

# [Supplementary] Procrustean Normal Distribution for Non-Rigid Structure from Motion

Minsik Lee      Jungchan Cho      Chong-Ho Choi      Songhwai Oh  
 Department of EECS, ASRI, Seoul National University, 151-742, Seoul, Korea  
 mlee.paper@gmail.com      {cjcc83, chchoi, songhwai}@snu.ac.kr

TABLE I  
 AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITHOUT NOISE AND MISSING DATA

	CSF2	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	<b>0.1926</b>	0.0727	0.0727	0.0695	0.0695
walking	<b>0.0708</b>	0.0465	<b>0.1632</b>	0.0455	<b>0.1274</b>
shark	<b>0.0551</b>	0.0135	0.0156	<b>0.0204</b>	<b>0.0925</b>
face	0.0209	0.0165	<b>0.0247</b>	0.0197	<b>0.0827</b>
yoga	<b>0.0226</b>	0.014	<b>0.2013</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>0.4157</b>
stretch	<b>0.0219</b>	0.0156	<b>0.3472</b>	0.0151	0.0152
pickup	<b>0.0607</b>	0.0372	0.0341	<b>0.1505</b>	<b>0.1513</b>
drink	<b>0.0123</b>	<b>0.0037</b>	0.0036	0.0036	0.0035
dance	<b>0.1349</b>	0.1834	0.2199	0.203	0.2104

TABLE II  
 AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITH NOISE AND WITHOUT  
 MISSING DATA

	CSF2	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	<b>0.2061</b>	<b>0.0889</b>	0.0889	0.0859	0.0859
walking	0.0966	0.077	<b>0.1128</b>	0.0793	<b>0.1292</b>
shark	<b>0.1043</b>	0.06	0.073	0.0524	0.0612
face	<b>0.0543</b>	0.0403	0.0403	0.0384	0.0382
yoga	0.0529	<b>0.0409</b>	<b>0.0687</b>	0.0395	<b>0.4078</b>
stretch	0.0543	0.0444	<b>0.1035</b>	0.0443	<b>0.1024</b>
pickup	<b>0.0705</b>	0.0409	0.0462	<b>0.2233</b>	<b>0.2452</b>
drink	0.0365	<b>0.0339</b>	0.0339	0.0339	0.0339
dance	0.1544	0.1806	0.1975	0.165	<b>0.3673</b>

## I. PERFORMANCE UNDER VARIOUS MODIFICATIONS

One of the reviewers asked about how much the rotation initialization [1] and the scale constraint in EM-PND affect the performance. We show the comparison in Tables I – IV. Here, the performance of EM-PND with random initial rotations is significantly degraded for 40% of the examples. These correspond to the data with large deformations, as stated in the paper. However, when EM-PND uses the same rotation initialization method as CSF2 [1], EM-PND achieves up to 85% better performance than CSF2. This means that EM-PND contributes significantly to the performance improvement.

As discussed in the paper, a scale constraint is required for EM-PND to normalize the scale changes due to camera motions. To verify this, we performed experiments on EM-PND without the scale constraint. In Tables I – IV, the performance decreased significantly without the scale constraint for 20% of the examples. To confirm our claim, we also added some scale changes to the data. We linearly increased the frame scale as the frame number increased until the scale of the middle frame

TABLE III  
 AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITH MISSING DATA AND WITHOUT  
 NOISE

	CSF2	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	<b>0.4505</b>	0.0805	0.0806	0.0773	0.0773
walking	<b>0.1033</b>	0.0469	<b>0.0847</b>	0.0507	<b>0.0787</b>
shark	<b>0.0653</b>	0.0166	0.0163	0.0166	0.0214
face	<b>0.0412</b>	0.0177	0.0167	0.018	<b>0.0289</b>
yoga	<b>0.0854</b>	0.0181	<b>0.0732</b>	0.0225	<b>0.0925</b>
stretch	<b>0.0597</b>	0.015	<b>0.3796</b>	0.0147	0.0338
pickup	<b>0.0933</b>	0.0149	<b>0.1741</b>	<b>0.3271</b>	<b>0.4047</b>
drink	<b>0.0357</b>	0.0055	0.0055	0.0054	0.0054
dance	0.1415	0.1766	0.1912	0.2142	<b>0.2509</b>

TABLE IV  
 AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITH NOISE AND MISSING DATA

	CSF2	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	<b>0.4574</b>	0.0968	0.0968	0.0933	0.0934
walking	<b>0.1095</b>	0.0842	<b>0.1156</b>	0.0866	<b>0.1112</b>
shark	0.0872	0.0672	0.0766	0.0526	0.0635
face	0.0583	<b>0.0464</b>	<b>0.0745</b>	0.0435	0.0433
yoga	<b>0.1583</b>	0.0488	<b>0.094</b>	0.0528	0.0613
stretch	<b>0.0707</b>	0.0535	<b>0.299</b>	0.0534	<b>0.0848</b>
pickup	<b>0.0948</b>	0.0486	0.0485	<b>0.2906</b>	<b>0.3387</b>
drink	0.0428	0.0408	0.0411	0.0406	0.0407
dance	0.1501	<b>0.1601</b>	0.1532	<b>0.2084</b>	<b>0.27</b>

became two, and then reverse the process so that the last frame had the same size as the original frame. The results for these data are shown in Tables V – VIII. Here, we can see that the performance of EM-PND with no scale constraint gets even worse for the data under scale change, unlike the original EM-PND.

## II. DOF OF PND

The DOF of PND is  $n_Y - n_d - 1$  for  $\bar{\Sigma}$  and  $n_R(n_R + 1)/2$  for  $\Sigma$ . This is derived from (14). Since  $\|\bar{\Sigma}\| = 1$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0}$ , these relations rule out  $n_d + 1$  DOF from  $\bar{\Sigma}$ . After  $\bar{\Sigma}$  is decided,  $\mathbf{Q}_N$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  are determined based on  $\bar{\Sigma}$ . Hence, the only term that can change in  $\Sigma$  is  $\Sigma_R$ , which is a symmetric matrix. Therefore, the DOF of  $\Sigma$  is  $n_R(n_R + 1)/2$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. F. U. Gotardo and A. M. Martinez, “Non-rigid structure from motion with complementary rank-3 spaces,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, June 2011. 1

TABLE V  
AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITHOUT NOISE AND MISSING DATA  
UNDER SCALE CHANGE

	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	0.073	0.073	0.0718	0.0719
walking	<u>0.0467</u>	<b>0.0814</b>	<b>0.2006</b>	<b>0.1156</b>
shark	0.0139	0.0137	<b>0.0941</b>	<b>0.1099</b>
face	0.0164	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.0345</b>	<b>0.1326</b>
yoga	0.0143	<b>0.2284</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.5727</b>
stretch	<u>0.0161</u>	<b>0.5372</b>	<b>0.0251</b>	<b>0.3372</b>
pickup	0.0366	0.0429	<b>0.1288</b>	0.0451
drink	0.0035	0.0035	0.0038	0.0038
dance	0.183	0.2255	<b>0.4783</b>	<b>1.2941</b>

TABLE VI  
AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITH NOISE AND WITHOUT  
MISSING DATA UNDER SCALE CHANGE

	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	0.0896	0.0896	0.0883	0.0883
walking	0.0781	<b>0.1059</b>	<b>0.1119</b>	<b>0.1552</b>
shark	<u>0.0628</u>	<b>0.0937</b>	<b>0.0983</b>	<b>0.1304</b>
face	0.0428	0.0427	0.0424	0.0423
yoga	0.0436	<b>0.109</b>	0.0451	<b>0.3502</b>
stretch	0.0451	<b>0.1159</b>	0.0467	<b>0.2624</b>
pickup	0.0422	<b>0.0874</b>	0.0427	<b>0.1517</b>
drink	0.0349	0.0349	0.0339	0.034
dance	0.1865	0.1906	0.2138	<b>0.4299</b>

TABLE VII  
AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITH MISSING DATA AND WITHOUT  
NOISE UNDER SCALE CHANGE

	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	0.0806	0.0806	0.0794	0.0794
walking	0.0472	<b>0.0899</b>	<b>0.1066</b>	<b>0.1016</b>
shark	<u>0.0161</u>	0.0159	<b>0.2806</b>	<b>0.0973</b>
face	0.0176	0.0169	0.0216	<b>0.0249</b>
yoga	0.0187	<b>0.046</b>	<b>0.0306</b>	<b>0.1988</b>
stretch	0.0152	<b>0.2227</b>	<b>0.1577</b>	<b>0.1041</b>
pickup	<u>0.015</u>	<b>0.1494</b>	<b>0.2093</b>	<b>0.6444</b>
drink	0.0053	0.0054	0.0066	0.0061
dance	0.1778	0.187	<b>0.3985</b>	<b>0.3717</b>

TABLE VIII  
AVERAGE RECONSTRUCTION ERRORS WITH NOISE AND MISSING DATA  
UNDER SCALE CHANGE

	EM-PND	EM-PND/ random initial rotation	EM-PND/ without scale constraint	EM-PND/ random initial +no constraint
FRGC	0.0972	0.0973	0.0958	0.0959
walking	<u>0.0873</u>	0.1091	<b>0.1142</b>	<b>0.13</b>
shark	0.0763	0.0801	<b>0.1079</b>	0.0893
face	0.0488	0.0488	0.0485	0.0484
yoga	0.0548	<b>0.1079</b>	0.0586	<b>0.1002</b>
stretch	0.0539	<b>0.2159</b>	0.0552	<b>0.1709</b>
pickup	0.0499	0.0499	0.0502	<b>0.6887</b>
drink	0.042	0.0424	0.0409	0.041
dance	<u>0.1659</u>	0.165	<b>0.2557</b>	<b>0.3012</b>