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### Abstract

The theoretical estimate on the number of iterations that RANSAC needs to find a plane with a certain probability depends on the number of inliers, the number of outliers, and this probability. It assumes that the inliers lie exactly on the plane, and hence were measured with no measurement noise. In this short paper we will examine by experiments on artificial data how the number of iterations is affected when there is measurement noise. In urban reconstruction the model to be found is not a full plane but some facet on a plane. With measurement noise, the shape of this facet with may also affect the number of iterations, which we also examine experimentally.

## Introduction

To determine parameters of an unknown model, a technique called RANdom Sample Consensus (RANSAC) can sometimes be used. It takes observed data and assumes that the model parameters may already be determined from just a few observations. RANSAC is an iterative procedure that tries to find the best-fitting model by trying many, and determining the support for each model from all observations. The model (parameters) with most support is returned. RANSAC was introduced by Fischler and Bolles [1]. The particular use of RANSAC for building reconstruction was studied by Schnabel et al. [2], among others.

When RANSAC is used to determine the plane in a 3D point set P that contains the maximum number of points of P, we have to set a number of iterations that makes us sufficiently certain that the best plane we have found so far is in fact the plane with the most points. If P has n points, and the number of points inside the plane with the most points is k, we call k/n the inlier ratio. To have a probability p that we found the plane with the most points after r iterations, we have the expression p = 1 – ( 1 – (*k*/*n*)3 )*r*. This expression can be rewritten to know the value of r needed in the algorithm. However, it is valid only if there is no measurement noise, but data acquired with LiDAR will typically have 5 cm measurement noise. Hence the expression is incorrect in practice. We will examine how r depends on the measurement noise and also on the plane shape. To this end, we will run experiments on artificial data.

We phrase the research questions precisely:

1. Does the number of iterations required to find the best plane increase when noise is present, and how does it increase in the amount of noise?
2. When noise is present, does the facet shape influence the number of iterations that is needed, and in what way?

For both questions we assume that the probability with which we want to find the best plane is fixed to a constant. We aim to know r for p=0.95.

## Experiment set-up

To make our artificial data correspond to a possible scenario in the real World, we choose our point set P to lie in a box of 50x50x20 meters, where 20 meters is the height. We will place n-k points uniformly at random in the box, and another k points on the model. Then we perturb every one of the k points on the model by making a ball with radius b around it, and randomly replacing the point inside its ball, with uniform distribution.

The set-up has four aspects that can be varied to generate the test data: the values k and n, the shape of the model, and the radius b of the ball. We will use the following settings:

* n = 8000
* k = 500 or k = 1000
* The shapes are rectangles of different aspect ratios but the same area: 6x6, 9x4, 12x3, 15x2.4. We place them as rectangles horizontally in the middle of the box.
* The radius b of the ball is 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 cm.

This leads to 40 different setting combinations, called settings from now on, that all need to be repeated sufficiently often to get an estimate on r.

To run RANSAC, we need one more parameter, namely the distance to the plane (model) that is allowed for a point to be counted as support for that plane. We will choose this distance to be 4 cm. If we would choose it smaller than 4 cm, the setting with b = 4 cm might not even contain any plane that gets support from all k points originally placed on the facet.

Notice that we may find a plane with support higher than k. The 8000 randomly placed points could lie such that several of them support the plane as well. We will say that we found the plane when we get a support of at least 90% of k, so either 450 or 900, depending on the choice of k. We can then stop this test and record the number of iterations needed.

For every setting we do the following. We run RANSAC and count how many iterations are needed until we find a plane with the desired support. We do this 100 times and then choose as the estimate of r, the smallest number of iterations so that 95 of the runs found a plane with sufficient support within r iterations (and 5 of the runs needed more than r iterations).

## Results

[ Write this section. Choose a suitable way to present the outcome of the experiments. Make sure to summarize; a table containing 40x100=4000 values is not useful. Choose a visualization that helps to answer the research questions and is informative. Total length at most half a page of text to explain tables/figures/graphs/plots, and at most one page for these tables/figures/graphs/plots (and do not make them unreadably small). ]

Vraag 1

Iterations vs Noise measurement per area:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | k = 500 | | | | k = 1000 | | | |
| b | 6x6 | 9x4 | 12x3 | 15x2,4 | 6x6 | 9x4 | 12x3 | 15x2,4 |
| 0 | 7033 | 5298 | 5500 | 5014 | 1233 | 1098 | 926 | 984 |
| 1 | 6682 | 7309 | 6006 | 5491 | 1292 | 1198 | 1024 | 1063 |
| 2 | 6910 | 7189 | 6486 | 5990 | 1343 | 1239 | 1112 | 1075 |
| 3 | 7812 | 7752 | 7337 | 5549 | 1298 | 1444 | 1421 | 1394 |
| 4 | 9562 | 8897 | 6579 | 6793 | 1812 | 1620 | 1566 | 1383 |

*Table 1:*

*Graph 1: Results for k= 500*

*Graph 2: Results for k = 1000*

Vraag 2

Iterations vs area ratio per Noise measurement:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| area | ratio |
| 15x2,4 | 0,16 |
| 12x3 | 0,25 |
| 9x4 | 0,44 |
| 6x6 | 1,00 |

*Table 2: ratio per area*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | k=500 | | | | | k=1000 | | | | |
| Ratio | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0,16 | 5014 | 5491 | 5990 | 5549 | 6793 | 984 | 1063 | 1075 | 1394 | 1383 |
| 0,25 | 5500 | 6006 | 6486 | 7337 | 6579 | 926 | 1024 | 1112 | 1421 | 1566 |
| 0,44 | 5298 | 7309 | 7189 | 7752 | 8897 | 1098 | 1198 | 1239 | 1444 | 1620 |
| 1,00 | 7033 | 6682 | 6910 | 7812 | 9562 | 1233 | 1292 | 1343 | 1298 | 1812 |

*Table 3:*

*Graph 3 : Results for k= 500*

*Graph 4: Results for k= 1000*

<Resultaten van de drie sets>

Voor beste set (meeste iteraties):

Vraag1:

Grafiek y-as = iteratie, x-as = noise, k = 500, met items 4 verschillende planes

Grafiek y-as = iteratie, x-as = noise, k = 1000, met items 4 verschillende planes

Vraag2:

Grafiek y-as = iteratie, x-as = verschillende planes, k = 500, met items 4 verschillende noise

Grafiek y-as = iteratie, x-as = verschillende planes, k = 1000, met items 4 verschillende noise

Als het kan, een grafiek die laat zien hoe de andere datasets verschillen met de hoofd-dataset

## Evaluation and discussion

[ Write this section. Address the research questions and answer them as far as the experimental results justify this. Observe trends relating the number of iterations to b, and the number of iterations to the facet shape. At most half a page of text. Be succinct. ]

Antwoord vraag 1 en 2 voor hoofdset. Conclusie?: minder iteraties leidt tot meer variatie zdd de data zichzelf tegenspreekt.

## Conclusions

[ Summarize the paper in one short paragraph, saying what was researched and what was learned. Then write another paragraph describing what next could be done to answer the research questions better, and if applicable, give new interesting research questions that showed up because of this research. ]

Conludeer op de verschillen tussen set 1, 2 en 3, en de sets 1-3 en 4-5. Meer iteraties is wel/niet nuttig. Experiment was goed/slecht, met nieuwe iteraties is goed/slecht.
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