

1 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: Probabilistic Registration for Gaussian**  
2 **Process 3D shape modelling in the presence of extensive missing data\***

3 Filipa Valdeira<sup>†</sup>, Ricardo Ferreira<sup>‡</sup>, Alessandra Micheletti<sup>†</sup>, and Cláudia Soares<sup>§</sup>  
4

5 **SM1. Proof for update equations in 4.2.2.**

6 **SM1.1. Proposition 1.** With  $p(s, t, \theta)$  as defined in (4.4) we take expectation with respect  
7 to  $q_2(c, e)$  and  $q_{3i}(\varsigma_i)$  and drop the terms non dependent on  $\delta$ , as they are included in a constant  
8 term.

9 
$$\mathbb{E}_{-1}[\log p(x, y, \theta)] = -\frac{1}{2}\delta^T K^{-1}\delta - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N_T}\frac{1}{\varsigma_i^2}\sum_{j=1}^{N_S}\|s_j - \mathcal{T}_i\|^2 p_{ij} + C.$$

10 Manipulating the second term, we are able to obtain

11 
$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{N_T}\frac{1}{\varsigma_i^2}\sum_{j=1}^{N_S}\|s_j - \mathcal{T}_i\|^2 p_{ij} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_T}\frac{1}{\varsigma_i^2}\|t_i + \delta_i\|^2 \nu_i - 2\sum_{j=1}^{N_S}\sum_{i=1}^{N_T}\frac{1}{\varsigma_i^2}p_{ij}s_j^T(t_i + \delta_i) + C \\ &= (t + \delta)^T \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}(t + \delta) - 2s^T \tilde{P}^T \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}(t + \delta) + C \\ &= \delta^T \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}\delta - 2\left(\tilde{D}_\nu^{-1}\tilde{P}s - t\right)^T \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}\delta + C. \end{aligned}$$

12 Therefore, the expectation becomes

13 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{-1}[\log p(x, y, \theta)] &= -\frac{1}{2}\delta^T K^{-1}\delta - \frac{1}{2}\delta^T \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}\delta + \left(\tilde{D}_\nu^{-1}\tilde{P}s - t\right)^T \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}\delta + C \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\delta^T (K^{-1} + \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1})\delta + \left(\tilde{D}_\nu^{-1}\tilde{P}s - t\right)^T \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}\delta + C \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\delta^T \Sigma^{-1}\delta + \left(\hat{s} - t\right)^T \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}\delta + C, \end{aligned}$$

14 with  $\Sigma = (K^{-1} + \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1})^{-1}$  and  $\hat{s} = \tilde{D}_\nu^{-1}\tilde{P}s$ . Finally, we can obtain

15 
$$\mathbb{E}_{-1}[\log p(x, y, \theta)] = -\frac{1}{2}\left\{\delta - \Sigma \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}(\hat{s} - t)\right\}^T \Sigma^{-1}\left\{\delta - \Sigma \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\varsigma^2}^{-1}(\hat{s} - t)\right\} + C,$$

---

\*Submitted to the editors DATE.

**Funding:** This work has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Project BIGMATH, Grant Agreement No 812912.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Environmental Science and Policy, Università degli Studi di Milano, via Celoria 2, 20133 Milan, Italy ([filipa.marreiros@unimi.it](mailto:filipa.marreiros@unimi.it), [alessandra.micheletti@unimi.it](mailto:alessandra.micheletti@unimi.it)).

<sup>‡</sup> $\mu$ Robotics, Lisbon, Portugal ([ricardo.ferreira@robotics.pt](mailto:ricardo.ferreira@robotics.pt)).

<sup>§</sup>NOVA LINCS, Computer Science Department, NOVA School of Science and Technology, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, 2829-516 Caparica, Portugal ([Claudia.soares@fct.unl.pt](mailto:Claudia.soares@fct.unl.pt))

16 from which we have that  $q_1^*(\delta)$  follows a multivariate normal distribution with the following  
17 parameters

$$18 \quad q_1(\delta)^* = \phi(\delta; \Sigma \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\zeta^2}^{-1} (\hat{S} - T), \Sigma),$$

19 meaning that

$$20 \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\delta] &= \Sigma D_\nu D_{\zeta^2}^{-1} (\tilde{D}_\nu^{-1} \tilde{P}s - T) \\ \text{Cov}(\delta) &= \Sigma = (K^{-1} + \tilde{D}_\nu \tilde{D}_{\zeta^2}^{-1})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

21 **SM1.2. Proposition 2.** We will take the expectation of the joint with respect to  $q_1(\delta)$ ,  
22  $q_{3i}(\zeta_i)$  and drop the terms not dependent on  $c$  and  $e$ , obtaining

$$23 \quad \mathbb{E}_{-2}[\log p(x, y, \theta)] = \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} \left[ \log \left( \{wp_{out}(s_j)\}^{1-c_j} \left\{ \frac{1-w}{N_T} \right\}^{c_j} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \log \{ \langle \phi_{ij} \rangle \}^{c_j \gamma_i(e_j)} \right] + C,$$

24 where we defined  $\langle \phi_{ij} \rangle = \exp E[\log(\phi_{ij})]$ , computed from the other steps and assumed known  
25 at this point. As the the variance is only included in  $\langle \phi_{ij} \rangle$ , the computation of  $p_{ij}$  remains as  
26 in [SM1]

$$27 \quad p_{ij} = \frac{(1-w)\langle \phi_{ij} \rangle}{N_T wp_{out}(s_j) + (1-w) \sum_{i'=1}^{N_T} \langle \phi_{i'j} \rangle}$$

28 and we omit the derivation. Finally, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_{ij} \rangle &= \exp \mathbb{E}[\log(\phi_{ij})] = \exp \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \left( \frac{1}{(\zeta_i \sqrt{2\pi})^D} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\|s_j - \bar{t}_i\|^2}{2\zeta_i^2} \right\} \right) \right] \right\} \\ 29 \quad &= \frac{1}{(\zeta_i \sqrt{2\pi})^D} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\|s_j - E[\bar{t}_i]\|^2 + \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(\delta_i))}{2\zeta_i^2} \right\} \\ &= \phi_{ij}(s_j; \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i], \zeta_i^2) \exp \left\{ -\frac{\text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(\delta_i))}{2\zeta_i^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

30 **SM1.3. Proposition 3.** Because  $q_{3i}(\zeta_i)$  is a Delta dirac function we will directly maximize  
31 the lower bound, taking the expectation w.r.t.  $q_1(\delta)$  and  $q_2(c, e)$  and drop terms not dependent  
32 on  $\zeta_i^2$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\log p(x, y, \theta)] &= -\frac{D}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} p_{ij} \log \zeta_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \frac{1}{\zeta_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} \left[ \|s_j - E[\bar{t}_i]\|^2 + \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(\delta_i)) \right] p_{ij} + C \\ 33 \quad &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \left( D\nu_i \log \zeta_i^2 + \frac{1}{\zeta_i^2} \beta_i \right) + C \end{aligned}$$

34 where we have defined  $\beta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} p_{ij} (\|s_j - \hat{t}_i\|^2 + \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(t_i)))$ , assumed known at this step.  
 35 In order to maximize the ELBO we can minimize

$$36 \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \left( D\nu_i \log \varsigma_i^2 + \frac{1}{\varsigma_i^2} \beta_i \right),$$

37 so we can minimize each of the terms, such that

$$38 \quad (\varsigma_i^2)^* = \underset{\varsigma_i^2}{\text{argmin}} D \log(\varsigma_i^2) \nu_i + \frac{1}{\varsigma_i^2} \beta_i.$$

39 Taking the derivative and equalling to zero we get

$$40 \quad (\varsigma_i^2)^* = \frac{\beta_i}{D\nu_i}.$$

41 We can now reformulate this expression, noting that  $\beta_i$  can be written as

$$42 \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_i &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} p_{ij} s_j^T s_j - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} p_{ij} s_j^T \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i] + \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} p_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i]^T \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i] + \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} p_{ij} \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(t_i)) \\ &= [P \text{diag}(S) S]_i - 2 \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i]^T [PS]_i + \nu_i \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i]^T \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i] + \nu_i \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(t_i)) \end{aligned}$$

43 and so

$$44 \quad \varsigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{D} \left[ \frac{[P \text{diag}(S) S]_i - 2 \mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i]^T [PS]_i}{\nu_i} + \|\mathbb{E}[\bar{t}_i]\|^2 + \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(\delta_i)) \right].$$

## 45 **SM2. Detailed settings for experimental results.**

46 **SM2.1. Experiments in Section 5.1.** All methods consisting of GPSF variations (i.e.  
 47 *GPSF\_Full*, *GPSF\_bcpdReg*, *GPSF\_noTresh*) use a Squared Exponential Kernel, with a vari-  
 48 ance of 0.05 and a lengthscale of 1.5. The outlier probability is set to 0.1 and  $P_{MIN} = 0.01$ .  
 49 The initial value for the registration variance is  $\varsigma^2 = 1$ . *GPClosestPnt* uses the same ker-  
 50 nel. The variance for the observations (constant over the iterations) is set to 0.1 and the  
 51 maximum distance for the closest point attribution is 0.15. The parameters for BCPD can  
 52 be found in Table SM1, where we keep the notation used in the original paper and in the  
 53 authors implementation. The parameters for all methods were optimized on the Fish dataset  
 54 with deformation level 2, by grid search. They are kept constant throughout the experiments,  
 55 except for the variation of  $\omega$  when pointed out.

	$\omega$	$\lambda$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	normalization
<i>BCPD_Standard</i>	0.1	2	2	3	e
<i>BCPD_OPT_Norm</i>	0.1	1	1.5	2	e
<i>BCPD_OPT_noNorm</i>	0.1	1	10	0.1	x

**Table SM1**

Parameters for BCPD experiments.

## 56 SM2.2. Experiments in Section 5.2.

57 **SM2.2.1. Dataset.** The Simulated dataset is obtained by applying the following defor-  
58 mations to the original Ear dataset. We compute the average Euclidean distance between the  
59 template and each shape in the dataset, after which we select a subset of the 15 shapes with  
60 largest distance, with an average distance of 4.35cm.

61 *Missing data.* The real scans have missing points, not only uniformly spread, but also  
62 concentrated in particular regions of the ear which are more difficult to capture by the scanning  
63 process. Therefore, in the Ear dataset we introduce both uniform and structured missing data  
64 points. The former are randomly taken from the entire point set, corresponding to 5% of the  
65 total number of points. The latter are completely removed from a predefined region.

66 *Outliers.* The ear region also contains outliers, i.e. points with no correspondence in the  
67 template. In particular, the structured outliers come from the fact that when we cut the ear  
68 portion from the entire head of the scan we do not know exactly which points belong to the  
69 ear, and consequently include some extra points. To simulate this, we define a region around  
70 the ear where outliers are added with a 0.2 ratio of the total number of points of the shape.

71 *Measurement Noise.* For each point in the Ear dataset we introduce Gaussian noise with  
72 zero mean and standard deviation of 0.07, so that they are slightly displaced, to simulate the  
73 lack of complete accuracy in the screening process.

74 *Slight rotation, translation and scaling.* Even after removing the main components of these  
75 3 transformations it is expected that the different scans still present a small difference, not  
76 only due to limitations on the first step, but also due to natural differences in shape that do  
77 not allow for a better result. However, the Ear dataset is perfectly aligned, which can produce  
78 misleading results. Therefore, we apply to all shapes a random rotation uniformly taken from  
79 the interval of  $-4^\circ$  to  $+4^\circ$  on each axis, random scaling uniformly taken from the interval  
80  $[0.8, 1.2]$  and translation from the interval  $[-3, 3]$  on each component.

81 **SM2.2.2. Methods parameters.** BCPD settings are:  $\lambda = 10$ ,  $\beta = 1$ ,  $\omega = 0.3$ ,  $\gamma = 0.1$   
82 and normalization option set to  $x$  (normalized w.r.t. target shape). SFGP uses a Squared  
83 Exponential kernel with lengthscale of 10 and variance of 10. The outlier probability is set to  
84 0.1 and  $P_{MIN} = 0.01$ . The initial value for the registration variance is  $\zeta^2 = 5$ .

85 **SM2.3. Implementation details.** For BCPD we use the code provided by the authors  
86 at <https://github.com/ohirose/bcpd>. Gaussian Process Regression in SFGP and GP Closest  
87 Point is computed with the GPFlow library [SM2].

## 88 REFERENCES

- 89 [1] O. HIROSE, *A bayesian formulation of coherent point drift*, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and  
90 Machine Intelligence, 43 (2021), pp. 2269–2286.  
91 [2] A. G. D. G. MATTHEWS, M. VAN DER WILK, T. NICKSON, K. FUJII, A. BOUKOUVALAS, P. LEÓN-  
92 VILLAGRÁ, Z. GHAHRAMANI, AND J. HENSMAN, *GPflow: A Gaussian process library using TensorFlow*,  
93 Journal of Machine Learning Research, 18 (2017), pp. 1–6, <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-537.html>.