_0 \Delta x + (J_0 \Delta x)^T (J_0 \Delta x)]
 \end{aligned}$$

Take the derivative of the above and set it to 0, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial f(x_0 + \Delta x)^2}{\partial \Delta x} &= 2J_0^T f(x_0) + [(J_0^T J_0) + (J_0^T J_0)^T] \Delta x \\
 &= 2J_0^T f(x_0) + 2(J_0^T J_0) \Delta x \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

So we can solve for  $\Delta x$  with  $H = J_0^T J_0$ ,  $b = -J_0^T f(x_0)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 (J_0^T J_0) \Delta x &= -J_0^T f(x_0) \\
 \rightarrow H \Delta x &= g
 \end{aligned}$$

- Note: because  $J_0$  may not have an inverse, here we cannot multiply  $J_0^{-1}$  to eliminate  $J_0^T$
- In fact, to  $\Delta x$  is available if and only if  $H$  is **positive definite**.
- In least square,  $f(x)$  is a.k.a residuals. Usually, it represents the **error between a data point and from its ground truth**.

In SLAM, we always frame this least squares problem with  $\mathbf{e} = [\text{observed\_landmark} - \text{predicted\_landmark}]$  at each landmark. So all together, we want to **minimize the total least squares of the difference between observations and predictions**. In the meantime, at each landmark, there is an error covariance, so all together, there's an error matrix  $\Sigma$ . Here in cost calculation, we take  $\Sigma^{-1}$  so the **larger the error covariance, the lower the weight the corresponding difference gets**.

With  $e(x + \Delta x) \approx e(x) + J\Delta x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 x* &= \text{argmin}(|e^T \Sigma^{-1} e|) \\
 &\rightarrow \text{argmin}_{\Delta x} (|e(x + \Delta x)^T \Sigma^{-1} e(x + \Delta x)|) \\
 &\text{similar steps as above ...} \\
 &\rightarrow (J_0^T \Sigma^{-1} J_0) \Delta x = -J_0^T \Sigma^{-1} f(x_0)
 \end{aligned}$$

Using Cholesky Decomposition, one can get  $\Sigma^{-1} = A^T A$ . Then we can write the above as

$$((AJ_0)^T (AJ_0)) \Delta x = -(AJ_0)^T A f(x_0)$$

For a more detailed derivation, please see here

## Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) Optimization

Again, **Taylor expansion** works better when  $\Delta x$  is small, so the function can be better estimated by it. So, similar to regularization techniques on step sizes in deep learning, like L1, L2 regularization, we can regularize the step size,  $\Delta x$

$$(H + \mu I_H) \Delta x = -J_0^T f(x_0) = g$$

Intuitively,

- as  $\mu$  grows, the diagonal identity matrix  $\mu I_H$  grows, so  $H + \mu I_H \rightarrow \mu I_H$ . So,  $\Delta x \approx (H + \mu I_H)^{-1} g = \frac{g}{\mu}$ , which means  $\Delta x$  grows smaller. In the meantime,  $\Delta x$  will be similar to that in gradient descent.
- as  $\mu$  becomes smaller,  $\Delta x$  will become more like Gauss-Newton. However, due to  $\mu I_H$ ,  $(H + \mu I_H)$  is positive semi-definite, which provides more stability for solving for  $\Delta x$ .