Structural Matching Via Optimal Basis Graphs

Fred DePiero and John Carlin

CalPoly State University, San Luis Obispo, CA USA

Goals Target RT Measurements

- Sensing Conditions / Processing
 - Cluttered scenes and noisy sensor data. Deterministic Processing.
- Algorithm Test Conditions
 - Many excess (noise) nodes: <u>up to 100</u>%
 - Variety of types: random, strongly regular, banded
 - Low dynamic range of coloring: <u>0 or 2 discrete values</u>
 - Approximation to maximum common subgraph: OK
- Application Example
 - Landmark-based registration, find corresponding points in a single step, then coordinate transform.
 - Next, we may pursue fingerprint correspondence

• Small (4-node) graphs used to characterize local structure



Basis Graphs

Fred DePiero, Ph.D. CalPoly State University San Luis Obispo, California, USA

- 'Throw a BG at an input G1, and see where it lands'
- Under conditions of a random mapping between BG and G1, Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b], describing how likely
 - Root node of $BG \sim Node ni of G1$, and
 - Node b of BG \sim Node nx of G1

('~' means 'associated with')



Fred DePiero, Ph.D. CalPoly State University San Luis Obispo, California, USA

- 'Throw a BG at an input G1, and see where it lands'
- Under conditions of a random mapping between BG and G1, Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b], describing how likely
 - Root node of $BG \sim Node ni of G1$, and
 - Node b of BG \sim Node nx of G1
- The pdf p1[ni][nx][b]
 - Describes local structure
 - Provides an 'auxiliary' means to create a description, other than just using input graphs G1 and G2





('~' means 'associated with')

- Algorithm Overview
 - Find (partial) occurrences of basis graphs in input graphs to estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b], p2.
 - Find initial mapping probabilities by comparing basis graph occurrences and using a Gaussian model, (and any coloring).
 - Refine mapping probabilities via continuous relaxation.





- For given input graph G1, and given BG
 - Count (partial) occurrences of BG appearing in G1. $O\{N^4\}$.
 - Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b] via histogram counts.





- For given input graph G1, and given BG
 - Count (partial) occurrences of BG appearing in G1. $O\{N^4\}$.
 - Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b] via histogram counts.
- Find p2[nj][ny][b] similarly for G2





- For given input graph G1, and given BG
 - Count (partial) occurrences of BG appearing in G1. $O\{N^4\}$.
 - Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b] via histogram counts.
- Find p2[nj][ny][b] similarly for G2
- For pairs of nodes ni of G1 and nj of G2

 $MIN{p1[ni][nx][b] - p2[nj][ny][b]}$ by checking each

nx, ny to find minimum



- For given input graph G1, and given BG
 - Count (partial) occurrences of BG appearing in G1. $O{N^4}$.
 - Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b] via histogram counts.
- Find p2[nj][ny][b] similarly for G2
- For pairs of nodes ni of G1 and nj of G2
 - Find P_w[ni][nj] = N{ MIN {p1[ni][nx][b] p2[nj][ny][b]} } by checking each nx, ny to find minimum and applying a-priori Gaussian model, N



- For given input graph G1, and given BG
 - Count (partial) occurrences of BG appearing in G1. $O\{N^4\}$.
 - Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b] via histogram counts.
- Find p2[nj][ny][b] similarly for G2
- For pairs of nodes ni of G1 and nj of G2
 - Find P_w[ni][nj] = N{ MIN {p1[ni][nx][b] p2[nj][ny][b]} } by checking each nx, ny to find minimum and applying a-priori Gaussian model, N
 - Find P[ni][nj] = DS { P_w[ni][nj] } for all w. DS is the Dempster-Schafer method to combine evidence: P3 = 1 (1-P1)(1-P2)



- For given input graph G1, and given BG
 - Count (partial) occurrences of BG appearing in G1. $O\{N^4\}$.
 - Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b] via histogram counts.
- Find p2[nj][ny][b] similarly for G2
- For pairs of nodes ni of G1 and nj of G2
 - Find P_w[ni][nj] = N{ MIN {p1[ni][nx][b] p2[nj][ny][b]} } by checking each nx, ny to find minimum and applying a-priori Gaussian model, N
 - Find P[ni][nj] = DS{ P_w[ni][nj] } for all w. DS is the Dempster-Schafer method to combine evidence: P3 = 1 (1-P1)(1-P2)
- Refine P[ni][nj] via continuous relaxation. Use fixed # of iterations.



- For given input graph G1, and given BG
 - Count (partial) occurrences of BG appearing in G1. $O\{N^4\}$.
 - Estimate pdf p1[ni][nx][b] via histogram counts.
- Find p2[nj][ny][b] similarly for G2
- For pairs of nodes ni of G1 and nj of G2
 - Find P_w[ni][nj] = N{ MIN {p1[ni][nx][b] p2[nj][ny][b]} } by checking each nx, ny to find minimum and applying a-priori Gaussian model, N
 - Find $P[ni][nj] = DS \{ P_w[ni][nj] \}$ for all w. DS is the Dempster-Schafer method to combine evidence: P3 = 1 (1-P1)(1-P2)
- Refine P[ni][nj] via continuous relaxation. Use fixed # of iterations.
- Matching: Use P[ni][nj], selecting most likely assignment subject to structural (and color) constraints.





A Taxonomy:

How is Local Structure Described?

- Messmer
 - Identifies small graphs that were commonly occurring in expected scenes.
 - BG: No a-priori knowledge of particular inputs, generic set of BG
- Superclique
 - Local neighborhood formed via a fixed pattern (adjacent nodes).
 - BG: Use varied size & shape of neighborhood, multiple structures.
- Paths of Varying Length
 - Random walks, also Length-r Paths (LeRP)
 - BG: (vs. RW) Deterministic, tried to optimize shape not a random shape
- (In Contrast) Eigenvalue-Based Approaches
 - Eigenvalues are a global property of adjacency matrix
 - BG: Local structure is characterized
- (Note) Relaxation, Used to refine mapping probabilities
 - *BG*: Preprocessing effort used to find initial probability mapping.

Choice of Basis Graphs Optimized

- (When using a set of BG, repeat processing for each and select best result largest common subgraph.)
- Size of BG = 4 nodes (due to throughput needs). Team of smaller BG better than single larger BG.
- Team size = 3, based on speed/performance tradeoff.
- <u>Which team members</u>?
 Check all permutations of
 4-node connected graphs (38)



Many Teams Can Perform Well



(For a 16 node input, nominal)

- Original Question: *Which is the best team choice?*
- New Question: *What <u>properties</u> are common in the better teams?*

Best Teams Share a Shape Property

- Number and size of loops
- A large percentage of the better teams share property.
- Noticed some similar trends for best teams with more nodes.
- Intuitively pleasing result!

# Loops	Length
0	_
1	3
1	4

Testing Intended to be Challenging

- Monte Carlo trials (3000)
- High clutter, up to 100% additional nodes: 16->32
- Limited coloring: either none, or 2 colors
- Strongly regular, random, banded adjacency matrix *Banded graphs approximate many natural and man-made structures.*



BG Performs Better Than LeRP For Smaller Graphs

- Conditions:
 - 16-node inputs. No color.
 - Random graphs, edge probability 0.2, 0.3
 - 0, 50, 100% additional noise nodes
 - Optimal basis used for BG



Strongly Regular Most Challenging

• Conditions:

- 16-node inputs. No color.
- Strongly regular, randomly generated graphs. Degree 3,4
- 0, 50, 100% additional noise nodes
- Optimal basis used for BG



LeRP Performs Better Than BG For Larger Graphs

- Conditions:
 - 32-node inputs. No color.
 - Random graphs with banded adjacency matrices
 - 0, 50, 100% additional noise nodes
 - Optimal basis used for BG



Modest Coloring Yields Near-Ideal Results

- Conditions:
 - 16-node inputs.
 - Random graphs with banded adjacency matrices
 - 0, 50, 100% additional noise nodes
 - Optimal basis used for BG
- All cases with 16+16 or less, under 1 sec



Conclusions

- BG can perform well with high noise (100%) and zero coloring.
- Improved means to describe local structure benefits matching performance.
- Optimal choice of BG reported

	BG	LeRP
Smaller	++	
Inputs		
Larger		+
Inputs		

Performance Vs. Size