* Perspective inversion
  + Seen in the “necker cube” illustration: which way was it oriented? Which of the corners is closest?
  + Interesting to see the same optical illusions that humans go through can be experienced by a computer, albeit for slightly different reasons
  + Only occurs in orthographic projection, perspective projections at a distance
* 3 noncolinear coplanar points can be used to calculate the depth of the object in the scene for weak perspective
  + Additional points can lead to more accuracy, but no reduction in reflection ambiguity
* 4 noncollinear coplanar points can be used to calculate the depth of the object in the scene of a full perspective projection
  + Allow you to check for inconsistencies between solutions of sets of three points
* Once you have 6 points you can unambiguously determine the pose, because all 11 camera calibration parameters can be computer from the 12 linear equations
* Past researchers like Tan have created heuristics to determine which geometric solution is the most likely, so I’d be interested in knowing what the exact accuracy of the solution was when determining pose based on the most *likely* position and not going through all the possibilities
* Interesting to compare the movement of a pendulum to the likely solutions of the pose problem
* When talking about ambiguity, coplanar points are best
* When talking about stability, noncoplanar points are best
  + Changes in lateral displacement of points will be described with cos alpha, where alpha is the ratio of the major to minor axis of the ellipse created by the three points and its centroid and has to have magnitude of less than or equal to 1. There will be no linear term in the Taylor expansion of the orientation dependence.