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Our paper combines different areas of expertise within computer vision with algebraic geometry. Hence, here we try to provide more details in order to give a complete picture for both communities.

First, we present more details about the theory with the aim of making an informal explanation of some less familiar concepts from algebraic geometry for computer vision researchers. However, we still want to provide sufficient detail to allow an expert algebraic geometer to check the correctness of our results.

Secondly, we present additional results from the experiments in the main paper. We also present more qualitative examples of real reconstructions from the radial camera reconstruction pipeline, showing that our approach works for general 3D scenes.

7.1. Camera standard forms

Here we provide more details on our camera parameterization and a justification of our choices.

Proposition 2. Let \( P_1, \ldots, P_4 \in \mathbb{P}^4(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}) \) be generic. Then there exists \( H \in \text{PGL}_4(\mathbb{R}) \) such that the transformed cameras \( (P_i H, \ldots, P_4 H) \) have the form in (5).

Proof. Fixing a representation of each camera in homogeneous coordinates, consider the \( 4 \times 4 \) matrix obtained by stacking the first row of each camera:

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
P_1[1,: ] \\
P_2[1,: ] \\
P_3[1,: ] \\
P_4[1,: ]
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

For each \( i = 1, \ldots, 4 \), let \( d_i \) be the determinant of the matrix obtained by substituting the normalized row vector \((1/P_1[1,1]) P_1[2,: ]\) for \( P_i[1,: ] \) in \( A \). Let us set

\[
H = (\text{diag}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) A)^{-1}.
\]

This gives a well-defined element of \( \text{PGL}_4(\mathbb{R}) \), since rescaling any \( P_i \) also rescales Eq. (18). To see that the transformed cameras have the desired form, note first that \((P_i H)[1,: ] = d_i^{-1} e_i \sim e_i\) for each \( i = 1, \ldots, 4 \). Moreover, if \( d \) is a \( 1 \times 4 \) vector with \( d A = P_1[2,: ] \), then by Cramer’s rule, \( d \sim [d_1 \quad d_2 \quad d_3 \quad d_4] \), which gives \((P_i H)[2,: ] \sim e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4\).

Proposition 3. Let \( P_1, \ldots, P_4 \) be generic calibrated radial cameras. Then there exists a three-dimensional similarity transformation \( H \in S(3) \) such that \( (P_i H, \ldots, P_4 H) \) has the form in (10). Moreover, if each \( P_i \) is upright as in (14), then \( H \) can be chosen so that \( P_i H \) is also upright.

Proof. Consider four arbitrary calibrated radial cameras:

\[
P_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
r_{11}^\top & t_{11} \\
r_{12}^\top & t_{12}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
r_{21}^\top & t_{21} \\
r_{22}^\top & t_{22}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
P_3 = \begin{bmatrix}
r_{31}^\top & t_{31} \\
r_{32}^\top & t_{32}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad P_4 = \begin{bmatrix}
r_{41}^\top & t_{41} \\
r_{42}^\top & t_{42}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

To fix the first camera, we first transform the cameras by

\[
H_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
R_1 & -R_1t_1 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \in S(3),
\]

where

\[
R_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
r_{11} & r_{12} & r_{11} \times r_{12}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad t_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
t_{11} \\
t_{12}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Then we have

\[
\tilde{P}_1 = P_1 H_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

To fix the second camera, consider the subgroup of \( S(3) \) that stabilizes \( \tilde{P}_1 \). Its elements have the form

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & a \\
0 & 0 & 0 & b
\end{bmatrix}, \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}, b \neq 0.
\]

If we denote the second \( H_2 \)-transformed camera by

\[
\tilde{P}_2 = P_2 H_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
r_{21}^\top & \tilde{t}_{21} \\
r_{22}^\top & \tilde{t}_{22}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

we may obtain the form in (10) by choosing \( a, b \) such that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
a \\
b
\end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\det \tilde{P}_2[; : 3 : 4]} \begin{bmatrix}
-\tilde{t}_{21} \\
\tilde{t}_{22}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
Notice that in both, the general calibrated and upright cases, this formula gives \( b \neq 0 \). Thus, setting

\[
H_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & a \\
0 & 0 & 0 & b
\end{bmatrix}, \quad H = H_1 H_2,
\]

we obtain \( (P_1 H, \ldots, P_n H) \) as in Eqs. (10) and (14).  

7.2. Symmetries and Galois groups

In this section, we review some basics of group theory and Galois theory and the way it can be used to discover symmetries in polynomial systems that can be used to decompose large systems into sequences of smaller ones. We also provide additional technical details on symmetries of our polynomial systems.

To understand the relationships between the various formulations of the 13 point problem, note first that

\[
3584 = 16 \cdot 224 = 16 \cdot 4 \cdot 56 = 16 \cdot 4 \cdot 2 \cdot 28.
\]

Suppose we are given 13 suitably generic \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) point correspondences. Then, over the complex numbers, there are 28 radial quadrifocal tensors satisfying (4). The symmetry (6) shows that each tensor determines 2 distinct \( \text{PGL}_4(\mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}) \)-orbits of camera 4-tuples \( (P_1, \ldots, P_4) \). Each set of cameras can be calibrated in 4 different ways (Proposition 1), and SM Propositions 3 and 4 show that the resulting Euclidean reconstructions can be brought to the form (10) in 16 different ways. This decomposition into subproblems is reflected in the structure of the Galois groups associated to the various problem formulations. These Galois groups can be heuristically computed with numerical HC methods—see eg. [21] for details. We catalogue our results in Table 3, most of which we verified using two separate software systems, Macaulay2 [30] and HomotopyContinuation.jl [9]. We represent the Galois groups using semidirect products. E.g., for the Galois group \( G_{224} \) of the formulation with 224 solutions we consider the action map \( \alpha \) defined by the action on 56 blocks of size 4 that are preserved by \( G_{224} \). Then, \( G_{224} \) is isomorphic to the semidirect product of \( K = \ker \alpha \) and \( \text{im} \alpha \cong G_{56} \). Every permutation from the kernel stabilizes each of the 56 blocks. All the blocks can be divided into 28 pairs, where the action of \( K \) on each pair is isomorphic to \( (S_2 \times S_2) \rtimes S_4 \) and the solutions from all the pairs are permuted independently by \( K \). Thus, \( K \cong ((S_2 \times S_2) \times S_4)^{28} \). The subgroups \( G_{28} = S_{28}, G_{25} = S_{25}, G_{50} = S_2 \rtimes S_{25} \) obey the principle of being “as large as possible given the observed structure” [74]. Thus, conditional on HC producing a correct set of permutations, we can say each of these three is the full Galois/monodromy group.

We recall the basic “building blocks” that appear in each of the groups. The symmetric group on \( n \) letters, denoted \( S_n \), consists of all \( n! \) permutations of the set \( [n] := \{1, \ldots, n\} \). The alternating group \( A_n \) is the set of all \( n! / 2 \) permutations \( \sigma \in S_n \) that have an even number of ordered pairs \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \) with \( \sigma(i) > \sigma(j) \).

We also have combinations of these sets via direct (cartesian) products \( \times \), wreath products \( \wr \) and semi-direct products \( \rtimes \). The direct product is the cartesian product of sets with component-wise group multiplication.

The semi-direct product of groups gives a way to consider both groups inside a larger group where the product is not necessarily the component-wise product, and hence the products between elements from the components is not necessarily commutative. Typically if \( N \) and \( H \) are both subgroups of \( G \), with \( N \) a normal subgroup, \( G = NH \) and \( N \cap H = \{e\} \), then we write \( G = N \rtimes H \). In this case it is no loss to think of \( N \times H \) as the set \( \{ nh \mid n \in N, h \in H \} \), and one checks that the group product (concatenation) is actually closed. Moreover this (internal) semi-direct product is unambiguous precisely because we have embedded our component groups \( N, H \) into another group \( G \). Consequently, in settings like ours where we know how each of the component groups acts on a common set (being part of the Galois group) the action gives the embedding into a larger group, and disambiguates the notation which would otherwise be more complicated since the external semi-direct product is not unique. Also note that \( G = NH \) and \( N \cap H = \{e\} \) is true both for \( G = N \times H \) (both \( N \) and \( H \) normal in \( G \)) and \( G = N \rtimes H \) (only assume \( N \) normal in \( G \)), so for finite groups \( |N \times H| = |N \rtimes H| \).

The wreath product of symmetric groups \( S_n \rtimes S_m \) can be realized as a semidirect product \( (S_n \times \cdots \times S_n) \rtimes S_m \).

More concretely, it is the group of all \( (n!)^m \cdot m! \) permutations of the set \( [n] \times [m] \), which preserve the partition of this set into blocks of size \( n \) given by \( B_i = [n] \times \{i\} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). Roughly speaking, an algebraic problem with \( nm \) solutions decomposes as solving a problem with \( m \) solutions and then \( m \) problems with \( n \) solutions if and only if the Galois group of that problem is a subgroup of \( S_n \rtimes S_m \). See eg. [21, Prop. 2.8]. Thus, numerically computing the Galois groups gives a general test for testing the decomposability of minimal problems.

Importantly, each of the (putative) Galois groups from the 13 point problem contains the full symmetric group \( S_{28} \), which acts on the blocks of solutions corresponding to distinct quadrifocal tensors. This implies (see eg. [57]) that an exact solution to the any of these problems cannot be achieved solely by the standard arithmetic operations and extracting roots of polynomials of degree 27 or lower. Thus, in a very precise sense, the number 28 captures the algebraic complexity of these minimal problems. Similarly, our
results indicate that 25 is the algebraic complexity in the upright case.

We now describe the symmetry group for the calibrated formulation. As an abstract group, this is isomorphic to
\[ \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2. \]
This symmetry group may be understood as a group of deck transformations acting on the fibers of a branched cover associated to the minimal problem [21]. This group is also isomorphic to the Weyl group of the Lie group (SL<sub>2</sub>)<sup>4</sup> of symmetries of the variety of principal minors (radial quadrifocal tensors) living in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^2 \) (cf. [39, § 6]). It can be described by 4 mutually independent generators, which we now describe. The first generator, the “third-column flip” \( \Psi_1 : \mathbb{R}^{13} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{13} \), may be defined in Cayley parameters by
\[
\Psi_1(x_2, x_3, x_4, y_2, y_3, y_4, z_2, z_3, z_4, t_3, t_4) = (-x_2, -x_3, -x_4, -y_2, -y_3, -y_4, z_2, z_3, z_4, t_3, t_4).
\]
As the name suggests, and can be easily verified using the definition of Cayley, this symmetry effects the non-fixed camera matrices \((P_2, P_3, P_4)\) by reversing the sign of the third column in each matrix and leaving all other entries unchanged. Thus, two \( \Psi_1 \)-conjugate camera matrices are \( S(3) \)-equivalent via the matrix
\[
H_1 = \text{diag}(-1, -1, 1, 1) \sim \text{diag}(1, 1, -1, 1). \tag{20}
\]

For \( j = 2, 3, 4 \), we may define three more independent symmetries, with formulas analogous to those discussed in [45][Sec. 5.2]. As in the case of \( \Psi_1 \), each symmetries has the effect of multiplying all four cameras on the right by some \( H_i \in S(3) \). For \( j = 2 \),
\[
\Psi_2(x_2, x_3, x_4, y_2, y_3, y_4, z_2, z_3, z_4, t_3, t_4) = \begin{pmatrix} y_2 & x_2 & y_3 & x_3 & y_4 & x_4 & z_2 & z_3 & z_4 & -t_3 & -t_4 \end{pmatrix},
\]
which acts on cameras as
\[
H_2 = \text{diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1) \sim \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1) \in S(3). \tag{21}
\]

For \( j = 3 \),
\[
\Psi_3(x_2, x_3, x_4, y_2, y_3, y_4, z_2, z_3, z_4, t_3, t_4) = \begin{pmatrix} y_3 & x_3 & y_4 & x_4 & z_2 & z_3 & z_4 & -t_3 & t_4 \end{pmatrix},
\]
and for \( j = 4 \),
\[
\Psi_4(x_2, x_3, x_4, y_2, y_3, y_4, z_2, z_3, z_4, t_3, t_4) = \begin{pmatrix} y_4 & x_4 & y_3 & x_3 & z_2 & z_3 & z_4 & -t_3 & t_4 \end{pmatrix},
\]
both of which act on cameras as
\[
H_3 = H_4 = \text{diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1) \sim I \in S(3). \tag{25}
\]

We summarize the important properties of the symmetry group generated by \( \Psi_1, \ldots, \Psi_4 \) in the next proposition.

**Proposition 4.** Each symmetry \( \Psi_j \) for \( j = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) defined in Eqs. (19), (21), (23) and (24) preserves solutions to the 13 point problem in Cayley parameters, and induces a camera transformation \((P_1, \ldots, P_4) \mapsto (P_1H_j, \ldots, P_4H_j)\). Moreover, one solution in calibrated camera matrices is chiral (cf. [35, Prop. 10]) iff its entire orbit of 16 solutions under the group generated by \( \Psi_1, \ldots, \Psi_4 \) is.

**Proof.** All claims but the last may be verified by direct calculation. For the last, note that for generic \((P_1, \ldots, P_4)\), we can uniquely recover a scene point \( X_j \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) from its images \( I_{ij_1}, \ldots, I_{ij_4} \in \mathbb{R}^1 \). We assume the last coordinate of \( X_j \) equals 1. To enforce that \( X_j \) lies in front of any associated pinhole camera, we recall the chirality constraint used in [63, § 2.2]. Let \( x_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) be an image point in pixel coordinates corresponding to \( I_{ij} \). Eq. (1) implies that \( P_i X_j \) is the direction vector of the radial line through the projected point. For \( X_j \) to lie in front of an associated pinhole camera, we must have
\[
x_{ij}^T P_i X_j > 0 \quad \forall i.
\]
Now, fixing \( i_1, \ldots, i_4 \in \{0, 1\} \), we may consider the transformed arrangement \((P_1, \ldots, P_4)\) defined by setting \( \tilde{P}_i := P_iH_i \), where \( H = H_1 H_2 H_3 H_4 \). Then, for the transformed world point \( \tilde{X}_j = H^{-1}X_j \), Eq. (26) and the fact that \( x_{ij}^T \tilde{P}_i \tilde{X}_j = x_{ij}^T P_i X_j \) gives the last claim. \( \square \)

Next, we verify that the metric upgrade of Proposition 1 works as expected.

**Proposition 5.** If \( H \) in (13) has full rank, then all four transformed radial cameras \( P_1 H, \ldots, P_4 H \) are calibrated.

**Proof.** Let \( \Omega = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 0) \) be the symmetric matrix that represents the dual absolute quadric. Then, a radial camera \( P_k \) is calibrated if and only if
\[
(P_k \Omega)(P_k \Omega)^T = P_k \Omega P_k^T \sim I_{2 \times 2}. \tag{27}
\]
Letting \( \tilde{P}_i = P_i H \) be the transformed camera for each \( i = 1, \ldots, 4 \), we calculate
\[
(\tilde{P}_i \Omega)(\tilde{P}_i \Omega)^T = (P_i H \Omega)(P_i H \Omega)^T \\
\sim P_i H \Omega H^T P_i^T \\
\sim P_i V \text{diag}(\lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2, \lambda_3^2, 0) V^T P_i^T \\
\sim P_i Q P_i^T \\
\sim I_{2 \times 2}. \tag{28}
\]
\( \square \)
7.3. Internal constraints

This section presents details for the construction of internal constraints of radial quadrifocal tensors. We prove the result for the vanishing ideal of upright quadrifocal tensor and link historical Nanson’s equations, which define the internal constraints for a general quadrifocal tensor, to their modern treatment using cycle-sums.

For the upright case, we now describe the vanishing ideal [16, Def. 5, p. 32] of the image of the map

$$\Psi_{up}: \mathbb{R}^7 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{15},$$

$$(y_2,y_3,t_{31},t_{32},y_4,t_{41},t_{42}) \mapsto T_{P_1}(y,t),...T_{P_4}(y,t),$$

from Section 4.2. The next result is that this ideal is generated by the eight equations we discovered via elimination. The polynomials $f_{up}(T)$ and $g_{up}(T)$ have degree 5 and 22 and 52 terms, respectively. We do not know of any compact formula for them. For completeness, we supply the following Macaulay2 [30] code that can be used to compute them.

```macaulay2
FF = QQ;
R = FF[c2,s2,c3,s3,t31,t32,c4,s4,t41,t42]/ideal(a2^2+c2^2-1,a3^2+c3^2-1,b4^2+c4^2-1);
I4 = id_(R^4);
P1 = matrix {{1_FF, 0, 0, 0}, {0, 1_FF, 0, 0}};
P2 = matrix {{c2, 0, s2, 0}, {0, 1, 0, 1}};
P3 = matrix {{c3, 0, s3, t31}, {0, 1, 0, t32}};
P4 = matrix {{c4, 0, s4, t41}, {0, 1, 0, t42}};
stackedCameras = P1||P2||P3||P4;
quad = toList apply((0,0,0,0), (i,j,k,l) -> (i+j+k+l), det stackedCameras);
S = FF[T_(0,0,0,0)...T_(1,1,1,1)];
phi = map(R,S,quad);
J = ker(phi, SubringLimit=>9);
```

Table 3. We computed Galois/monodromy permutations for each of the different problem formulations. For readability, $G_n$ denotes the Galois group associated to a problem formulation with $n$ complex solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># solutions</th>
<th>group</th>
<th>group order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-pt</td>
<td>$S_2 \mid S_{28} \cong (S_2^{28} \mid A_{56}) \times G_{28}$</td>
<td>$28!$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>$S_2 \mid S_{28} \cong (S_2 \times S_2) \times S_{28} \times G_{28}$</td>
<td>$28 \cdot 27$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>$S_2 \mid S_{28} \cong (S_2 \times S_2) \times S_{28} \times G_{28}$</td>
<td>$28 \cdot 27 \cdot (4 \cdot 4!)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3584</td>
<td>$S_2 \mid S_{28} \cong (S_2 \times S_2) \times S_{28} \times G_{28}$</td>
<td>$28 \cdot 27 \cdot (4 \cdot 4!)^2 \cdot 28$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-pt</td>
<td>$S_2 \mid S_{25} \cong S_{25} \times G_{25}$</td>
<td>$25! \cdot 25$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>$S_2 \mid S_{25} \cong S_{25} \times G_{25}$</td>
<td>$25! \cdot 25$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$S_2 \mid S_{25} \cong S_{25} \times G_{25}$</td>
<td>$25! \cdot 25$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition 6. The vanishing ideal of all upright radial quadrifocal tensors (that is, the image of $\Psi_{up}$) is generated by two degree-5 homogeneous forms $f_{up}(T)$, $g_{up}(T)$ and the variables $T_{0,0,0,0}, T_{1,1,1,1}, T_{1,1,1,0}, T_{1,1,0,1}, T_{1,0,1,1}, T_{0,1,1,1}.$

The above Macaulay2 computation, if run without the option SubringLimit, would return a complete set of generators of the vanishing ideal. However, this did not terminate after a day of computation. Instead, we can argue using basic commutative algebra, similar to an argument given in [61, Thm. 1.1].

**Proof.** Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{15}_C$ be the the complexified image of $\Psi_{up}$, and $Y = V(J) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{15}_C$ be the projective vanishing locus of the eight polynomials which generate the ideal $J$. Then $X \subseteq Y$, and $X$ has a unirational parametrization, whose Jacobian we can evaluate at a rational point to deduce that $\dim(X) \geq 7$. On the other hand, computing a partial Gröbner basis of the ideal $J$ allows us to check that $\dim(Y) \leq 7$, from which we may conclude that $\dim(X) = \dim(Y) = 7$ and that $X$ is an irreducible component of $Y$. Since the ideal $J$ generated by the 8 polynomials is a complete intersection, it follows from Macaulay’s unmixedness theorem [22, Thm. 18.14] that $Y$ is equidimensional and $J$ has no embedded primes. To prove $J$ is prime, it is enough to show that $Y$ is irreducible and that $J$ is radical. Irreducibility of $Y$ can be proved by checking that $\deg(X) = \deg(Y) = 25 = \deg f_{up} \cdot \deg g_{up}$. Indeed,
The last inequality above holds by Bézout’s theorem. The first can be checked by producing a single problem instance with at least 25 complex solutions in tensors. More precisely, we fabricate random rational data in $I_{ij} \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and check that the equations (2) give us radical zero-dimensional ideals in cameras and tensors of the respective expected degrees 50 and 25. These computations also show $J$ is generically-reduced, from which it follows, since $J$ is Cohen-Macaulay, that $J$ is radical. We may conclude that $J$ is the prime vanishing ideal of $X$. □

Next, we define Nanson’s equations discussed in Section 4.1, which give a subset of the internal constraints in the general case. We recall from Sec. 4 that internal constraints on quadrifocal tensors are the same as homogeneous polynomials vanishing on the image of the projective principal minor map,

$$
\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{15},
X \mapsto [A_S(X) \mid S \subset \{1, 2, 3, 4\}].
$$

As noted in the introduction, the first set of equations vanishing on the image of $\Phi$ was produced by Nanson [55]. Lin and Sturmfels [48] gave an interpretation of Nanson’s relations in terms of cycle sums. They also observed that Nanson’s equations were not sufficient to generate the prime ideal of all polynomials vanishing on the image of $\Phi$, and they produced 718 linearly independent polynomials of degree 12 which they proved determine the radial quadrifocal variety as a subscheme of $\mathbb{P}^{15}$. Work of Borodin and Rains [7] also existed of these 718 polynomials, and the fact that a projective variety of dimension 13 and degree 28.

Following [48, Prop. 3], we may define 15 cycle-sum polynomials $C_I(X)$ in the entries of a $4 \times 4$ matrix $X$ as follows. For each nonempty $I \subset \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ of size $d$, define

$$
C_I(X) = \sum_{I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_d} (-1)^{k+d} (k-1)! A_{I_1}(X) \cdots A_{I_d}(X),
$$

where the sum is taken over all partitions of the set $I$. Nanson’s matrix $N = [n_1 \mid n_2 \mid n_3 \mid n_4]$ can be expressed in terms of the cycle-sums (cf. Eq. (28)) as follows:

$$
n_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
C_{1, 2, 3}(X)C_{1, 4}(X) \\
C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{2, 3}(X) \\
C_{1, 3, 4}(X)C_{2, 3}(X) \\
C_{2, 3, 4}(X)C_{1, 4}(X)
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
n_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{1, 3}(X) \\
C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{2, 3}(X) \\
C_{1, 3, 4}(X)C_{2, 3}(X) \\
C_{2, 3, 4}(X)C_{1, 3}(X)
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
n_3 = \begin{bmatrix}
C_{1, 3, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) \\
C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) \\
C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) \\
C_{2, 3, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
n_4 = \begin{bmatrix}
2C_{2, 3, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 4}(X)C_{1, 4}(X) + C_{1, 3, 4}(X)C_{2, 3}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) \\
2C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) + C_{2, 3, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) \\
2C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) + C_{2, 3, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X) \\
C_{1, 2, 4}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)C_{1, 2}(X)
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(29)

Finally, we provide an alternative formula for the Hartley-Schaffalitzky map defined in Equation (6),

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\psi_{HS}(P_1) \\
\psi_{HS}(P_2) \\
\psi_{HS}(P_3) \\
\psi_{HS}(P_4)
\end{bmatrix} = D_{8 \times 8}(p) \cdot T(p) \cdot D_{4 \times 4}(p),
$$

where

$$
D_{8 \times 8}(p) = \text{diag}
\begin{bmatrix}
1, 1, p_{21}, p_{21}, p_{31}, p_{31}, p_{41}, p_{41}
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
D_{4 \times 4}(p) = \text{diag}
\begin{bmatrix}
1, p_{11}, p_{11}, p_{11}, p_{11}, p_{11}, p_{11}, p_{11}
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
T(p) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & p_{21} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & p_{31} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & p_{41}
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(30)

Note that $T(p)$ is formed by transposing the interleaved non-identity $4 \times 4$ matrix formed by each camera’s second row (cf. [32, § 2.2]).

The group $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times (S_4 \rtimes \text{GL}_4^1)$ acts on $8 \times 4$ matrices $[A, B]^{\top}$ and preserves the set of special maximal minors of $[A, B]^{\top}$, or the principal minors of $A^{-1}B$ [39]. Let $\mathbb{Z}_2 \rtimes \mathbb{T}^4$ denote the subgroup where the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ is the transpose action and $\mathbb{T}^4$ is the 4-dimensional torus of non-zero scalars acting by conjugation. It is straightforward to check that $\mathbb{Z}_2 \rtimes \mathbb{T}^4$ does not change the values of the principal minors, and moreover, we have presented the HS symmetry as an element of this group.

8. Cameras from Radial Quadrifocal Tensors

Here, we describe details of a method used for recovering uncalibrated cameras in the form (5) from a radial
quadrifocal tensor estimated using either the linear method or the “Implicit 13” solver. This method does not assume any constraints on a radial quadrifocal tensor. It sends “slightly incorrect” radial quadrifocal tensors to “slightly incorrect” camera matrices.

Having recovered a quadrifocal tensor $T \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2}$, we may, assuming genericity, rescale it so that $T_{0,0,0,0} = 1$. With respect to our standard form, several camera parameters are rational functions in $T$:

$$
\begin{align*}
p_{44} &= -T_{0,0,0,1} \\
p_{33} &= -T_{0,0,1,0} \\
p_{22} &= -T_{0,1,0,0} \\
p_{11} &= -T_{1,0,0,0} \\
p_{41} &= p_{44} - \frac{T_{1,0,0,1}}{p_{11}} \\
p_{31} &= p_{33} - \frac{T_{1,0,1,0}}{p_{11}} \\
p_{21} &= p_{22} - \frac{T_{1,1,0,0}}{p_{11}}.
\end{align*}
$$

In principle, solving a single quadratic equation is sufficient to recover the remaining 6 unknowns $p_{23}, p_{32}, p_{24}, p_{42}, p_{34}, p_{43}$, but this assumes that the tensor entries are known to exactly satisfy all internal constraints on radial quadrifocal tensors. This assumption almost surely fails for the linear method, and the same is true for the minimal solver due to the inherent inexactness of polynomial system solving. Nevertheless, when using either method we may recover 8 candidates for the remaining unknowns by solving three independent quadratic equations. We describe a method for recovering candidates for the pair $(p_{23}, p_{32})$: the other pairs $(p_{24}, p_{42}), (p_{34}, p_{43})$ may be treated similarly.

To recover the pair $(p_{23}, p_{32})$, we use the equations

$$
\begin{align*}
T_{0,1,0,0} &= p_{23}p_{32} - p_{22}p_{33} \\
T_{1,0,0,0} &= p_{11}p_{22}p_{31} - p_{11}p_{23}p_{31} - p_{11}p_{21}p_{32} + \cdots \\
&+ p_{11}p_{23}p_{32} + p_{11}p_{21}p_{33} - p_{11}p_{22}p_{33},
\end{align*}
$$

where, using (31), we have underlined the only unknown quantities. Thus, subtracting $p_{11}$ times the first equation from the second, we obtain an affine-linear equation in the unknown pair, which lets us write

$$
p_{32} = \frac{a}{b + cp_{23}}
$$

for some scalars $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. Substituting (33) into either of the equations in (32) and clearing denominators, we obtain a single quadratic equation in the unknown $p_{23}$.

After solving all 3 pairs of quadratic equations, we get 8 possible decompositions of the quadrifocal tensor $T$.

If tensor $T$ does not exactly fulfill the internal constraints, this previously-described procedure is not optimal, since the elements $T_{0,1,1,1}$ and $T_{1,1,1,1}$ are not considered in the recovery procedure described above. This often happens for both the 15 point linear solver, and the 13 point implicit solver, as the 15 point linear solver does not consider any internal constraints, while the 13 point implicit solver is somewhat unstable. Therefore, we propose a local optimization step, which starts from cameras $P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4$, and performs 3 steps of the Gauss-Newton method to minimize the sum of squared differences between each of the 16 elements of the tensor $T$, and the corresponding elements calculated from the unknowns by equation (3) from the main paper. We have observed that the local optimization improves the rotation and translation error, on average by 2-3 decimal positions.

9. Additional experiments

Here, we give an additional experimental evaluation of the proposed method. For the evaluation, we consider two datasets Grossmunster and Kirchenge from Larsson et al. [47], and 11 scenes from ETH3D [71]. For each dataset, we randomly sample 200 sets of 4 images which share at least 50 3D points in the ground truth reconstruction. Table 4 presents a more detailed evaluation of the experiment shown in Table 2 in the main paper. For every considered solver (Linear, 13 Explicit, 13 Implicit, 7 Explicit, 7 Implicit), we give the fraction of the scenes whose rotation and translation error are below given thresholds. Namely, we consider thresholds 5°, 10°, 20° for rotation, and 10cm, 20cm, 50cm for translation. The table shows that both “13 Explicit” and “13 Implicit” are consistently more successful than the “Linear” solver. The 7 point upright solvers reach good results for datasets whose cameras satisfy the upright constraint.

In Figures 7–9 we show more qualitative results from integrating the radial quadrifocal solver into the 1D radial Structure-from-Motion pipeline from Larsson et al. [47].
Figure 7. Qualitative results of 1D radial Structure-from-Motion on the Eglise dataset (85 images) from [62].

Figure 8. Qualitative results of 1D radial Structure-from-Motion on the Door dataset (12 images) from [62].

Figure 9. Qualitative results of 1D radial Structure-from-Motion on the Nikolai dataset (89 images) from [62].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset, # tuples</th>
<th>Solver</th>
<th>Rotation error</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5°</td>
<td>&lt; 10°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossmünster</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchen 200 tuples</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Explicit</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Explicit</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Explicit</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electro</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facade</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Explicit</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td>Linear 13 Explicit</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Linear 13 Implicit</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>Linear 13 Implicit</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrains</td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>Linear 13 Implicit</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrains</td>
<td>Linear 13 Implicit</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear 7 Implicit</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Real tests on datasets [47], [71]. Detailed evaluation of the experiment in Table 2. We report the fraction of poses whose rotation and translation errors are below given thresholds.
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