
Subject: Registration of 3D shells?

Posted by [Dick Jackson](#) on Wed, 15 May 2002 16:22:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi all,

I'd like to know if anyone has any experience to share on registration of 3D shells. That is, if you have two IDLgrPolygons (or Surfaces) that are 'snapshots' of the surface of an object, which:

- may not have perfect overlap (unmatching data on some edges of each object),
 - need some rigid-body transformation (translation or rotation in 3D) to bring them together,
 - may differ slightly in the actual object's detail,
- find the optimal transform to bring them together.

One complication is that the datasets are large (1024x1024 points per surface).

Experiments with Constrained_Min and Craig Markwardt's TNMIN have been promising with small datasets, I wonder if anyone has tackled this with bigger ones in IDL.

Any help is appreciated!

Cheers,

--

-Dick

Dick Jackson / dick@d-jackson.com
D-Jackson Software Consulting / <http://www.d-jackson.com>
Calgary, Alberta, Canada / +1-403-242-7398 / Fax: 241-7392

Subject: Re: Registration of 3D shells?

Posted by [anne.martel](#) on Fri, 17 May 2002 09:35:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The registration of 2 surfaces is quite a common problem in medical image registration. One successful approach is that proposed by Charles Pelizzari (JCAT, 1989, 13:20-26) where you try to fit one surface on top of the other like fitting a hat on a head. The most efficient way to do this is to generate a distance map (sometimes called a chamfer map) using one surface and then rotate the other surface so that the distance between any point on the rotated surface and the stationary surface is minimised. You usually only need to calculate the distance for a subset of the surface points. The only problem with the algorithm is that it can converge to a local minimum (like putting on

the hat back to front)

Anne

"Dick Jackson" <dick@d-jackson.com> wrote in message
news:<3cQE8.82791\$GG6.7187426@news3.calgary.shaw.ca>...
> "Craig Markwardt" <craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu> wrote in message
> news:onptzxkpqu.fsf@cow.physics.wisc.edu...
>>
>> "Dick Jackson" <dick@d-jackson.com> writes:
>>
>>> Hi all,
>>>
>>> I'd like to know if anyone has any experience to share on registration
> of 3D
>>> shells. That is, if you have two IDLgrPolygons (or Surfaces) that are
>>> 'snapshots' of the surface of an object, which:
>> ...
>>
>> Hi Dick--
>>
>> Are these 2d or 3d data sets? When you say surface that could be an
>> isosurface within a 3d data volume, or simple the surface $z = f(x,y)$
>> of a 2d data set.
>>
>> I think registration of 2d data sets is commonly done with a cross
>> correlation.
>
> Yes, they are generally like a $z = f(x,y)$ surface, in that a surface doesn't
> wrap around behind itself. With some datasets we have regular (x,y),
> sometimes not.
>
> As I understand it, cross correlation could find the best x-y translation
> with regular (x,y), but we have rotation and translation in 3D to contend
> with. My solution will need 6 parameters, can cross correlation help out
> here?
>
> Thanks for your interest!
>
> Cheers,

Subject: Re: Registration of 3D shells?
Posted by [Dick Jackson](#) on Fri, 17 May 2002 14:47:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks, that's the direction I'm looking at with Constrained_Min and TNMIN.

Choosing a subset of points might keep it tractable.

"Anne Martel" <anne.martel@nottingham.ac.uk> wrote in message
news:a4bf6780.0205170135.37e51c32@posting.google.com...

> The registration of 2 surfaces is quite a common problem in medical
> image registration. One successful approach is that proposed by Charles
> Pelizzari (JCAT, 1989, 13:20-26) where you try to fit one surface on
> top of the other like fitting a hat on a head. The most efficient way
> to do this is to generate a distance map (sometimes called a chamfer
> map) using one surface and then rotate the other surface so that the
> distance between any point on the rotated surface and the stationary
> surface is minimised. You usually only need to calculate the distance
> for a subset of the surface points. The only problem with the
> algorithm is that it can converge to a local minimum (like putting on
> the hat back to front)

>

> "Dick Jackson" <dick@d-jackson.com> wrote in message
news:<3cQE8.82791\$GG6.7187426@news3.calgary.shaw.ca>...

>> "Craig Markwardt" <craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu> wrote in message
>> news:onptzxkpqu.fsf@cow.physics.wisc.edu...

>>>

>>> "Dick Jackson" <dick@d-jackson.com> writes:

>>>

>>>> Hi all,

>>>>

>>>> I'd like to know if anyone has any experience to share on
registration

>> of 3D

>>>> shells. That is, if you have two IDLgrPolygons (or Surfaces) that
are

>>>> 'snapshots' of the surface of an object, which:

>>> ...

>>>

>>> Hi Dick--

>>>

>>> Are these 2d or 3d data sets? When you say surface that could be an
>>> isosurface within a 3d data volume, or simple the surface $z = f(x,y)$
>>> of a 2d data set.

>>>

>>> I think registration of 2d data sets is commonly done with a cross
>>> correlation.

>>>

>> Yes, they are generally like a $z = f(x,y)$ surface, in that a surface
doesn't

>> wrap around behind itself. With some datasets we have regular (x,y),
>> sometimes not.

>>>

>> As I understand it, cross correlation could find the best x-y

translation

>> with regular (x,y), but we have rotation and translation in 3D to
contend

>> with. My solution will need 6 parameters, can cross correlation help out
>> here?

>>

>> Thanks for your interest!

>>

>> Cheers,
