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Abstract: The problem of direct projective transformation from the general to the normal case of stereophotogrammetry is treated by means of image correlation. Therefrom result linear equations containing optimal approximate values of relative orientation, which are to be introduced into a post-adjustment because of the redundancy of this method. The resulting error propagation is discussed and finally an example for a digital stereo pair is given.
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0. INTRODUCTION

In Vol. 12, No. 1 (1990) of the photogrammetric journal of Finland H. Haggren and I. Ninti published a method for the 2-D projective transformation of general stereo pairs into the strictly normal case of photogrammetry. Their method is based on the correlation of two overlapping projectivities of a spatial object (Thompson 1969), from which the parameters of transformation can be derived. Since the correlation refers to metric images, its effect corresponds to the method of linearization by redundant observations, because eight homologous points are needed. This method is already known from (Rinner 1963) as "unconditional conjunction of successive images" and delivers two components of the base (b₂,b₃) and three rotations of the second image. The goal of the transformation to the normal case is to obtain parallel epipolar lines in order to facilitate the automatic search for homologous points in the reconstruction of the object from digital stereo pairs (Kreiling 1976). Thus the parameters of Rinner's method are not very useful, because the normal case does not arise directly therefrom. In contrast to this, the other possibility of relative orientation, i.e. the use of rotations only (Brandstätter 1991), delivers the convergency and consequently the parameters of the desired transformation.

1. THEORETICAL ASPECTS

1.1 Condition of intersection and projective transformation

Using the analytical quantities

\[ \mathbf{R} = [1, \mathbf{J}, \mathbf{K}] \] matrix of orientation (reconstruction)

\[ \mathbf{E} = (x, y, -c) \] vector of centered image coordinates

\[ \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{x} \] projector in the model space

\[ \mathbf{b} = (b₁, b₂, b₃) \] stereo base (b = \( \mathbf{x₀} - \mathbf{x₀}' \))

\[ \lambda \] scalar coefficient (stretching factor)

the reconstruction of a point \( \mathbf{x} \) of the model space from the coordinates \( x' \) and \( x'' \) of the two images \( \mathbf{P} \) and \( \mathbf{P}' \) (condition of intersection) reads

\[ \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x₀} + \lambda' \mathbf{R}' \mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x₀}'' + \lambda' \mathbf{R} \mathbf{x}'' \quad (1.1.1) \]

and the coordinates in one of the two images arise from the projection

\[ \lambda x = \mathbf{R} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x₀}) \quad (1.1.2) \]

If \( \mathbf{R} \) does not yet contain the elements of absolute orientation, its parameters \( \mathbf{\phi}', \mathbf{K}', \mathbf{\phi}'' \) ( \( \mathbf{\phi}'' = \mathbf{\phi}' \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{\phi}'' \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} \) difference of lateral tilts) represent only the relative orientation. The desired normal case (defined by the unit matrix \( \mathbf{E} \)) results analogously to (1.1.2) from

\[ \lambda \mathbf{x} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{E} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x₀}) \quad (1.1.3) \]

Introducing \( \mathbf{x} \) from (1.1.1) this relation converts to

\[ \lambda \mathbf{x} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{E} (\mathbf{x₀} + \lambda \mathbf{R} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x₀}) = \lambda \mathbf{R} \mathbf{x} \]

direct projective transformation to the normal case is given by

\[ \mathbf{t} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{x}, \quad \tau = \lambda \mathbf{w}/\lambda \]

or after elimination of the unknown coefficient \( \tau \) by formation of the quotients \( -\mathbf{x}w/c \) and \( -\mathbf{y}w/c \)

\[ \begin{align*}
1x + jy + kC &= e₁ \mathbf{x} \quad (1.1.4) \\
1x + jy + kC &= e₂ \mathbf{x} \\
1x + jy + kC &= e₃ \mathbf{x}
\end{align*} \]

wherein the \( e_i \) (i = 1, 2, 3) are the rows of \( \mathbf{R} \). These equations correspond, of course, to the equations of (Kreiling 1976) but also to those of (Haggren and Ninti 1990), disregarding the formal discrepancy that there the last number of the denominator equals 1. The aim of this method is therefore, to find the unknown orientations of the two images.

Knowing \( \mathbf{w} \), the quotient \( \tau \) can be determined from

\[ \frac{\tau^2 \mathbf{w} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{R})^T(R)}{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{R} \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \]

regarding \( p^2 = p₁^2 + p₂^2 + p₃^2 = x^2 + y^2 + c^2 = \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x} \) is equivalent to \( \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x} \), as

\[ \begin{align*}
\sqrt{\mathbf{w} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{w}} &= p \quad (1.1.6) \\
\frac{\mathbf{T}}{\mathbf{w} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{w}} &= \frac{p}{\mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}}
\end{align*} \]

the ratio of the two distances from the common center of projection to the points \( \mathbf{x} \) (original) and \( \mathbf{w} \) (transformed).

1.2 Orientation from image correlation

Using \( \mathbf{b} \), the condition of intersection (1.1.1) can also be written as

\[ \lambda' \mathbf{p}'' = \mathbf{b} + \lambda' \mathbf{p}'' \quad (1.2.1) \]

from which follows after vector multiplication by \( \mathbf{b} \) and scalar multiplication by \( \mathbf{p}'' \) because of...
The vector product is equivalent to \( p' \times b \cdot p'' = 0 \), if

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -b_3 & b_2 \\ b_3 & 0 & -b_1 \\ -b_2 & b_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]

and by means of \( p = R \times (1.2.2) \) converts to

\[
p''Tb'' = x'^T R' T B' x'' = x'^T C x'' = 0.
\]

It contains the matrix \( C \) of correlation as it is used in (Rinner 1963) and put into projective relationships by (Thompson 1968). A more detailed structure may be obtained from

\[
C = \begin{bmatrix} 1^T \\ J^T \\ k^T \end{bmatrix} B \begin{bmatrix} 1 & J & k \end{bmatrix} =
\]

\[
= \begin{pmatrix} (1'x^*)\cdot b' (j'x')\cdot b' (k'x')\cdot b' \\ (1''x^')\cdot b' (j''x')\cdot b' (k''x')\cdot b' \end{pmatrix},
\]

which shows the connexion with the unit vectors of the two camera systems.

\( C \) has two important properties (Thompson 1968):

1. From

\[
C'x_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Cx_0 = 0 \quad (1.2.5)
\]

(result the coordinates \( x_0 \) of the epipoles.

2. The (dualistic) transformations

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{h}' &= C x' \\
\mathbf{n}' &= C x'
\end{align*}
\]

(1.2.6)

deliver the coefficients of the epipolar lines

\[
\begin{align*}
h'.x &= 0 \\
n'.x &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

the geometric loci of homologous points.

Due to the homogeneity of (1.2.3) only a matrix

\[
Z = (1/c_2)C \quad (c_2 \neq 1)
\]

(1.2.7)

can be calculated (Rinner 1963), where \( c_2 \) is the probably biggest component, but it can be used instead of \( C \) without any limitation, since (1.2.5) is homogeneous too and the \( h \) of (1.2.6) contains coefficients of homogeneous equations, where common factors do not have any influence. As for further considerations of this paper, the calculation of the coordinates of the epipoles is of main interest.

One restriction must be obeyed, which results from possible linearity among the rows of the (8x8)-matrix for the determination of the eight components of \( Z \). In order to avoid such singularities, in space the points of correlation should not coincide with planes passing three other points. Thus the model should be clearly spatial and the points well-distributed.

1.3 Reconstruction of the model

Regarding \( R = E \), from the two formulas (1.1.1) of reconstruction results their difference

\[
\lambda_4 x_4' = - \lambda_4 x_4'' = -b \cdot y_n' \cdot y_n
\]

and the successive scalars multiplications by a vector \( y'nT=(c,0,xn) \) yield therefrom because of \( x_4(1) \cdot y_n(1) = 0 \) the expressions

\[
\lambda_4 = \frac{b \cdot y_n}{x_n \cdot y_n'} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_4 = \frac{b \cdot y_n}{x_n \cdot y_n'}
\]

(1.3.1)

for the stretching factors, depending only on the base and the image coordinates of the normal case. If rotational relative orientation is to be used, the base takes the form \( b^T = (1,0,0) \) and the formulas of (1.3.1) change by means of \( b \cdot y'n=c, \)

\[
x_n \cdot y_n' = c(x_n-x_n'), \quad x_n \cdot y_n' = c(x_n-x_n')
\]

(1.3.2)

to

\[
\lambda_4 = \frac{1}{x_n',x_n''}
\]

that is the reciprocal of the x-parallax. \( \lambda_4 \) approaches infinity, if \( x_n''-x_n' \), indicating parallel projectors, or in other words, images of points in infinity.

Knowing \( \lambda_4 \), from (1.1.3) arises the simple formula of reconstruction

\[
X = x_0 + \lambda_4 x_n
\]

(1.3.3)

which delivers the coordinates of the model. The well-known effect of double determination from \( P' \) and \( P'' \) enables the check of calculation and from (1.3.3) results analogously to (1.1.6) the expression

\[
\lambda_4 = \frac{(X-x_0) \cdot (X-x_0)}{x_n \cdot x_n}
\]

(1.3.4)

as a final test of the reconstruction from the normal case.

2. DETERMINATION OF THE PARAMETERS OF TRANSFORMATION

2.1 The rotational relative orientation

This procedure is well-known from analog photogrammetry and is executed in such a way that the left image \( P' \) is moved only by tip \( \mathbf{a} \) and swing \( K' \), the right image \( P'' \) by tilt \( \mathbf{a} ' \), tip \( \mathbf{a} '' \) and swing \( K '' \). Thus the movement of \( P' \) is to be described by the orientation matrix (Wolf 1974, p. 533)

\[
R' = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\mathbf{a} \cos K & -\cos\mathbf{a} \sin K & \sin\mathbf{a} \\ \sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} - \sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & -\sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \sin\mathbf{a} - \sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & -\sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} - \sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} \\ -\cos\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} -\sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & \cos\mathbf{a} \sin K \sin\mathbf{a} -\sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & \cos\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} -\sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(2.1.1)

and the movement of \( P''(O'=0) \) by

\[
R'' = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\mathbf{a} \cos K & -\cos\mathbf{a} \sin K & \sin\mathbf{a} \\ -\sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} - \sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & -\sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \sin\mathbf{a} - \sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & -\sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} - \sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} \\ \sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} -\sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & \sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \sin\mathbf{a} -\sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} & \sin\mathbf{a} \sin K \cos\mathbf{a} -\sin\mathbf{a} \cos K \cos\mathbf{a} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(2.1.2)

The correlation matrix (1.2.4) results now because of \( b_2+b_3=0 \) in

702
and contains only the second and third components of the 1, 3, k.

2.2 Computation of the parameters

First of all it is to be assumed that the coordinates xo', yo' and xo", yo" of the epipoles are already calculated from 

\[ z_{Txo'} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z_{Txo"} = 0. \]

They are the images of the base given by \[ AO'XO' = R'Tb \quad \text{and} \quad AO"XO" = -R'Tb, \]

or

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_{o'} \\
  y_{o'} \\
  -1
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
  \cos\phi' \cos\kappa' \\
  -\cos\phi' \sin\kappa' \\
  \sin\phi'
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_{o''} \\
  y_{o''} \\
  -1
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
  -\cos\phi'' \sin\kappa'' \\
  \cos\phi'' \sin\kappa'' \\
  \sin\phi''
\end{bmatrix},
\]

from which independently from  \( \phi' \) follow

\[ \tan\kappa = -\frac{y_{o'}}{x_{o'}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tan\phi = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{x_{o'}^2 + y_{o'}^2}}. \]

for both images. By means of these parameters R'=[t',j',k'] is known. The still missing parameter  \( \phi" \) of R" may be calculated now from any component of (2.1.3). The best way is to use the third column

\( (i'_{2}\cos\phi" + i'_{3}\sin\phi") \cos\phi" = c_{32}z_{13} \)

\( (j'_{2}\cos\phi" + j'_{3}\sin\phi") \cos\phi" = c_{32}z_{23} \)

\( -k'_{3}\sin\phi" \cos\phi" = c_{32}z_{33} \)

and to eliminate  \( \cos\phi" \) by

\[ c_{32}z_{33} \]

\[ \cos\phi" = \frac{c_{32}z_{33}}{-k'_{3}\sin\phi"}. \]

Therefore there are two symmetric possibilities

\[ \tan\phi" = \frac{z_{32}j'_{3}}{z_{32}k'_{3} - z_{32}i'_{3}} = \frac{z_{32}j'_{2}}{z_{32}k'_{3} - z_{32}i'_{3}} \]

(2.3.2)

arise for the determination of \( \phi" \), which result from the fact that the transcendental problem of orientation has been linearized by more observations than necessary. Moreover, C is calculated irrespective of the conditions of rectangularity and normalization of the unit vectors i, j, k, so that an iterative post-processing must take place in order to get an algebraically and stochastically consistent set of parameters.

2.3 Adjustment

The rotation matrices of section 2.2 undoubtedly will be very close approximations (R) to the most probable solutions R. Hence small additional rotations dR will give the final position of the images according to

\[ R = dR(R) = (E+dA)(R), \]

\[ dA = 
\begin{bmatrix}
  0 & -dK & d\phi \\
  dK & 0 & -d\theta \\
  -d\phi & d\theta & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \]

By means of a vector  \( \nu=(v_x,v_y,0) \) of the residuals of coordinate measurement and by neglecting quantities of second order, (1.2.3) turns to

\[ (x' + v')^T[(E+dA')(R') ] \bar{B} [(E+dA") (R") ](x" + v") = 
\]

\[ = x'^T(C)x' + x'^T(C)v' + (p')^T dA' B (p') + 
\]

\[ + (p")^T B dA" (p") = 0, \]

wherein \( (C)=(R')B(R") \) and \( (p)=(R)x \). Because of

\[ dA'^T B = 
\begin{bmatrix}
  0 & -d\phi' & -dK' \\
  d\phi' & 0 & -d\theta' \\
  -dK' & d\theta' & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \]

\[ B dA" = 
\begin{bmatrix}
  0 & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \]

and using the substitutions \( \delta p = x'^T(C)x' = \text{parallax} \),

\[ v'^T(C)x' + v'^T(C)v' = (h')^Tv' \]

(according to eq. (1.2.6), one linearized coplanarity equation (without round brackets at h and p) reads

\[ \delta p = h' + v' + h'' + v" = p' + p" \]

and represents formally the general case of least squares adjustment, i.e. conditions with unknowns. But as the residuals of one equation do not appear in any other equation (Tab. 2.3), the procedure can be simplified by introduction of the fictitious residuals (Wolf 1968, p.105, Rinner 1972, p.402)

\[ w = h'v_x + h'v_y + h''v_x + h''v_y \]

and the related weights

\[ 1 = \frac{h_{1}'^2}{g} + \frac{h_{2}'^2}{g} + \frac{h_{1}''^2}{g} + \frac{h_{2}''^2}{g}, \]

\[ \frac{1}{g} = \frac{v_x}{g_{x'}} + \frac{v_y}{g_{y'}} + \frac{v_x}{g_{x''}} + \frac{v_y}{g_{y''}}, \]

Tab. 2.3: Scheme of the linearized equations of coplanarity
which convert to
\[ 1/g = q^2 \left( h_1^2 + h_2^2 + h_3^2 + h_4^2 \right), \] (2.3.1)

if the a priori variances \( q_1^2 = q_2^2 = q^2 \) of the measured coordinates are equivalent. Adjustment and error computation correspond therefore to the rules of customary adjustment of weighted observation equations. In this way, also more than eight points can easily be used for image correction without adjustment of the calculation of \( Z \) where the condition \( \det(Z)=0 \) must be obeyed (Haggren and Niini 1990). Thus \( Z \) can only deliver approximate values of relative orientation.

The results of the adjustment will be the solutions
\[ da' = (d^2Q'dk'), \quad da'' = (d^2Q''dk'') \]
and the matrix of dispersion
\[ S_a = \sigma^2 Q = \sigma^2 \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & Q_2 \\ Q_2 & Q_2 \end{bmatrix}, \] (2.3.2)
containing instead of the estimate \( s^2 \) the known a priori variance \( \sigma^2 \) and the submatrices \( Q_1 \) belonging to \( P' \) and \( Q_2 \) belonging to \( P'' \). \( Q_2 \) indicates the stochastic correlation between the images, which influences the reconstruction of the model but not the transformations into the normal case. Hence the dispersion of the rotation \( P'\rightarrow P'' \) will be
\[ S_a' = \sigma^2 Q_1 = \sigma^2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \]
and of the rotation \( P''\rightarrow P'' \)
\[ S_a'' = \sigma^2 Q_2 = \sigma^2 \begin{bmatrix} Q_{a2} & Q_{a1} \\ Q_{a2} & Q_{a2} \end{bmatrix}. \]

3. NORMAL CASE

3.1 Transformation

By means of the calculated elements of relative orientation, the transformation (1.1.4) will yield image coordinates \( X \) of the normal case. Using now eight points \( X \) for a correlation of the transformed images, the result must be, because of \( R^*\rightarrow R^* = E \), the easily predictable matrix
\[ Z_h = Ch = EBE = E \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} E = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \]
as a global check of the whole procedure. The detailed test may be performed by the inverse transformation \( X = T R^* X \) from the normal case to the real situation or analogous to (1.1.5)
\[ x = -c \quad \text{and} \quad y = -c, \] (3.1.1)
\[ k_x X \quad k_x X \]
These formulas will be needed also for the inevitable transformation of pixels from the normal to the original images in connexion with the interpolations of grey levels by resampling. The search for homologous points (pixels) is to be executed now in \( P' \) along the epipolar line \( h', x' = 0 \) with
\[ h' = C \alpha x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ c \\ y' \end{bmatrix}, \]
and for curvature of the profile along the epipolar line \( h', x' = 0 \)
\[ h'' = C \alpha x' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x'' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ c \end{bmatrix}. \]

hence \( y'' = cy' \) too. This implies that, of course, all homologous points are situated at identical parallel epipolar lines in the very same plane (Haggren and Niini 1990).

3.2 Propagation of errors concerning transformation

The influence of small variations onto (1.1.4) is implicitly given by
\[ \begin{align*}
\Delta XH &= \Delta(B_a + B_x X), \\
(3.2.1)
\end{align*} \]

and in scalar notation after regrouping
\[ \begin{align*}
\Delta dXH &= \Delta(B_a + B_x X), \\
(3.2.2)
\end{align*} \]

results, where \( B_a \) contains the well-known coefficients of small rotations and \( B_x \) indicates the influence of small coordinate shifts in the original image. If these differential movements are stochastic quantities, the uncertainty of \( x_h \) results from the expectation \( E(B_a d(x_d x_d)^T) \) (Peizer et al. 1985) because of \( E(dadx^T) = 0 \) (and \( dx \) and \( dX \) are independent)
\[ \begin{align*}
\Delta XN &= E(B_a d(x_d x_d)^T) = E(B_a d(x_d x_d)^T) + B_x E(d(x_d x_d)^T) \Delta XN = B_x E(d(x_d x_d)^T) + B_x E(d(x_d x_d)^T), \\
(3.2.2)
\end{align*} \]

Assuming that the original images are very close to the normal case, i.e. \( R = E \), the second part of (3.2.2) converts, because of \( B_a x = c \) and
\[ \begin{align*}
B_x dx &= B_x \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ c \end{bmatrix} dx = B_x \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ c \end{bmatrix} dy = E dx, \\
(3.2.3)
\end{align*} \]
to \( B_x T = E \). In this case, the uncertainties of the coordinate measurement add directly to the un-
certainties from relative orientation and its fictitious weights (2.3.1) take the form
\[
7/g = 2 \sigma^2 \left( y^2 + c^2 \right)
\]
(3.2.3)

because of (3.1.2) and (3.1.3), it shows the fact that, in the normal case, the weights decrease strictly with \( y \) only. As weights do not influence very much results of adjustments, relation (3.2.3) could also be used for images which do not deviate to much from normal position.

3.3 Propagation of errors concerning reconstruction

After relative orientation and transformation to the normal case, the uncertainty of the model will depend on the dispersion \( \sigma_w \) (3.3.2) of the image coordinates \( x_w \). Since small variations of \( X \) read (using the left image \( P' \))
\[
\begin{align*}
dX &= dx_1 \lambda_1 dx_1' + \lambda_2 dx_2', \\
\lambda_1 &= \lambda_2 = \frac{\sigma^2(dx_1^2 - dx_2^2)}{(x_1^2 - x_2^2)^2}
\end{align*}
\]
eq of equ. (3.3.2) the expectations are:
\[
E(\hat{dx_1}^2) = \lambda_1 \sigma^2 \left[ \text{co-variance matrix} \right],
\]
\[
E(\hat{dx_1}^2 \hat{dx_2}^2) = \lambda_2 \sigma^2 \left[ \text{co-variance matrix} \right],
\]
and regarding \( E(\hat{dx_1}^2 \hat{dx_2}^2) = 0 \), the co-variances of the correlation \( P' \rightarrow P' \) may be taken from \( \sigma_w^2 = E(\hat{dx_1}^2) \), i.e.

\[
\Sigma_w = \begin{bmatrix}
x_{1x} & x_{1y} & x_{1z} \\
x_{2x} & x_{2y} & x_{2z} \\
x_{1x} & x_{2x} & \sigma_{y}^2
\end{bmatrix} = \sigma^2 B_1 Q'_1 T B_a^{-1},
\]

Finally, there results the somewhat long but useful formula

\[
\hat{\Sigma_w} = \begin{bmatrix}
x_{1x} & x_{1y} & x_{1z} \\
x_{2x} & x_{2y} & x_{2z} \\
x_{1x} & x_{1y} & \sigma_{y}^2
\end{bmatrix} = \lambda_1 \sigma^2 \left[ \text{co-variance matrix} \right],
\]

for the uncertainty of a stereoscopically reconstructed model. It is seen that \( \lambda = 1/(\sigma_{x_{1x}} \sigma_{x_{1y}}) \) represents the dominating factor and that the first term of this relation will have the most important influence at the limits of accuracy. Thus quality control of stereophotogrammetric evaluation should focus mainly on this expression in order to avoid regions of insufficient precision.

4. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

The following page contains a stereo pair (1, 2) taken by a Rollafometric 6006 (c=51.18) in general positions. These two images are to be correlated in order to get their relative orientation. The coordinates of the points of correlation are (in mm):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( P^\text{m1} )</th>
<th>( P^\text{m2} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x )</td>
<td>( y )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-12.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result of computational correlation:

\[
Z = \begin{bmatrix}
-0.000371 & 0.26580 & 0.01087 \\
0.28609 & 0.01536 & -0.99664 \\
-0.00645 & 1.00000 & -0.01313
\end{bmatrix}
\]

det(\( Z \)) = -0.0001351 * 0 because of neglecting the conditions of orthonormalization.

Provisional epipole in \( P' \): \( (x') = 192.457 \) \( (y') = 1.476 \)

Approximate rotations of \( P' \): \( (\theta') = -16.546 \) \( (k') = -0.488 \)

Provisional epipole in \( P' \): \( (x') = -178.264 \) \( (y') = -0.569 \)

Approximate rotations of \( P' \): \( (\theta') = 17.799 \) \( (k') = -0.203 \)

The rotations are given in grads.

Matrix of correlation from

\[
(Z) = (1/c_22 (R')^T B'(R') =
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
-0.00404 & 0.26580 & 0.01111 \\
0.28548 & 0.01706 & -0.99454 \\
-0.00696 & 1.00000 & -0.01310
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Error equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
& x' \text{ and } y' \text{ from } (2.3.2). \\
& Q' = [Q' \text{ and } Q' \text{ from } (2.3.2).]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\sigma_{x_{1x}} & \sigma_{x_{1y}} & \sigma_{x_{1z}} \\
\sigma_{y_{1x}} & \sigma_{y_{1y}} & \sigma_{y_{1z}} \\
\sigma_{z_{1x}} & \sigma_{z_{1y}} & \sigma_{z_{1z}}
\end{bmatrix} = \lambda_1 \sigma^2 \left[ \text{co-variance matrix} \right] = \begin{bmatrix}
x_{1x} & x_{1y} & x_{1z} \\
x_{2x} & x_{2y} & x_{2z} \\
x_{1x} & x_{1y} & \sigma_{y}^2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& + \lambda_2 \sigma^2 \left[ \text{co-variance matrix} \right] = \begin{bmatrix}
x_{1x} & x_{1y} & x_{1z} \\
x_{2x} & x_{2y} & x_{2z} \\
x_{1x} & x_{1y} & \sigma_{y}^2
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

(3.3.3)
Inverse matrix (units 1.10^-6):

\[
Q = \begin{bmatrix}
8.484 & 0.902 & 1.076 & 4.334 & -1.887 \\
0.902 & 1.768 & -0.871 & -4.126 & 1.276 \\
1.076 & -0.871 & 0.521 & 2.128 & -0.812 \\
4.334 & -4.126 & 2.128 & 20.392 & -2.079 \\
-1.887 & 1.276 & -0.812 & -2.079 & 1.517 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Standard error of adjustment: \( so = \pm 0.117 \)

Standard error of measured coordinates: \( s = \pm 1.6 \mu \text{m} \)

(fictitious weights \( g = 5000 \))

Solutions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta x &= -0.182 \\
\Delta y &= 0.025 \\
\Delta u &= -0.010 \\
\Delta v &= 0.237 \\
\Delta w &= 0.023 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Definitive rotations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varphi &= -16.728, \eta = 0.463, \zeta = -0.878, \theta = 17.561, \nu = -0.180 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Definitive matrix of rotation of \( P' \):

\[
R' = \begin{bmatrix}
0.965449 & 0.007025 & -0.259756 \\
-0.007275 & 0.999774 & 0.000000 \\
0.259749 & 0.001890 & 0.965674 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

containing the elements for the transformation of image 1.
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