

Statistics on Manifolds

PGA, Jacobi fields, and optimization

Stefan Sommer, Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Manifold Valued Statistics

For almost all problems involving Principal Geodesic Analysis, PGA, non-linearity, (Riemannian) mani- finds geodesics subspaces of a folds are useful modeling tools. But manifold which either maximizes the loss of vector space structure the variance of the projection of a means that the usual Euclidean dataset to the subspaces or minispace statistical operations must be mizes the reconstruction errors. In redefined. For some operations Euclidean space, we have

this is easy, e.g. kNN, which relies $v^i = \operatorname{argmax} \|v\| = 1$ solely on the metric structure. For others, it is considerably harder.

Regression, SVM, and PCA has been generalized to manifolds, but, unsolved issues remain. One is how variance formulation of PGA, to to compute the result of the operations. Often, problems appears

as optimization problems involving

variations of geodesics. This work

 $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\left\langle x_{j},v\right\rangle^{2}+\sum_{l=1}^{i-1}\left\langle x_{j},v^{l}\right\rangle^{2}\right)$

using orthogonal projections. For even for these operations, many manifolds, this translates, in the

 $\begin{aligned} v^{i} &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\|v\|=1, v \in V_{i-1}^{\perp}} \\ &\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d(\mu, \pi_{S_{v}}(x_{j}))^{2} \end{aligned}$

Exact PGA Algorithm

In [SLN10], we perform gradi- Differences in tagents space: ent descent or similar optimiza-

tion methods on the cost function defining PGA. The hard part is differentiating $d(\mu, \pi_{S_v}(x_j))^2$, and, in particular, the projection $\pi_{S_v}(x_j)$, which itself is an optimization problem. Using the IVP's for the



first and second derivative of the Differences on manifold: exponential map, we get this gradi-

ent.

An iteration of exact PGA:

space PCA) is sufficient.





We see several interesting non-Euclidean effects: the minimiz-

considers such problems, how they $S_{v} = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\operatorname{span}\{V_{i-1}, v\})$ can be solved without linearizing the manifold, and how the resulting which uses the manifold projection computations allow the computa- $\pi_{S_v}(x_j)$ of the data point x_j to the tion of Principal Geodesic Analysis, geodesic subspace S_v and mania generalization of PCA to mani- folds distances by the metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$. folds.

ing residual and maximizing variance formulations are not equiva-The computations are heavy, but lent, variance can decrease when the indicators can determine if including more principal compothe linearized algorithm (tangent nents, the greedy definition of PGA results in weak performance, etc.

Experiment: Human Poses

The pose of a human body can A recorded pose: be represented by spatial coordinates of the end-effectors: joints and end-points of bones. Since the length of bones is constant, the poses will reside on a (3k - b)dimensional implicitly represented manifold $M = F^{-1}(0)$. Here $F^{i}(x) = \|e_{i_{1}} - e_{i_{2}}\|^{2} - l_{i_{1}}^{2},$



where e_{i_1} and e_{i_2} denote the coordinates of the end-effectors and l_i the First principal component of eight constant length of the *i*th bone. poses: In [SLHN10], we perform linearized and exact PGA and get differences as follows:

Exponential Map, Jacobi Fields, and Derivatives

Jacobi fields arises from the var- the exponential map. Theses ODE's ion of the initial velocity of are fundamental in computing exgeodesics. Geodesics can be de- act PGA.

scribed by ODE's in which the ini- Furthermore, Jacobi fields allow estial velocity appear as initial val- timation of the sectional curvature By differentiating the initial of the manifold by the equation ues.



$$||J_t|| = t - \frac{1}{6}Kq_0(\sigma)t^3 + O(t^4)$$

Upper bounds for the injectivity radius, the minimum length of nonminizing geodesics, can also be

values, we get ODE's generating Ja- computed using vanishing Jacobi cobi fields, and second derivaties of fields.

Princ. comp.:	1	2	3	4
angle (°):	5.30	2.19	1.82	1.21
approx. sq. res.:	2.43	1.17	0.43	0.10
exact sq. res.:	2.41	1.18	0.44	0.11
difference:	0.05	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
difference (%):	0.5	-0.6	-2.3	-13.3

Furthermore, we can predict these differences using indicators.

Camera output:



The human pose manifold is relatively curved and the recorded data show large variation. This gives notable differences between the two methods. For other datasets (e.g. bicycle chain shape manifolds), the differences are neglible showing that linearization is a good approximation for these cases.

The presented research is joint work with François Lauze, Søren Hauberg, and Mads Nielsen.

References

- [SLHN10] Stefan Sommer, Francois Lauze, Søren Hauberg, and Mads Nielsen, Manifold valued statistics, exact principal geodesic analysis and the effect of linear approximations, ECCV 2010 (Heraklion, Greece), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6316, Springer, Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 43–56.
- [SLN10] Stefan Sommer, François Lauze, and Mads Nielsen, The differential of the exponential map, jacobi fields, and exact principal geodesic analysis, Submitted. (2010).