



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***EFFECT OF MASKING TECHNIQUES ON COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY
REDUCTION OF SCALE INVARIANT FEATURE TRANSFORM***

YUNUSA ALI SAI'D

FK 2015 150



**EFFECT OF MASKING TECHNIQUES ON COMPUTATIONAL
COMPLEXITY REDUCTION OF SCALE INVARIANT FEATURE
TRANSFORM**

By

YUNUSA ALI SAI'D

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra
Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy**

April 2015

COPYRIGHT

All materials contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright ©Universiti Putra Malaysia



DEDICATIONS

I dedicate this work of mine to my Mum and Dad. May the mercy of Allah be upon us all. Your support and courage is what made me what I am today. Thank you.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**EFFECT OF MASKING TECHNIQUES ON COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY
REDUCTION OF SCALE INVARIANT FEATURE TRANSFORM**

By

YUNUSA ALI SAI'D

April 2015

Chair: Professor Madya Mohammad Hamiruce Marhaban, Ph.D.

Faculty: Engineering

The Scale Invariant Feature Transform (SIFT) is algorithm use in feature detection and description, it is famous and has dominated the research community. The SIFT is a standard compared to others. Notwithstanding its sturdiness, SIFT has limitation of computational complexity, this has pose great limitation to real time and on-line implementations. Effort has been done by researchers to improve on SIFT performance because of it robustness, the computational cost was reduced to some extent but the distinctiveness cannot be compared with others(Descriptors). Thus, the aim of this research is to propose masking techniques to images, by eliminating areas with no or sparse keypoints in the feature extraction process, thereby reducing the computational cost of SIFT as the dominant descriptor in computer and robotic vision. Performance of the proposed approach was able to reduce the computational time to 47.27% at 0.7 Threshold with 17.94% in keypoint reduction. However, the masked SIFT was used in place categorization for performance evaluation. The evaluation was conducted using two classifiers in pattern recognition on the classification of Royal Institute of Technology-Image Data for Robot Localization (KTH-IDOL2) database. The classifiers are Nearest Neighbor (NN) and Multilayer Perceptron (MLP). Comparison of the categorization and classification accuracy produced 70% with the nearest neighbor(NN) and improved to 80% with Multilayer perceptron. In conclusion, the proposed approach was able to improved the computational time of SIFT higher than the recent published work in literature.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doctor Falsafah

**KESAN TEKNIK PELITUPAN KEPADA PENGURANGAN KERUMITAN
PENGIRAAN PENJALMAN SKALA CIRI TIDAK BERUBAH**

Oleh

YUNUSA ALI SAI'D

April 2015

Pengerusi: Professor Madya Mohammad Hamiruce Marhaban, Ph.D.

Fakulti: Kejuruteraan

Penggunaan algoritma Penjelmaan Skala Ciri Tidak Berubah (SIFT) yang terkenal dalam pengesanan dan pemerihalan sesuatu ciri telah mendominasi komuniti penyelidikan atas faktor kekukuhanannya. Meskipun kukuh, penggunaan SIFT pada masa sebenar atau atas talian adalah terhad kerana kerumitan dalam pengiraannya. Pelbagai usaha dan teknik yang sedang dan telah dilakukan oleh penyelidik-penyelidik untuk memperbaiki prestasi SIFT dengan mengurangkan masa pengiraannya tanpa mengurangi kekukuhanannya. Untuk itu, kajian ini mencadangkan teknik pelitupan imej digunakan, iaitu dengan menghapuskan kawasan tanpa titik penting atau kurang padat semasa proses pengekstrakan ciri supaya masa pengiraan SIFT sebagai penghurai yang dominan didalam komputer dan visi robotik dapat dikurangkan. Menerusi pendekatan yang di-cadangkan, masa pengiraan telah dikurangkan sebanyak 47.27% pada 0.7 ambang dengan 17.94% titik penting dikurangkan. Untuk menilai ketepatan pengkategorian kawasan menerusi kaedah pelitupan SIFT, eksperimen dijalankan ke atas pengkalan data Royal Institute of Technology-Image Data for Robot Localization (KTH-IDOL2) dengan menggunakan dua pengelas sebagai pengiktirafan corak; iaitu Jiran Terhampir (NN) dan Perseptron Berbilang Lapis (MLP). Ketepatan klasifikasi yang dihasilkan dengan Jiran Terhampir (NN) adalah 70% dan meningkat kepada 80% dengan Perseptron Berbilang Lapis (MLP). Kesimpulannya, pendekatan yang dicadangkan dapat mengurangkan masa pengiraan SIFT lebih rendah berbanding kerja baru-baru ini yang disiarkan dalam sorotan kajian.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my parents and friends, for always being there for me. To Aishat my wife, my children Muhammad Auwal, Usama and Summaiya, for their patience during this academic journey. To advisor; Assoc. Prof. Madya M.H. Marhaban, for his support and help. To Assoc. Prof Madya Abd Rahman Ramli for his fatherly support and advice also, Dr. Siti Anom for her advice, support and assistance.

Special thanks, to Engr Dr. Danjuma Isah former Rector of Kaduna Polytechnic, who supported my nomination for sponsorship for further studies.

Sincere thanks to all my group members especially Habibu Rabiou for his assistance with the implementation of LBP, Reza Shoorangiz on my numerous questions, Arash Toudeski and Komeil for their assistance. Finally, special thanks to my friend Dr. Abdullahi Iliyusu from faculty of Agriculture UPM for his welfare and proof reading of the thesis.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Mohammad Hamiruce Marhaban, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairperson)

Abd Rahman Ramli, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Siti Anom Ahmad, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

BUJANG KIM HUAT, Ph.D.

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by University Putra Malaysia, as according to the University Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature _____ Date: _____

Name and Matric No.: _____

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under the supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: _____

Name of
Chairman of
Supervisory
Committee: _____

Signature: _____

Name of
Member of
Supervisory
Committee: _____

Signature: _____

Name of
Member of
Supervisory
Committee: _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
APPROVAL	iv
DECLARATION	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
 CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Feature Based Approach Using SIFT	2
1.3 Problem Statement	2
1.3.1 Research Question	3
1.4 Research Objectives	3
1.5 Thesis Contributions	3
1.6 Scope and Limitations	3
1.7 Thesis Structure	4
 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Overview of the SIFT Algorithm	6
2.3 Scale Invariant Feature Transform (SIFT)	14
2.4 Summary of the chapter	17
 3 MATHEMATICAL MODELLING	18
3.1 Introduction	18
3.2 Database	18
3.2.1 Database Analysis	19
3.3 Entropy	22
3.3.1 Image entropy	24
3.4 Thresholding	28
3.4.1 Masking	28
3.5 Computational Complexity	33
3.5.1 SIFT Algorithm Complexity	33
3.5.2 Complexity of Masked Algorithm	35
3.6 Place categorization	38

3.6.1	Place categorization approach	39
3.6.2	Window size	39
3.6.3	Keypoint Matching	39
3.7	Image classification	40
3.7.1	Nearest Neighbor classifier	40
3.7.2	Multilayer Perceptron	41
3.8	Data Association	44
3.9	Summary of the chapter	46
4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	47
4.1	Introduction	47
4.2	Database	47
4.3	Entropy	47
4.4	Demonstration of computational complexity on a sample image	49
4.5	Entropy Threshold	53
4.6	Analysis of Categorization Performance	55
4.7	Window size	56
4.8	SIFT Processing Time	57
4.9	Masking model	61
4.10	Classification result	68
4.11	Summary of the chapter	75
5	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	76
5.1	Conclusion	76
5.2	Recommendation	77
	REFERENCES	78
	APPENDICES	83
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	115
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Camera specification	20
3.2 Complexity and operation for different stages of SIFT for a $N \times N$ pixel	34
3.3 Equation for different stages of SIFT for a $N \times N$ pixel	34
3.4 Complexity and operation for different stages of masked SIFT for a $N \times N$ pixel	36
3.5 Equation for different stages of masked SIFT for a $N \times N$ pixel	37
3.6 Place Categorization	38
4.1 Summary of processing time for a sample image using SIFT	50
4.2 Comparison between Original SIFT processing time and Masked SIFT	52
4.3 Performance accuracy of original image matching	54
4.4 Summary of Average Information loss and computation time	54
4.5 Performance accuracy of original image matching for categorization	55
4.6 Analysis on Categorization Performance	56
4.7 Analysis of time reduction between original SIFT and Masked SIFT. P Stands for Processing	58
4.8 Continuation of analysis on time reduction between original SIFT and Masked SIFT	59
4.9 Table of coefficients	67
4.10 Confusion matrix for Original SIFT	68
4.11 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.1 threshold	68
4.12 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.2 threshold	68
4.13 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.3 threshold	69
4.14 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.4 threshold	69
4.15 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.5 threshold	69
4.16 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.6 threshold	69
4.17 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.7 threshold	70
4.18 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.8 threshold	70
4.19 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.9 threshold	70
4.20 Comparison of classification Accuracy for original and masked SIFT	71
4.21 Confusion matrix for original SIFT	72
4.22 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.1 threshold	72
4.23 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.2 threshold	72
4.24 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.3 threshold	72
4.25 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.4 threshold	73
4.26 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.5 threshold	73
4.27 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.6 threshold	73
4.28 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.7 threshold	73
4.29 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.8 threshold	74
4.30 Confusion matrix for masked SIFT at 0.9 threshold	74
4.31 Classification Accuracy for Multilayer Perceptron	74

4.32 Comparison result of classification accuracy 75

B.1 Complexity and operation for different stages of masked SIFT for a $N \times N$ pixel 85



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Synopsis library of SIFT	6
2.2 Two octaves of Gaussian scale Pyramid. The difference of Near Gaussian image produce the difference of Gaussian images. The Gaussian image is down sampled by factor of 2 (image taken from (Lowe, 2004))	8
2.3 Pyramid generation (a) Gaussian scale pyramid and (b) Difference of Gaussian pyramid	9
2.4 keypoint detection flow chart	10
2.5 SIFT descriptor gradient directions are gathered into orientation histograms surrounding the middle region outline by the keypoint. The gradients are initially weighted by a Gaussian window described by the round figure. From the 8×8 model, a 2×2 descriptor is calculated in this manner, where each bin include a 4×4 subdivision of region. Experiment conducted in this research work used 4×4 descriptor calculated from 16×16 arrangement (Lowe, 2004)	12
2.6 Keypoint representation flow chart	13
2.7 Practical demonstration of Keypoint selection stage: (a) keypoints locations detected in the image, 1260 keypoints (b) keypoints after removing low contrast extreme (c) keypoint after removing edge points and (c) Final keypoints with scale and orientation 410 keypoints	14
3.1 Data acquisition platform	19
3.2 Image for different location	21
3.3 Map of the surrounding	22
3.4 Entropy distribution for image 1	25
3.5 Image 1	25
3.6 Entropy Distribution for Image 2	26
3.7 Image 2	26
3.8 Entropy distribution for image 1 and 2 with 409 and 370 keypoints	26
3.9 image 1	27
3.10 image 2	27
3.11 image 3	28
3.12 Histogram of Keypoints vs entropy for different sampled image	28
3.13 Entropy Distribution of an image	29
3.14 Threshold entropy of pixel	30
3.15 Feature extracted from masked image	31
3.16 Masked SIFT on Original image	31
3.17 Masking procedure	32
3.18 Masked image with reduced number of effective pixel	36
3.19 Screen shot of the explorer for data classification	43
3.20 Architecture of the MLP network (Schalkoff, 1997)	44

3.21 Structure of the database showing all components and how the query image is matched	46
4.1 Sample images from IDOL database	48
4.2 Samples images with range of entropy	49
4.3 Keypoints vs No of frames	50
4.4 Processing time vs No of frame	51
4.5 SIFT complexity based on Keypoint and processing time for 100 images	51
4.6 Sample image (a) original image (b) original image with 409 keypoints (c) masked image with keypoints and (d) original image with masked 381 keypoints	53
4.7 Categorization accuracy vs entropy	55
4.8 Information loss for various window size	57
4.9 Computation time for various window size	57
4.10 Information loss and computational time at different Threshold	60
4.11 R-squared original SIFT	62
4.12 R-squared masked at 0.1 and 0.2 threshold	63
4.13 R squared masked at 0.3 and 0.4 threshold	64
4.14 R squared masked at 0.5 and 0.6 threshold	65
4.15 R squared masked at 0.7 and 0.8 threshold	66
4.16 R squared masked at 0.9 threshold	67
A.1 Screen shot of a masked image, the car racing lane is masked, so that the cars can be seen only through the word RACE	83
B.1 Masked image with reduced number of pixel	84
C.1 Percentage reduction in keypoints	86
C.2 Percentage reduction in Processing time	87

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SIFT	Scale Invariant Feature Transform
NN	Nearest Neighbour
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
GDOH	Gradient Distance and Orientation Histogram
DOG	Difference of Gaussian
DOM	Difference of mean
SOM	Sum of Mean
SLAM	Simultaneous Localization and Mapping
SVM	Support Vector Machine
MLP	Multilayer Perceptron

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The computer vision and robotic research community used algorithms such as (Speed Up-Robust Feature) SURF, (Scale Invariant Feature Transform) SIFT, (Feature From Accelerated Segment Test) FAST and so on, for extracting features, describing an object in an image, object detection and recognition.

These algorithms tend to extract distinctive features which are invariant to scale, orientation, and illumination changes, that can detect the same features in different images with changes in view point and background. SURF, SIFT and FAST have different limitations and benefits.

However, performance evaluation conducted shows that SIFT is the best compared to other methods (Mikolajczyk and Schmid, 2005). SIFT was invented (Lowe, 1999) and first presented to the research community in 1999 and later some enhancements were made to the algorithm in 2004 (Lowe, 2004). The features detected during the extraction process are used for matching query image in database of various objects captured at different positions. A match is established when most of the keypoints are consistent on an object's features. With the scale space theory (Witkin, 1997), SIFT can analyze an image using the scale space by forming an image pyramid with Gaussian blur filters to estimate the Difference of Gaussians (DoG) that occurs between two stages of the image scale space pyramid. Potential keypoints' locations are calculated by determining maxima and minima through adjacent differences of Gaussian stages. The keypoints are examined for stability and for each stable location, descriptors are formed. The representation of the local image data is formed by the descriptor around the keypoints in a manner robust to scale, orientation, rotation and illumination changes (Rihan, 2005).

SIFT was first designed for object detection and recognition (Morel and G., 2011). However, because it is invariant to scale, orientation, translation, rotation and zoom, it has wide application in robotic research, map building and is manageable in hybridization (integrating different maps). The principle of hybridization is to overcome limitations of different maps, thereby benefits are derived. Various ways to carry out hybridization exist in the literature, for example, Buschka and Saffiotti (2004), and Thrun (1998) have planned hybrid metric-topological maps to combine precision of metric maps alongside with the justifiability of topological maps. In addition, Topological maps are being built on the high of a metric one, whereas others do the opposite. Feature maps are applied together with each topological and metric data, whereas others use clearly separated representations. Despite this, there is no systematic approach on how various maps are to be combined and produce to work. This problem makes any hybrid map somehow challenging (Buschka and Saffiotti, 2004) but,

feature map can overcome this limitation. Feature based map record the position of important features like corner and intersection. However, it is quite straight forward to draw a second illustration of those maps as a result of precise spatial information they offered (Se et al., 2002).

1.2 Feature Based Approach Using SIFT

Application of feature based approach using SIFT have produced favorable outcome in numerous areas such as object recognition (Lowe, 2004), localization for mobile robot (Kosecka and Yang, 2005) and panoramas frame work (Brown and Lowe, 2003). SIFT produced the best result based on comparative analysis conducted on different descriptors (Mikolajczk and Schmid (2005)). The following two unique distinguishing points make SIFT famous in computer vision and robotics(Xiaosong, 2006) :

- (i) Highly distinctive extracted keypoints by SIFT are invariant to illumination, scale, image transformation and changes to camera view point.
- (ii) computational speed of the algorithm is enhanced with Difference of Gaussian (DoG) and Laplacian of Gaussian (LoG) approximation within the average time to produce good features.

1.3 Problem Statement

Surrounding areas of image can be described in different ways. SIFT features seem to be appropriate framework for deriving useful representations of the image. It tries to search out a brand new reduced topological space that provides the simplest separation between the various categories within the image. Moreover, the representation are more condensed than the original raw image.

The detectors and descriptors are widely used for object detection, recognition and map building with application to domestic robot, autonomous vehicle and unmanned aerial vehicle. It is mostly thought over carefully that improvement in the past ten years on the application has been one of the famous goal reached in the research community of computer vision and robotics.

Despite the sturdiness of SIFT, it has limitation of computational complexity because of the time needed to calculate the 128 Dimensional features Lowe, 2004. This has pose great limitation to real time and on-line implementations, especially, that now system are run using hand held devices Acharya et al. (2014). However, various effort were made by researchers to improve on SIFT computational complexity because of its robustness. The computational time was reduced to some extent using SURF and PCA-SIFT, but, the distinctiveness was not able to achieve good performance as SIFT (Mikolajczyk and Schmid, 2005).

Data association of image features using classification of label instances in real time with the known traditional approaches (SVM, NN, etc.) produce low accuracy results. Wrong data association produce incompatible map that lead to deviation in

path planning and navigation in golem position. Thus, computational complexity and data association in the mapping algorithm are some of the key difficulty that need to be addressed (Thrun and Leonard (2008),Durrant-Whyte and Bailey (2008),Thrun (2002)).

1.3.1 Research Question

- (i) Can isolating region with low or sparse keypoints in an image, reduce the processing time so that only areas with concentrated keypoints having high entropy will be extracted?
- (ii) What is suitable values for the entropy threshold and window size so that the processing time can be reduced without sacrificing the performance?
- (iii) How can we improve the classification accuracy place categorization?
- (iv) What is the relationship between entropy and keypoints?

1.4 Research Objectives

The aim of the study is to investigate feature based techniques to reduce the processing time of SIFT. The specific objectives are to :

- (i) Develop an algorithm based on SIFT with masking to reduced keypoint descriptors in order to reduce processing time.
- (ii) Compare the performance of the proposed algorithm with the original SIFT algorithm.

1.5 Thesis Contributions

The contributions of this work are as follows :

- (i) Proposed introduction of masking approach on SIFT to reduce the computational complexity, in order to make it suitable for real time application.
- (ii) Implementation of masking SIFT features by matching to establish a threshold value.
- (iii) Established relationship between entropy and keypoints.
- (iv) Use masked features to improve classification accuracy.

1.6 Scope and Limitations

The Scope and Limitations for this research work are as follows:

- (i) The research work focus on the reduction of computational cost of the algorithm SIFT in feature extraction.

- (ii) The research work conducted experiment on information loss based on entropy threshold as a very important factor in place categorization and classification.
- (iii) The research work experiment on computational complexity based on entropy threshold for place categorization and classification.
- (iv) The research work conducted experiment on various window size based on entropy threshold.
- (v) The research work undertook to proposed a mathematical model using least square approach to predict processing time for any number of keypoints and at selected threshold.
- (vi) The experiment conducted in this research work were based on 2D data only
- (vii) The Research work is limited to indoor environment.
- (viii) The experimental result are limited only to masking on KTH-IDOL database.

1.7 Thesis Structure

SIFT as a algorithm that have dominated the robotic research community has the limitation of computational complexity, which is an issue of concern. Therefore, chapter Two present review of the most common efforts to solve SIFT problem.

SIFT algorithm in feature extraction to reduce the computational complexity were presented in chapter Three. The procedures and implementation of masking area with low entropy were discussed.

In chapter four, result of the proposed approach was presented. The comparison between the original SIFT and Masked SIFT was discussed. Furthermore, evaluations to test the proposed approach were experimented.

Chapter five presents the conclusion and recommendation for future work.

REFERENCES

- Acharya, K., Aniruddha, B., Venkatesh, R. and Vadhiyar, S. S. 2014. A real-time implementation of {SIFT} using {GPU}. *Journal of Real-Time Image Processing* 1–11.
- Bao, Y., Ishii, N. and Du, X. 2004. Combining multiple k-nearest neighbor classifiers using different distance functions 634–641.
- Bay, H., Ess, A., Tuytelaars, T. and Van Gool, L. 2008. Speeded-Up Robust Features (SURF). *Computer Vision and Image Understanding* 110 (3): 346–359.
- Bay, H. and Tuytelaars, T. and Van Gool, L. 2006, In Computer Vision {ECCV} 2006, In *Computer Vision {ECCV} 2006*, 404–417, Springer, 404–417.
- Beis, J. S. and Lowe, D. G. 1997. Shape Indexing Using Approximate Nearest-Neighbour Search in High-Dimensional Spaces. In *Proceedings of The IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1000–1006. IEEE.
- Boiman, O., Shechtman, E. and Irani, M. 2008. In defense of nearest-neighbor based image classification. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2008. {CVPR} 2008. {IEEE} Conference on*, 1–8. IEEE.
- Brown, M. and Lowe, D. G. 2003. Recognising Panoramas. In *ICCV*, 12–18.
- Brunelli, R. 2009. *Template Matching Techniques in Computer Vision: Theory and Practice*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Buschka, P. and Saffiotti, A. 2004. Some Notes on the Use of Hybrid Maps for Mobile Robots. In *Proceedings of The 8th International Conference on Intelligent Autonomous Systems*, 547–556.
- Calonder, M., Lepetit, V., Strecha, C. and Fua, P. 2010. Brief: Binary robust independent elementary features. In *International Conference on Computer vision (ECCV)*, 778–792. Springer.
- De Terana, F. and Dopico, F. M. and Van Dooren, P. 2014. Matrix Polynomials with Completely Prescribed Eigenstructure .
- Desai, A. 2012. Analysis of Machine Learning Algorithms using WEKA. *International Journal of Computer Application* 27–32.
- Durrant-Whyte, H. and Bailey, T. 2008. Simultaneous Localization and Mapping: Part I. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Magazine* 13 (2): 99–110.
- Durrant-Whyte, H., Majumder, S. and Thrun, S., De-Battista, M. and Scheduling, S. 2003, In Robotics Research, In *Robotics Research*, 49–60, Springer, 49–60.
- Fernandez-Madrigal, J. and Claraco, J. L. B. and Global, I. 2013. *Simultaneous Localization and Mapping for Mobile Robots: Introduction and Methods*. Information Science Reference.

- Frank, E., Hall, M., Holmes, G., Kirkby, R., Pfahringer, B., Witten, I. H. and Trigg, L. 2010, In Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery Handbook, In *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery Handbook*, 1269–1277, Springer, 1269–1277.
- Grabner, M., Grabner, H. and Bischof, H. 2006, In Computer Vision ACCV, In *Computer Vision ACCV*, 918–927, Springer, 918–927.
- Gray, R. M. 2011. *Entropy and Information Theory*. 2nd edn., , vol. 1. Springer.
- Huertas, A. and Medioni, G. 1986. Detection of Intensity Changes with Subpixel Accuracy Using Laplacian-Gaussian Masks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (5): 651–664.
- Ismail, A. and Marhaban, M. 2009. A simple Approach to Determine the Best Threshold Value for Automatic Image Thresholding. In *{IEEE} International Conference on Signal and Image Processing Applications (ICSIPA)*, 162–166. IEEE.
- Kawewong, A., Tangruamsub, S. and Osamu, H. 2009. Wide-baseline visible features for highly dynamic scene recognition. In *Computer Analysis of Images and Patterns*, 723–731. Springer.
- Ke, Y. and Sukthankar, R. 2004. {PCA-SIFT:} A More Distinctive Representation for Local Image Descriptors. In *Proceedings of The {IEEE} Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition{CVPR}*, 502–506.
- Kosecka, J. and Li, F. and Yang, X. 2005. Global Localization and Relative Positioning Based on Scale-Invariant Keypoints. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 52 (1): 27–38.
- Ledwich, L. and Williams, S. 2004. Reduced SIFT Features for Image Retrieval and Indoor Localisation. In *Australian Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 3. Cite-seer.
- Li, X.R. and Zhang, K. and Jiang, T. 2004. Minimum Entropy Clustering and Applications to Gene Expression Analysis. In *Proceedings of The IEEE Computational Systems Bioinformatics Conference*, 142–151. IEEE.
- Lowe, D. G. 1999. Object Recognition From Local Scale-Invariant Features. In *Proceedings of The Seventh IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 1150–1157. IEEE.
- Lowe, D. G. 2004. Distinctive Image Features From Scale-Invariant Keypoints. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 60 (2): 91–110.
- Luo, J., A., P., Caputo, B. and Jensfelt, P. 2006. The kth-idol2 database. *KTH, CAS/C-VAP, Tech. Rep* 304.
- Madokoro, H., Utsumi, Y. and Sato, K. 2012a. Scene Classification Using Unsupervised Neural Networks for Mobile Robot Vision. *{SICE} Annual Conference* 1568–1573.

- Madokoro, H., Utsumi, Y. and Sato, K. 2012b. Scene Classification Using Unsupervised Neural Networks for Mobile Robot Vision. *{SICE} Annual Conference* 1568–1573.
- MATLAB. 2011. *version 7.13.0.564 (R2011b)*. Natick, Massachusetts: The Math-Works Inc.
- Mikolajczyk, K. and Schmid, C. 2005. A Performance Evaluation of Local Descriptors. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 27 (10): 1615–1630.
- Miksik, O. and Mikolajczyk, K. 2012. Evaluation of local detectors and descriptors for fast feature matching. In *International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, 2681–2684. IEEE.
- Morel, J. and G., Y. 2011. Is {SIFT} Scale Invariant? *Inverse Problems and Imaging* 5 (1): 115–136.
- Moreno, P., Bernardino, A. and Santos-Victor, J. 2009. Improving the SIFT descriptor with Smooth Derivative Filters. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 30 (1): 18–26.
- Mozos, O. M., Mizutani, H., Kurazume, R. and Hasegawa, T. 2012. Categorization of Indoor Places Using the Kinect Sensor. *Sensors* 12 (5): 6695–6711.
- Nixon, M. S. and Aguado, A. S. 2012. *Feature Extraction and Image Processing for Computer Vision*. Academic Press.
- Prasanna, S., Mahadeva, Y. B., Pinto, J. P. and Hermansky, H. ????, Analysis of confusion matrix to combine evidence for phoneme recognition, Tech. rep.
- Ratha, N. K., Karu, K. and Chen, S. and Jain, A. K. 1996. A real-time matching system for large fingerprint databases. *{IEEE} Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 18 (8): 799–813.
- Rihan, J. 2005. *An Exploration of the SIFT Operator*. PhD thesis, Department Computer Vision and Information Technology. Oxford brookes University.
- Rosten, E. and Drummond, T. 2006, In Computer Vision ECCV, In *Computer Vision ECCV*, 430–443, Springer, 430–443.
- Rublee, E., Rabaud, V. and Konolige, K. and Bradski, G. 2011. ORB : an efficient alternative to SIFT or SURF. In *International Conference on Computer vision (ICCV)*, 2564–2571. IEEE.
- Sabuncu, M. R. 2004. *Entropy-Based Image Registration*. PhD thesis, School of Electrical Engineering. Princeton University.
- Schalkoff, R. J. 1997. *Artificial neural networks*. {McGraw}-Hill Higher Education.

- Schmid, C., Mohr, R. and {others}. 1997. Local grayvalue invariants for image retrieval. *{IEEE} Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 19 (5): 530–534.
- Se, S., Lowe, D. and Little, J. 2002. Mobile Robot Localization and Mapping with Uncertainty Using Scale-Invariant Visual Landmarks. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 21 (8): 735–758.
- Se, S., Lowe, D. G. and Little, J. J. 2005. Vision-Based Global Localization and Mapping for Mobile Robots. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* 21 (3): 364–375.
- Shannon, C. E. 1948. A mathematical theory of communications. *Bell System Tech. J* 27 (5): 379–423.
- Shi, S., Yu, M., Yan, G. and Yu, L. 2014. Improved Scheme on SIFT Image Matching Efficiency. In *Proceedings of The 9th International Symposium on Linear Drives for Industry Applications*, 781–787. Springer.
- Thrun, S. 1998. Learning Metric-Topological Maps for Indoor Mobile Robot Navigation. *Artificial Intelligence* 99 (1): 21–71.
- Thrun, S. 2002. Robotic Mapping: A survey. *Exploring Artificial Intelligence in The New Millennium* 1–35.
- Thrun, S. and Leonard, J. J. 2008. Simultaneous Localization and Mapping. *Springer handbook of robotics* 871–889.
- Turitzin, M., A., H. and Gustavsson, C. 2004, Interim Report: Improving SIFT Features, www.robots.stanford.edu.
- Vinukonda, P. 2011. *A Study of the Scale-Invariant Feature Transform on a Parallel Pipeline*. PhD thesis, Faculty of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College. Louisiana State University.
- Wichmann, F. A. and Hill, N. J. 2001. The psychometric function: I. Fitting, Sampling, and Goodness of Fit. *Perception and Psychophysics* 63 (8): 1293–1313.
- Witkin, A. P. 1983. Scale-Space Filtering: A New Approach to Multi-Scale Description. In *IEEE*.
- Wu, J. 2009. *Visual Place Categorization: Problem, Dataset, and Algorithm*. PhD thesis, college of computing. Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Wu, J., Christensen, H. I. and Rehg, J. M. 2009. Visual place categorization: Problem, dataset, and algorithm. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 4763–4770. IEEE.
- Wu, J. and Rehg, J. M. 2008. Where am I: Place Instance and Category Recognition Using Spatial PACT. In *{IEEE} Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition {CVPR}*, 1–8. IEEE.

Wu, J. and Rehg, J. M. 2011. {CENTRIST:} A visual descriptor for scene categorization. *{IEEE} Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 33 (8): 1489–1501.

Xiaosong, W. 2006. *A SIFT Tool*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science. University of Bristol.

