

A POLYNOMIAL FORMULA FOR THE PERSPECTIVE FOUR POINTS PROBLEM

DAVID LEHAVI AND BRIAN OSSERMAN

ABSTRACT. We present a fast and accurate solution to the perspective n -points problem, by way of a new approach to the $n = 4$ case. Our solution hinges on a novel separation of variables: given four 3D points and four corresponding 2D points on the camera canvas, we start by finding another set of 3D points, sitting on the rays connecting the camera to the 2D canvas points, so that the six pair-wise distances between these 3D points are as close as possible to the six distances between the original 3D points. This step reduces the perspective problem to an absolute orientation problem (which has a solution via explicit formula). To solve the first problem we set coordinates which are as orientation-free as possible: on the 3D points side our coordinates are the squared distances between the points. On the 2D canvas-points side our coordinates are the dot products of the points after rotating one of them to sit on the optical axis. We then derive the solution with the help of a computer algebra system.

1. INTRODUCTION

The perspective n point problem (PnP) goes back to the mid 19th-century, and seeks to recover the 6DoF pose of a calibrated camera given n points in the world, and their images on a camera canvas. The problem arises as a localization problem in most computer visions problems involving both images and 3D data. Typically in these problems one starts with a large number of pairings between 2D and 3D points, where each pairing is (sadly) correct with relatively low probability; one then uses many subsets of size 3 or 4 of these pairings as the “seeds” or “RANdom SAMple” part of a RANSAC on the entire set of pairings.

The $n = 3$ and $n = 4$ cases are conceptually different: the case $n = 3$ (which goes back to [G]) admits four pairs of solutions for nondegenerate configurations, whereas for $n = 4$ the problem is overdetermined. The latter case is typically solved by a minimization strategy such as “EPnP” [LMFP] (which minimizes some error-metric on the pose) or “SQPnP” [TL] (which minimizes the “reconstruction error”, and is closer in spirit to our error measure). In this paper we propose an alternative solution to the $n = 4$ problem, which takes *merely* ~ 250 nanosec/4-tuple,¹ and in our experience typically produces solutions with better reprojection error than general pose (not distance) least square minimizers when applied to $n = 4$. Moreover, our algorithm provides an error measure with high correlation to the reprojection error, and one may efficiently reject high-error seeds and then unite compatible seeds before even solving for the actual pose. In addition, our algorithm consists almost entirely of evaluating algebraic formulas, so it is almost devoid of branches, which makes it extremely amenable to SIMD implementation.

The crux of our idea is to reduce the number of parameters involved in both the problem input, and the problem (intermediate) output. Instead of directly representing the coordinates of each of the four input 3D points and the four 2D canvas points, which would require $(3 + 2) \cdot 4 = 20$ numbers, our input consists of the 6-tuple of squared distances between the 4-tuple of 3D points, together with the 6-tuple

Date: January 23, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 65D19, 68T45, 13-04, 14P10.

¹Running on a 5 GHz 13th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-1360P.

of dot products between the 4-tuple of 2D canvas points, where the latter are taken after rotating the viewpoint and the canvas so that one point is on the optical axis. Likewise, our (intermediate) output consists of four distances along the rays connecting the camera to the four 2D canvas points; our goal is to get “new” 3D points along these rays which admit pairwise distances close to the 6 pairwise distance between the input 3D points. Thus, this intermediate output consists of four numbers, instead of the $4 + 3$ numbers typically needed to represent rotation (via quaternionic representation) and translation.

This concise representation of data enables us to run a computer algebra system (with some human intervention in the middle), and get an *explicit algebraic formula* for the output in terms of the input. Having achieved the intermediate output, which is in effect another configuration of 3D points, we can reject seeds having high error, and then unite low-error seeds when they yield the same set of z -depths for a common triple of points. This is all done prior to solving the absolute orientation problem (using e.g. Horn’s algorithm – see [Ho]), which yields additional efficiency compared to approaches that require solving for the pose on each seed separately. Finally, we use Fletcher’s variant of the Levenberg-Marquardt gradient descent algorithm [F] to fine-tune the solution and minimize the reprojection error. Another benefit of uniting seeds before solving for pose is that simply by prioritizing seeds which can be united with large numbers of other seeds, our approach will often implicitly discard seeds which have very low apparent error but are in fact based on mismatched points, since these typically can’t be united with as many other seeds.

2. SETUP

To say that the $n = 4$ case of the perspective problem is overdetermined means that the among all possible sets of quadruples of points in \mathbb{R}^3 together with quadruples of points on an image plane, only a smaller-dimensional subset has the property that the 3D points can be matched up with the image plane points after a suitable rigid transformation. It turns out that this subset is an algebraic variety: i.e., it can be defined in terms of some polynomial equations. Finding one or more of these equations would already be extremely helpful in the perspective problem, as it would in principle allow for extremely efficient seed rejection without attempting to solve for pose. Ultimately, we will see that this constellation of ideas leads us to efficient algorithms for solving for the pose as well. With this motivation, in this section we set up our situation from the point of view of algebraic geometry, defining some basic constraints arising from the perspective problem and looking at how they can be expressed as polynomial equations when we replace our initial tuples of points with tuples of distances. For this purpose, it is cleaner to work with lines through the origin (i.e., as points in the projective plane) in place of points on an image plane.

We begin by describing how to encode quadruples of points up to rigid transformations in terms of distances, and similarly for lines. First, fix an ordering on pairs (i, j) with $0 \leq i < j \leq 3$; then taking square distances induces an algebraic map

$$(1) \quad (\mathbb{R}^3)^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6$$

given explicitly by $(P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3) \mapsto (\|P_i - P_j\|^2)_{i,j}$. Note that this map is invariant under orthogonal transformations and translations (applied simultaneously to all four points), so its fiber are unions of orbits of the group of rigid transformations. In fact, it is easy to check that a (possibly degenerate) tetrahedron is determined up to rigid transformations uniquely by the side lengths, so we have:

2.1. Proposition. *The non-empty fibers of (1) each consist of a unique orbit of the action of the group of rigid transformations. Therefore, we can think of the image of (1) as being a realization of the quotient of $(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ by this group action.*

2.2. Remark. It will not be needed for our main results, but we can explicitly describe the image of (1) in terms of Cayley-Menger determinants as follows: it is the set of 6-tuples which are nonnegative, whose square roots satisfy all the appropriate triangle inequalities (allowing for non-strict inequalities since we have thus far not required the P_i to be distinct), and which together have the Cayley-Menger determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} 0 & \|P_0-P_1\|^2 & \|P_0-P_2\|^2 & \|P_0-P_3\|^2 & 1 \\ \|P_0-P_1\|^2 & 0 & \|P_1-P_2\|^2 & \|P_1-P_3\|^2 & 1 \\ \|P_0-P_2\|^2 & \|P_1-P_2\|^2 & 0 & \|P_2-P_3\|^2 & 1 \\ \|P_0-P_3\|^2 & \|P_1-P_3\|^2 & \|P_2-P_3\|^2 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

being nonnegative. Observe that because our coordinates correspond to square distances, each individual triangle inequality is not algebraic in these coordinates. However, each triple of triangle inequalities coming from a fixed subset of $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ can be expressed in terms of a 2-dimensional Cayley-Menger determinant, so imposes a semialgebraic condition.

Next, consider the open subset

$$\mathcal{U}_0 \subseteq (\mathbb{RP}^2)^4$$

consisting of quadruples (L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3) of lines in \mathbb{R}^3 through the origin such that none of the L_i is orthogonal to L_3 . We define a map

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{U}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6$$

by

$$(L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3) \mapsto \left(\left(\frac{\|(L_3 \cdot L_3)L_i - (L_i \cdot L_3)L_3\|^2}{(L_i \cdot L_3)^2(L_3 \cdot L_3)} \right)_{i=0,1,2}, \left(\frac{(L_3 \cdot L_3)\|(L_j \cdot L_3)L_i - (L_i \cdot L_3)L_j\|^2}{(L_i \cdot L_3)^2(L_j \cdot L_3)^2} \right)_{0 \leq i < j \leq 2} \right).$$

Note that this formula is invariant under scaling each L_i (so that it is in fact well-defined on each line), and also under simultaneous orthogonal transformations of the L_i .

The above formula can be understood explicitly as follows: up to orthogonal transformations, we may assume that L_3 is equal to $(0, 0, t)$, and then since none of the other L_i are orthogonal to L_3 on \mathcal{U}_0 , we can let p_i be the intersection of each L_i with the plane $z = 1$ (including $p_3 = (0, 0, 1)$). With these representatives, the above formula is simply given by the square distances in the plane, as

$$\left((\|p_3 - p_i\|^2)_{i=0,1,2}, (\|p_i - p_j\|^2)_{0 \leq i < j \leq 2} \right).$$

This formula is not invariant under translations, but it is invariant under (simultaneously applied) orthogonal transformations.

2.3. Remark. Since the p_i are coplanar, the image of this map is constrained to the hypersurface given by the vanishing of the Cayley-Menger determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} 0 & \|p_0-p_1\|^2 & \|p_0-p_2\|^2 & \|p_0-p_3\|^2 & 1 \\ \|p_0-p_1\|^2 & 0 & \|p_1-p_2\|^2 & \|p_1-p_3\|^2 & 1 \\ \|p_0-p_2\|^2 & \|p_1-p_2\|^2 & 0 & \|p_2-p_3\|^2 & 1 \\ \|p_0-p_3\|^2 & \|p_1-p_3\|^2 & \|p_2-p_3\|^2 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{vmatrix}.$$

In principle, this should be relevant to us as it will impose an additional equation on the variety of interest to us, but in practice we have not found it to be helpful in our elimination of variables.

It is convenient to introduce coordinates on the targets of (1) and (2) as follows.

2.4. Notation. Using *cyclic indexing*

$$i \in \{0, 1, 2\}, j \equiv i + 1 \pmod{3}, \quad k \equiv j + 1 \pmod{3},$$

for the target of (1) we let c_i for $i = 0, 1, 2$ denote the $(i, 3)$ -coordinate, and a_i for $i = 0, 1, 2$ denote the (j, k) -coordinate, and for the target of (2) we set b_i for $i = 0, 1, 2$ such that $b_i - 1$ is the $(i, 3)$ -coordinate, and then d_i for $i = 0, 1, 2$ such that $b_j + b_k - 2d_i$ is the (j, k) -coordinate.

Thus, the c_i and a_i still represent squared distances, but the b_i and d_i are better understood as dot products:

$$b_i = \frac{(L_i \cdot L_i)(L_3 \cdot L_3)}{(L_j \cdot L_3)^2}, \quad d_i = \frac{(L_j \cdot L_k)(L_3 \cdot L_3)}{(L_j \cdot L_3)(L_k \cdot L_3)}.$$

With the normalized p_i described above, we simply get $b_i = p_i \cdot p_i$ and $d_i = p_j \cdot p_k$. Consequently, the above Cayley-Menger determinant becomes

$$(3) \quad \begin{vmatrix} 0 & b_0+b_1-2d_2 & b_0+b_2-2d_1 & b_0-1 & 1 \\ b_0+b_1-2d_2 & 0 & b_1+b_2-2d_0 & b_1-1 & 1 \\ b_0+b_2-2d_1 & b_1+b_2-2d_0 & 0 & b_2-1 & 1 \\ b_0-1 & b_1-1 & b_2-1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{vmatrix}.$$

Now, evidently there is a canonical incidence variety in

$$(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus (0))^4 \times (\mathbb{RP}^2)^4$$

consisting of $(P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3, L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3)$ such that each P_i lies on L_i . We are interested in studying the image of this variety under the product map of (1) with (2). We use the coordinates on the target spaces introduced above. Our key observation is the following:

2.5. Proposition. *Suppose a point $(c_0, c_1, c_2, a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2, d_0, d_1, d_2)$ is in the image of the incidence variety under the product of (1) with (2). Then there exist nonzero z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3 satisfying (again using cyclic indices):*

$$(4) \quad a_i = b_j z_j^2 + b_k z_k^2 - 2d_i z_j z_k \quad c_i = z_3^2 + b_i z_i^2 - 2z_i z_3$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

Proof. If the given point is in the image of the product map, by invariance under rotation we may without loss of generality assume that it is the image of some $((P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3), (L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3))$ where $L_3 = (0, 0, t)$; then because $(L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3) \in \mathcal{U}_0$ we have that none of the L_i for $i > 0$ are perpendicular to L_3 , so we may fix representatives $p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 = (0, 0, 1)$ for the L_i on the $z = 1$ plane as above. Since each P_i is on L_i by definition of the incidence variety, there exists z_i such that $P_i = z_i p_i$, and z_i is nonzero since we have excluded the origin of \mathbb{R}^3 in defining the incidence variety. Following through the definitions of the maps and the coordinates we verify that the desired equations are satisfied for these z_i . \square

Since map (1) is invariant under rigid transformations in the source space, we can rephrase proposition 2.5 in terms of compatibility of 4-tuples of points with 4-tuples of lines as follows. We also take the opportunity to record the exact meaning of the z_i .

2.6. Corollary. *Suppose that $(P, L) = (P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3, L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3)$ has the properties that none of the L_i is orthogonal to L_3 , and there exists a rigid transformation T such that for each i , we have that $T(P_i) \neq 0$ and $T(P_i)$ lies on L_i . Let $(c_0, c_1, c_2, a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2, d_0, d_1, d_2)$ be the image of (P, L) under (1) \times (2). Then there exist nonzero z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3 such that the equations (4) are satisfied; more precisely, the z_i are the z -depths of $T(P_i)$ relative to the image plane at distance 1 from the origin, and with L_3 as its optical axis.*

Note that the description above can be phrased mathematically as saying that each z_i is the dot product of $T(P_i)$ with a unit representative of L_3 . Also, this description determines the z_i only up to simultaneous change of sign.

2.7. Remark. In the above proof, we can re-express our equations in an invariant way in terms of the P_i and L_i as follows: since $p_3 = L_3/||L_3||$ and $p_i = L_i||L_3||/(L_3 \cdot L_i)$, we find that $P_i = z_i p_i$ become $p_3 = z_3 L_3/||L_3||$ and $P_i = z_i L_i ||L_3||/(L_3 \cdot L_i)$ for $i > 0$. We can clear denominators, but are left with the square root implicit in $||L_3||$ appearing in each equation. We see that although the equation

$$P_i = z_i p_i$$

looks innocuous and algebraic, it is in fact not algebraic “upstairs” in

$$(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus (0))^4 \times (\mathbb{RP}^2)^4 \times \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Thus, one advantage of using the maps (1) and (2) is that they convert non-algebraic equations of interest into algebraic equations.

3. THE CORRESPONDENCE VARIETY

We are now in a position to define the algebraic varieties which are the main focus of our analysis.

3.1. Definition. Define $W \subset \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^4$ to be the zero locus of the equations in (4), and the *correspondence variety* V to be the image of the projection of W on $\mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^6$.

Note that V is larger than the image of the incidence variety referenced in proposition 2.5, since we have ignored the Cayley-Menger determinant condition discussed in remark 2.3. However, this is ultimately irrelevant to our work.

We make the following observation:

3.2. Proposition. W is irreducible of dimension 10, and V is also irreducible, of dimension at most 10.

In fact we will see in Corollary 3.9 below that V also has dimension 10.

Proof. Geometrically, the equations defining W can be viewed as realizing W as the graph of a map $\mathbb{R}^{10} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6$ (since they are giving formulas for the a_\bullet, c_\bullet in terms of the other variables). Thus, we actually have that W is isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{10} . The second statement follows because V is defined as the image of W . \square

From an algebraic point of view we have two goals in mind: one is to describe the correspondence variety V , and another is to find explicit equations describing the fibers of $W \rightarrow V$ (i.e., to solve explicitly for the possible z_i , at least for the generic case). For the first goal, although we ultimately provide enough equations to uniquely determine V in proposition 3.11 below, we reiterate that having even one equation for V is already a breakthrough, since it provides a new method of recognizing mismatched four-tuples in the perspective four points problem without having to actually attempt to solve for the pose. On the other hand, although the perspective problem ultimately requires us to solve for the z_i , we observe that because $(z_0, \dots, z_3) \mapsto -(z_0, \dots, z_3)$ acts on the solution space of our equations, the appropriate purely algebraic goal is to recover the set $\{z_i \cdot z_j\}_{0 \leq i < j \leq 3}$.

More concretely, both of these goals involve eliminating z_i : for the first goal, we need to eliminate all of the z_i , while for the second goal we will proceed by eliminating three of them at a time, and finding a tractable equation for the remaining one. Indeed, the main result of this section is the following:

3.3. Lemma. *There exist (explicitly presented) quadric polynomials*

$$Q_i(x) = X_{i2} \cdot x^2 + X_{i1} \cdot x + X_{i0} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq 3$$

with each X_{ij} being a polynomial in $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$, such that $Q_i(z_i^2)$ vanishes identically on W .

See the appendix for the actual formulas for the Q_i .

We then leverage a natural S_3 action on the indices of our coordinates to cancel leading terms and obtain linear equations for the z_i^2 , and subsequently equations for V as well.

Furthermore, and from an engineering point of view, the coefficients $X_{i\eta}$ are of small degree in the $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$, and contain only a few tens of monomial summands each. In practice, our experiments show that the behaviour of the solutions of the Q_i under noise in the coefficients is extremely stable.

In order to obtain the desired Q_i s, we begin by simply coding the equations in (4) into **Singular**:

```
ring r=0, (c0,c1,c2,a0,a1,a2,b0,b1,b2,d0,d1,d2,z0,z1,z2,z3), (dp(12),dp(4));
poly f1 = b1*z1^2+b2*z2^2-2*d0*z1*z2-a0;
poly f2 = b2*z2^2+b0*z0^2-2*d1*z2*z0-a1;
poly f3 = b0*z0^2+b1*z1^2-2*d2*z0*z1-a2;
poly f4 = z3^2+b0*z0^2-2*z0*z3-c0;
poly f5 = z3^2+b1*z1^2-2*z1*z3-c1;
poly f6 = z3^2+b2*z2^2-2*z2*z3-c2;
ideal I=f1,f2,f3,f4,f5,f6;
```

The chosen polynomial ordering is natural due to our desire to eliminate the last four variables from the ideal. We proceed to compute Q_0 ; the first two steps are straightforward:

```
ideal I0_3=eliminate(I, z3); // very fast
ideal I0_2=eliminate(I0_3, z2); // seconds
size(I0_2); // returns 13
```

However, trying to directly eliminating z_1 from the above ideal hit a computational brick wall; instead, we define a subideal, and eliminate from it:

```
ideal J0_2=I0_2[1],I0_2[3],I0_2[5]; // HUMAN INTERVENTION
ideal J0_1=eliminate(J0_2, z1); // this one takes a few minutes
size(J0_1); // returns 13, J0_1[1] is degree 2 in z0^2
```

The three polynomials in the definition of $J0_2$ are simply the shortest three from $I0_2$, and the reason for using three of them is that this is the minimal number which would be expected to support eliminating z_1 while still having a nontrivial equation in z_0 . We thus define Q_0 :

3.4. Definition. Let $Q_0(x)$ be the polynomial obtained by replacing z_0^2 with x in the above $J0_1[1]$, considered as a quadratic polynomial in x with coefficients being polynomials in the $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$.

The resulting polynomial is indeed “small” in terms of number of coefficients and their degree in $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$.

We now introduce the aforementioned S_3 action:

3.5. Definition. Let S_3 act on $\mathbb{R}[a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet, z_\bullet]$, by identifying it with the permutations of $\{0, 1, 2\}$ and letting it act on the indices of all of the sets of variables (thus, fixing only z_3).

From this we are able to conclude the following.

3.6. Proposition. *For any $\sigma \in S_3$, if we set $i = \sigma(0)$ and we apply σ to $Q_0(z_0^2)$, we obtain a polynomial in $I \cap \mathbb{R}[a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet, z_i^2]$ which is quadratic in z_i^2 .*

Proof. Indeed, note that because we found Q_0 by a sequence of eliminations and passing to a subideal, we have that the key properties of Q_0 can be rephrased as follows: $Q_0(z_0^2)$ is an element of our original ideal I , which lies in the subring generated by the $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$ and z_0^2 , and it is moreover quadratic when viewed as a polynomial in z_0^2 . The key observation is that although our S_3 action does not fix the generators f_i of I , it does permute them, so it preserves the ideal as a whole. The desired statement follows. \square

We next prove that the S_3 action can act nontrivially on a Q_i even when i is fixed by the permutation.

3.7. Proposition. $Q_0(z_0^2)$ is not projectively invariant under the transposition $\tau_{1,2}$.

Proof. We can check this via computer algebra; we obtain the coefficients $X_{0,0}$, $X_{0,1}$, and $X_{0,2}$ as shown below, and see the non-invariance under $\tau_{1,2}$ by checking the degrees of c_2 and c_1 in $X_{0,0}$.

```
poly X0_0=coef(J0_1[1], z0)[2,3];
poly X0_1=coef(J0_1[1], z0)[2,2];
poly X0_2=coef(J0_1[1], z0)[2,1];
coef(X0_0, c2); // only degree 0
coef(X0_0, c1); // degree 2
```

□

Thus, in order to solve for z_0^2 we may use $Q_0(z_0^2)$ and $\tau_{1,2}(Q_0(z_0^2))$ to cancel leading coefficients and obtain a linear equation for z_0^2 (in practice, if we are evaluating an example in **Singular** we simply take the gcd of the two quadrics to obtain the linear polynomial).

Next, acting on $Q_0(z_0^2)$ with the transpositions $\tau_{0,2}$ and $\tau_{0,1}$, we get explicit expressions for Q_1, Q_2 , and can likewise obtain linear equations for z_1^2 and z_2^2 .

Finally, to get an expression for Q_3 we run the following code in the same spirit as our derivation of Q_0 :

```
ideal I3_2=eliminate(I, z2);
ideal I3_1=eliminate(I3_2, z1);
ideal J3_1=I3_1[1], I3_1[3], I3_1[4]; // HUMAN INTERVENTION
ideal J3_0=eliminate(J3_1, z0);
```

We then set Q_3 to be $\text{coef}(J3_0[1], z3)$, completing the proof of lemma 3.3. As before, we see that its coefficients $X_{3,i}$ have differing degrees in the c_\bullet :

```
poly X3_0=coef(J3_0[1], z3)[2,3];
coef(X3_0,c1); // degree 2
coef(X3_0,c0); // degree 3
```

It follows that we can apply $\tau_{0,1}$ to Q_3 to obtain a linear equation for z_3^2 . This is enough to determine the all of the z_i s up to independent sign changes; in order to achieve our goal of determining them up to simultaneous sign changes, it suffices to simply use the equations in (4) to recover $\{z_i \cdot z_j\}_{0 \leq i < j \leq 3}$. Thus, we have (at least in theory) achieved our second goal of describing the fibers of $W \rightarrow V$.

3.8. Example. Consider the example where we are given

$$P_0 = (0, 0, 0), \quad P_1 = (1, 0, 0), \quad P_2 = (1, 1, 0), \quad P_3 = (0, 0, 3),$$

and canvas points

$$(2, 1, 1), \quad \left(\frac{17}{13}, \frac{9}{13}, 1\right), \quad \left(\frac{11}{15}, \frac{4}{5}, 1\right), \quad \left(\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{11}{16}, 1\right),$$

so that the lines L_i generated by these are

$$L_0 = t(2, 1, 1), \quad L_1 = t(17, 9, 13), \quad L_2 = t(11, 12, 15), \quad L_3 = t(8, -11, 16).$$

Then $a_0 = \|P_1 - P_2\|^2 = 1$, $a_1 = \|P_0 - P_2\|^2 = 2$, $a_2 = \|P_0 - P_1\|^2 = 1$, $c_0 = \|P_0 - P_3\|^2 = 9$, $c_1 = \|P_1 - P_3\|^2 = 10$, and $c_2 = \|P_2 - P_3\|^2 = 11$. We also compute that $b_0 = 6$, $b_1 = 99/25$, $b_2 = 45/8$, $d_0 = 9/2$, $d_1 = 21/4$, and $d_2 = 24/5$ (note that the above canvas points are not normalized to get $p_3 = (0, 0, 1)$, so we cannot apply the simplified dot product formulas to get the b_i and d_i ; rather, we use the invariant forms in terms of the lines L_i).

If we use **Singular** to generate our linear equations for the z_i^2 , we obtain the following equations:

$$z_0^2 - 1 = 0, \quad 9z_1^2 - 25 = 0, \quad 9z_2^2 - 16 = 0, \quad z_3^2 - 9 = 0.$$

Recall that these z_i are z -depths for the normalized p_i , where $p_3 = (0, 0, 1)$. Plugging into (4) we find that all the $z_i z_j$ are positive, so we should choose all positive signs for the z_i (i.e., $z_0 = 1$, $z_1 = 5/3$, $z_2 = 4/3$, $z_3 = 3$). Using these z -depths with the normalized p_i does indeed reproduce the same square distances for the $z_i p_i$ as we have for the P_i , as desired.

Observe that rather than rotating to obtain $p_3 = (0, 0, 1)$, since we only care about the square distances between the p_i , it is enough to choose scaled \tilde{p}_i so that $\tilde{p}_i \cdot \tilde{p}_3 = 1$ for all i ; doing this to the above points gives $\tilde{p}_0 = (2, 1, 1)$, $\tilde{p}_1 = \frac{3}{35}(17, 9, 13)$, $\tilde{p}_2 = \frac{3}{28}(11, 12, 15)$ and $\tilde{p}_3 = \frac{1}{21}(8, -11, 16)$. Then we have

$$z_0 \tilde{p}_0 = (2, 1, 1), z_1 \tilde{p}_1 = (\frac{17}{7}, \frac{9}{7}, \frac{13}{7}), z_2 \tilde{p}_2 = (\frac{11}{7}, \frac{12}{7}, \frac{15}{7}), z_3 \tilde{p}_3 = (\frac{8}{7}, \frac{-11}{7}, \frac{16}{7}).$$

The example shows that at least some fibers of the map $W \rightarrow V$ are finite; from Chevalley's theorem it follows that the fibers are finite on a dense open subset of W , and we can conclude the following.

3.9. Corollary. *The map $W \rightarrow V$ has generically finite fibers, so $\dim V = \dim W = 10$.*

Before we turn to practical computational matters, we also describe how we obtain the equations for V . We make the following definitions:

3.10. Definition. For each i , let $g_{i,i}$ be the rational function in $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$ which expresses z_i^2 according to the linear equations derived above. For each pair of distinct i, j , let $g_{i,j}$ be the rational function in $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$ obtained from the appropriate equation in (4) as the expression for $z_i z_j$ after isolating $z_i z_j$ on one side and plugging in $g_{k,k}$ for each of the z_k^2 .

3.11. Proposition. *Equations for V are obtained by setting*

$$g_{i,i} g_{j,j} = (g_{i,j})^2$$

for each $i < j$, and

$$g_{i,j} g_{j,k} = g_{i,k} g_{j,j}$$

for all distinct i, j, k , and clearing denominators as necessary.

Moreover, if we let Z be the codimension-1 subset on which at least one of the d_i or one of the denominators of the $g_{i,i}$ vanishes, the above equations are a complete set of equations for V on the complement of Z . Furthermore, V is not contained in Z , so the above equations determine V completely.

Proof. If we start with a point of V , our previously derived linear equations for z_i^2 tell us that we must have $z_i^2 = g_{i,i}$ for each i , and the conditions $z_i z_j = g_{i,j}$ for i, j distinct are likewise obtained from the equations (4) together with the equations for the z_i^2 . We then obtain the desired equations from the identities $z_i^2 z_j^2 = (z_i z_j)^2$ and $(z_i z_j)(z_j z_k) = (z_i z_k) z_j^2$ respectively.

In order to see that these are all the equations for V on the complement of Z , it is conceptually helpful to introduce variables $z_{i,j}$ for all i, j intended to represent putative values of $z_i z_j$. From this point of view, we see that (at least on the complement of Z) imposing our original equations on the original set of variables gives the same results as introducing the $z_{i,j}$, and then imposing that $z_{i,j} = g_{i,j}$ for all i, j , together with

$$(5) \quad z_{i,i} z_{j,j} = (z_{i,j})^2$$

for all i, j distinct, and

$$(6) \quad z_{i,j} z_{j,k} = z_{i,k} z_{j,j}$$

for all i, j, k distinct. Note that setting $z_{i,j} = g_{i,j}$ is possible precisely because we are assuming we are in the complement of Z .

Now, suppose we are given values for the $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$ which satisfy the above-described equations. Then setting $z_{i,j} = g_{i,j}$ for all i, j , if we have values z_i such that $z_{i,j} = z_i z_j$ for all $i \leq j$ then by

construction the equations (4) are automatically satisfied, so we have produced a point of W , and our original point lay in V , as desired. But if we choose z_i to be a square root of $z_{i,i}$ for each i , then equation (5) guarantees that we have $z_{i,j} = z_i z_j$ up to signs. If all the z_i are zero, there is nothing more to check, but if some $z_j \neq 0$, we can fix a sign choice for z_j , and then determine the signs of z_i for $i \neq j$ by setting $z_i = z_{i,j}/z_j$ (again, this still satisfies $z_i^2 = z_{i,i}$ due to (5)). Then we conclude that $z_{i,k} = z_i z_k$ for all i, k not equal to j by applying Equation (6), completing the argument.

Finally, example 3.8 above shows that V is not contained in Z . In particular, it follows that V is determined by our equations, since V is irreducible, so we can recover it as the closure of $V \setminus Z$. \square

The above argument that suitable z_i s can be recovered from $z_{i,j}$ s satisfying (5) and (6) has various well-known classical formulations. For instance, it can be phrased in terms of the symmetric matrix $(z_{i,j})_{i,j}$ having rank 1, with our equations as (selected) minors. It is also closely related to the statement that the second Veronese embedding is indeed an imbedding of projective spaces, which implies that the set of $z_{i,j}$ s up to simultaneous scaling determine the z_i s up to simultaneous scaling (in our case, since the $z_{i,j}$ s themselves are not just up to scaling, it follows that the only possible scaling for the z_i s is by ± 1).

3.12. Remark. In theory, any given one of the equations we describe above could turn out to be trivial if we produce the same formulas on both sides. However, since we know that we have produced enough equations to determine V , and since V has codimension 2, we know without even computing the equations that we are at least producing some nontrivial constraints on the variables.

3.13. Remark. Continuing along the lines of the preceding remark, we know that points of V that arise from vision problems are not generic, since they satisfy the Cayley-Menger equations. Thus, even if our polynomials Q_i are nondegenerate generically on V , it is theoretically possible that they vanish uniformly on the locus of interest. The same goes for the equations for V we produce in proposition 3.11: we could in principle have that the set Z which we had to omit contains the locus of interest for us.

Of course, we have seen from real-world experience that this is not the case, but it is also ruled out definitively by example 3.8, where we start with actual 4-tuples of points, with the second tuples being coplanar, and verify that we get nontrivial linear equations for the z_i^2 . We know for theoretical reasons that starting with a coplanar quadruple of points will yield values for which the Cayley-Menger determinant vanishes, but of course one can also check this directly in this example; one finds that $(8/3, -5, 4/3, 1, -47/10)$ is in the kernel of the matrix.

3.14. Remark. Shifting our attention to practical concerns, the topic of actually evaluating complex multivariate polynomials is a matter of current research. All approaches are by and large inspired by Horner's classical algorithm, where one typically builds a directed acyclic evaluation graph whose non-terminal nodes are of the form

`Current_node_value = some_variable * child0_value + child1_value,`

and where the terminal nodes are either variables or numbers. This form of evaluation plays nicely with the standard hardware machine operation "fused multiply and add". The evaluation graphs we built for the coefficients $X_{00}, X_{01}, X_{02}, X_{30}, X_{31}, X_{32}$ have 113, 150, 122, 120, 132, 83 nonterminal nodes respectively. No doubt less naive approaches than what we tried would yield better results.

3.15. Remark. Even after one recovers the z_i^2 (or 16 possibilities for them), there remains the problem of solving for the z_i s themselves. If there is no *a priori* constraint on their sign (up to a global sign choice), then the fastest solution is to find the nontrivial eigenvector of the rank-1 symmetric matrix whose entries are z_{ij} , and normalize it to the correct length.

However, in a vision problem we assume the 3D points are in front of the camera, and one then knows that (after accounting for the original canvas rotation) all the points are in front of the camera, and the signs relative to one another are predetermined.

3.16. Remark (some algebraic comments). Our coordinates choice is motivated by invariant theory: This is more evident on the 3D side the a_i, c_i are the invariants under (the 6-dimensional group $E(3)$ of) rigid transformations of the 12-dimensional space representing four points in \mathbb{R}^3 . On the 2D side the b_i, d_i are the invariants under the 1D group of rotations about the optical axis of the 6 dimensional space of planar configurations of 3 points.

We originally tried to act with the full group of rotations on the 2D side. This would give much more symmetric equations in place of (4), but on the other hand, it means moving to a spherical canvas representation. This proved computationally infeasible, probably due to the non-algebraicity explained in remark 2.7.

Another direction is to try to “slice” the moduli space instead of taking invariants; we already partially did this for the 2D points by taking a representative for the configuration for which one point is on the optical axis. However, one can do much more: e.g. on the 3D side force one of the points to be at origin, another to be on the optical axis, and another on some plane containing this axis. This did not prove computationally fruitful (specifically, one gets rather ugly equations).

4. UTILIZATION FOR THE PERSPECTIVE n -POINTS PROBLEM

We begin by summarizing the entire process of solving a perspective n -points problem using our results.

Suppose we are given n prospective matched pairs (\hat{P}_i, \hat{p}_i) between distinct 3D points \hat{P}_i and distinct canvas points \hat{p}_i (imbedded at $z = 1$), with $n \geq 4$. Then:

- Choose a suitable N based on n and the amount of computational time available, and choose N random subsets $S_1, \dots, S_N \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, each of size 4.
- For each $m \leq N$, set up the perspective 4-points problem obtained by letting P_0, \dots, P_3 be the set of \hat{P}_i for $i \in S_m$, and L_0, \dots, L_3 the lines through the origin generated by the corresponding \hat{p}_i s. (Also note the signs of the dot products of these \hat{p}_i s, for later use in recovering the signs of the z_i)
- Compute the values of $a_\bullet, b_\bullet, c_\bullet, d_\bullet$ from the P_i and L_i using our invariant formulas for each.
- Compute the coefficients of the quadric polynomials Q_0, \dots, Q_3 as described in remark 3.14.
- Find the 2^4 possible values of the z_i^2 as roots of the Q_i .
- For each of the 2^4 possibilities, solve for the z_i from the z_i^2 by taking square roots and assigning signs as determined by the signs of the dot products of the corresponding original canvas points (i.e., if L_0, \dots, L_3 correspond to $\hat{p}_{j_0}, \dots, \hat{p}_{j_3}$ respectively, set the sign of each z_i to agree with the sign of $\hat{p}_{j_i} \cdot \hat{p}_{j_3}$; recall that although the z -depths will all be positive relative to the original canvas, the z_i s are with respect to a rotated canvas, so we use the dot products to determine signs).
- Among the 2^4 possibilities, choose the tuple of z_i values which minimizes the error in the equations (4).
- Renormalize the z_i to give z -depths with respect to the original canvas, by setting

$$z'_i = \frac{\|\hat{p}_{j_3}\|}{\hat{P}_{j_i} \cdot \hat{p}_{j_3}}$$

for each i , with the j_i as above (see corollary 2.6 and the subsequent expression of the z_i as dot products).

- Systematically unite subsets S_i of points which have low error, which overlap on three of the four indices, and which have strong agreement of the renormalized z'_i for these three indices.
- Apply Horn’s algorithm [Ho] to solve for orientation on the united subsets of point matches.
- Minimize reprojection error with Fletcher’s algorithm [F].

We conclude with some contextual remarks on practical computational considerations.

4.1. Remark. We prefer to solve the Q_i s than to use the derived linear forms, since the latter would either mean evaluating very complex symbolic expressions, or doubling the number of X_{ij} we have to evaluate. Solving the quadrics amounts just to taking a square root and keeping track of the combinatorics of the 2^4 solutions.

One may argue that following the same reasoning we could have dealt with a quartic in z_0^2 (it is rather easy to find this quartic just from the 3 equations not involving z_3 : this is the quartic describing the 2×4 solutions to the perspective 3 points problem). The reason we prefer the quadric is twofold: solving a quartic equation involves many roots, which one has to keep track of (and not only a sign), and the algebraic computation is far less stable.

4.2. Remark. With real life data, due to the presence of measurement, as well as numerical inaccuracies, the set of equations cannot be exactly solved. As always, we seek the solution which minimizes some error model. The standard error model for the perspective n points model is the *reprojection error*: the sum of the squares of the distances between the points on the canvas, and the projection of the 3D points on the canvas. Minimizing the reprojection error cannot be done exactly, but rather is solved with some optimization algorithm.

One can view the sum of the difference of the evaluations of `f1...f6` after substituting in the estimations of z_i as the “error” in our solution. Although this is not the reprojection error, it is – unlike the error in many other non-gradient-descent algorithms – something which lies, in a sense, in the same domain: namely it is the difference between the square of the lengths between the points in 3D, and the difference between the “best” points along the rays.

To get a more balanced error evaluation, it is better to solve all the z_i^2 from their respective Q_i , although if solution stability were not an issue, given even just one, we can derive linear equations for the rest in terms of rational functions in the one we solved for.

While our error is not identical to the reprojection error, it is usually close enough so that for real data we get a “seed solution” which is an order of magnitude closer to the optimized solution than we would obtain from EPnP type solutions.

Finally, note that if the error for a configuration is large, the configuration may be discarded without solving the absolute orientation problem at all.

4.3. Remark. Observe that all the operations involved in computing z_i^2 – including taking a square root – are vectorizable on any modern architecture. This fact give a large performance boost – more than an order of magnitude – compared to EPnP type algorithms. Specifically, on a regular CPU supporting AVX2, solving one configuration takes an average of 250 nano-seconds when vectorized.

REFERENCES

- [F] R. Fletcher *Modified Marquardt Subroutine for Non-Linear Least Squares* Technical report. NTIS Issue Number 197213, available online at <https://ntrl.ntis.gov/NTRL/dashboard/searchResults/titleDetail/AERER6799.xhtml>
- [GHTC] X. Gao, X. Hou, J. Tang, and H. Cheng. *Complete solution classification for the perspective-three-point problem*. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 2003, 25(8):930–943.
- [G] J.A. Grunert. *Das Pothenot’sche Problem, in erweiterter Gestalt; nebst Bemerkungen über seine Anwendung in der Geodäsie*. in Grunerts Archiv für Mathematik und Physik 1841 (1) p 238-248 <https://archive.org/details/archivdermathem00grungoog/page/n256/mode/2up>

- [Ho] B.K.P. Horn *Closed-form solution of absolute orientation using unit quaternions* Journal of the Optical Society of America A Vol. 4, Issue 4, pp. 629-642 (1987)
- [LMFP] Lepetit V, Moreno-Noguer F, Fua P. *EPnP: An Accurate $O(n)$ Solution to the PnP problem*. International journal of computer vision, 2009, 81(2): 155-166
- [TL] G. Terzakis; M. Lourakis *A Consistently Fast and Globally Optimal Solution to the Perspective-n-Point Problem*. ECCV 2020. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Vol. 12346. pp. 478-494.

APPENDIX A. THE OUTPUT OF OUR SINGULAR PROGRAM

The output was post processed to remove the * symbol:

```
x00 = c0^2a0b1d0d1-2c0c1a0b1d0d1+c1^2a0b1d0d1+c0^2a1b1d0d1-2c0c1a1b1d0d1+c1^2a1b1d0d1-c0^2a2b1d0d1+2c0c1a2b1d0d1-c1^2a2b1d0d1
+2c0a0a2b1d0d1-2c1a0a2b1d0d1+2c0a1a2b1d0d1-2c1a1a2b1d0d1-2c0a2^2b1d0d1+2c1a2^2b1d0d1+a0a2^2b1d0d1+a1a2^2b1d0d1-a2^3b1d0d1
-c0^2a0b1b2d2+2c0c1a0b1b2d2-c1^2a0b1b2d2-c0a0^2b1b2d2+c1a0^2b1b2d2+c0^2a1b1b2d2-2c0c1a1b1b2d2+c1^2a1b1b2d2+2c0a0a1b1b2d2
-2c1a0a1b1b2d2-c0a1^2b1b2d2+c1a1^2b1b2d2+c0^2a2b1b2d2-2c0c1a2b1b2d2+c1^2a2b1b2d2-a0^2a2b1b2d2+2a0a1a2b1b2d2-a1^2a2b1b2d2
+c0a2^2b1b2d2-c1a2^2b1b2d2+a0a2^2b1b2d2-a1a2^2b1b2d2-2c0^2a1d0^2d2+4c0c1a1d0^2d2-2c1^2a1d0^2d2+2a1a2^2d0^2d2-c0a0^2b1b2
-c1a0^2b1b2+2c0a0a1b1b2+2c1a0a1b1b2-c0a1^2b1b2-c1a1^2b1b2+2c0a0a2b1b2+2c1a0a2b1b2+a0^2a2b1b2-2c0a1a2b1b2-2c1a1a2b1b2
-2a0a1a2b1b2+a1^2a2b1b2-c0a2^2b1b2-c1a2^2b1b2-2a0a2^2b1b2+2a1a2^2b1b2+a2^3b1b2+4c0a1a2d0^2d2+4c1a1a2d0^2d2-4a1a2^2d0^2
-4c0a0a2d0d1-4c0a1a2d0d1+4c0a2^2d0d1+2c0a0^2b2d2-4c0a0a1b2d2+2c0a1^2b2d2-2c0a2^2b2d2
```

```
x01 = -4c0a0b0b1d0d1+4c1a0b0b1d0d1-4c0a1b0b1d0d1+4c1a1b0b1d0d1+4c0a2b0b1d0d1-4c1a2b0b1d0d1-4a0a2b0b1d0d1-4a1a2b0b1d0d1+4a2^2b0b1d0d1
-2c0^2b0b1b2d2+4c0c1b0b1b2d2-2c1^2b0b1b2d2+2a0^2b0b1b2d2-4a0a1b0b1b2d2+2a1^2b0b1b2d2-4c0a2b0b1b2d2+4c1a2b0b1b2d2-4a0a2b0b1b2d2
+4a1a2b0b1b2d2+2c0^2b0d0^2d2-4c0c1b0d0^2d2+2c1^2b0d0^2d2+4c0a1b0d0^2d2-4c1a1b0d0^2d2-4a1a2b0d0^2d2-2a2^2b0d0^2d2+2c0^2b1d1^2d2
-4c0c1b1d1^2d2+2c1^2b1d1^2d2+4c0a0b1d1^2d2-4c1a0b1d1^2d2+4a0a2b1d1^2d2-2a2^2b1d1^2d2-4c0^2d0d1d2^2+8c0c1d0d1d2^2-4c1^2d0d1d2^2
+4a0a2d0d1d2^2+4a1a2d0d1d2^2+2c0^2b2d2^2-3c0c1b2d2^2+2c1^2b2d2^2-3a0^2b2d2^2+4a0a1b2d2^2-3a1^2b2d2^2-3c0a0b0b1b2-4c1a0b0b1b2
+4c0a1b0b1b2+4c1a1b0b1b2+4c0a2b0b1b2+4c1a2b0b1b2+4a0a2b0b1b2-4a1a2b0b1b2-4a2^2b0b1b2-4c0a1b0d0^2d2-4c1a1b0d0^2d2-4c0a2b0d0^2d2
-4c1a2b0d0^2d2+4a1a2b0d0^2d2+4a2^2b0d0^2d2+4c0a0b0d0d1+4c0a1b0d0d1-4c0a2b0d0d1+4a0a2b0d0d1+4a1a2b0d0d1-4a2^2b0d0d1-4c1a0b1d0d1
-4c1a1b1d0d1+4c1a2b1d0d1+4a0a2b1d0d1+4a1a2b1d0d1-4a2^2b1d0d1+4c0a0b1d1^2d2+4c1a0b1d1^2d2-4c0a2b1d1^2d2-4c1a2b1d1^2d2-4a0a2b1d1^2d2
+4a2^2b1d1^2d2+4c0a0b0b2d2-2a0^2b0b2d2-4c0a1b0b2d2+4a0a1b0b2d2-2a1^2b0b2d2+4c0a2b0b2d2+2a2^2b0b2d2+4c1a0b1b2d2-2a0^2b1b2d2
-4c1a1b1b2d2+4a0a1b1b2d2-2a1^2b1b2d2-4c1a2b1b2d2+2a2^2b1b2d2+8c1a1d0^2d2+8c0a2d0d1d2+8c1a2d0d1d2-8a0a2d0d1d2-8a1a2d0d1d2
-8c0a0d1^2d2+4a0^2b2d2^2-8a0a1b2d2^2+4a1^2b2d2^2-4c0a2b2d2^2-2c1a2b2d2^2
```

```
x02 = 4a0b0^2b1d0d1+4a1b0^2b1d0d1-4a2b0^2b1d0d1+4c0b0^2b1b2d2-4c1b0^2b1b2d2+4a0b0^2b1b2d2-4a1b0^2b1b2d2-4c0b0^2d0^2d2
+4c1b0^2d0^2d2+4a2b0^2d0^2d2-4c0b0b1d1^2d2+4c1b0b1d1^2d2-8a0b0b1d1^2d2+4a2b0b1d1^2d2+8c0b0d0d1d2^2-8c1b0d0d1d2^2-4a0b0d0d1d2^2
-4a1b0d0d1d2^2-4a2b0d0d1d2^2-4c0b0b2d2^2+4c1b0b2d2^2-3a0b0b2d2^2+4a1b0b2d2^2+3a0d1^2d2^2-3c0b0^2b1b2-4c1b0^2b1b2+4a2b0^2b1b2
+4c0b0^2d0^2+4c1b0^2d0^2-4a2b0^2d0^2-4a0b0^2d0d1-4a1b0^2d0d1+4a2b0^2d0d1-4a0b0b1d0d1-4a1b0b1d0d1+4a2b0b1d0d1-4c0b0b1d1^2d2
+4c1b0b1d1^2d2-4a2b0b1d1^2d2-4a0b0^2b2d2+4a1b0^2b2d2-4a2b0^2b2d2-4a0b0b1b2d2+4a1b0b1b2d2-4a2b0b1b2d2-8c1b0d0^2d2
-8c0b0d0d1d2-8c1b0d0d1d2+8a0b0d0d1d2+8a1b0d0d1d2+8a0b0d1^2d2-8c1b1d1^2d2+8a0b1d1^2d2+4c0b0b2d2^2+4c1b0b2d2^2+8a0b0b2d2^2
-8a1b0b2d2^2+4a2b0b2d2^2+16c1d0d1d2^2-16a0d1^2d2^2-8c1b2d2^2
```

```
x30 = c0^2c1b0b1b2+c0c1^2b0b1b2-c0^2c2b0b1b2+c1^2c2b0b1b2-c0c2^2b0b1b2-c1c2^2b0b1b2+c0^2a1b0b1b2-c1^2a1b0b1b2+2c0c2a1b0b1b2
+2c1c2a1b0b1b2-c0a1^2b0b1b2-c1a1^2b0b1b2-c0^2a2b0b1b2-2c0c1a2b0b1b2-2c1c2a2b0b1b2+c2^2a2b0b1b2+2c1a1a2b0b1b2-2c2a1a2b0b1b2
+a1^2a2b0b1b2+c0a2^2b0b1b2+c2a2^2b0b1b2-a1a2^2b0b1b2-c0^3b0b1b2-2c0^2c1b0b1b2-c0c1^2b0b1b2+c0^2c2b0b1b2+2c0c1c2b0b1b2+c1^2c2b0b1b2
-c0^2a1b0b1d1+2c0c1a1b0b1d1+c1^2a1b0b1d1+2c0^2a2b0b1d1+2c0c1a2b0b1d1-2c0c2a2b0b1d1-2c1c2a2b0b1d1-2c0a1a2b0b1d1-2c1a1a2b0b1d1
-c0a2^2b0b1d1+c2a2^2b0b1d1+a1a2^2b0b1d1+2c0^2c2b1d1^2d2-2c1c2a2b1d1^2d2-2c2a2^2b1d1^2d2+c0^3b0b2d2-c0^2c1b0b2d2
+2c0^2c2b0b2d2-2c0c1c2b0b2d2+c0c2^2b0b2d2-c1c2^2b0b2d2-2c0^2a1b0b2d2+2c0c1a1b0b2d2-2c0c2a1b0b2d2+2c1c2a1b0b2d2+c0a1^2b0b2d2
-c1a1^2b0b2d2-c0^2a2b0b2d2-2c0c2a2b0b2d2-c2^2a2b0b2d2+2c0a1a2b0b2d2+2c2a1a2b0b2d2-a1^2a2b0b2d2-4c0^2c2d1^2d2+4c0c1c2d1^2d2
+4c0c2a2d1^2d2-2c0^2c1b2d2^2+2c1c2^2b2d2^2-4c1c2a1b2d2^2+2c1a1^2b2d2^2+4c0^2c1d1d2^2-4c0c1c2d1d2^2-4c0c1a1d1d2^2
```

```
x31 = -4c0c1b0b1b2-2c1^2b0b1b2+4c0c2b0b1b2+2c2^2b0b1b2-4c0a1b0b1b2-4c2a1b0b1b2+2a1^2b0b1b2+4c0a2b0b1b2+4c1a2b0b1b2-2a2^2b0b1b2
+4c0^2b0b1d1+4c0c1b0b1d1-4c0c2b0b1d1-4c1c2b0b1d1-4c0a1b0b1d1-4c1a1b0b1d1-4c0a2b0b1d1+4c2a2b0b1d1+4a1a2b0b1d1-2c0^2b1d1^2d2
+2c1^2b1d1^2d2-4c0c2b1d1^2d2+4c1c2b1d1^2d2-4c2a2b1d1^2d2+2a2^2b1d1^2d2-4c0^2b0b2d2+4c0c1b0b2d2-4c0c2b0b2d2+4c1c2b0b2d2
+4c0a1b0b2d2-4c1a1b0b2d2+4c0a2b0b2d2+4c2a2b0b2d2-4a1a2b0b2d2+4c0^2d1^2d2-4c0c1d1^2d2+4c0c2d1^2d2-4c1c2d1^2d2-4c0a2d1^2d2
-4c2a2d1^2d2+2c0^2b2d2^2+4c0c1b2d2^2-4c1c2b2d2^2-2c2^2b2d2^2+4c1a1b2d2^2+4c2a1b2d2^2-2a1^2b2d2^2-4c0^2d1d2^2-4c0c1d1d2^2
+4c0c2d1d2^2+4c1c2d1d2^2+4c0a1d1d2^2+4c1a1d1d2^2-2c0^2b0b1+2c1^2b0b1+4c0a1b0b1+4c1a1b0b1-4c1a2b0b1-4a1a2b0b1+2a2^2b0b1
+2c0^2b0b2-2c2^2b0b2+4c2a1b0b2-2a1^2b0b2-4c0a2b0b2-4c2a2b0b2+4a1a2b0b2+2c1^2b1b2-2c2^2b1b2+4c2a1b1b2-2a1^2b1b2-4c1a2b1b2+2a2^2b1b2
-4c0^2b0d1+4c0c2b0d1+4c0a1b0d1+4c0a2b0d1-4c2a2b0d1-4a1a2b0d1-4c1^2b1d1+4c0c2b1d1+4c0a1b1d1+8c1a2b1d1-4a2^2b1d1+8c2a2d1^2+4c0^2b0d2
-4c0c1b0d2-4c0a1b0d2+4c1a1b0d2-4c0a2b0d2+4a1a2b0d2-4c0c1b2d2+4c2^2b2d2-8c2a1b2d2+4a1^2b2d2-4c0a2b2d2+8c0c1d1d2-8c0c2d1d2
-8c0a1d1d2+8c0a2d1d2-8c1a1d2^2
```

```
x32 = 4c1b0b1b2-4c2b0b1b2+4a1b0b1b2-4a2b0b1b2-4c0b0b1d1+4c2b0b1d1+4a1b0b1d1+4c0b1d1^2-4c1b1d1^2+4a2b1d1^2+4c0b0b2d2-4c1b0b2d2
-4a2b0b2d2-4c0d1^2d2+4c1d1^2d2+4a2d1^2d2-4c0b2d2^2+4c2b2d2^2-4a1b2d2^2+4c0d1d2^2-4c2d1d2^2-4a1d1d2^2+4c0b0b1-4c1b0b1-8a1b0b1
+4a2b0b1-4c0b0b2+4c2b0b2-4a1b0b2+8a2b0b2-4c1b1b2+4c2b1b2-4a1b1b2+4a2b1b2+4c0b0d1-4c2b0d1-4a1b0d1-4c0b1d1+8c1b1d1-4c2b1d1-4a1b1d1
-8a2b1d1-8a2d1^2-4c0b0d2+4c1b0d2+4a2b0d2+4c0b2d2+4c1b2d2-8c2b2d2+8a1b2d2+4a2b2d2-8c1d1d2+8c2d1d2+8a1d1d2-8a2d1d2+8a1d2^2
+8a1b0-8a2b0+8a1b1-8a2b2+16a2d1-16a1d2"
```

Email address: dlehavi@gmail.com

Email address: brian.osserman@gmail.com