

Three-view Focal Length Recovery From Homographies

Yaqing Ding¹ Viktor Kocur² Zuzana Berger Haladová² Qianliang Wu³
Shen Cai⁴ Jian Yang³ Zuzana Kukelova¹

¹ Visual Recognition Group, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague
{yaqing.ding, kukelzuz}@fel.cvut.cz

² Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Comenius University in Bratislava
{viktor.kocur, haladova}@fmph.uniba.sk

³ PCA Lab, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, China
{wuqiangliang, csjyang}@njust.edu.cn

⁴ Visual and Geometric Perception Lab, Donghua University
hammer_cai@163.com

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a novel approach for recovering focal lengths from three-view homographies. By examining the consistency of normal vectors between two homographies, we derive new explicit constraints between the focal lengths and homographies using an elimination technique. We demonstrate that three-view homographies provide two additional constraints, enabling the recovery of one or two focal lengths. We discuss four possible cases, including three cameras having an unknown equal focal length, three cameras having two different unknown focal lengths, three cameras where one focal length is known, and the other two cameras have equal or different unknown focal lengths. All the problems can be converted into solving polynomials in one or two unknowns, which can be efficiently solved using Sturm sequence or hidden variable technique. Evaluation using both synthetic and real data shows that the proposed solvers are both faster and more accurate than methods relying on existing two-view solvers. The code and data are available on <https://github.com/kocurvik/hf>.

1. Introduction

Estimating relative camera motion from multiple views using point correspondences is a classical problem in computer vision. Efficient solutions for various camera configurations have been well-studied in the literature [4, 18–21, 27, 33, 37, 38, 43]. For example, with two fully calibrated cameras, the relative camera pose can be efficiently determined using 5-point algorithms [19, 27, 37]. In contrast to the two view case, the calibrated three-view rela-




Figure 1. Three cameras view the same plane, defining two homographies $\mathbf{H}_2, \mathbf{H}_3$. The two homographies have the same reference image, which should correspond to the same normal vector \mathbf{n} .

tive pose problem is much more challenging. This problem can be solved using four triplets of point correspondences [38, 39],¹ however it results in a very complex system of polynomial equations. Thus, the existing solutions [24, 38] to this problem are only approximate and can often fail, *i.e.*, the returned solution can be arbitrarily far from the geometrically correct solution.

An important scenario arises when the focal length is the only unknown in the camera intrinsic parameters, referred to as the partially calibrated case. This setup is practical since most modern cameras have zero skew and a centered principal point. When two cameras share an equal yet unknown focal length, their relative motion and the common focal length can be estimated using six point correspondences [19, 27, 29, 43]. Similarly, if one camera is fully calibrated and the other has an unknown focal length, six

¹Note, that configuration of four points in three views generates an over-constrained problem. In this case, we have 12 constraint for 11 degrees of freedom (DOF). A minimal solution would need to drop one constraint, *e.g.*, by considering only a line passing through one of the points in the third view [24] or by considering a “half” point correspondence.

point correspondences are also required [5, 27, 29]. For two cameras with different, unknown focal lengths, at least seven point correspondences are necessary to recover both the relative motion and the focal lengths [3, 18].

Three-view focal length problems are significantly more complex, often involving polynomial systems with hundreds of solutions. For example, when the three cameras share the same focal length, there can be up to 668 possible solutions [7, 10, 13]. Such systems can be solved using homotopy continuation methods [22, 41]. The running times of the CPU variants of the solvers for four points in three cameras with unknown shared focal length range from 250ms to 1456ms. Efficient GPU implementations are much faster; however, with runtimes 16.7ms to 154ms they are still too slow for practical applications.

Scenes with planar surfaces, such as floors, walls, doors, facades, and other common structures, are prevalent in man-made environments. When points are coplanar, homography-based algorithms require four point correspondences [20] to estimate the relative pose of two cameras. Unfortunately, any attempt to recover intrinsic parameters from two views of a planar surface (using only point correspondences without additional priors) is futile, as stated in the following theorem [36, 37]: "For any choice of intrinsic parameters, any homography can be realized between two views by positioning the views and a plane in a particular way." However, it has been shown that focal lengths can be recovered from three-view homographies [23, 35], *i.e.* three cameras observing a planar surface (see illustration in Figure 1).

In this paper, we propose novel solutions to the problem of estimating the focal lengths from three-view homographies. We consider four possible cases: (i) three cameras having an unknown equal focal length, (ii) three cameras having two different unknown focal lengths, (iii) three cameras with one known focal length and two unknown equal focal lengths, and (iv) three cameras with one known focal length and two unknown different focal lengths (see Table 1). We propose novel formulations to these problems and discuss the number of possible solutions for each case. The main contributions of the paper include:

- We solve the three-view focal length problems using four coplanar points. We use the property that four coplanar points in three views define two independent homographies, which should share the same plane normal vector.
- Based on the normal vector consistence, we derive new explicit constraints on the focal lengths and the homographies. We provide a detailed problem formulation for the above-mentioned cases, which are then converted into solving polynomial systems in only one or two unknowns.
- This allows us to develop solvers using efficient Sturm sequences or hidden variable technique. The proposed solvers are significantly more efficient than the existing

solvers to this problem [23]. Moreover, in extensive synthetic and real experiments, we show an improvement in accuracy over the state-of-the-art two-view solvers.

- We propose a new dataset consisting of 6 scenes (four indoor and 2 outdoor) containing 1870 images captured with 14 different cameras. Ground truth focal lengths are estimated using the standard calibration method [46]. We will make both the dataset and the code publicly available.
- To our knowledge, we are the first to extensively evaluate focal length self-calibration from three views of planar scenes on large amounts of synthetic and real scenes, and compare the solutions with different two-view and three-view baselines for cameras observing general scenes.

2. Related Work

Homography estimation is a well-studied problem in the literature and can be solved using the 4-point algorithm, which involves solving a system of eight homogeneous linear equations [20]. However, with only point correspondences, two-view homography does not provide additional constraints on the focal length, making the two-view homography not suitable for self-calibration. To recover the intrinsic parameters from the two-view homography, we need additional priors. In [4], under pure rotation assumption, the authors propose two minimal solutions for the two-view homography-based focal length estimation with one or two focal length parameters. In [15], the authors use sensorfusion, *i.e.*, combining camera with gravity from IMU (Inertial measurement unit), to reduce the DOF of the motion parameters. In general, the gravity prior can provide up to two constraints on the focal length.

Focal length recovery from homographies in more views was first discussed in [35]. Malis *et al.* compute homographies among multiple views, iteratively testing various focal lengths to find the one that minimizes a cost function. However, this method is time-consuming and sensitive to noise.

The work most closely related to ours is by Heikkilä [23], where the constraints on the focal length and the normal vector are derived, and non-iterative solutions to the problem of recovering focal lengths from three-view homographies is proposed. For three cameras with the same unknown focal length, [23] solves three polynomials in three unknowns. However, these polynomials have very high degrees, making them challenging to solve efficiently. Heikkilä first applies SVD to a 82×82 matrix, followed by Gaussian-Jordan elimination of a 82×164 matrix. Finally, the solver finds the solutions by computing the eigenvalues of a 82×82 matrix. For three cameras with two different focal lengths, Heikkilä's method needs to solve four polynomials in four unknowns by performing Gaussian-Jordan elimination of a 176×352 matrix and computing the eigenvalues of a 176×176 matrix.

In contrast to complex solutions presented in [23], we

propose very efficient solutions to the problem of recovering focal lengths from three-view homographies. For cameras with the same focal length, our novel solver only requires computing the roots of a univariate polynomial of degree 9, which can be efficiently solved using Sturm sequences. For cameras with two different focal lengths, we compute solutions from the eigenvalues of a 18×18 matrix.

For general scenes, focal lengths can be recovered together with the epipolar geometry. For two cameras with equal unknown focal lengths, the minimal 6-point solvers [5, 19, 27, 29, 43] use rank-2 and trace constraints on the essential matrix. The 5-point solver [44] solves the plane+parallax scenario for cameras with unknown focal length using four coplanar points and one off-plane point. This solver can be used within the DEGENSAC framework [9] to complement the six point solvers in order to improve performance for scenes that are not completely planar, but contain a dominant plane. For the single unknown focal length problem, the two-view geometry can be solved using the single-side 6-point solver [5, 29]. For the relative pose problem with different and unknown focal lengths, the solution computes the fundamental matrix using the 7-point solver [20], followed by the extraction of the focal lengths from this matrix [3, 25].

As discussed above, three-view focal length problems for general scenes are significantly more complex and their homotopy continuation solutions [7, 10, 13] are impractical.

3. Problem Statement

In this section we introduce the three-view focal length problem using coplanar points along with the used notation. We consider a set of 3D points $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}$ which lie on a plane defined by

$$\mathbf{n}^\top \mathbf{X}_i = d, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{n} = [n_x, n_y, n_z]$ is the unit normal of the plane and d is the distance of the plane to origin.

The points are observed by three cameras such that \mathbf{X}_i is projected to a 2D point $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ by the j -th camera $\mathbf{K}_j[\mathbf{R}_j | \mathbf{t}_j]$. In many practical scenarios, it is often reasonable to assume that the cameras have square-shaped pixels, and the principal point coincides with the image center [19]. This leaves only the focal point unknown and thus $\mathbf{K}_j = \text{diag}(f_j, f_j, 1)$.

Without loss of generality, we set the coordinate system such that $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{t}_1 = \mathbf{0}$. We use $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ to denote the points $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}$ expressed in the coordinate system of the j -th camera giving us

$$\mathbf{X}_{i,j} = \mathbf{R}_j \mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{t}_j, j = 2, 3. \quad (2)$$

We can express the 3D point $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ using the 2D projections $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ as

$$\mathbf{X}_{i,j} = \lambda_{i,j} \mathbf{K}_j^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{i,j}, \quad (3)$$

where $\lambda_{i,j}$ is the depth of the point. Substituting (1) into (2) we obtain

$$\mathbf{X}_{i,j} = \mathbf{R}_j \mathbf{X}_i + \frac{\mathbf{t}_j}{d} \mathbf{n}^\top \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{X}_i, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_j = \mathbf{R}_j + \frac{\mathbf{t}_j}{d} \mathbf{n}^\top$ is the Euclidean homography matrix. Further substituting (3) into (4) and expressing \mathbf{X}_i in (4) in the coordinate system of the first camera, we obtain

$$\lambda_{i,j} \mathbf{K}_j^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{i,j} = \lambda_{i,1} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{K}_1^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{i,1}, \quad (5)$$

which can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{m}_{i,j}]_\times \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{m}_{i,1} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \text{with } \mathbf{G}_j &\sim \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where \sim indicates equality up to a scale factor and \mathbf{G}_j represents homography between the first and the j^{th} camera.

By using point correspondences between two images we can use equations (6) to obtain 2D homographies \mathbf{G}_j . Our aim is to estimate the unknown focal lengths f_j from \mathbf{G}_2 and \mathbf{G}_3 . There are several possible configurations of three cameras based on combinations of known and unknown equal or different focal lengths. In Section 5 we derive solvers for four such camera configurations denoted as Case I-IV, which we list in Table 1.

We derive the new solvers by utilizing a key observation that both \mathbf{H}_2 and \mathbf{H}_3 are related to the normal vector \mathbf{n} . In the next section, we use this to show that \mathbf{G}_2 and \mathbf{G}_3 can provide two constraints on the intrinsic parameters, which can be used to recover the focal lengths.

4. Our Approach

Given two 2D homographies \mathbf{G}_j , we have

$$\mathbf{H}_j \sim \mathbf{K}_j^{-1} \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{K}_1. \quad (7)$$

Thus for known \mathbf{G}_j , \mathbf{H}_j are polynomial matrices in the focal length parameters. To solve for the focal lengths, we need to find the constraints on \mathbf{H}_j . Based on the formulation of the Euclidean homography (4), we know that [20]

$$\mathbf{E}_j = [\mathbf{t}_j]_\times \mathbf{H}_j = [\mathbf{t}_j]_\times (\mathbf{R}_j + \frac{\mathbf{t}_j}{d} \mathbf{n}^\top) = [\mathbf{t}_j]_\times \mathbf{R}_j, \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{E}_j is the essential matrix corresponding to \mathbf{H}_j . Let's consider \mathbf{H}_j^\top , where

$$\mathbf{H}_j^\top = \mathbf{R}_j^\top + \frac{\mathbf{n}}{d} \mathbf{t}_j^\top. \quad (9)$$

It can be easily shown that the essential matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j$ corresponding to \mathbf{H}_j^\top is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j = [\mathbf{n}]_\times \mathbf{H}_j^\top = [\mathbf{n}]_\times (\mathbf{R}_j^\top + \frac{\mathbf{n}}{d} \mathbf{t}_j^\top) = [\mathbf{n}]_\times \mathbf{R}_j^\top. \quad (10)$$

Problems	Proposed Solvers	Focal length			No. of Solutions		Eigenvalue		Time (μs)	
		View 1	View 2	View 3	Ours	Heikkilä [23]	Ours	Heikkilä [23]	Ours	Heikkilä [23]
Case I	\mathbf{H}_{fff}	f	f	f	9	70	Sturm	82×82	17.3	1404
Case II	\mathbf{H}_{ff}	Known	f	f	6	-	Sturm	-	19.4	-
Case III	$\mathbf{H}_{f\rho\rho}$	f	ρ	ρ	17	152	18×18	176×176	200	5486
Case IV	$\mathbf{H}_{f\rho}$	Known	f	ρ	9	-	12×12	-	106	-

Table 1. Four possible cases for three views. i) Equal and unknown focal length for three cameras; ii) Known focal length of reference camera, equal and unknown focal length for target cameras; iii) Focal lengths of reference camera and two target cameras are different; iv) Known focal length of reference camera, different and unknown focal lengths for target cameras.

Thus the essential matrices derived from different \mathbf{H}_j^\top are related by the same normal vector \mathbf{n} in the reference camera coordinate. As shown in [37, 42], a valid essential matrix should satisfy the singular and trace constraints

$$\det(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j) = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j^\top \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j - \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j^\top) \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j = \mathbf{0}.$$

In our case, we omit the zero determinant constraint since $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_j$ is already singular by construction (10).

Substituting (7) into the trace constraints (11) gives us nine equations per homography, *i.e.*, 18 equations for two homography matrices \mathbf{H}_2 and \mathbf{H}_3 . Only two from the nine equations are algebraically independent, *i.e.*, one homography matrix provides two constraints on the focal lengths and the normal vector parameters. For the case of equal unknown focal length, we have only 3 unknowns (f, n_x, n_y) (since (11) is homogenous in \mathbf{n} , we can let $n_z = 1$) and thus an over-constrained problem. The problem can be solved using only one of the nine trace constraint equations for $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_2$. These equations can be solved using the Gröbner basis method [30, 32] The final solver performs Gauss-Jordan elimination of a 118×141 matrix and extracts solutions from the eigenvectors of a 23×23 matrix. However, this solver is not efficient enough for real-time applications.

To derive more efficient solutions, we use additional constraints. It can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{n}]_\times \mathbf{H}_j^\top \mathbf{H}_j [\mathbf{n}]_\times^\top &= [\mathbf{n}]_\times \mathbf{R}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_j [\mathbf{n}]_\times^\top, \\ &= [\mathbf{n}]_\times [\mathbf{n}]_\times^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Substituting (7) into (12) gives

$$[\mathbf{n}]_\times \mathbf{Q}_j [\mathbf{n}]_\times^\top \sim [\mathbf{n}]_\times [\mathbf{n}]_\times^\top, \quad (13)$$

with

$$\mathbf{Q}_j = (\mathbf{K}_j^{-1} \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{K}_1)^\top (\mathbf{K}_j^{-1} \mathbf{G}_j \mathbf{K}_1). \quad (14)$$

Note that, we use \sim instead of equality in (13) since \mathbf{H}_j from (7) is up to a scale factor. Since \mathbf{Q}_j are symmetric

matrices, we can write them as

$$\mathbf{Q}_j = \begin{bmatrix} q_{j1} & q_{j2} & q_{j3} \\ q_{j2} & q_{j4} & q_{j5} \\ q_{j3} & q_{j5} & q_{j6} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Then (13) can be rewritten as

$$[\mathbf{n}]_\times \mathbf{Q}_j [\mathbf{n}]_\times^\top = s_j [\mathbf{n}]_\times [\mathbf{n}]_\times^\top, \quad j = 2, 3 \quad (16)$$

where we add scale factors to ensure the equality. Note that both the left and right of (16) are symmetric matrices, hence we can get 6 equations for each j .

To simplify our 12 equations, we can eliminate some unknowns from these equations using the elimination ideal technique [11]. This technique was recently used to solve several minimal camera geometry problems [29].

In our case, we first create an ideal J generated by 12 polynomials (16). Then, the unknown elements of the normal $\{n_x, n_y\}$ and the scale factor s_2, s_3 are eliminated from the generators of J by computing the generators of the elimination ideal $J_1 = J \cap \mathbb{C}[q_{21}, \dots, q_{36}]$. Here, q_j are the entries of $\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_3$. These generators can be computed using computer algebra software Macaulay2 [17] (for more details and the input Macaulay2 code see the SM).

In this case, the elimination ideal J is generated by seven polynomials g_i of degree 6 in the elements of $\mathbf{Q}_j, j = 2, 3$. The final constraints are only related to the 12 elements of the symmetric matrices \mathbf{Q}_i (6 from \mathbf{Q}_2 and 6 from \mathbf{Q}_3). To the best of our knowledge, these constraints are first shown in this paper and have not been used in the computer vision literature before. Alternatively, we can eliminate n_x, n_y from the 18 equations of the trace constraints (11), however, this will result in more complicated equations since the constraints will be related to the 18 elements of \mathbf{H}_i .

5. New Solvers

In this section, we propose solvers for the four different cases outlined in Tab. 1 using the constraints derived in the previous section. We also propose a method based on LO-RANSAC [8] that utilizes the new solvers for robust estimation of focal lengths from three views of planar scenes.

5.1. One Unknown Focal Length Parameter

Case I. We first consider the case where the three cameras have equal and unknown focal length, *i.e.*, $f_1 = f_2 = f_3 = f$, and $\mathbf{K}_{1,2,3} = \text{diag}(f, f, 1)$. By substituting \mathbf{K}_j into the generators g_i , $i = 1, \dots, 7$ of the elimination ideal J , we obtain 7 univariate polynomials in f , which are of degree 9 in $\alpha = f^2$. They form an over-constrained system. We only need one of them to find the solutions to f . To find the roots of the degree 9 univariate polynomial we use the Sturm sequence method [16]. We denote this solver as \mathbf{H}_{fff} .

Case II. In the second case, we assume that f_1 is known, and $f_2 = f_3 = f$ are unknown. This case occurs when a calibrated camera is used to capture the reference image, and the second uncalibrated camera captures two target images. Similar to Case I, we only need to find the roots of a univariate polynomial in f , in this case of degree 6, using Sturm sequences [16]. We denote this solver as \mathbf{H}_{ff} .

5.2. Two Unknown Focal Length Parameters

In the second group of solvers, we consider self-calibration problems with two different unknown focal lengths. There are two practical cases:

Case III. In this case, we assume two unknown focal lengths $f_1 = f$, and $f_2 = f_3 = \rho$, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{K}_1 = \text{diag}(f, f, 1)$ and $\mathbf{K}_{2,3} = \text{diag}(\rho, \rho, 1)$. This corresponds to a situation where the first uncalibrated camera is used to capture the reference image and the second uncalibrated camera captures two target images. By substituting \mathbf{K}_j into the constraints g_i from the elimination ideal, we obtain 7 polynomials in two unknowns α, β , ($\alpha = f^2, \beta = \rho^2$), which can be written as

$$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (17)$$

where \mathbf{M} is a 7×28 coefficient matrix and

$$\mathbf{v} = [1, \beta, \dots, \beta^6, \alpha, \alpha\beta, \dots, \alpha\beta^6, \dots, \alpha^3, \dots, \alpha^3\beta^6]^\top, \quad (18)$$

is a vector consisting of the 28 monomials. The system of polynomial equations in (17) can be solved using different algebraic methods [11]. There are also different state-of-the-art approaches for generating efficient algebraic solvers [2, 19, 26, 27, 32]. In this paper, we use the hidden variable technique to derive polynomial eigenvalue solution based on [27].

Polynomial Eigenvalue Solution. The polynomial system in (17) contains four polynomials in two unknowns (α, β) , and the highest degree of the unknown α is 3. In this case, α can be chosen as the hidden variable, *i.e.* we can consider it as a parameter. Then the system of polynomial equations (17) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{C}(\alpha)\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{C}(\alpha)$ is a 7×7 polynomial matrix parameterized by α , and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = [1, \beta, \dots, \beta^6]^\top$ is a vector of monomials in β

without α . $\mathbf{C}(\alpha)$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{C}(\alpha) = \alpha^3\mathbf{C}_3 + \alpha^2\mathbf{C}_2 + \alpha\mathbf{C}_1 + \mathbf{C}_0, \quad (20)$$

where $\mathbf{C}_3, \mathbf{C}_2, \mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_0$ are 7×7 coefficient matrices containing only numbers. For this problem, the matrix \mathbf{C}_3 is only rank 4, resulting in four zero eigenvalues. To speed up the solver, we remove these zero eigenvalues from the computations. To do this, we first need to transform the matrices \mathbf{C}_i by considering linear combinations of their rows, such that there are three zero rows in the transformed matrix \mathbf{C}_3 . To remove the zero rows in the transformed \mathbf{C}_3 , we use the technique from [15] and consider the transpose of (19)

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^\top \mathbf{C}^\top(\alpha) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (21)$$

In this case, we have

$$\mathbf{C}^\top(\alpha) = \alpha^3\mathbf{C}_3^\top + \alpha^2\mathbf{C}_2^\top + \alpha\mathbf{C}_1^\top + \mathbf{C}_0^\top. \quad (22)$$

The zero rows in \mathbf{C}_3 are now zero columns in \mathbf{C}_3^\top . Since \mathbf{C}_0 is full rank, we let $\gamma = \frac{1}{\alpha}$ and rewrite (22) as

$$\mathbf{C}^\top(\gamma) = \gamma^3\mathbf{C}_0^\top + \gamma^2\mathbf{C}_1^\top + \gamma\mathbf{C}_2^\top + \mathbf{C}_3^\top. \quad (23)$$

If we consider (23) as a polynomial eigenvalue problem [1], the solutions to γ are the eigenvalues of 21×21 matrix

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ -\mathbf{C}_0^{-\top}\mathbf{C}_3^\top & -\mathbf{C}_0^{-\top}\mathbf{C}_2^\top & -\mathbf{C}_0^{-\top}\mathbf{C}_1^\top \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

The three zero columns in \mathbf{C}_3^\top can now be removed together with their corresponding rows to eliminate the zero eigenvalues [27]. In this way, we obtain 18 possible solutions. Once we have solutions to α , the remaining unknown β can be extracted from the null vector of $\mathbf{C}(\alpha)$ based on (19). We denote this solver as $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho\rho}$.

Note that in the proposed polynomial eigenvalue formulation, we solve a relaxed version of the original problem (11). The original system (11) has 17 solutions, as it can be shown, *e.g.*, using the computer algebra system Macaulay2 [17]. In the polynomial eigenvalue formulation, we have one spurious solution that does not ensure that the elements of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ satisfy $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = [1, \beta, \dots, \beta^6]^\top$.

Case IV. Finally, we consider a case where f_1 is known and $f_2 = f, f_3 = \rho$ are unknown. The solver for this case, we denote it as $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho}$, performs steps similar to the solver $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho\rho}$ for Case III. In this case, the $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho}$ solver computes the eigenvalues of a 12×12 matrix. Due to space limitations, we describe the $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho}$ solver for Case IV in the SM.

5.3. Robust Estimation of Focal Lengths

To estimate focal lengths from three images of planar scenes we utilize the LO-RANSAC framework [8] using a strategy

inspired by [37]. We first extract triplet point correspondences from images (e.g. using [12, 34]). In each RANSAC iteration we sample 4 triplets from which we estimate \mathbf{G}_2 and \mathbf{G}_3 using DLT [20]. These matrices are used as inputs to solvers proposed in Section 5.1 and 5.2.

For each resulting real positive solution we use (7) to obtain \mathbf{H}_2 , which is then decomposed into two possible poses $(\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{t}_2)$. We then use these poses and focal lengths to triangulate three of the sampled points in the first two views thus obtaining points \mathbf{X}_{i1} . We use the corresponding points in the third view to obtain \mathbf{R}_3 and \mathbf{t}_3 using the P3P solver [14]. Note that it is possible to obtain \mathbf{R}_3 and \mathbf{t}_3 by decomposing \mathbf{H}_3 and using a single correspondence to obtain the scale of \mathbf{t}_3 , but in practical experiments we found the approach using P3P faster and more accurate. We score the generated models using pairwise Sampson error for each of the three image pairs. Whenever a new so-far-best model is found we perform local optimization using the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm minimizing the pairwise Sampson error across the three pairs of views. In addition to the estimated focal lengths this strategy also produces the relative poses of all three cameras. We denote the proposed robust estimators as $\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \text{P3P}$ for Case I, $\mathbf{H}_{ff} + \text{P3P}$ for Case II, $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho\rho} + \text{P3P}$ for Case III and $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho} + \text{P3P}$ for Case IV to distinguish them from the solvers. Our implementation is based on PoseLib [31].

For Case I and II this approach is able to find the single unknown focal length even when the scene is fully planar. For Case III and IV we may obtain multiple solutions from which the correct focal lengths can not be distinguished using only planar points thus requiring some off-plane points during scoring and local optimization.

6. Experiments

We perform extensive experiments on synthetic and real data to evaluate the performance of the proposed solvers and the robust focal length estimation strategy described in Section 5.3. We compare our solvers with several baselines using either pairwise or triplet correspondences. For pairwise correspondences, we consider the 6 point solver for relative pose with one unknown shared focal length [27] denoted as $f\mathbf{E}f$ and its combination with the 4 + 1 point plane and parallax solver [44] using the DEGENSAC framework [9], which we denote as $f\mathbf{E}f + \text{PP}$. We also evaluate the solver for one unknown focal length [5] denoted as $\mathbf{E}f$. When considering triplets, we use a strategy [37] of using a pairwise solver followed by triangulation of points and registration of the third camera using the P3P solver [14]. (see Section 5.3 for more details). We denote the methods that work with triplet correspondences as $f\mathbf{E}f + \text{P3P}$, $f\mathbf{E}f + \text{PP} + \text{P3P}$, $\mathbf{E}f + \text{P3P}$ respectively.

Note that we do not compare with the solvers proposed in [23]. As visible from Table 1 these solvers are significantly




Figure 2. Numerical stability of the proposed solvers.

cantly slower than our solvers² and they return significantly more solutions that need to be tested inside RANSAC. As such they are not practical for real-world applications. Moreover, the solver for Case IV proposed in [23] returns solutions only to one of the two unknown focal lengths.

Except for the numerical stability experiment, due to space constraints, in the main paper we present only results for Case I and Case II. Experiments for Case III and IV for synthetic and real data are in the SM.

6.1. Synthetic experiments

Numerical Stability. In the first experiment, we study the numerical stability of the solvers proposed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. The synthetic data is generated in the following setup. We sample 200 3D points distributed on a plane with a random orientation. The focal lengths of the cameras are generated from a uniform distribution $f_g \in [300, 3000]$ px with a field of view of 90 degrees. The baseline between consecutive cameras is set to be 10 percent of the average scene distance. We generated 10,000 random scenes with 3D points on different planes and different transformations between consecutive views. The focal length error ξ_f is defined as:

$$\xi_f = \frac{|f_e - f_g|}{f_g}, \quad (25)$$

where f_g, f_e represent the ground-truth focal length and the estimated focal length, respectively. For the solvers with different focal lengths, we use the geometric mean of the two focal length errors $\xi_f = \sqrt{\xi_{f_1} \xi_{f_2}}$.

Fig. 2 shows the results of the \log_{10} relative focal length error for the proposed methods by considering the solution closest to the ground truth. As can be seen, all of our solvers are numerically stable without large errors.

Accuracy of the Estimated Focal Lengths. Next, we evaluate the performance of the robust estimators proposed in Section 5.3 on synthetic data. We show how varying noise levels and the proportion of points that lie on a plane affect their accuracy compared to baselines.

The synthetic data is generated with $n = 200$ 3D points visible by the three $1920\text{px} \times 1080\text{px}$ cameras with focal

²The reported runtimes are runtimes of the original Matlab implementations of [23] and the Matlab + mex implementations of our solvers on I7-11700K CPU.




Figure 3. Focal length errors for the evaluated methods in synthetic experiments. **Case I:** (a) We vary the proportion of points which lie on the dominant plane with fixed noise $\sigma = 1$. (b, c) We vary noise σ with (b) $n_p/n = 1.0$ (i.e. all points lie on a plane) and (c) $n_p/n = 0.5$. **Case II:** (d) We vary the proportion of points which lie on the dominant plane with fixed noise $\sigma = 1$. (e) We vary noise σ with $n_p/n = 1.0$. (f) We perturb the known focal length ρ so that its error is ξ_ρ with fixed noise $\sigma = 1$ and $n_p/n = 1.0$.

	Method	Sample	Median ξ_f	Mean ξ_f	mAA _f (0.1)	mAA _f (0.2)	Runtime (ms)
Case I	$\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ ours	4 triplets	0.0439	0.1491	51.49	65.58	49.31
	$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P3P}$ [45]	6 triplets	0.0503	0.2215	47.83	61.45	37.44
	$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP} + \mathbf{P3P}$	6 triplets	0.0518	0.2240	47.11	60.65	41.18
	$f\mathbf{E}f$ [27]	6 pairs	0.4793	0.7143	10.49	17.07	24.54
	$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP}$ [44]	6 pairs	0.5166	0.7935	10.31	16.51	31.95
Case II	$\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ ours	4 triplets	0.0611	0.2244	43.11	55.54	35.97
	$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P3P}$ [45]	6 triplets	0.0692	0.2438	40.42	52.35	31.81
	$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP} + \mathbf{P3P}$	6 triplets	0.0714	0.2529	39.86	51.58	34.35
	$\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P3P}$	6 triplets	0.0691	0.2655	40.60	52.13	36.82
	$f\mathbf{E}f$ [27]	6 pairs	0.4623	0.7085	12.01	19.12	28.59
	$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP}$ [44]	6 pairs	0.4968	0.7875	12.11	18.98	37.60
	$\mathbf{E}f$ [5]	6 pairs	0.6827	0.6843	8.87	13.01	22.59

Table 2. Comparison of the focal length estimation accuracy of the evaluated methods on our dataset of planar scenes.

lengths sampled uniformly $f_g \in [300, 3000]$. The cameras are positioned randomly such that their views overlap. n_p of the total n points lie on a plane with random orientation. From the 3D points we create triplets with 75% inlier ratio by randomly shuffling 25% of the points. We add Gaussian noise with standard deviation of σ to the pixel coordinates of points. We run all of the tested methods in PoseLib [31] for a fixed number of 100 iterations with the Sampson error threshold of 3 px. For methods that use only pairwise correspondences we consider only the first two views. For each configuration we generate 100 random scenes.

Fig. 3 shows the results of the synthetic experiments in which we vary both σ and n_p . For Case II we also show how the error in the known focal length ρ affects the accuracy of the methods (Fig. 3 (f)). When considering Case I,

$\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ shows significantly better accuracy than the remaining methods when a large portion of points lie on a single dominant plane (Fig. 3 (a)) even under high levels of noise (Fig. 3 (b)). This indicates a clear superiority of $\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ when dealing with images of planar scenes. Similarly, for Case II, $\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ also shows improved focal length estimation accuracy when considering planar scenes, although the improvement over competing methods is not as significant. For fully planar scenes, as expected, the two-view solvers $f\mathbf{E}f$, $f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP}$ and $\mathbf{E}f$ fail to generate correct solutions (Fig. 3 (b),(e),(f)). For scenes with few of the plane points, e.g., scenes with $n_p/n \in [0.95, 0.9]$, the $f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP}$ solver, i.e., the solver where the 4 + 1 plane+parallax solver is utilized within DEGENSAC with $f\mathbf{E}f$ [44], outperforms the $f\mathbf{E}f$ solver (Fig. 3 (a)). This




Figure 4. Median ξ_f and $mAA_f(0.1)$ plotted for different number of RANSAC iterations (10, 20, 50, 100, 200, 500, 1000, 2000, 5000, 10000). All methods are evaluated in combination with $\mathbf{P3P}$ [14] and non-linear optimization within PoseLib [31]. We do not include methods relying solely on pairwise correspondences since they all result in very low accuracy (median $\xi_f > 0.4$, $mAA_f(0.1) < 0.2$).

is not surprising since the $f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP}$ solver [44] was developed to handle scenes with dominant planes and some off-the plane points. The solvers that work with triplet correspondences, *i.e.* $f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P3P}$, $f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP} + \mathbf{P3P}$, $\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P3P}$, outperform the two-view solvers.

6.2. Real-World Experiments



Figure 5. The six planar scenes captured in our evaluation dataset.

Dataset

Since there are no suitable datasets for evaluating focal length recovery on planar scenes, we have collected a new dataset for evaluation which we will make publicly available. We have collected the dataset using 14 different cameras. For each camera we obtained ground truth focal lengths using the standard calibration method [46] with a checkerboard pattern. Using these cameras we have captured four indoor and two outdoor planar scenes from various positions resulting 1870 images in total. Sample images of the scenes are shown in Fig. 5. To obtain triplet correspondences we used SuperPoint features [12] with Light-Glue matches [34]. More details are available in SM.

For Case I we have randomly sampled 500 image triplets per camera per scene. For Case II/III we sampled 50 triplets per camera pair and for Case IV 10 triplets per camera triplet. We only kept image triplets which had at least 10

triplet matches. For some scenes and cameras it was impossible to obtain 500, 50 or 10 triplets respectively resulting in 35 472 image triplets for Case I, 18 219 triplets for Case II/III and 12 876 for Case IV. Details on the cameras, numbers of images and triplets are provided in SM.

Evaluation. We evaluate the methods using ξ_f (25) and the mean average accuracy derived from ξ_f [25], which we denote as $mAA_f(t)$ representing the normalized area under the curve of the cumulative distribution function of ξ_f on interval $[0, t]$.

Table 2 shows the results for our $\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{ff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ solvers and the baselines for RANSAC with a fixed maximum number of 1000 iterations, with early termination at 0.9999 success probability (allowed after the first 100 iterations), and epipolar threshold of 3px. The results show significantly better accuracy of $\mathbf{H}_{fff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{ff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ compared to the baseline methods.

To further demonstrate the efficacy of our method we also performed speed-vs-accuracy tradeoff evaluation by running each method for a different number of fixed RANSAC iterations. We measured runtime for all methods on one core of Intel Icelake 6338 2GHz processor. The results for our methods and the baselines are shown in Fig. 4. Since our methods use the same non-linear optimization strategy as the baselines which utilize triplets, given enough iterations the different methods eventually converge to similar focal lengths resulting in similar accuracy. However, the results show that our solvers lead to very accurate results in fewer iterations compared to the baselines showcasing their practical viability for focal length estimation.

Limitations. Our solvers have several limitations. First, the pure translation is a degenerate case for the \mathbf{H}_{fff} and \mathbf{H}_{fpp} solvers. However, if the focal length of the reference camera is known, we can still recover the focal lengths of the target cameras under pure translation.

Using the proposed solvers we may obtain multiple solutions. Therefore these solvers need to be used within a robust estimation framework such as RANSAC. Other sim-

pler strategies such as voting [6] may fail due to the fact that more than one solution may be geometrically feasible.

Moreover, as mentioned above for Case III and IV focal lengths can not be distinguished using only planar points thus requiring some off-plane points during scoring. Note that this is a property of the problem and not the solvers. Problem with recovering one focal length for Case III was mentioned also in [23].

7. Conclusion

We address the problem of estimating the focal lengths of three cameras observing a planar scene. We derive novel constraints for this problem and use them to propose four new efficient solvers for different possible camera configurations. We extensively evaluate the proposed solvers on both real and synthetic data showing their superiority over baseline approaches. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to perform such extensive evaluation for these problems. For this purpose, we introduce a new public dataset of planar scenes captured by multiple calibrated cameras.

Acknowledgments

Y.D. and Z.K. were supported by the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) JUNIOR STAR Grant (No. 22-23183M). V.K. and Z.B.H. were supported by the TERAIS project, a Horizon-Widera-2021 program of the European Union under the Grant agreement number 101079338 and by Slovak Research and Development Agency under project APVV-23-0250. Z. B. H. was supported by the grant KEGA 004UK-4/2024 “DICH: Digitalization of Cultural Heritage”. Q. W. and J. Y. were supported by the National Science Fund of China under Grant Nos. U24A20330 and 62361166670. The results were obtained using the computational resources procured in the project National competence centre for high performance computing (project code: 311070AKF2) funded by European Regional Development Fund, EU Structural Funds Informatization of society, Operational Program Integrated Infrastructure.

References

- [1] Zhaojun Bai, James Demmel, Jack Dongarra, Axel Ruhe, and Henk van der Vorst. *Templates for the solution of algebraic eigenvalue problems: a practical guide*. SIAM, 2000. 5
- [2] Snehal Bhayani, Zuzana Kukelova, and Janne Heikkila. A sparse resultant based method for efficient minimal solvers. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020. 5
- [3] Sylvain Bougnoux. From projective to euclidean space under any practical situation, a criticism of self-calibration. In *Sixth International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 790–796. IEEE, 1998. 2, 3
- [4] Matthew Brown, Richard I Hartley, and David Nistér. Minimal solutions for panoramic stitching. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2007. 1, 2
- [5] Martin Bujnak, Zuzana Kukelova, and Tomas Pajdla. 3d reconstruction from image collections with a single known focal length. In *2009 IEEE 12th International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1803–1810. IEEE, 2009. 2, 3, 6, 7
- [6] Martin Bujnak, Zuzana Kukelova, and Tomas Pajdla. Robust focal length estimation by voting in multi-view scene reconstruction. In *Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13–24. Springer, 2009. 9
- [7] Chiang-Heng Chien, Hongyi Fan, Ahmad Abdelfattah, Elias Tsigaridas, Stanimire Tomov, and Benjamin Kimia. GPU-based homotopy continuation for minimal problems in computer vision. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. 2, 3
- [8] Ondřej Chum, Jiří Matas, and Josef Kittler. Locally optimized ransac. In *Pattern Recognition: 25th DAGM Symposium, Magdeburg, Germany, September 10-12, 2003. Proceedings 25*, pages 236–243. Springer, 2003. 4, 5
- [9] Ondrej Chum, Tomas Werner, and Jiri Matas. Two-view geometry estimation unaffected by a dominant plane. In *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'05)*, volume 1, pages 772–779. IEEE, 2005. 3, 6, 11
- [10] Andrea Porfiri Dal Cin, Timothy Duff, Luca Magri, and Tomas Pajdla. Minimal perspective autocalibration. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. 2, 3
- [11] David A Cox, John Little, and Donal O’shea. *Using algebraic geometry*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005. 4, 5, 11
- [12] Daniel DeTone, Tomasz Malisiewicz, and Andrew Rabinovich. Superpoint: Self-supervised interest point detection and description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 224–236, 2018. 6, 8, 14
- [13] Yaqing Ding, Chiang-Heng Chien, Viktor Larsson, Karl Åström, and Benjamin Kimia. Minimal solutions to generalized three-view relative pose problem. In *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023. 2, 3
- [14] Yaqing Ding, Jian Yang, Viktor Larsson, Carl Olsson, and Kalle Åström. Revisiting the p3p problem. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023. 6, 8
- [15] Yaqing Ding, Jian Yang, Jean Ponce, and Hui Kong. Homography-based minimal-case relative pose estimation with known gravity direction. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2022. 2, 5
- [16] Walter Gellert, M. Hellwich, H Kästner, and H Küstner. *The VNR concise encyclopedia of mathematics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012. 5
- [17] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www2.macaulay2.com>. 4, 5, 11
- [18] Richard Hartley. Estimation of relative camera positions for uncalibrated cameras. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. Springer, 1992. 1, 2
- [19] Richard Hartley and Hongdong Li. An efficient hidden variable approach to minimal-case camera motion estimation. *Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*,

2012. [1](#), [3](#), [5](#)
- [20] Richard Hartley and Andrew Zisserman. *Multiple view geometry in computer vision*. Cambridge university press, 2003. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [21] Richard I Hartley. In defense of the eight-point algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 1997. [1](#)
- [22] Jonathan D Hauenstein and Margaret H Regan. Adaptive strategies for solving parameterized systems using homotopy continuation. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 2018. [2](#)
- [23] Janne Heikkilä. Using sparse elimination for solving minimal problems in computer vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [9](#), [12](#)
- [24] Petr Hruby, Timothy Duff, Anton Leykin, and Tomas Pajdla. Learning to Solve Hard Minimal Problems. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. [1](#)
- [25] Viktor Kocur, Daniel Kyselica, and Zuzana Kukelova. Robust self-calibration of focal lengths from the fundamental matrix. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5220–5229, 2024. [3](#), [8](#)
- [26] Zuzana Kukelova, Martin Bujnak, and Tomas Pajdla. Automatic generator of minimal problem solvers. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2008: 10th European Conference on Computer Vision, Marseille, France, October 12–18, 2008, Proceedings, Part III 10*, pages 302–315. Springer, 2008. [5](#)
- [27] Zuzana Kukelova, Martin Bujnak, and Tomas Pajdla. Polynomial eigenvalue solutions to minimal problems in computer vision. *Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, 2012. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [11](#)
- [28] Zuzana Kukelova, Jan Heller, and Andrew Fitzgibbon. Efficient intersection of three quadrics and applications in computer vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1799–1808, 2016. [11](#)
- [29] Zuzana Kukelova, Joe Kileel, Bernd Sturmfels, and Tomas Pajdla. A clever elimination strategy for efficient minimal solvers. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [30] Viktor Larsson, Kalle Åström, and Magnus Oskarsson. Efficient solvers for minimal problems by syzygy-based reduction. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017. [4](#)
- [31] Viktor Larsson and contributors. PoseLib - Minimal Solvers for Camera Pose Estimation, 2020. [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [13](#)
- [32] Viktor Larsson, Magnus Oskarsson, Kalle Åström, Alge Wallis, Zuzana Kukelova, and Tomas Pajdla. Beyond gröbner bases: Basis selection for minimal solvers. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018. [4](#), [5](#)
- [33] Hongdong Li. A simple solution to the six-point two-view focal-length problem. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. Springer, 2006. [1](#)
- [34] Philipp Lindenberger, Paul-Edouard Sarlin, and Marc Pollefeys. Lightglue: Local feature matching at light speed. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 17627–17638, 2023. [6](#), [8](#), [14](#)
- [35] Ezio Malis and Roberto Cipolla. Camera self-calibration from unknown planar structures enforcing the multiview constraints between collineations. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2002. [2](#)
- [36] Stephen Maybank. *Theory of reconstruction from image motion*. Springer, 1993. [2](#)
- [37] David Nistér. An efficient solution to the five-point relative pose problem. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2004. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [38] David Nistér and Frederik Schaffalitzky. Four Points in Two or Three Calibrated Views: Theory and Practice. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2006. [1](#)
- [39] Long Quan, Bill Triggs, and Bernard Mourrain. Some Results on Minimal Euclidean Reconstruction from Four Points. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 2006. [1](#)
- [40] Johannes L Schonberger and Jan-Michael Frahm. Structure-from-motion revisited. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4104–4113, 2016. [13](#)
- [41] Andrew J Sommese and Charles W Wampler. *The Numerical solution of systems of polynomials arising in engineering and science*. World Scientific, 2005. [2](#)
- [42] P Stefanovic. Relative orientation—a new approach. *ITC Journal*, 3(417-448):2, 1973. [4](#)
- [43] Henrik Stewénus, David Nistér, Fredrik Kahl, and Frederik Schaffalitzky. A minimal solution for relative pose with unknown focal length. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2005. [1](#), [3](#)
- [44] Akihiko Torii, Zuzana Kukelova, Martin Bujnak, and Tomas Pajdla. The six point algorithm revisited. In *Computer Vision—ACCV 2010 Workshops: ACCV 2010 International Workshops, Queenstown, New Zealand, November 8–9, 2010, Revised Selected Papers, Part II 10*, pages 184–193. Springer, 2011. [3](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [11](#)
- [45] Charalambos Tzamos, Daniel Barath, Torsten Sattler, and Zuzana Kukelova. Relative pose of three calibrated and partially calibrated cameras from four points using virtual correspondences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16078*, 2023. [7](#)
- [46] Zhengyou Zhang. A flexible new technique for camera calibration. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 22(11):1330–1334, 2000. [2](#), [8](#), [14](#)

Three-view Focal Length Recovery From Homographies

Supplementary Material

In this supplementary material, we provide additional information promised in the main paper. More detailed information on the constraints introduced in Sec. 4 of the main paper is provided in Sec. 8. In Sec. 9 we provide the details of the proposed $\mathbf{H}_{\rho f}$ solver for Case IV. This solver was briefly introduced in Sec. 5.2 of the main paper. In Sec. 10 we provide an evaluation of the proposed methods $\mathbf{H}_{\rho\rho f} + \mathbf{P4Pf}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\rho f} + \mathbf{P4Pf}$ for Case III and IV using both synthetic and real data. Sec. 11 contains information on the dataset that we have collected and used for evaluation in Sec. 6.2 of the main paper.

8. New Constraints

Here we provide details on the constraints introduced in Sec. 4 of the main paper. We show the steps for their derivation including Macaulay2 [17] code.

To derive the constraints relating the focal lengths and the elements of the matrix \mathbf{Q}_i , we first create an ideal I [11] generated by the 12 polynomials extracted from the matrix equation Eq (16) in the main paper, *i.e.* the equation

$$[\mathbf{n}]_{\times} \mathbf{Q}_j [\mathbf{n}]_{\times}^{\top} = s_j [\mathbf{n}]_{\times} [\mathbf{n}]_{\times}^{\top}, \quad j = 2, 3 \quad (26)$$

Note that both the left and right of (26) are symmetric matrices, hence we can get 6 equations for each j .

In the next step, the unknown elements of the normal vector \mathbf{n} , *i.e.*, n_x, n_y, n_z , and the scale factors s_2, s_3 are eliminated from the generators of I by computing the generators of the elimination ideal $J = I \cap \mathbb{C}[q_{21}, \dots, q_{36}]$. Here, q_j are the entries of $\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_3$. These generators can be computed, for example, in the computer algebra software Macaulay2 [17] using the following code:

```
KK = ZZ / 30097;
R = KK[q21, q22, q23, q24, q25, q26,
q31, q32, q33, q34, q35, q36, nx, ny, nz, s2, s3]
Q2 = matrix({{q21, q22, q23}, {q22, q24, q25}, {q23, q25, q26}});
Q3 = matrix({{q31, q32, q33}, {q32, q34, q35}, {q33, q35, q36}});
Nx = matrix({0, -nz, ny}, {nz, 0, -nx}, {-ny, nx, 0});
eqs = flatten(Nx*Q2*transpose(Nx) - s2*Nx*transpose(Nx)
| Nx*Q3*transpose(Nx) - s3*Nx*transpose(Nx) | nz-1);
I = ideal eqs;
J = eliminate(I, {nx, ny, nz, s2, s3});
```

In this case, the elimination ideal J is generated by seven polynomials g_i of degree 6 in the elements of \mathbf{Q}_j , $j = 2, 3$. The final constraints are only related to the 12 elements of the symmetric matrices \mathbf{Q}_i (6 from \mathbf{Q}_2 and 6 from \mathbf{Q}_3).

9. Solver for Case IV

In this section, we present details on the $\mathbf{H}_{\rho f}$ solver for Case IV, which was introduced in Sec. 5.2 of the main paper.

Similar to Case III, the system of polynomials g_i , $i = 1, \dots, 7$ can be written as $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, where \mathbf{M} is a 7×16 coefficient matrix and

$$\mathbf{u} = [1, \beta, \dots, \beta^3, \alpha, \alpha\beta, \dots, \alpha^3, \dots, \alpha^3\beta^3]^{\top}, \quad (27)$$

is a vector consisting of the 16 monomials. We can choose α as the hidden variable, resulting in

$$\mathbf{A}(\alpha)\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (28)$$

where $\mathbf{A}(\alpha)$ is a 7×4 polynomial matrix parameterized by α , and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = [1, \beta, \dots, \beta^3]^{\top}$ is a vector of 4 monomials in β without α . To solve the problem (28) as a polynomial eigenvalue problem, it is sufficient to choose four out of the seven rows in (28) to get a square matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\alpha)$. In this case, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\alpha) = \alpha^3 \mathbf{A}_3 + \alpha^2 \mathbf{A}_2 + \alpha \mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_0, \quad (29)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_3, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_0$ are 4×4 matrices. The solutions to α are given by the eigenvalues of the following 12×12 matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ -\mathbf{A}_3^{-1}\mathbf{A}_0 & -\mathbf{A}_3^{-1}\mathbf{A}_1 & -\mathbf{A}_3^{-1}\mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

In this way, we obtain 12 possible solutions. The remaining steps are similar to Case III. We denote this solver as $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho}$. Note that in this case, the original seven polynomial equations have only nine solutions. By selecting a subset of four polynomials, we introduced three more solutions. Still, the resulting solver is more efficient than the solver to the original seven equations, due to Gauss-Jordan elimination and computations of complex coefficients that are performed in a solver with 9 solutions.

10. Evaluation for Case III and Case IV

In this section we evaluate the robust estimators $\mathbf{H}_{\rho f f} + \mathbf{P3P}$ for Case III and $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho} + \mathbf{P3P}$ for Case IV which were presented in Sec.5.3 of the main paper. As baselines for comparison we use the combination of the $f\mathbf{E}f$ solver [27] or its DEGANSAC [9] variant with the plane and parallax solver [44] together with the $\mathbf{P4Pf}$ solver [28] for Case III and the $\mathbf{E}f$ solver in combination with $\mathbf{P4Pf}$ solver [28] for Case IV.

We use the same evaluation metrics as in the main paper. Since two focal lengths are estimated jointly we use the geometric mean of their error $\xi_f = \sqrt{\xi_{f1}\xi_{f2}}$.




Figure 6. Focal length errors for the evaluated methods in synthetic experiments with local optimization disabled. **Case III:** (a) We vary the proportion of points which lie on the dominant plane with fixed noise $\sigma = 1$. (b, c) We vary noise σ with (b) $n_p/n = 1.0$ and (c) $n_p/n = 0.95$. **Case IV:** (d,e,c) Same setup as for Case III. The synthetic setup is described in Sec. 6.1 if the main paper.

	Method	FOV Filtering	Sample	Median ξ_f	Mean ξ_f	mAA _f (0.1)	mAA _f (0.2)	Runtime (ms)
Case III	$H_{f\rho\rho} + P3P$ ours	-	4 triplets	0.2463	0.7266	19.34	29.68	121.62
	$fEf + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.2890	0.5889	16.33	25.84	34.09
	$fEf + PP + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.2950	0.6253	16.04	25.46	35.66
	$H_{f\rho\rho} + P3P$ ours	35.5° - 61.5°	4 triplets	0.1478	0.5895	24.07	37.40	142.64
	$fEf + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.2136	0.4914	18.34	29.84	40.57
	$fEf + PP + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.2199	0.5127	17.89	29.23	42.67
	$H_{f\rho\rho} + P3P$ ours	50° - 70°	4 triplets	0.1171	0.4628	27.22	42.32	136.19
	$fEf + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.1582	0.3744	22.31	35.61	37.33
	$fEf + PP + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.1629	0.3781	21.95	35.09	39.37
Case IV	$H_{f\rho} + P3P$ ours	-	4 triplets	0.3286	0.5647	14.83	24.01	60.11
	$Ef + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.3871	0.4881	11.99	19.61	32.50
	$H_{f\rho} + P3P$ ours	35.5° - 61.5°	4 triplets	0.1559	0.2770	20.85	35.06	98.21
	$Ef + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.1982	0.3092	16.90	29.63	56.74
	$H_{f\rho} + P3P$ ours	50° - 70°	4 triplets	0.1101	0.2258	26.52	43.30	89.18
	$Ef + P4Pf$		6 triplets	0.1198	0.2342	24.84	41.36	50.77

Table 3. Results on the real-world dataset of planar scenes for Case III and IV. FOV filtering denotes the range of FOV values that is used to reject models within RANSAC.

10.1. Multiple Geometrically Valid Solutions

We observe that for both Case III and Case IV a single planar scene may result in multiple geometrically valid solutions. This makes it difficult to select a single correct solution for a given set of point correspondences. This leads to generally worse performance of the proposed solvers than for Case I and Case II. Note, that this is a feature of the problems and not the solvers. Problem with recovering one

focal length for Case III was mentioned also in [23].

In Case III and Case IV, in contrast to baselines that use two-view fEf and Ef solvers and that completely fail for purely planar scenes, our solvers among the returned solutions contain the geometrically correct solution (see Figure 2 in the main paper). The proposed solvers just cannot distinguish between the returned solutions without additional information. In Sec 10.3 we show how some simple strate-

	Scene	Method	Sample	Median ξ_f	Mean ξ_f	mAA $_f(0.1)$	mAA $_f(0.2)$	Runtime (ms)
Case III	Original	$\mathbf{H}_{f\rho\rho} + \mathbf{P3P}$ ours	4 triplets	0.3076	1.1358	15.48	24.34	133.43
		$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P4P}f$	6 triplets	0.2494	0.5515	16.36	26.59	37.40
		$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP} + \mathbf{P4P}f$	6 triplets	0.2620	0.5622	15.36	24.98	39.44
	Off-plane	$\mathbf{H}_{f\rho\rho} + \mathbf{P3P}$ ours	4 triplets	0.1540	0.6324	29.39	39.64	142.92
		$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P4P}f$	6 triplets	0.2035	0.4716	25.08	34.84	38.36
		$f\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{PP} + \mathbf{P4P}f$	6 triplets	0.2115	0.5959	24.60	34.30	40.53
Case IV	Original	$\mathbf{H}_{f\rho} + \mathbf{P3P}$ ours	4 triplets	0.3843	0.5970	11.92	19.90	69.22
		$\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P4P}f$	6 triplets	0.4011	0.4896	11.00	18.98	32.95
	Off-plane	$\mathbf{H}_{f\rho} + \mathbf{P3P}$ ours	4 triplets	0.2381	0.5239	21.81	31.71	69.97
		$\mathbf{E}f + \mathbf{P4P}f$	6 triplets	0.3150	0.4300	17.30	25.64	35.54

Table 4. Evaluation results on the original Book scene from the planar scenes dataset and its modified version with objects added in order to introduce off-plane scenes (see Fig. 7). The modified version of the scene was captured by eight cameras. Therefore, for evaluation of the original scene we only consider triplets of images taken by the same eight cameras.

gies using prior knowledge about the focal lengths can significantly improve performance on real-world data even for these challenging problems.

We note that this problem can also be overcome whenever the scene contains a sufficient number of off-plane points. In such cases, there is one dominant plane with some off-plane objects visible in the three views. The off-plane points can then lead to higher scores for the correct solutions and are therefore selected during RANSAC. We demonstrate this both in synthetic experiments presented in the next section and with real-world experiments using which are presented in Sec. 10.3.

10.2. Synthetic Experiments

We perform synthetic experiments with a setup similar to the one presented in Sec. 6.1 of the main paper. To better compare the performance of solvers under multiple possible valid solutions, we perform the experiment using vanilla RANSAC (without local optimization). The results of the synthetic experiments presented in Fig. 6 show that the estimators $\mathbf{H}_{\rho ff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ for Case III and $\mathbf{H}_{f\rho} + \mathbf{P3P}$ for Case IV perform better than the baselines when considering a planar scene as well as scenes with a dominant plane. We also note that for all solvers the accuracy of the estimated focal lengths improves as more off-plane points are added to the planar scene.

10.3. Real-World Experiments

We also perform experiments on the real-world dataset introduced in this paper. To overcome issues with multiple geometrically feasible solutions, we propose a simple strategy of acceptable field-of-view (FOV) ranges for the focal lengths. During RANSAC we simply discard all solutions with focal lengths outside of the predetermined range.

In Tab. 3 we show the results comparing our method and the baseline approaches in three different variants. As the first variant we do not discard any solutions. For



Figure 7. We added two objects to a scene from the planar dataset and recaptured it with 8 cameras that were also used to capture the original scene for comparison.

the second variant, we set range of acceptable FOVs by considering the prior for focal lengths used by the popular SfM software COLMAP [40] which is set as $f_p = 1.2\max(\text{width}, \text{height})$, which corresponds to a field of view of $\sim 45^\circ$. To obtain a range we consider 30% increase or decrease in focal length, resulting in the acceptable field of view range from 35.5° to 61.5° . As the last variant we use a range of 50° to 70° . We chose this range since most commercially available phone cameras fall within it.

All variants were implemented in PoseLib [31]. We set the maximum epipolar threshold to 3 px. We used early termination with 0.9999 confidence and a minimum of 100 iterations and a maximum of 1000.

For all of the proposed variants and both cases our methods $\mathbf{H}_{\rho ff} + \mathbf{P3P}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\rho f} + \mathbf{P3P}$ show superior performance in terms of the accuracy of the estimated focal lengths compared to the baselines. We also note that the performance of all evaluated methods significantly improves when filtering solutions based on the predetermined field of view ranges. Showcasing how a simple strategy can significantly improve the accuracy of all evaluated methods.

Evaluation using a scene with off-plane points

We also perform additional evaluation with one scene which is similar to the Book scene from our planar dataset, but we include additional objects (see Fig. 7) to introduce some off-plane points. This sequence was captured by 8

ID	Description	FOV	Width	Height	Images							Triplets		
					Asphalt	Boats	Book	Facade	Floor	Papers	Calib	Case I	Case II/III	Case IV
IPhoneOldBack	Apple iPhone SE (2nd generation) back camera	62.8°	4032	3024	20	19	22	20	20	20	14	3000	2806	2822
IPhoneOldFront	Apple iPhone SE (2nd generation) front camera	56.5°	3088	2320	20	18	18	23	17	21	18	2755	2984	3089
IPhoneZBHBBack	Apple iPhone SE (3rd generation) back camera	63.3°	4032	3024	19	19	21	20	20	20	20	3000	2761	2781
IPhoneZBHFront	Apple iPhone SE (3rd generation) front camera	56.2°	3088	2320	20	20	22	19	21	20	20	2389	2900	3065
LenovoTabletBack	Tablet Lenovo TB-X505F back camera	59.7°	2592	1944	20	20	21	18	20	17	13	3000	2968	3079
LenovoTabletFront	Tablet Lenovo TB-X505F front camera	62.3°	1600	1200	✗	21	21	✗	16	✗	20	1500	1803	2189
MotoBack	Motorola Moto E4 Plus back camera	64.7°	4160	3120	20	23	22	21	22	20	37	2013	2529	2903
MotoFront	Motorola Moto E4 Plus front camera	71.0°	2592	1952	✗	18	19	✗	✗	✗	19	1000	1400	1732
Olympus	Olympus uD600,S600 compact digital camera	49.1°	2816	2112	19	23	24	17	21	21	23	3000	3145	3171
SamsungBack	Samsung Galaxy S5 Mini back camera	56.1°	3264	1836	✗	20	28	✗	20	20	18	2000	2356	2594
SamsungFront	Samsung Galaxy S5 Mini front camera	69.4°	1920	1080	19	24	19	23	19	20	20	2798	3023	3120
SamsungGlossyBack	Samsung Galaxy S III Mini back camera	53.8°	2560	1920	20	21	19	20	19	20	21	3000	3073	3180
SamsungGlossyFront	Samsung Galaxy S III Mini front camera	55.6°	640	480	21	20	26	20	20	21	20	3000	1790	1726
DellWide	Dell Precision 7650 notebook camera	80.0°	1280	720	✗	21	22	✗	22	✗	20	1500	1254	1446
SonyTelescopic	Sony α5000 digital camera with 55-210mm Lens	23.5°	5456	3064	20	20	20	22	18	✗	20	1517	1664	1815
Total					218	307	324	223	275	220	303	35472	18219	12876
Triplets Case I					3574	7500	7500	5500	5898	5500	✗			
Triplets Case II					649	5100	4856	2538	2555	2521	✗			
Triplets Case IV					252	4256	3871	1472	1618	1407	✗			

Table 5. Summary of our evaluation dataset. The table shows the number of included images per scene per camera and the number of extracted triplets. The last three columns indicate how many triplets for a given case contain an image from a given camera (*e.g.* for Case IV we use 1815 triplets for which at least one of the images was taken using Dell Precision 7650 notebook camera). The fourth row from bottom denotes the total number of images per scene in the dataset and in the last three columns the total number of triplets per case. The last three rows show how many triplets are included for each scene.

of the cameras used to capture the planar dataset. It contains 87 images in total and we used them to generate 5066 triplets for Case III and 1473 triplets for Case IV.³ We perform a comparison between the results obtained on this scene with off-plane objects and results obtained on the original planar scene. For the original planar scene we only consider triplets using the same cameras as in the scene with off-plane objects. Tab. 4 shows a comparison of the results for all evaluated methods. The results show a significant improvement of all methods when off-plane objects are introduced in the scene. This shows that the problem becomes easier when the scene is not fully planar, but retains a significant dominant plane with some off-plane points. In this scenario, our methods show significantly better performance over the baselines.

11. Real World Dataset

This section provides the detailed information about the dataset used for real-world evaluation presented in Sec. 6.2 of the main paper. The descriptions of the cameras and dataset statistics regarding the total number of images and extracted triplets are provided in Tab. 5. The dataset contains 1870 images of 4 indoor and 2 outdoor planar scenes captured with 14 calibrated cameras. We purposefully select some scenes to be more challenging (*e.g.* repeating patterns in Floor, few significant landmarks in Asphalt). In total we use provide 66 567 image triplets for evaluation of the different cases.

³Note that this scene is not included in the dataset presented in Sec. 11 due to its different nature, *i.e.* containing additional non-planar objects.

11.1. Calibration

To calibrate the cameras, we used a standard checkerboard pattern printed on hard plastic. We manually removed blurry or otherwise unsuitable calibration images from the dataset. We calibrated the cameras using [46]. During calibration, we used the assumption of square pixels (*i.e.* $f_x = f_y$). We also modeled tangential and radial distortion to obtain more accurate focal lengths. All used cameras exhibited low distortion so we use the original distorted images for evaluation to better reflect accuracy in real scenarios where cameras are expected to have low and unknown distortion. The images used for calibration, as well as the calibration code and estimated intrinsics, will be made available with the dataset.

11.2. Triplet Point Correspondence Extraction

To obtain triplet correspondences we used SuperPoint [12] with inference in the original image resolution keeping at most 2048 best keypoints. We matched the keypoints using LightGlue [34] to first perform pairwise matches. Since SuperPoint was trained to only be rotationally invariant up to 45° rotations we have extracted pairwise matches by rotating one of the images four times with a step of 90° and selecting the orientation which produced the largest number of matches. Afterwards, we kept only those correspondences which were matched across all three pairs thus producing triplets. We will provide the extracted correspondences as part of the dataset upon release.