

# Synchronisation of Partial Multi-Matchings via Non-negative Factorisations

Florian Bernard<sup>1,2</sup>, Johan Thunberg<sup>3</sup>, Jorge Goncalves<sup>3</sup>, Christian Theobalt<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MPI Informatics    <sup>2</sup> Saarland Informatics Campus    <sup>3</sup> LCSB Luxembourg

**Abstract.** In this work we study permutation synchronisation for the challenging case of partial permutations, which plays an important role for the problem of matching multiple objects (e.g. images or shapes). The term synchronisation refers to the property that the set of pairwise matchings is cycle-consistent, i.e. in the full matching case all compositions of pairwise matchings over cycles must be equal to the identity. Motivated by clustering and matrix factorisation perspectives of cycle-consistency, we derive an algorithm to tackle the permutation synchronisation problem based on non-negative factorisations. In order to deal with the inherent non-convexity of the permutation synchronisation problem, we use an initialisation procedure based on a novel rotation scheme applied to the solution of the spectral relaxation. Moreover, this rotation scheme facilitates a convenient Euclidean projection to obtain a binary solution after solving our relaxed problem. In contrast to state-of-the-art methods, our approach is guaranteed to produce cycle-consistent results. We experimentally demonstrate the efficacy of our method and show that it achieves better results compared to existing methods.

**Keywords:** partial permutation synchronisation, multi-matching, spectral decomposition, non-negative matrix factorisation

## 1 Introduction

The problem of matching features across images or shapes is a fundamental topic in vision and has a high relevance in a wide range of problems. Potential applications include shape deformation model learning [1, 2], object tracking, 3D reconstruction, graph matching, or image registration. The fact that many tasks that seek for a matching between a pair of objects can be formulated as the NP-hard quadratic assignment problem (QAP) [3] illustrates the difficulty of matching problems. The more general problem of matching an entire collection of objects, rather than a pair of objects, is referred to as *multi-matching*. In general, such multi-matching problems are computationally at least as difficult as pairwise matching problems, as they can be phrased in terms of simultaneously

---

**Acknowledgements:** This work was funded by the ERC Starting Grant CapReal (335545) and by the Luxembourg National Research Fund (C14/BM/8231540).

solving multiple pairwise matching problems that are coupled via consistency constraints. Using such couplings of pairwise problems is a common approach for solving multi-matching problem in practice [4–7].

Due to the importance and practical relevance of making use of pairwise matchings to solve multi-matching problems, in this work we focus on studying *permutation synchronisation* methods. The aim of these methods is to process a given set of “noisy” pairwise matchings such that *cycle-consistency* is achieved. In the case of full matchings, cycle-consistency refers to the property that compositions of pairwise matchings over cycles must be equal to the identity matching. Synchronisation methods have been studied extensively both in the context of multi-matching (e.g. [8–12]) as well as for general transformations (e.g. [13–20]). One can interpret the synchronisation methods as a denoising procedure, where the wrong matchings (i.e. the noise) that account for cycle inconsistencies in the set of pairwise matchings are to be filtered out.

Most commonly, the synchronisation of pairwise matchings is formulated as an optimisation problem over permutation matrices. In the work by Pachauri et al. [8], a solution for the synchronisation of permutation matrices based on a spectral factorisation is presented. A major limitation of this work is that the method is only suitable for *full* permutation matrices, i.e. it is assumed that all features are present in all objects (cf. Sec. 3.3). While this limitation has recently been addressed in the work by Maset et al. [11], in their work they do not aim for cycle-consistency. Since the (unknown) true matchings must be cycle-consistent, we argue that cycle-consistency is essential and should be strived for.

The main objective of this work is to present a novel approach for the synchronisation of pairwise matchings that addresses the mentioned shortcomings of existing methods. To this end, we present an improved formulation for the permutation synchronisation problem that finds a non-negative approximation of the range space of the pairwise matching matrix. In contrast to [8], our approach can handle *partial* pairwise matchings. Moreover, unlike [11, 21], our approach guarantees cycle-consistent matchings.

**Main contributions:** The main contributions of our work on the synchronisation of partial permutations can be summarised as follows: (i) Motivated by clustering and matrix factorisation perspectives of cycle-consistency in the set of pairwise matchings, we derive an *improved algorithm for permutation synchronisation* based on non-negative factorisations. (ii) While the proposed formulation is non-convex, we propose a *novel procedure for initialising* the variables. (iii) Moreover, we present a *novel projection procedure* to obtain a binary solution from the relaxed formulation. (iv) Experimentally we demonstrate that our method achieves *superior results* on synthetic and real datasets, while addressing the aforementioned shortcomings.

## 2 Related Work

In this section we discuss existing works that are most relevant to our approach.

**Transformation synchronisation:** Synchronisation methods have been studied for various kinds of transformations. The synchronisation of (special) orthogonal transformations has been considered based on spectral methods [15, 22, 20], semidefinite programming approaches [15, 23, 20], or Lie-group averaging methods [13, 16]. The case of rigid-body transformations, which is particularly relevant in the context of vision, has been studied in semidefinite programming frameworks [23, 24], as well as in the context of spectral approaches [17, 25]. In general, the spectral approaches are more scalable compared to semidefinite programming methods. In addition to the centralised methods, distributed synchronisation methods have also been presented, both for the case of undirected graphs [26], as well as for the more general case of directed graphs [19].

**Permutation synchronisation:** Since permutation matrices are a subset of the orthogonal matrices, one could consider permutation synchronisation as a special case of the orthogonal synchronisation methods. However, in general the permutation synchronisation problem appears to be more difficult due to the additional binary constraints. Moreover, if one considers partial permutations, this interpretation as special case is no longer valid. The synchronisation of full permutation matrices has been presented by Pachauri et al. [8], with follow-up works that consider the case of partial matchings [18, 11]. We devote Sec. 3.3 to an in-depth explanation of these approaches, where we also identify their main weaknesses upon which our approach improves.

**Matching problems:** Matching problems between two objects are commonly formulated in terms of the linear assignment problem (LAP) [27, 28] or the quadratic assignment problem (QAP) [29, 30, 27, 31]. When one matches graphs, the LAP corresponds to matching node attributes only, whereas the QAP seeks a matching that respects node attributes as well as edge attributes [32]. Computationally, the difference between both is that the LAP can be solved globally in polynomial time (e.g. via the Hungarian method [28] or the Auction algorithm [33]), whereas the QAP is known to be NP-hard [3]. Hence, for solving QAPs in practice, existing approaches either resort to (expensive) branch and bound methods [34], or to approximations, e.g. based on spectral methods [35, 36], dual decomposition [37], linear relaxations [38, 39], convex relaxations [40–43, 4, 44, 45, 7], path following [46, 32, 47], or alternating directions [48].

**Multi-matching problems:** The problem of matching more than two objects can be phrased as multi-graph matching (MGM) problems [49–51, 9, 51, 4, 52, 7], which in general are computationally very challenging. If one uses first-order terms only, so that geometric relations between the features are not explicitly taken into account, multi-matching can efficiently be solved as (constrained) clustering problem [53, 10]. The approaches described in [4–7] phrase MGM in terms of multiple pairwise matchings. The work in [21] is closely related to the permutation synchronisation methods [8, 18, 11], as the authors formulate the multi-matching problem directly in terms of a low-rank optimisation problem for a given set of pairwise matchings. However, the so-obtained matchings do generally not exhibit cycle-consistency.

### 3 Background

#### 3.1 Notation

Let  $\mathbf{1}_{pq}$  and  $\mathbf{0}_{pq}$  denote  $p \times q$  matrices comprising of ones and zeros, respectively. We use the shorthand  $\mathbf{1}_p$  and  $\mathbf{0}_p$  for  $q = 1$ . We use  $X_+$  to denote that all negative elements in the matrix  $X$  are replaced by 0. For an integer  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define  $[i] := \{1, \dots, i\}$ . For a  $p \times q$  matrix  $X$ , and the index sets  $A \subseteq [p], B \subseteq [q]$ , we denote by  $X_{A,B}$  the  $|A| \times |B|$  submatrix of  $X$  that is formed from the rows with indices in  $A$  and the columns with indices in  $B$ . We use the colon notation to denote the full index set, e.g.  $X_{:,B} = X_{A,B}$  for  $A = [p]$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , the function  $\text{sign} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^p$  is defined as  $(\text{sign}(x))_i = 1$  if  $x_i \geq 0$ , and  $-1$  otherwise. The set of (full) permutation matrices is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_p := \{X \in \{0, 1\}^{p \times p} : X\mathbf{1}_p = \mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{1}_p^T X = \mathbf{1}_p^T\}. \quad (1)$$

The set of  $p \times q$  partial permutation matrices  $\mathbb{P}_{pq}$  is defined as


$$\mathbb{P}_{pq} := \{X \in \{0, 1\}^{p \times q} : X\mathbf{1}_q \leq \mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{1}_p^T X \leq \mathbf{1}_q^T\}. \quad (2)$$

#### 3.2 Partial Permutation Synchronisation

Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}, k > 2$  be the total number of objects (e.g. images or shapes) that are to be matched. We assume that in object  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $i \in [k]$ , there are  $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$  features, where the total number of features is denoted as  $m = \sum_{i=1}^k m_i$ . Moreover, we assume that there is a total number of  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  distinct features across all objects  $i \in [k]$  in the *universe*. We use  $P_{ij} \in \mathbb{P}_{m_i m_j}$  to denote a (partial) permutation matrix that encodes the matching between the  $i$ -th object and the  $j$ -th object (Fig. 1(i)). To be more specific, the element  $(P_{ij})_{pq} \in \{0, 1\}$  at position  $(p, q)$ ,  $p \in [m_i], q \in [m_j]$  of matrix  $P_{ij}$  is 1 iff the  $p$ -th feature of object  $i$  is matched to the  $q$ -th feature of object  $j$ . For  $P_{ij} \in \mathbb{P}_{m_i m_j}$ , let  $W = [P_{ij}]_{i,j \in [k]} \in [\mathbb{P}_{m_i m_j}]_{i,j \in [k]}$  be the  $m \times m$  matrix of pairwise (partial) matchings.

**Cycle-consistency of partial matchings:** In contrast to full matchings, where cycle-consistency refers to the property that compositions of pairwise matchings over cycles must be *equal* to the identity matching, in the case of partial matchings one only requires that compositions of pairwise matchings over cycles must be *a subset of the identity matching*. Due to potential pairwise *non-matchings* (i.e. zero rows or columns in  $P_{ij}$ ) along a cyclic path, some of the original matchings may vanish. A convenient way to define *cycle-consistency* of partial matchings is based on universe features:

**Definition 1.** *The matrix of pairwise (partial) matchings  $W = [P_{ij}]_{i,j \in [k]}$  is said to be cycle-consistent (or synchronised) iff there exists a set  $\{P_i \in \mathbb{P}_{m_i d} : i \in [k], P_i \mathbf{1}_d = \mathbf{1}_{m_i}\}$  such that for all  $i, j \in [k]$  it holds that  $P_{ij} = P_i P_j^T$ .*



**Fig. 1.** Conceptual illustration of (i) relative matchings, (ii) absolute matchings, (iii) the matrix factorisation perspective, and (iv) the graph of pairwise matchings. The objects are denoted by 1, 2 and 3, where corresponding features across objects are labelled by the same letter from A to D. The *relative* matchings are represented by the permutation matrices  $P_{ij}$  (e.g.  $P_{12}$ ), and the *absolute* matchings are represented by the permutation matrices  $P_i$  (e.g.  $P_1$ ) that match each feature to one of the universe features a, b, c, d. Since cycle-consistency holds in this case, the matrix  $W$  in (iii) can be factorised into  $UU^T$  (Lemma 1); and the graph of pairwise matchings in (iv) is a union of the disconnected cliques a, b, c and d (Lemma 2).

The matrices  $P_i \in \mathbb{P}_{m_i d}$  can be interpreted as assignments of each feature of the  $i$ -th object to one of the features in the universe (Fig. 1(ii)), where the  $\ell$ -th row of  $P_i$  is the assignment of the  $\ell$ -th feature of object  $i$  to a particular feature in the universe. The requirement  $P_i \mathbf{1}_d = \mathbf{1}_{m_i}$  ensures that each feature of object  $i$  is assigned to exactly one feature of the universe.

For  $\mathcal{U} := \{U \in [\mathbb{P}_{m_i d}]_{i \in [k]} : U \mathbf{1}_d = \mathbf{1}_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ , one can characterise cycle-consistency of partial matchings in terms of a low-rank factorisation [11], which is also illustrated in Fig. 1(iii):

**Lemma 1.** *The pairwise (partial) matching matrix  $W$  is cycle-consistent iff there exists a matrix  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , such that  $W = UU^T$ .*

*Proof.* To prove the statement we identify  $U = [P_1^T \ P_2^T \ \dots \ P_k^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ . One can easily see, cf. Def. 1, that cycle-consistency implies that there exists a  $U$  that has the desired properties. Likewise, if a  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  with  $W = UU^T$  is given, one can see that the blocks  $\{P_i\}$  of  $U$  satisfy  $P_i \mathbf{1}_d = \mathbf{1}_{m_i}$  as well as  $P_{ij} = P_i P_j^T$ .  $\square$

**Optimisation problem:** Lemma 1 shows that in the noise-free case, the matrix of pairwise matchings  $W$  can be factorised as  $W = UU^T$ . Given a *noisy*  $W$ , a straightforward way to phrase the permutation synchronisation problem is to consider the constrained nonlinear least-squares problem

$$\arg \min_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \|W - UU^T\|_F^2. \quad (3)$$

Since Problem (3) is non-convex, finding an exact solution is intractable for reasonably large instances. Hence, various simplifications have been considered in the literature, as we describe next.

### 3.3 Spectral Relaxations

In this section we summarise the key ideas of existing spectral relaxations, where we also identify their shortcomings when synchronising *partial* permutations.

**Full matchings:** In the case of (cycle-consistent) full matchings, it holds that  $U^T U = k\mathbf{I}_d$ . Thus,  $\|W - UU^T\|_F^2 = \langle W, W \rangle - 2\langle W, UU^T \rangle + \langle UU^T, UU^T \rangle = \text{const} - 2\langle W, UU^T \rangle$ . Hence, for full matchings, the authors of [8] relax the constraint  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  to  $U^T U = k\mathbf{I}_d$ , and then solve Problem (3) with the relaxed constraints by eigendecomposition, followed by a projection step.

**Partial matchings:** For the partial matchings case, the authors of [11] propose to maximise  $\langle W, UU^T \rangle$  based on eigendecomposition. In the *partial* matchings case, in general we have that  $U^T U \neq k\mathbf{I}_d$ , so that the objective  $\langle W, UU^T \rangle$  differs from the objective in Problem (3). Instead, for  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  the objective  $\langle W, UU^T \rangle$  counts the number of *equal matchings* between the matrices  $P_{ij}$  and  $P_i P_j^T$  for all  $i, j$ . A further difficulty, particularly in the *partial* matching case, is related to the necessary projection due to the relaxation of the constraints, as we describe next.

**Projection:** When the constraint  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  is replaced by  $U^T U = k\mathbf{I}_d$ , after obtaining  $U$  based on the spectral decomposition of  $W$ , one needs to project  $U$  onto the set  $\mathcal{U}$ . Since for any orthogonal matrix  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  it holds that  $(UQ)(UQ)^T = UQQ^T U = UU^T$ , the factorisation  $UU^T$  is only determined up to such a matrix  $Q$ . Hence, for projecting the blocks of  $U$ , one can choose a suitable orthogonal matrix  $Q$  in order to simplify the projection. For the full matching case, the authors of [8] suggest to perform Euclidean projections of the  $d \times d$  blocks of  $UQ$  for the choice  $Q = P_1^T$ . Under the assumption that  $W$  is relatively close to the form  $UU^T$ , the matrix  $P_1$  remains close to being orthogonal, such that the first block of  $UQ$  is close to the identity matrix, while the remaining blocks of  $UQ$  shall become close to permutation matrices.

Since for partial permutations the matrices  $P_i$  are of dimension  $m_i \times d$ , where generally  $m_i < d$ , the assumption that the  $P_i$  are near-orthogonal breaks, and thus such a procedure is not applicable anymore (cf. Sec. 4.1 for details). As workaround, instead of projecting the blocks of  $U$  onto  $\mathcal{U}$ , the authors of [11] perform a projection of the blocks of  $UU^T$ , such that the  $m \times m$  matrix  $\text{proj}(UU^T)$  is obtained. While it is reasonable (under small noise assumptions) to assume that the blocks of  $UU^T$  are close to being (partial) permutation matrices, in

this approach one cannot guarantee that the matrix  $\text{proj}(UU^T)$  satisfies the conditions in Lemma 1, and thus, cycle-consistency is violated.

Another approach for the projection is pursued by the authors of [21, 18], where a greedy strategy is employed for obtaining blocks of partial permutations from the matrix of eigenvectors  $U$ .

### 3.4 Clustering Perspective

Here, we summarise the clustering perspective of synchronisation (cf. [18, 10]), which will become useful to motivate our approach in Sec. 4. For that, we consider the *graph of pairwise matchings*  $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}(W)$  (cf. Fig. 1(iv) for an illustration). The (non-negative)  $m \times m$  matrix  $W$  is considered as the adjacency matrix of  $\mathcal{G}$ , so that  $\mathcal{G}$  comprises  $m$  nodes (recall that  $m = \sum_i m_i$ ). The value  $(W)_{pq} \in \mathbb{R}$  at position  $(p, q)$  of  $W$  denotes the edge weight that represents the affinity of nodes  $p \in [m]$  and  $q \in [m]$ , where  $(W)_{pq} = 0$  means that there is no edge. Note that w.l.o.g. we assume  $(W)_{pp} = 1$  for all  $p \in [m]$ . As shown by Tron et al. [10], and illustrated in Fig. 1(iv), cycle-consistency can compactly be formulated in terms of the graph of pairwise matchings:

**Lemma 2.** *The graph of pairwise matchings  $\mathcal{G}(W)$  is cycle-consistent iff it is a union of disconnected cliques.*

*Proof.* See Prop. 2 in [10]. □

**Lemma 3.** *Let the graph of pairwise matchings  $\mathcal{G}(W)$  be cycle-consistent so that it is a union of the disconnected cliques  $C_i \subseteq [m]$ ,  $i \in [d]$ . It holds that all columns of the matrix  $W_{:,C_i} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times |C_i|}$  are equal for a given  $i \in [d]$ .*

*Proof.* We denote by  $c_i$ ,  $i \in [d]$ , the number of elements in the  $i$ -th clique. Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a union of  $d$  disconnected cliques, there is a permutation  $P \in \mathbb{P}_m$  such that  $PWP^T$  is the block-diagonal matrix  $PWP^T = \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_{c_1 c_1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{c_d c_d})$ . Moreover, for  $P$  it holds that  $\mathbf{I}_{:,C_i} = P^T \mathbf{I}_{:,A_i}$  for  $A_i = \{d_i+1, d_i+2, \dots, d_i+c_i\}$  with  $d_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^{i-1} c_\ell$ . From  $\mathbf{I}_{:,C_i} = P^T \mathbf{I}_{:,A_i}$  it follows that  $(PW)_{:,C_i} = (PW) \mathbf{I}_{:,C_i} = (PW P^T) \mathbf{I}_{:,A_i} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_{c_1 c_1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{c_d c_d}) \mathbf{I}_{:,A_i} = [\mathbf{0}_{c_i c_1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{c_i c_{i-1}}^T, \mathbf{1}_{c_i c_i}^T, \mathbf{0}_{c_i c_{i+1}}^T, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{c_i c_d}^T]^T$ , which shows that the columns of  $(PW)_{:,C_i}$  are equal. Hence, with  $PW$  being a permutation of the rows of  $W$ , the columns of  $W_{:,C_i}$  must also be equal. Since cycle-consistency implies symmetry of  $W$ , the analogous statement also holds for the rows of  $W$ . □

Lemma 3 illustrates that one can cluster the columns (or rows) of  $W$  to identify to which *universe feature* they belong (cf. Fig. 1(iv)).

## 4 Proposed Approach

The main idea of our approach is to formulate the permutation synchronisation problem in terms of a *non-negative matrix factorisation* (NMF) [54]. To be more

specific, we propose to solve

$$\arg \min_{V \geq 0, H \geq 0} \|W - VH\|_F^2, \quad (4)$$

where  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  and  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ . Problem (4) is a relaxation of Problem (3), where the constraints  $V = H^T$  are dropped, and the constraint set  $\mathcal{U}$  is replaced by non-negativity constraints. At first sight it may appear unnatural that one aims for an *unsymmetric* factorisation  $VH$  of the symmetric matrix  $W$ . However, we have found that this is advantageous compared to a symmetric factorisation, which we believe is due to the following reasons: (i) On the one hand, from a theoretical perspective the factorisation  $VH$  enables to get a better rank- $d$  approximation of  $W$  (cf. Lemma 1) compared to enforcing  $H^T$  to be equal to  $V$ . (ii) On the other hand, the unsymmetric NMF optimises over a higher-dimensional space, such that it has more freedom during the optimisation and is thus less prone to unwanted local optima of the non-convex Problem (4). (iii) Furthermore, with the inherent clustering properties of NMF [55–60], Problem (4) can also be understood from the clustering point-of-view (cf. Sec. 3.4). In the clustering perspective, the columns of the matrix  $V$  can be seen as the *cluster centres*, where each column of  $W$  is a conic combination of the columns of  $V$ , and the corresponding column of  $H$  contains the coefficients. The motivation for enforcing both  $V$  and  $H$  to be non-negative is as follows: when cycle-consistency holds, the columns of  $V$  should be non-negative and mutually orthogonal, so that each row in  $V$  can contain at most one non-zero element. Thus, if the factor matrix  $H$  is such that  $W = VH$ , then, since  $W$  is non-negative,  $H$  needs to be non-negative.

Before we present the overall synchronisation algorithm, we first introduce our rotation scheme, which is used for the initialisation of  $V$  and  $H$ , as well as for the final projection of  $V$  onto  $\mathcal{U}$ .

#### 4.1 Rotation Scheme

For  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times d}$ ,  $i \in [k]$ , let  $X = [X_1^T, \dots, X_k^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  be a rank- $d$  matrix that comprises a low-rank approximation of  $W$ , i.e.  $W \approx XX^T$ . For any orthogonal matrix  $Q$  we have that  $XX^T = (XQ)(XQ)^T$ , so that we can freely choose  $Q$  and use  $(XQ)(XQ)^T$  as low-rank approximation of  $W$  in place of  $XX^T$ . The purpose of this section is to describe a procedure to find a  $Q$ , such that  $XQ$  is closer to the set  $\mathcal{U}$  compared to  $X$ , which is for example beneficial for performing a Euclidean projection of  $X$  onto  $\mathcal{U}$ . To this end, we generalise the full-matching rotation scheme in [8], which will be explained in the next paragraph, such that one can find a suitable orthogonal matrix  $Q$  for the case of *partial* matchings.


**Challenges:** As discussed in Sec. 3.3, in the case of full matchings, i.e.  $m_1 = \dots = m_k = d$ , the authors of [8] set  $Q = X_1^T$  so that  $XQ$  is close to a matrix that comprises blocks of permutations. Now, in the case of partial matchings, the problem is that generally all  $m_i$  are strictly smaller than  $d$ , i.e. there is no object  $i$  in which *all* the universe features are present. Hence, the matrices  $X_i$  are not square (and thus not orthogonal), so that for any  $i$  we have that  $XX_i^T(XX_i^T)^T = XX_i^T X_i X^T \neq XX^T$ .



**Our approach:** For finding a suitable orthogonal matrix  $Q$  in the case of partial matchings, we propose to consider  $d$  rows of the matrix  $X$ , which we do not restrict to be chosen from a single block  $X_i$ . Instead, these  $d$  rows can be selected from arbitrary blocks. While in an ideal case we would like to find  $d$  such rows of  $X$  that are mutually orthogonal, the matrix  $X$  forming the low-rank approximation  $XX^T$  of a *cycle-inconsistent*  $W$  will generally not contain  $d$  mutually orthogonal rows. Assuming that  $X$  is dominated by non-negative elements, we aim to find  $d$  rows of  $X$  that are close to mutually orthogonal unit vectors  $e_i^T$ ,  $i \in [d]$ , where  $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is defined as the vector that is 1 at position  $i$  and zero elsewhere. The linear map  $f : \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ , defined as  $(f(X))_{ij} = X_{ij} - \frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{\ell \neq j} |X_{i\ell}|$ , contains a score in element  $(f(X))_{ij}$  that approximately measures the similarity between the  $i$ -th row and the unit vector  $e_j^T$ . Using these similarity scores, we find the  $d$  largest elements in  $f(X)$  that are in disjoint columns. This can be phrased as the (partial) linear assignment problem

$$Y^*(X) := \arg \max_{Y \in \mathbb{P}_{md}, \mathbf{1}_m^T Y = \mathbf{1}_d^T} \langle Y, f(X) \rangle, \quad (5)$$

which can be solved efficiently by the Auction algorithm [33, 61]. Here, the minimiser  $Y^*(X)$  is a binary  $m \times d$  matrix, that contains exactly  $d$  elements with value 1 that are in disjoint columns, such that the sum over  $f(X)$  (the similarity score) at these non-zero positions is maximised. The non-zero rows of  $Y^*(X)$  should correspond to (approximately) mutually orthogonal rows of  $X$ . The matrix  $R = X^T Y^*(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the transposition of the selected  $d$  rows of  $X$ . Eventually, since  $R$  is only expected to be approximately orthogonal, we orthogonalise it via singular value decomposition to obtain the matrix  $\bar{Q}$ . We set  $Q = \bar{Q} \text{diag}(\text{sign}(\mathbf{1}_d \bar{Q}))$  to ensure that the column sums of  $XQ$  are non-negative. Note that  $Q$  is still an orthogonal matrix. In Fig. 2 we illustrate that when applying this rotation scheme to a matrix  $X$ , the rotated matrix  $XQ$  has a structure that is much closer to an element of  $\mathcal{U}$  compared to  $X$ .



**Fig. 2.** Effect of our rotation scheme applied to  $X$ .

## 4.2 Initialisation

Since Problem (4) is non-convex, the initialisation of the matrices  $V$  and  $H$  plays a crucial role. We propose to initialise  $V$  and  $H$  based on a rotation of the spectral factorisation of the pairwise matching matrix  $W$ . Hence, we first compute the best rank- $d$  approximation of  $W$  using eigendecomposition, so that  $W \approx XX^T$ , where  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  is the matrix of the (scaled) most dominant eigenvectors of  $W$ . Subsequently, we rotate the columns of  $X$  such that it is

dominated by non-negative elements, followed by applying  $Q$  so that it becomes closer to  $\mathcal{U}$ , as described in Sec. 4.1.

As  $X$  was computed via eigendecomposition of  $W$ , it may be dominated by negative elements such that its rows may generally be far away from unit vectors  $e_i^T$ ,  $i \in [d]$ . We deal with this by rotating  $X$  such that it becomes dominated by positive elements, i.e.  $\mathbf{1}_m^T X \mathbf{1}_d > 0$ . To this end, we apply two transformations to  $X$  before we apply the matrix  $Q$  from Sec. 4.1: (i) First, we ensure that the column sums of  $X$  are *non-negative*, i.e. we define  $X' = XQ^{\text{sign}}$  with  $Q^{\text{sign}} = \text{diag}(\text{sign}(\mathbf{1}_m X))$ . (ii) Second, based on the assumption that the sizes of the universe cliques are well-balanced, we enforce the column sums to be *equal*. This is achieved by setting  $X'' = X'Q_1Q_2^T$ , where the orthogonal matrices  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are computed using Gram-Schmidt orthogonalisation based on the following result:

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  such that  $X^T X = \mathbf{I}_d$  and  $\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\| \neq 0$ . Define  $x_1 = \frac{1}{\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|} X^T \mathbf{1}_m$ ,  $y_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathbf{1}_d$ . For  $Q_1 = [x_1, q_2, \dots, q_d] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $Q_2 = [y_1, q'_2, \dots, q'_d] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , where  $q_2, \dots, q_d$  and  $q'_2, \dots, q'_d$  are chosen such that  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are orthogonal matrices, it holds that all column sums of  $X' = XQ_1Q_2^T$  are equal, i.e.  $\mathbf{1}_m^T X' = s \mathbf{1}_d^T$  for the scalar  $s = \frac{\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|}{\sqrt{d}}$ .*

*Proof.* We have that  $\mathbf{1}_m^T X x_1 = \frac{1}{\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|} (\mathbf{1}_m^T X)(X^T \mathbf{1}_m) = \frac{1}{\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|} \|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|^2 = \|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|$ . Since the  $q_2, \dots, q_d$  are orthogonal to  $x_1 = \frac{1}{\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|} X^T \mathbf{1}_m$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{1}_m^T X q_i = q_i^T (X^T \mathbf{1}_m) = 0$  for all  $i \in \{2, \dots, d\}$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{1}_m^T X Q_1 = [\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|, 0 \dots, 0]$ . Now, since  $y_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathbf{1}_d$  is constant, it follows that  $\mathbf{1}_m^T X Q_1 Q_2^T = [\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|, 0 \dots, 0] Q_2^T = \|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\| y_1^T = \frac{\|X^T \mathbf{1}_m\|}{\sqrt{d}} \mathbf{1}_d^T$ .  $\square$


Eventually, since we use an NMF algorithm based on multiplicative updates (cf. Sec. 4.4) that requires a non-negative initialisation, we set  $V = (X''Q)_+$  and  $H = (X''Q)_+^T$ . We illustrate the effect of the individual steps in Fig. 3, where it can be seen that this procedure results in a  $V$  that is structurally much closer to  $\mathcal{U}$  compared to the initial  $X$ .

### 4.3 Projection onto $\mathcal{U}$

After solving Problem (4) (with the algorithm described in Sec. 4.4), we perform a projection-after-rotation, i.e. we find  $Q$  (Sec. 4.1), and then project  $VQ$  onto  $\mathcal{U}$  to obtain  $U$ . This is done by solving  $k$  (independent) linear assignment problems via the Auction algorithm [33, 61]. Moreover, similarly to existing approaches (e.g. [21, 11]), we prune bad matchings. To this end, we define a threshold  $\theta \geq 0$  and remove all matchings in  $U$  where  $VQ \odot U$  is smaller than  $\theta$ , for  $\odot$  denoting the Hadamard product.

### 4.4 Algorithm

We call the overall synchronisation procedure NMF SYNC, which is summarised in Algorithm 1. NMF SYNC comprises the following main steps: (i) initialisation



**Fig. 3.** Illustration of the effect of the individual steps of our initialisation procedure. From top to bottom we show the histogram of values in the matrix, the colour-coding of these values, the actual matrix, and a summary of its column sums. From left to right we show the input  $X$ ,  $X' = XQ^{\text{sign}}$  with non-negative column sums,  $X'' = X'Q_1Q_2^T$  with equal column sums, and  $V = (X''Q)_+$  after applying our rotation scheme.

of  $V$  and  $H$  (Sec. 4.2), (ii) minimisation of Problem (4), (iii) projection of  $V$  onto  $\mathcal{U}$  to obtain  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  (Sec. 4.3), and (iv) computation of the synchronised  $W^{\text{sync}} = UU^T$ .

---

### Algorithm 1: NMF SYNC

---

**Input:**  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ ,  $d, \theta$   
**Output:** synchronised  $W^{\text{sync}}$   
// find best rank- $d$  approximation of  $W$  (spectral method [8, 11])  
1  $[X, \Lambda] \leftarrow \text{eig}(W, d)$   
2  $X \leftarrow X\Lambda^{0.5}$   
// initialise according to Secs. 4.1 and 4.2  
3  $X' \leftarrow XQ^{\text{sign}}, X'' \leftarrow X'Q_1Q_2^T, V \leftarrow (X''Q)_+, H \leftarrow V^T$   
4 **Repeat**  
| // multiplicative updates of NMF [62],  $\epsilon > 0$  is a small number (numerical reasons)  
5  $H \leftarrow H \odot ((V^TW) \oslash ((V^TV)H + \epsilon))$  //  $\odot$  is element-wise division  
6  $V \leftarrow V \odot ((WH^T) \oslash (W(HH^T) + \epsilon))$   
// normalise so that the columns of  $V$  and  $H^T$  have the same  $\ell_2$ -norms  
7  $T \leftarrow \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_m^T (V \odot V))^{0.5}$   
8  $V \leftarrow VT^{-1}, H = TH$   
// project onto  $\mathcal{U}$  according to Sec. 4.3  
9  $\bar{Q} \leftarrow V^TY^*(V)$  // solve Problem (5) (LAP, Auction algorithm [33, 61])  
10  $Q \leftarrow \bar{Q} \text{diag}(\text{sign}(\bar{Q}))$   
11  $U \leftarrow \text{proj}_{\mathcal{U}}(VQ)$  // project  $VQ$  onto  $\mathcal{U}$  by solving  $k$  independent LAPs  
12  $U \leftarrow \text{prune}(VQ, U, \theta)$  // prune uncertain matchings  
// compute synchronised  $W$   
13  $W^{\text{sync}} \leftarrow UU^T$

---

## 5 Experiments

In this section we evaluate NMF<sub>SYNC</sub> and compare it against existing permutation synchronisation approaches. To be more specific, we consider the SPECTRAL method [8], as implemented by the authors of [21] to handle partial matchings based on a greedy rounding procedure, the MATCH<sub>EIG</sub> method [11], and the MATCH<sub>ALS</sub> method [21]. In our experiments we first consider synthetic data in a wide range of different configurations, followed by experiments on real-world data. In order to quantify the consistency of the pairwise matchings we define the *cycle-error*  $e_{\text{cycle}}$  as follows:

$$e_{\text{cycle}}(W) = \frac{1}{k^3} \sum_{i,j \in [k]} \|(P_{ik})_{R_{ik},:} (P_{kj})_{:,C_{kj}} - (P_{ij})_{R_{ik},C_{kj}}\|_F, \quad (6)$$

where for  $i, j \in [k]$ , the sets  $R_{ij} \subseteq [m_i]$  and  $C_{ij} \subseteq [m_j]$  denote the indices of non-zero rows and columns of  $P_{ij}$ , respectively. We use the ground truth error  $e_{\text{gt}}$  (*gt-error*) to measure the discrepancy between a given  $W$  and the ground truth pairwise matchings  $W_{\text{gt}}$ , which we define as  $e_{\text{gt}}(W) = \|W - W_{\text{gt}}\|_F$ .

### 5.1 Synthetic Data

For our synthetic data experiments we generate the pairwise matchings  $W$  for a given number of objects  $k$ , the universe size  $d$ , the observation rate  $\rho$ , and the error rate  $\sigma$  as follows: For each  $i \in [k]$ , we sample a random partial permutation matrix  $P_i \in \mathbb{P}_{m_i,d}$  that fulfills  $P_i \mathbf{1}_d = \mathbf{1}_{m_i}$ . Then, to mimic *non-matchings*, we replace each row of  $P_i$  with probability  $1-\rho$  with a zero row. Eventually, the ground truth matrix of cycle-consistent matchings is obtained as  $W_{\text{gt}} = [P_{ij}]_{i,j \in [k]} = [P_i P_j^T]_{i,j \in [k]}$ . Now, in order to obtain the noisy matrix of pairwise matchings  $W$ , we perturb each block  $P_{ij}$  of  $W_{\text{gt}}$  individually by randomly selecting a proportion of  $\sigma$  of the rows of  $P_{ij}$ , and then shuffle the selected rows. Note that we perturb  $W_{\text{gt}}$  in a symmetric fashion. For each evaluated configuration, we draw 100 samples of  $W$  and report the averaged results.

**Results:** The results of this experiments are shown in Fig. 4, where the rows show the *cycle-error*, the *gt-error*, and the number of matchings (*#matchings*); and the columns show four different evaluation scenarios where in each scenario a different parameter varies along the horizontal axis. While the MATCH<sub>EIG</sub> and MATCH<sub>ALS</sub> methods generally result in a non-zero *cycle-error*, meaning that the resulting matchings are *not cycle-consistent*, the NMF<sub>SYNC</sub> method guarantees cycle-consistent matchings. It can be seen that the overall result quality of NMF<sub>SYNC</sub> is superior compared to the other methods (considering both the *gt-error* and the *cycle-error*, i.e. the first two rows in Fig. 4).

### 5.2 Real Data


In our second set of experiments we consider real-world matching problems based on the GRAFFITI [63], EPFL [64] and the MIDDLEBURY [65] datasets, all of which

come with ground truth registrations. To obtain the pairwise matchings  $W$ , we first extract SIFT features [66] from the images, and then obtain the pairwise matchings based on RANSAC [67]. Our evaluations are based on the protocol of [11], where further details are described. Note that for processing the large instances #17 and #18 of the MIDDLEBURY dataset we approximate the LAP in (5) using on a greedy method (cf. [11]).

**Results:** In Fig. 5 we show quantitative results. The first three rows show the *cycle-error* versus the *precision* (the number of correct matchings divided by the number of predicted matchings) for the individual problem instances #1 to #18. Each method is represented by a disk that is coloured according to the legend, where the size of each disk is proportional to the relative number of matchings. Our NMF SYNC method always achieves cycle-consistency, while at the same time achieving a higher precision than its competitors in almost all cases. For the moderately-sized problem instances #1 to #16, where  $m$  is between 2299 and 18,843, all methods have comparable runtimes, with MATCHALS being slower in instances #10, #14, #15 and #16. Note that we were not able to evaluate MATCHALS on the very large instances #17 and #18 since it run out of memory (cf. Sec. 5.3).

### 5.3 Discussion & Limitations

Due to the pruning of uncertain matchings in NMF SYNC based on the choice of  $\theta$  (Sec. 4.3), the total number of obtained matchings of NMF SYNC varies depending on the input quality. For example, the third column in Fig. 4 illustrates that when increasing the error rate while keeping the other parameters fixed, the number



**Fig. 4.** Quantitative results for synthetic data for different varying parameters on the horizontal axis (the number of objects  $k$ , the observation rate  $\rho$ , the error rate  $\sigma$ , and the universe size  $d$ ). Note that the *cycle-error* of NMF SYNC is always 0. For the synthetic data experiments, the cycle-error of SPECTRAL is also 0. Considering both the *gt-error* and the *cycle-error*, NMF SYNC is clearly superior compared to its competitors.


of matchings returned by NMF<sub>SYNC</sub> is decreasing. This reflects that our method implicitly takes into account the increased corruption rate of the input. Note that the other methods also incorporate a pruning of uncertain matches.

Our synthetic data experiments suggest that our method is particularly well-suited for cases when only limited data is available. In the real data experiments, our method achieves significantly better results compared to its competitors in terms of cycle-error and precision.

The spectral decomposition and the NMF algorithm have equal *per-iteration* computational complexities, i.e.  $\mathcal{O}(m^2d)$ . While the Auction algorithm [33] for solving the LAP has (roughly) cubic *worst-case* complexity [68], the analysis in [69] suggests that the *average* complexity is in the regime  $\mathcal{O}(m^2 \log m)$ . In contrast to MATCHALS, our method never requires the computation of the dense and large  $m \times m$  matrix  $VH$  (cf. Alg. 1), such that NMF<sub>SYNC</sub> is much more memory efficient. With that, our method is able to handle very large problem instances, as we show in Fig. 5 for instances #17 and #18, where  $m \approx 200,000$ .

## 6 Conclusions

Based on a non-negative factorisation of the matrix of pairwise matchings, we have presented the NMF<sub>SYNC</sub> method for the synchronisation of partial permu-



**Fig. 5.** Results for the datasets GRAFFITI (#1–#8), EPFL (#9–#14), and MIDDLEBURY (#15–#18). The title of each plot shows the size of the pairwise matching matrix  $m$  in parentheses. NMF<sub>SYNC</sub> always achieves a cycle-error of 0, and achieves a higher precision in almost all cases. The bottom row shows the runtimes of the methods.

tation matrices. In order to deal with the non-convexity of the resulting formulation, we have proposed a novel scheme for rotating the solution of the spectral relaxation such that it provides a suitable initialisation for the NMF. Moreover, we have generalised the projection-after-rotation approach of the SPECTRAL method [8], so that it can handle *partial* matchings (Sec. 4.3). In contrast to the MATCHALS method [21], and the more recent MATCHEIG method [11], our approach is guaranteed to produce a cycle-consistent solution. Since cycle-consistency is an intrinsic property of the (unknown) true matchings, we argue that it is important to achieve.

## References

1. Cootes, T.F., Taylor, C.J.: Active Shape Models - Smart Snakes. In: British Machine Vision Conference. (1992) 266–275
2. Heimann, T., Meinzer, H.P.: Statistical shape models for 3D medical image segmentation: A review. *Medical Image Analysis* **13**(4) (2009) 543–563
3. Sahni, S., Gonzalez, T.: P-Complete Approximation Problems. *Journal of the ACM* **23**(3) (July 1976) 555–565
4. Kezurer, I., Kovalsky, S.Z., Basri, R., Lipman, Y.: Tight Relaxation of Quadratic Matching. *Comput. Graph. Forum* (2015)
5. Yan, J., Wang, J., Zha, H., Yang, X., Chu, S.: Consistency-driven alternating optimization for multigraph matching: A unified approach. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **24**(3) (2015) 994–1009
6. Yan, J., Cho, M., Zha, H., Yang, X., Chu, S.M.: Multi-graph matching via affinity optimization with graduated consistency regularization. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **38**(6) (2016) 1228–1242
7. Bernard, F., Theobalt, C., Moeller, M.: Tighter Lifting-Free Convex Relaxations for Quadratic Matching Problems. *arXiv* (2018)
8. Pachauri, D., Kondor, R., Singh, V.: Solving the multi-way matching problem by permutation synchronization. In: NIPS. (2013)
9. Huang, Q.X., Guibas, L.: Consistent shape maps via semidefinite programming. In: Symposium on Geometry Processing. (July 2013)
10. Tron, R., Zhou, X., Esteves, C., Daniilidis, K.: Fast Multi-Image Matching via Density-Based Clustering. In: ICCV. (2017)
11. Maset, E., Arrigoni, F., Fusiello, A.: Practical and Efficient Multi-View Matching. In: ICCV. (2017)
12. Schiavinato, M., Torsello, A.: Synchronization Over the Birkhoff Polytope for Multi-graph Matching. (2017)
13. Govindu, V.M.: Lie-algebraic averaging for globally consistent motion estimation. In: CVPR. (2004)
14. Hadani, R., Singer, A.: Representation Theoretic Patterns in Three-Dimensional Cryo-Electron Microscopy II—The Class Averaging Problem. *Foundations of computational mathematics* **11**(5) (2011) 589–616
15. Singer, A., Shkolnisky, Y.: Three-Dimensional Structure Determination from Common Lines in Cryo-EM by Eigenvectors and Semidefinite Programming(). *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* **4**(2) (June 2011) 543–572
16. Chatterjee, A., Govindu, V.M.: Efficient and robust large-scale rotation averaging. In: CVPR. (2013)

17. Bernard, F., Thunberg, J., Gemmar, P., Hertel, F., Husch, A., Goncalves, J.: A Solution for Multi-Alignment by Transformation Synchronisation. In: CVPR, Boston, MA (June 2015)
18. Arrigoni, F., Maset, E., Fusiello, A.: Synchronization in the Symmetric Inverse Semigroup. ICIAP (2017)
19. Thunberg, J., Bernard, F., Gonçalves, J.M.: Distributed methods for synchronization of orthogonal matrices over graphs. *Automatica* **80** (2017) 243–252
20. Wang, L., Singer, A.: Exact and stable recovery of rotations for robust synchronization. *Information and Inference* (2013)
21. Zhou, X., Zhu, M., Daniilidis, K.: Multi-image matching via fast alternating minimization. In: ICCV. (2015)
22. Bandeira, A.S., Singer, A., Spielman, D.A.: A Cheeger inequality for the graph connection Laplacian. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **34**(4) (2013) 1611–1630
23. Chaudhury, K.N., Khoo, Y., Singer, A.: Global registration of multiple point clouds using semidefinite programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **25**(1) (2015) 468–501
24. Bandeira, A.S., Charikar, M., Singer, A., Zhu, A.: Multireference alignment using semidefinite programming. (2014)
25. Arrigoni, F., Rossi, B., Fusiello, A.: Spectral Synchronization of Multiple Views in SE(3). *SIAM J Imaging Sciences* **9**(4) (2016) 1963–1990
26. Tron, R., Vidal, R.: Distributed 3-d localization of camera sensor networks from 2-d image measurements. *Transactions on Automatic Control* **59**(12) (2014) 3325–3340
27. Burkard, R., Dell’Amico, M., Martello, S.: Assignment problems. (2009) 1–402
28. Munkres, J.: Algorithms for the Assignment and Transportation Problems. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* **5**(1) (March 1957) 32–38
29. Koopmans, T.C., Beckmann, M.: Assignment Problems and the Location of Economic Activities. *Econometrica* **25**(1) (January 1957)
30. Lawler, E.L.: The quadratic assignment problem. *Management science* **9**(4) (1963) 586–599
31. Loiola, E.M., de Abreu, N.M.M., Netto, P.O.B., Hahn, P., Querido, T.M.: A survey for the quadratic assignment problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* **176**(2) (2007) 657–690
32. Zhou, F., De la Torre, F.: Factorized Graph Matching. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **38**(9) (2016) 1774–1789
33. Bertsekas, D.P.: *Network Optimization: Continuous and Discrete Models*. Athena Scientific (1998)
34. Bazaraa, M.S., Elshafei, A.N.: An exact branch-and-bound procedure for the quadratic-assignment problem. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)* **26**(1) (March 1979) 109–121
35. Leordeanu, M., Hebert, M.: A Spectral Technique for Correspondence Problems Using Pairwise Constraints. In: ICCV. (2005)
36. Cour, T., Srinivasan, P., Shi, J.: Balanced graph matching. NIPS (2006)
37. Torresani, L., Kolmogorov, V.: A dual decomposition approach to feature correspondence. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **35**(2) (2013) 259–271
38. Swoboda, P., Kuske, J., Savchynskyy, B.: A dual ascent framework for lagrangean decomposition of combinatorial problems. In: CVPR. (2017)



39. Swoboda, P., Rother, C., Alhaija, H.A., Kainmller, D., Savchynskyy, B.: Study of lagrangean decomposition and dual ascent solvers for graph matching. In: CVPR. (2017)
40. Zhao, Q., Karisch, S.E., Rendl, F., Wolkowicz, H.: Semidefinite programming relaxations for the quadratic assignment problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization* **2**(1) (1998) 71–109
41. Schellewald, C., Schnörr, C.: Probabilistic subgraph matching based on convex relaxation. In: International Workshop on Energy Minimization Methods in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. (2005) 171–186
42. Fogel, F., Jenatton, R., Bach, F., d’Aspremont, A.: Convex relaxations for permutation problems. (2013) 1016–1024
43. Fiori, M., Sapiro, G.: On spectral properties for graph matching and graph isomorphism problems. *Information and Inference* **4**(1) (2015) 63–76
44. Aflalo, Y., Bronstein, A., Kimmel, R.: On convex relaxation of graph isomorphism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**(10) (2015) 2942–2947
45. Dym, N., Maron, H., Lipman, Y.: DS++: A flexible, scalable and provably tight relaxation for matching problems. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)* **36**(6) (2017)
46. Zaslavskiy, M., Bach, F., Vert, J.P.: A Path Following Algorithm for the Graph Matching Problem. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **31**(12) (2009) 2227–2242
47. Jianga, B., Tanga, J., Dingb, C., Luo, B.: Binary Constraint Preserving Graph Matching. In: CVPR. (2017)
48. Lê-Huu, D.K., Paragios, N.: Alternating Direction Graph Matching. In: CVPR. 6253–6261
49. Williams, M.L., Wilson, R.C., Hancock, E.R.: Multiple graph matching with Bayesian inference. *Pattern Recognition Letters* (1997)
50. Yan, J., Tian, Y., Zha, H., Yang, X., Zhang, Y., Chu, S.M.: Joint Optimization for Consistent Multiple Graph Matching. ICCV (2013)
51. Yan, J., Xu, H., Zha, H., Yang, X., Liu, H.: A matrix decomposition perspective to multiple graph matching. In: CVPR. (2015)
52. Shi, X., Ling, H., Hu, W., Xing, J.: Tensor power iteration for multi-graph matching. In: CVPR. (2016)
53. Yan, J., Ren, Z., Zha, H., Chu, S.: A constrained clustering based approach for matching a collection of feature sets. In: International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR). (2016)
54. Lee, D.D., Seung, H.S.: Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization. *Nature* **401**(6755) 788–791
55. Ding, C.H.Q., He, X.: On the Equivalence of Nonnegative Matrix Factorization and Spectral Clustering. *SDM* (2005) 606–610
56. Li, T., Ding, C.H.Q.: The Relationships Among Various Nonnegative Matrix Factorization Methods for Clustering. *ICDM* (2006)
57. Ding, C.H.Q., 0001, T.L., Jordan, M.I.: Nonnegative Matrix Factorization for Combinatorial Optimization - Spectral Clustering, Graph Matching, and Clique Finding. *ICDM* (2008)
58. Yang, Z., Oja, E.: Clustering by Low-Rank Doubly Stochastic Matrix Decomposition. *ICML* (2012)
59. Lu, H., Fu, Z., Shu, X.: Non-negative and sparse spectral clustering. *Pattern Recognition* **47**(1) (2014) 418–426
60. Yang, Z., Corander, J., Oja, E.: Low-Rank Doubly Stochastic Matrix Decomposition for Cluster Analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* (2016)

61. Bernard, F., Vlassis, N., Gemmar, P., Husch, A., Thunberg, J., Goncalves, J., Hertel, F.: Fast correspondences for statistical shape models of brain structures. In: Proc. SPIE Medical Imaging. (2016)
62. Berry, M.W., Browne, M., Langville, A.N., Pauca, V.P., Plemmons, R.J.: Algorithms and applications for approximate nonnegative matrix factorization. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **52**(1) (2007) 155–173
63. Mikolajczyk, K., Tuytelaars, T., Schmid, C., Zisserman, A., Matas, J., Schaffalitzky, F., Kadir, T., Van Gool, L.J.: A Comparison of Affine Region Detectors. *International Journal of Computer Vision* **65**(1-2) (2005) 43–72
64. Strecha, C., von Hansen, W., Van Gool, L., Fua, P., Thoennessen, U.: On benchmarking camera calibration and multi-view stereo for high resolution imagery. In: CVPR. (2008)
65. Seitz, S.M., Curless, B., Diebel, J., Scharstein, D., Szeliski, R.: A Comparison and Evaluation of Multi-View Stereo Reconstruction Algorithms. In: CVPR. (2006)
66. Lowe, D.G.: Distinctive Image Features from Scale-Invariant Keypoints. *International Journal of Computer Vision* **60**(2) (2004) 91–110
67. Fischler, M.A., Bolles, R.C.: Random sample consensus: a paradigm for model fitting with applications to image analysis and automated cartography. *Communications of the ACM* **24**(6) (June 1981)
68. Bertsekas, D.P.: The auction algorithm: A distributed relaxation method for the assignment problem. *Annals of Operations Research* **14**(1) (1988) 105–123
69. Schwartz, B.L.: A computational analysis of the Auction algorithm. *European Journal of Operational Research* **74**(1) (1994) 161–169