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Abstract

Doctor of Philosophy

Body-SLAM: Simultaneous Localization and Mapping inside Human Body

by Guanqun Bao

Wireless capsule endoscopy (WCE) offers a patient-friendly, non-invasive and painless investigation of the entire small intestine, where other conventional wired endoscopic instruments can barely reach. As a critical component of the capsule endoscopic examination, physicians need to know the precise position of the endoscopic capsule in order to identify the position of intestinal disease after it is detected by the video source. To define the position of the endoscopic capsule, we need to have a map of inside the human body. However, since the shape of the small intestine is extremely complex and the RF signal propagates differently in the non-homogeneous body tissues, accurate mapping and localization inside small intestine is very challenging. In this dissertation, we present an in-body simultaneous localization and mapping technique (Body-SLAM) to enhance the positioning accuracy of the WCE inside the small intestine and reconstruct the trajectory the capsule has traveled. In this way, the positions of the intestinal diseases can be accurately located on the map of inside human body, therefore, facilitates the following up therapeutic operations. The proposed approach takes advantage of data fusion from two sources that come with the WCE: image sequences captured by the WCE’s embedded camera and the RF signal emitted by the capsule. This approach estimates the speed and orientation of the endoscopic capsule by analyzing displacements of feature points between consecutive images. Then, it integrates this motion information with the RF measurements by employing a Kalman filter to smooth the localization results and generate the route that the WCE has traveled. The performance of the proposed motion tracking algorithm is validated using empirical data from the patients and this motion model is later imported into a virtual testbed to test the performance of the alternative Body-SLAM algorithms. Experimental results show that the proposed Body-SLAM technique is able to provide accurate tracking of the WCE with average error of less than 2.3cm.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Many of the profound innovations in science and engineering start with metaphors presented in the science fictions. The wireless information networking industry was motivated by the Captain Kirk’s communicator in the 1960s science fiction series “Star Trek”. The idea was formed in the early 1980s; the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) released the Industrial, Scientific and Medical (ISM) bands; the IEEE 802.11 standardization committee created the WLAN standard in 1997 [1]. After almost half a century, modern smart phones are what the evolution of the “Star Trek” communicator fantasy brought to us. Recently, another 1960s science fiction, the “Fantastic Voyage”, in which a space craft with its crew were shrunk to become a micro-device capable of traveling inside human body to remove a brain clot, has stimulated a new wave of innovative science and engineering for the Body Area Network (BAN) [2–5]. That space craft lost its navigation capabilities and went through an unguided dramatic traveling experience within the human body before it exits through tears from the eye of the human subject. Today, wireless endoscopic capsules are traveling inside the digestive system in the same way as the space craft in the fantastic voyage traveled and one can
envision emergence of a number of other similar applications for micro-robots inside the human body.

1.1 Evolution of Wireless Capsule Endoscopy (WCE)

Endoscopy [6] is a medical procedure used to examine the interior wall of the digestive system. According to a study conducted in 2002 [7], approximately 19 million people in the United States were estimated to be affected by disorders of the small intestine. This statistic indicates that effective advancements in endoscopy technology are extremely worthy of investigation. When using the conventional endoscopic instrument, a long flexible tube with a miniature camera needs to be inserted through the mouth or the anus in order to get into the gastrointestinal (GI) tract. Owing to its rigidity and large size, it causes much discomfort to whoever undergoes this procedure. This generally limits the willingness of patients to have their GI tract examined regularly. Furthermore, the lack of capability to reach the entire small intestine is also a significant shortcoming of the current wired endoscope.

Wireless Capsule Endoscopy (WCE) [8–11], a significant step in the efforts of developing a more effective endoscopy technique, was invented to overcome the above limitations. The first WCE prototype for the small intestine was approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 2001. Over subsequent years, this technology has been evolving into one of the most popular non-invasive imaging tools of the intestinal disease diagnosis. WCE is a pill-shaped device which consists of a short focal length CMOS camera, light source, battery and radio transmitter [12, 13]. After the endoscopic capsule is swallowed by a patient, this miniature device propelled by peristalsis of GI tract begins to work and record images at least 2 frames per second (permitting the acquisition of over 50
000 images) while moving along the GI tract. At the same time, images are sent out wirelessly in Ultra High Frequency (UHF) at 432 MHz to a small portable recorder attached to the waist [14]. The images are subsequently downloaded from the portable recorder to a workstation for analysis off line. The whole examine process takes about 8 h, during this period, the patient do not need to be confined to a hospital or clinic environment during the examination and is free to continue their daily routine. Up to now, WCE has been used to detect the following diseases [15–17] small intestinal bleeding, Crohn disease, ulcer, tumors, vascular lesions and colon cancers.

1.2 Motivation

Although WCE provides a non-invasive wireless imaging technology for observing the entire GI tract, one significant drawback of this technology is that it cannot localize itself during its several hours journey. Therefore, when an abnormality is detected by the video source, the physicians have limited idea where the abnormality is located which prevents the following up therapeutic operations being executed immediately. Therefore, having a precise localization system for the endoscopic capsule would greatly enhance the benefits of WCE.

However, localization of the WCE inside the human body is not trivial. There are some fundamental technical challenges which make accurate localization inside human body a difficult task.

- First, we don’t have a clear map of inside human body. A map of the digestive system plays a very important role in refining the localization results [18–20] since everything goes through the GI tract follows the same route. However, existing
computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) imaging tools are not able to provide enough resolution to extract the path of the small intestine.

- Second, conventional single source localization techniques, for example RF localization techniques, cannot provide satisfactory localization results due to the non-homogeneity and severe attenuation of body tissues [21]. We need to design more complicated hybrid localization algorithms that integrate all possible data sources to enhance the localization accuracy. To do this, we need researchers with multidisciplinary background including wireless localization, robotics and image processing etc.

- Third, validation of existing localization algorithms are challenging [22]. After the capsule is swallowed by the patient, we have limited control of the endoscopic capsule. Exploratory clinical procedures such as planar X-ray imaging and Ultrasound cannot be easily used for verifying the position and motion status of the capsule due to their high cost and potential risk to the patient’s health.

- Last but most importantly, operating experiments inside human body is extremely difficult. As we mentioned previously, there are practical challenges to verify the performance of any localization algorithm. Moreover, human subjects are different from one and another, we need a uniform platform to do comparative performance evaluation for different algorithms.

These challenges make design of an accurate localization system for the WCE inside human body a unsolvable engineering problem for more than 13 years. And this became the motivation of my research: To design a localization system that is able to precisely localize the endoscopic capsule as it travels along the digestive system and meanwhile reconstruct the map inside of the small intestine.
1.3 Contributions

To meet the challenges introduced above, in this dissertation, we present an in-body simultaneous localization and mapping technique (Body-SLAM) to enhance the positioning accuracy of WCE inside the small intestine and meanwhile reconstruct the trajectory the capsule has traveled. The contributions of this multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary dissertation are:

- Design and performance evaluation of a Body-SLAM algorithm to accurate localize the position of WCE and reconstruct the 3D map the capsule has traveled. The proposed Body-SLAM technique estimates the speed and orientation of the endoscopic capsule by analyzing displacements of feature points between consecutive images and this motion information is integrated with the RF measurements by employing a Kalman filter to smooth the localization results and the generated 3D map.

- To achieve this objective, we modeled the motion of the endoscopic capsule using empirical data obtained from a actual patients. This motion model is further imported into a emulation testbed for performance evaluation.

- We designed a tested for performance evaluation of hybrid localization algorithms that benefits from content of the endoscopic images as well as the features of the RF signal emitted from the video capsule. We used this testbed to demonstrate the effectiveness of hybrid localization algorithms for Body-SLAM inside small intestine.

The specific contributions of mine are reflected in the following publications:
Chapter 1. Introduction


A full publication list can be found in Appendix A.

1.4 Outline of the Dissertation

This dissertation focuses on the hybrid localization which we called “Body-SLAM” for the wireless capsule endoscopy and testbed design for comparative performance evaluation of various localization algorithms inside human body. The rest of the dissertation
is organized as follows: in chapter 2, we give an overview of the existing localization technologies of WCE and addressed the technical challenges in this field. In Chapter 3, we present a hybrid localization technique, which we called “Body-SLAM”, that uses endoscopic images for motion tracking and combines the motion information with the RF signal radiated from the capsule to enhance the localization accuracy, and meanwhile reconstruct the trajectory the capsule has traveled. In chapter 4, performance evaluation of the proposed localization algorithm are given by using empirical data and design of emulation testbed. Finally, we conclude the dissertation in chapter 5 and give the suggested direction of future work.
Chapter 2

Challenges in WCE Localization

While physicians can receive clear images of the interior of the entire digestive system using WCE, they have little idea of the exact location of the capsule when an abnormality is found by the video source. To localize intestinal abnormalities, physicians have to administrate successive radiological, endoscopic or surgical operations, which are invasive and potentially harmful to patient’s health. If we could develop a wireless localization system to localize these devices, not only can physicians diagnose the medical diseases, but they can also learn where the diseases are located. However, designing such a localization system is a very challenging task. In this chapter, we review the existing localization techniques, especially the RF localization techniques, discuss their limitations and address the challenges in designing localization system for inside human body.
2.1 Overview of Wireless Capsule Endoscopy (WCE)

Wireless Capsule Endoscopy (WCE) is a pill-shaped device which consists of a short focal length CMOS camera, light source, battery and radio transmitter [12, 13] as shown in Figure 2.1. After the endoscopic capsule is swallowed by a patient, this miniature device begins to work and record images at least 2 frames per second while moving along the GI tract. At the same time, images are sent out wirelessly to a data recorder attached to the patient’s waist. The whole process takes about 8 h, then all the image data are downloaded into a work station and physicians could inspect the whole video and diagnosis diseases in the GI tract. Being such an innovative technique without cable connection, WCE offers a patient-friendly, non-invasive and painless investigation of the entire GI tract, especially the small intestine, where other conventional endoscopic instrument can barely reach. Up to now, WCE has been used to detect the following diseases: small intestinal bleeding, Crohn disease, ulcer, tumors, vascular lesions and colon cancers [15–17].

A typical capsule endoscopy system consists of 3 components shown in Figure 2.2 [12, 13]:

1. A wireless capsule endoscope

   *All capsule endoscopes have similar components: a disposable plastic capsule, a complementary metal oxide semiconductor or high-resolution charge-coupled device image capture system, a compact lens, white-light emitting diode illumination sources, and an internal battery source.*

2. A sensing system with sensing pads or a sensing belt to attach to the patient, a data recorder, and a battery pack.
The mode of data transmission is either via ultra-high frequency band radio telemetry (PillCam, EndoCapsule) or human body communications (MiroCam). The latter technology uses the capsule itself to generate an electrical field that uses human tissue as the conductor for data transmission. Currently PillCam SB2 and MiroCam are available with extended battery life, which may be beneficial in patients with delayed small-bowel transit.

3. A personal computer workstation with proprietary software for image review and interpretation.

Major visualization systems are RAPID Reader from Given Imaging, WS-1 EndoCapsule from Olympus America and MiroView from IntroMedic.

Specifications of each individual WCE system are outlined in Table 2.1.
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Figure 2.1: The architecture of WCE

Figure 2.2: Wireless Capsule Endoscopy
## Table 2.1: FDA-approved wireless capsule systems and specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCE company</th>
<th>Size, mm</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>View angle</th>
<th>Frame rate</th>
<th>Battery life</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndoCapsule</td>
<td>11 × 26</td>
<td>3.5 g</td>
<td>145°</td>
<td>2 /sec</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>512 × 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympus America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PillCam SB2</td>
<td>11 × 26</td>
<td>2.8 g</td>
<td>156°</td>
<td>2 /sec</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>256 × 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Imaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PillCam SB3</td>
<td>11 × 26</td>
<td>2.8 g</td>
<td>156°</td>
<td>2-6/sec</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>320 × 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Imaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PillCam SB2EX</td>
<td>11 × 26</td>
<td>3.3 g</td>
<td>156°</td>
<td>2 /sec</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>256 × 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Imaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiroCam</td>
<td>11 × 26</td>
<td>3.3 g</td>
<td>170°</td>
<td>3 /sec</td>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>320 × 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intromedic Co Ltd</td>
<td>11 × 26</td>
<td>3.5 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Literature Review

WCE provides a noninvasive way to inspect the entire small intestine. As a critical component of capsule endoscopic examination, physicians need to know the precise position of the endoscopic capsule in order to identify the position of intestinal disease after it is found by the video source [23–25]. The follow up therapeutic operations and effect of drug administration are heavily dependent on the accuracy of capsule’s position information [26]. Therefore, having a precise and reliable localization system plays an important role in enhancing the benefits of WCE. During the past few years, many attempts have been made to develop accurate and reliable localization systems for the WCE. A good review of existing localization techniques is given in [27]. These technologies can be divided into those using magnetic field [28–32] or inertial systems [33], using image processing techniques [34] and techniques using RF signals [4, 35–37].

In magnetic sensing based techniques, a magnet is inserted into the WCE and the WCE is located by measuring the magnetic field [38, 39]. This technique increases the weight and size of the WCE and the magnetic field of the WCE used for localization will be interfered by the external magnetic fields used for other applications such as the Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) systems. One can also insert radiation opaque material into the WCE and trace the location of the WCE using X-ray or Computed Tomography (CT) scan. Continuous imaging using X-ray or CT scan is very expensive and it bears the health risks for the patient [27, 40].

In [33], Ciuti and his colleagues magnetic inertial sensing based localization system. They inserted a three-axis accelerometer LIS331DL into the capsule. This inertial sensing not only provides the approximate location and orientation of the capsule in digestive tract, but also provides feedback to the actuation system to preserve a reliable
magnetic link between the external permanent magnet and the capsule. However, it would be difficult to make a compact capsular mechanism to be swallowable with the integration of such a inertial sensing subsystem and four cylindrical magnets. Also, this localization technique only offers rough spatial information (an average error of 3 cm) without data in a vertical direction.

Besides the magnetic field based and inertial sensing based techniques, using computer vision based technique for localization the WCE is being investigated \[34, 41–44\]. Because the capsule endoscope changes position and direction very slow, some identical areas exist in the successive two endoscopic images, so we can find the correspondent point pairs in these two images. Using the image correspondences, we can determine the motion (rotation and translation) parameters of capsule endoscope with an appropriate algorithm. This approach can be a complementary method for improving the magnetic localization and orientation method.

Using the RF signal used for image transmissions for the WCE to also locate the capsule offers a natural and low cost solution that does not add to the capsule extra complexity and payload \[4, 45–49\]. Therefore, it has been chosen for use with the smartpill capsule in USA and the M2A capsule in Israel. RF signal has been widely used for locating an object in both outdoor and indoor environments with the accuracy achieved up to hundreds of millimeters \[19, 50\]. Nevertheless, applying radio frequency in the task of tracking an object when it moves inside a special environment, such as the GI tract, is a challenge. This is because high-frequency signals suffer significant attenuation at different levels when they pass through different living tissues, whereas low-frequency signals due to their long wavelengths are not able to deliver the desired precision of several millimeters. The most commonly used RF techniques are Received Signal Strength (RSS) and Time of Arrival (ToA). In the following sections, we will explain the principle
of using RF signal for localization and address their limitations and challenges when applied inside human body.

## 2.3 RF Localization Techniques

The wireless localization industry was initiated by Global Positioning System (GPS) for outdoor navigation in early 1970s and later evolved into Indoor Positioning System (IPS) in 1990s \cite{51-57}. Soon after, with the release of Body Area Network (BAN) IEEE 802.15.6 standard and arising of implantable micro-robots, the future trend of this localization technique is moving inside the human body \cite{4, 58-60}. The first major application for this localization technology is the wireless capsule endoscopy \cite{7, 29, 61-63}.

A commonly used RF localization infrastructure is to attach many calibrated external RF sensors to the anterior abdominal wall of the human body to detect the RF signal emitted by the wireless capsule as shown in Figure 2.3. By interpreting the character of the received signal (RSS or ToA) into distance between the capsule and body mounted sensor array, position of the capsule can be estimated by pattern matching algorithms such as least square algorithm and maximum likelihood algorithm \cite{28, 36}. However, RF localization of micro-robots inside humans is not trivial. Compared to outdoor and indoor environments, the inside of the human body is a complex environment making engineering design and visualization a formidable task \cite{64}. The inside of the human body is an extremely complex medium for RF propagation because it is a non-homogeneous liquid-like environment with irregularly shaped boundaries and severe path-loss. Things become more complex when it comes inside human body since the road map for the movements of the micro-robot is blurry and the body mounted sensors
used as references for localization are also in motion. More importantly, reliable designs need testing the hardware implementation, but we cannot easily test devices inside the human bodies. Therefore, existing RF localization systems sometimes end up providing discontinuous and scattered estimations with large errors.

![A typical RF localization system](image)

**Figure 2.3:** A typical RF localization system

### 2.3.1 RSS based techniques

The name of “wireless” capsule endoscope indicates its capability to transmit the images by RF signal. The transmitter embedded inside the capsule sends endoscopic images, which are captured during its travel along the GI tract, to several receivers placed uniformly on the exterior of the patient abdomen as shown in Figure 3.12. Taking advantage of this integrated function, people can measure the strength of the received RF signals at each sensor and use each sensor as a reference node to localize the capsule (mobile node). The tracking algorithm is based on the observation that the closer the receiver is to the transmitter, the stronger signal it catches. The relationship between
Table 2.2: Parameters for the statistical implant to body surface path loss model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implant to body surface</th>
<th>(LP(d_0)) dB</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
<th>(\sigma_{dB})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep tissue</td>
<td>47.14</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near surface</td>
<td>49.81</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the RSS reading and the distance from the transmitter to the receiver can be expressed by a pathloss model as given below [45, 46, 65, 66]:

\[
RSS(d) = P_t - PL(d_0) - 10\alpha \log_{10} \frac{d}{d_0} + S(d > d_0) \tag{2.1}
\]

where \(d\) is the distance between transmitter and receiver, \(P_T\) is the transmit power, \(PL(d_0)\) is the path loss for a reference distance \(d_0\) (i.e. 50 mm), \(\alpha\) is the path loss gradient which is determined by the propagation environment. For example, in free space, \(\alpha\) equals to 2. Since the human body tissue strongly absorbs RF signal, a much higher value for the path loss gradient is expected for inside human body. \(S\) is a Gaussian random variable caused by shadow fading. From Eq. 2.1, the distances between the capsule and each of the sensors can be roughly estimated by the RSS readings. Then, the capsule’s location can be calculated using trilateration method.

A propagation attenuation model plays a vital role in the RSS technique. In order to reduce the positioning error, it is necessary to develop an appropriate implant to body surface path loss model. The parameters of one of the most cited signal attenuation model developed by National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) at MICS band are summarized in Table 2.2.

The empirical model mentioned previously is not accurate enough for the complex environment of the GI tract. The model was developed by National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) at MICS band.
Instead of using a signal propagation model, another RSS based localization scheme is called “finger printing” technique [47]. The way of finger printing technique works is to create a lookup table for position estimation first. Offline measurement survey needs to be done in advance, in which at each position of the capsule, both the corresponding signal strength measured by each of the sensors and its position data were recorded into the table. During the experiment, online data were compared with the data stored in the lookup table to find the closest match and thus to select the most appropriate position. However, since we don’t have a map of inside the body to do the survey and people are different in term of body shape, this method doesn’t have too much practical value.

2.3.2 ToA based techniques

For RF based localization, a widely known benefit of ToA based techniques is their high accuracy compared to RSS based techniques [60, 67]. The ToA based technique relies on measurements of travel time of signals between the known reference nodes and unknown mobile node. Ranging distance is calculated by multiplying the propagation velocity of RF signal and the measured ToA value [60, 68].

\[ d_i = c \times \tau_i \]  

However, since the human body is formed of tissues with different characteristics of conductivity and relative permittivity, the RF signal propagates with various speed through different organs [69]. These variations in the speed are the dominant source of error for the ToA-based RF localization inside the human body. Also, in near-field application, time-based methods are difficult because radio waves travel with a very high speed \(3 \times 10^8 \text{m/s}\); thus, an extremely strict time synchronization of less than 1 ns is
required in order to obtain the position resolution of 0.3 m. Another geometric location
method, time difference of arrival (TDoA), does not have these disadvantages. All it
needs is a transmission that has a recognizable unambiguous starting point. The data
used in the location calculations is the time difference in the reception of that starting
point at the several reference nodes, and not the actual time of flight of the signal from
the target to the fixed sensors. But in order to have sufficient data to find the mobile’s
coordinates, TDoA requires one more reference node than ToA.

2.3.3 Localization Algorithms

In every ranging based localization, the position of the mobile node is determined as
the intersection of the spheres [70], of which centers are the coordinates of the reference
nodes and radius are the ranging distance $m_i$ between the reference nodes $[x_i \ y_i \ z_i]^T$
and the target node $[x \ y \ z]^T$, where

$$m_i^2 = (x - x_i)^2 + (y - y_i)^2 + (z - z_i)^2 \quad (2.3)$$

Since inside the human body is an non-homogeneous environment, there is difference
between the true distance and the ranging distance using ToA. Therefore, the spheres do
not always intersect at one single point. The goal of the localization algorithm is to find
out the best estimation of the target’s actual position based on the noisy measurements.
Two most commonly used optimal estimation algorithms are least square algorithm and
maximum likelihood algorithm. In the following subsections, we explained how these
two algorithms works.
2.3.3.1 least square algorithm

In least square (LS) algorithm \[71, 72\], at least three reference nodes are needed to solve the least square problem. Substituting

\[\begin{align*}
x' &= x - x_1 \\
y' &= y - y_1 \\
z' &= z - z_1
\end{align*}\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

into Eq. 2.3 and subtracting the first one \((i = 1)\) successively from it for \(i = 2, 3\) results in an equation set in the matrix form as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x_2 - x_1 \\
x_3 - x_1 \\
\vdots \\
x_n - x_1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x' \\
y' \\
z'
\end{bmatrix}
= \frac{1}{2}
\begin{bmatrix}
m_1^2 - m_2^2 + k_2 - k_1 \\
m_1^2 - m_3^2 + k_3 - k_1 \\
\vdots \\
m_1^2 - m_n^2 + k_n - k_1
\end{bmatrix}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

where

\[k_i = x_i^2 + y_i^2 + z_i^2\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

it can be denoted as

\[2At = b\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)
where

\[ t = \begin{bmatrix} x & y & z \end{bmatrix}^T \]  \hfill (2.9)

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
  x_2 - x_1 & y_2 - y_1 & z_2 - z_1 \\
  x_3 - x_1 & y_3 - y_1 & z_3 - z_1 \\
  \vdots \\
  x_n - x_1 & y_n - y_1 & z_n - z_1
\end{bmatrix}
\]  \hfill (2.10)

\[
b = \begin{bmatrix}
  m_1^2 - m_2^2 + k_2 - k_1 \\
  m_1^2 - m_3^2 + k_3 - k_1 \\
  \vdots \\
  m_1^2 - m_n^2 + k_n - k_1
\end{bmatrix}
\]  \hfill (2.11)

The solution can be obtained by using the least square method \[72, 73\]:

\[ t = \frac{1}{2}(A^T A)^{-1} A^T b \]  \hfill (2.12)

### 2.3.3.2 maximum likelihood algorithm

This section talks about how to using maximum likelihood (ML) algorithm \[74, 75\] to do the localization. Assume the RSS measurements intensity for each sensor is

\[ R_i = \gamma_i \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{C_k}{|\rho_k - r_i|^\alpha} + \omega_i \]  \hfill (2.13)
where \( R_i \) is the t-th sample; \( \gamma_i \) is gain factor, \( C_k \) is intensity of the k-th contaminant source, \( \rho_k \) is the position of the k-th source, \( r_i \) is the position of the mobile node, \( \omega_i \) is the background noise.

Eq. 2.14 can be also expressed as

\[
R_i = \gamma_i \frac{C}{m_i^2} + \omega_i
\]  (2.14)

where \( m_i \) is shown in Eq. 2.3, which is the Euclidean distance between the mobile node and sensor nodes.

Setting \( \xi_i = (\omega_i - \mu_i) / \sigma_i \sim N(0, 1)\), \( (R_i - \mu_i) / \sigma_i \sim N(\gamma_i \frac{C}{\sigma_i m_i^2}, 1)\), we can define the following matrix notation:

\[
Z = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{(R_1 - \mu_1)}{\sigma_1}, \frac{(R_2 - \mu_2)}{\sigma_2}, \ldots, \frac{(R_N - \mu_N)}{\sigma_N}
\end{bmatrix}^T
\]  (2.15)

\[
G = \text{diag}\left[ \frac{\gamma_1}{\sigma_1}, \frac{\gamma_2}{\sigma_2}, \ldots, \frac{\gamma_N}{\sigma_N} \right]
\]  (2.16)

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{m_1^2}, \frac{1}{m_2^2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{m_N^2}
\end{bmatrix}^T
\]  (2.17)

\[
\xi = \begin{bmatrix}
\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_N
\end{bmatrix}^T
\]  (2.18)

We use MLE method to estimate the location. The joint probability density function can be expressed as:
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\[ f(Z|\theta) = (2\pi)^{N/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (Z - GDC)^T (Z - GDC) \right\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.19)

its log likelihood function is:

\[ L(\theta) \sim -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| Z_i - \gamma_i \frac{C}{m_i^2} \right\| = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \frac{R_i - \mu_i}{\sigma_i} - \gamma_i \frac{C}{m_i^2} \right\| \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.20)

where the \( \theta \) is the estimated mobile position. Thus, we can get the maximum likely mobile position by minimizing this function [76].

2.3.4 Cramer-Rao Lower Bound (CRLB)

Cramer-Rao lower bound (CRLB), named in honor of Harald Cramer [77] and Calyam-pudi Radhakrishna Rao [78] who were among the first to derive it, expresses a lower bound on the variance of estimators of a deterministic parameter. In the localization literature [79, 80], CRLB defines the lower bound on the precision of a localization that one algorithm can reach. To calculate the CRLB for localization inside human body, we define a performance evaluation scenario and models for the behavior of the localization metrics mentioned above, the RSS and ToA, for RF signaling in between the GI tract and the body-mounted sensors used for localization. In this section, we introduce a general scenario for comparative performance evaluation of RSS and ToA based localization for capsule endoscopy application. The scenario is designed to reflect the performance in different organs, the path of movement of the WCE inside the small intestine, and the number and pattern of installation of body mounted sensors on the torso. Since the received signal on the body-mounted sensors is distorted with the multipath receptions
caused by the refraction at the boundary of organs and tissues inside the human body, models for behavior of the RSS and ToA are fairly complicated.

Consider the WCE whose location is being indexed as 1 and \(m\) body mounted receiver sensors denoted with indexes 2...\(m+1\) as shown in Figure 2.4. Each receiver sensor \(i\) is capable of measuring the ToA \(\tau_i\) or RSS \(r_i\) from the WCE. The observation vector is \(X = [\tau_2...\tau_{m+1}]\) for the ToA case or \(X = [r_2...r_{m+1}]\) for the RSS. Assume the localization coordinate of the WCE is \(\theta_1 = [x_1, y_1, z_1]\), then our objective here is to estimate the location of the WCE \(\hat{\theta}_1\). The \(\tau_i\) observation are modeled as normal random variables \(f_{\tau_i|\theta_1,\bar{v}} \sim N(d_{i,1}|\bar{v}, \sigma_T^2)\), where \(d_{i,1}\) is the distance between the WCE and receiver sensor \(i\). \(\bar{v}\) is the average propagation speed of the RF signal inside the human GI tract, and \(\sigma_T\) is the parameter describing the ToA ranging error caused by human tissue non-homogeneity. The \(r_i\) measurements are log-normally distributed \(f_{r_i|\theta_1,\theta_i} \sim N(P_r(dB), \sigma^2_{sh})\), with \(P_r(dB) = P_0(dB) - 10\alpha \log(10(d_{1,i}))\). \(P_0(dB)\) is the RSS
at the reference distance from the WCE. $\alpha$ is the pathloss gradient and $\sigma^2_{sh}$ is the variance of the log normal shadowing.

The CRLB of $\hat{\theta}_1$ is $\text{cov}(\hat{\theta}_1) \geq I(\theta_1)^{-1}$ is the Fisher information matrix (FIM)

$$ I_{\theta_1} = -E\nabla_{\theta_1}(\nabla_{\theta_1}\ln\lambda(X|\theta_1, \theta)) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{xx} & I_{xy} & I_{xz} \\ I_{xy} & I_{yy} & I_{yz} \\ I_{xz} & I_{yz} & I_{zz} \end{bmatrix} $$

(2.21)

where $\lambda(X|\theta_1, \theta)$ is the logarithm of the joint conditional probability density function:

$$ \lambda(X|\theta_1, \theta) = \sum_{i=2}^{m+1} \log f_{\tau_1|\theta_1, \theta_i} \quad (\text{for ToA}) $$

(2.22)

$$ \lambda(X|\theta_1, \theta) = \sum_{i=2}^{m+1} \log f_{r_1|\theta_1, \theta_i} \quad (\text{for RSS}) $$

(2.23)

and

$$ I_{xx} = -\sum_{i=2}^{m+1} E\left[\frac{\partial^2 \ln f_{\tau_1|\theta_1, \theta_i}}{\partial^2 x^2_1}\right] \quad (\text{for ToA}) $$

(2.24)

$$ I_{xx} = -\sum_{i=2}^{m+1} E\left[\frac{\partial^2 \ln f_{r_1|\theta_1, \theta_i}}{\partial^2 x^2_1}\right] \quad (\text{for RSS}) $$

(2.25)

Similar expressions can be extend to $I_{yy}, I_{zz}, I_{xy}, I_{xz}$ and $I_{yz}$. The CRLB on the variance of the ToA/RSS location estimation is
\[ \sigma_1^2 = tr \{cov_\theta(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{z}_1)\} \]

\[ = min tr(cov(\theta_1)) = tr(I(\theta_1)^{-1}) \]

\[ = (-I_{xx}(I_{yy} + I_{zz}) + I_{xy}I_{xy} + I_{xz}I_{xz}.../(-I_{xx}I_{yy}I_{zz} + I_{xx}I_{yz}I_{yz}... + I_{xz}I_{yy}I_{zz})) \] (2.26)

### 2.4 Challenges of Localization inside Small Intestine

There are a number of fundamental multi-disciplinary scientific and technological challenges facing the RF localization of the WCEs inside the human body. To design an accurate localization system for inside human body we need to consider the following [4]:

- **Modeling of the Movements of WCE inside the GI Tract**

  The first challenge for meaningful analysis of RF localization inside the human body is to use clinical databases and clinical procedures performed by GI specialist, to model the movements of the endoscopy capsule inside the GI tract [81]. Previously acquired and stored databases of patients with approximately 55,000 images per patient could be examined for detection of landmarks or fixed points such as the pylorus and the ileocecal valve [29, 82]. Using the location of these landmarks, the number of images that observes the landmark, and the fact that the images are taken at a rate of two frames/sec (recently released WCE can take up to six frames/sec), we should design a model for the movements of the capsule in the GI tract to be mapped into the hardware and visualization platform. In the future, inertial sensing units that are small enough to be embedded in a pill size device could be used to provide real time information about pitch and roll angles of
the endoscopic capsule. This information could be used to enhance the movement model provided by examining the images reported by the capsule. The improved model for the movements of the WCE using inertial sensors would enhance the RF localization result. The feedback controlled inertial sensors have been already used to monitor the robotic end luminal system using magnetic field to efficiently perform diagnostic and surgical medical procedures [33].

- In every localization technique, map always plays a very important role in terms of refining the localization results [18, 19]. Existing literature [20] reported that a clear street map is able to reduce the GPS localization error from tens of meters to several meters in the urban area. In case of the localization inside human body, “map” is even more important since everything goes through the GI tract follows the same route. Knowing a clear pattern of the intestinal tract will greatly enhance the localization accuracy. Therefore, tracing the path of intestinal tract is essential to the accurate capsule localization.

- Modeling of the Wideband RF Propagation from Inside the Human Body

The second challenge is to model the wideband characterization of the RF propagation channel between an endoscopy capsule and body-mounted sensors [83, 83, 84]. We could use measurements inside phantoms and on the human subject’s body surface to calibrate existing software simulation tools for direct solution of Maxwell’s equations inside the human body. We then could use the software to determine the waveforms observed by a body-mounted sensor used as a reference point for localization or another endoscopy capsule inside the tract that could be used for cooperative localization purposes. Finally, it should be possible to design models for the temporal and spatial features of these waveforms (that are extracted for
localization techniques) as capsules travel along the GI tract, to be used by the CPS for performance evaluation and visualization.

- Design of Complicated Algorithms for Localization inside the GI Tract

The third challenge would be the design and comparative performance evaluation of alternative localization algorithms and discovery of methods for visualization of the results. For this part one needs to consider the use of channel models for spatial and temporal variation of the signal, the model for the track of physical movement of the capsule inside digestive system, and landmarks detected from video frames of the endoscopy capsule camera [41, 63, 85, 86]. In addition to the RF localization features, we may expect that these algorithms could exploit the knowledge of pattern of movements and the visual data observed by the camera inside the tract. The Cramer-Rao lower bound (CRLB) for the performance of basic RSS and ToA based localization algorithms for capsule endoscopy are already available in the literature [87]. We can use these bounds as a guideline for the expected performance of the designed algorithms [88].

- Security and Reliability Issues

One last challenge in RF localization for WCEs would be to examine and where possible quantify the security, reliability, and privacy of implantable WCEs in human bodies. Here, there is an impending need to understand and analyze radio propagation of signals from WCEs outside the human body at larger distances where they may (a) cause interference (accidental or malicious) to the localization of WCEs and or devices inside a human body (b) recovered by more powerful devices towards identifying existence of such WCEs in specific patients. The former impacts the reliability of localization of the WCEs inside the human body while
the latter impacts the privacy of patients and the medical procedures that may be conducted on the patients.

In the following chapters, we are going to elaborate how we meet these challenges.
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Design of Algorithms for

Body-SLAM

Since the RF signal suffers from the noisy characteristics of wireless channel and multi-path distortions, it is natural to resort to other techniques to improve the overall performance of the localization system. One way to enhance the performance of RF localization is to combine the motion information of the capsule by employing a data fusion algorithm such as Kalman filter [89] or particle filter [43, 90, 91]. In our previous work [53], we have used both filters to integrate the RSS-based Wi-Fi localization and the movement models from inertial sensors including accelerometers and gyroscopes for cooperative robotic localization in indoor areas. The results were promising since this method shown the potential to enhance the localization accuracy by combining data from various sensor sources. However, as we mentioned previously, inertial sensors that meet the accuracy requirement for the WCE applications are too large to be embedded inside a video capsule and even if they can be embedded as the assembly technology...
improves, the cost of the capsule will be increased dramatically. In the localization literature, there has been a trend to extract motion parameters from consecutive image sequence to improve the accuracy of RF localization, which is known as visual based Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (V-SLAM) algorithm \cite{92-94}. In the WCE application, since the endoscopic capsule continuously takes pictures with very short time interval (up to 6 frames / sec), it is possible to extract the motion information of the capsule by processing the video stream captured by the embedded vision sensor. This motion information can be used as an alternative of inertial sensors to smooth the RF localization results and meanwhile to reconstruct the trajectory that the capsule has traveled in the same manner of V-SLAM for the indoor geo-location.

### 3.1 Formulation of Body-SLAM

For every location aware application, higher positioning accuracy can be achieved by employing hybrid techniques which take advantage of data fusion of different sensors \cite{89}. Since the only two data sources come with the endoscopic capsule are video stream captured by the embedded vision sensor and wireless signal received by the body mounted RF sensors, an intuitive idea to enhance the localization accuracy of the capsule is through combination of the two \cite{95}. As we mentioned before, the endoscopic capsule continuously takes pictures at short time interval (2 - 6 frames / sec) as it travels. Thus, it is possible to obtain information such as how quick the capsule moves and the direction of moving to track the position of the capsule. In this chapter, we present a novel motion tracking algorithm for the endoscopic capsule by analyzing the displacements of unique portion of the scene, which referred as feature points (FPs), between consecutive image frames. The proposed motion tracking algorithm consists of 3 steps: feature
points matching, image unrolling and quantitative calculation of motion parameters. Detailed procedures of each step are explained in the upcoming subsections.

Figure 3.1: Overall flow chart of Body-SLAM
3.2 Motion Tracking using Endoscopic Images

The movement of the endoscopic capsule is highly unpredictable. It may move fast, slow, rotate and with any combination of the movements stated above. This complicated movement of the wireless capsule creates great errors to the localization accuracy since the Received Signal Strength (RSS) varies a lot due to fast fading and sudden change of antenna gain caused by flipping and rotating. Thus, knowing how the capsule moves will help us to better understand the radio propagation channel inside human body and therefore enhance the accuracy of the existing localization methods.

3.2.1 Analyzing the Content of Endoscopic Images

3.2.1.1 Image segmentation using SRM

To model the pattern of movements of the endoscopic capsule, we need to categorize the endoscopic images first to get a conceptual idea how the capsule moves [85]. Based on our observation, the received endoscopic images can be briefly categorized into two basic categories: “facing the tunnel” (FT) and “facing the lumen” (FL). Two sets of typical FT and FL images are shown in Figure 3.2. FT is the case when the focal axis of the camera is parallel to the center of the intestinal tube. The major feature of this set of images is always there would be a black hole (we call it “tunnel” here) somewhere in the picture representing the vanishing line of the intestinal tube. Through a sequence of consecutive FT images, we can clearly see the capsule either moves propelled by the intestinal motility. On the contrast, FL is the case where the capsule tends to stop or moves not as fast as in the FT. The reason why we do such classification is we are trying to develop a geometric model for the FT images to quantitatively calculate the speed of the capsule.
To distinguish the FT images from the FL images seems to be a fairly easy task for the human eye, however, it has been proved to be extremely difficult for the machines. Major sources of difficulties include highly complicated shape of the scene, various lightning conditions and uncontrolled noise include liquid and bubbles inside the GI tract [85].

Given a set of labeled images, finding what is in common among each set and what is difference between different set can provide inductive clues for classifier design. Some normally used feature descriptors such like Histogram of Oriented Gradients (HOG) and Local Binary Pattern (LBP) [96] doesn’t work well for our application since no distinguish difference can be found between the two image sets. Thus, in terms of image representation, our approach is a region-based method. We used a Statistical Region Merging (SRM) techniques described in [97] to segment the original image into several sub-regions with each region represent an object. The basic idea of this technique is to grow the major regions iteratively by combining smaller regions or pixels with homogeneous properties. A typical example of segmented FT image is shown in Figure 3.3 with segmented regions shown in their representative colors. From Figure 3.3 we can clearly see that after the segmentation, the image preserved the tunnel shape (the darkest component in the center) while the complex textures around the tunnel are get rid of. This
will effectively reduce the variance in the feature space.

\begin{equation}
P(R, R') = \begin{cases} 
\text{Merge} & \text{if } |\bar{R} - \bar{R}'| \leq \sqrt{s^2(R, Q) + s^2(R', Q)} \\
\text{Not merge} & \text{Otherwise}
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

where $\bar{R}$ is the average value of a certain color channel inside region $R$, $s(R, Q)$ is a threshold function whose value is controlled by $Q$. Detailed expression of $s(.)$ can be found in [97]. A good threshold is to find balance between preserving the major components of the scene and the risk of over merging. The choice $Q$ control the coarseness of the segmentation: a large $Q$ will keep more detailed regions while a small $Q$ tends to merge the small regions. From the experimental point of view, we set the value of $Q$ to be 16.
After merging, pixels inside each isolated region share a common color expectation while the expectations between adjacent regions are different for at least one color channel. Then, we can extract features out of the segmented images. To reach a good classification performance, the feature selection must obey the following rule: choose the feature that is more likely to appear in one set other than in the other set. This can be measured by calculating the co-occurrence of similar instances from different sets with the same label. Features that are more distinguishable may increase the precision of classification. Nine features are selected to classify the images. They are the size of the darkest region of the segmented image, length of the darkest region, length of the darkest region, RGB value for the darkest region and RGB value for the remaining regions.

### 3.2.1.2 Image classification using SVM classifier

After feature extraction, the segmented images are classified using a Kernel Support Vector Machine (K-SVM). The training data set are labeled in the following format \( \{ x_i, y_i \} \), where \( x_i \) is a \( n \times 1 \) feature vector, each element of the feature vector is composed by the feature we extracted from the previous section, since we extracted 9 features to represent an image, here \( n = 9 \), and \( y_i \in \{ +1, -1 \} \) is the label of the image. If the endoscopic image is FT, \( y_i = +1 \), otherwise, \( y_i = -1 \). Suppose we have some hyperplanes which separates the positive from the negative examples, the points \( x \) that lie on the hyperplane must satisfy

\[
wx + b = 0 \tag{3.2}
\]

where \( w \) is a weight vector with the same dimension of \( x \) and \( b \) is a bias term, which is a real number. The distance between a training sample \( x_i \) and the boundary, usually
called “geometric margin”, can be expressed as follows:

\[
\frac{\mathbf{w}^T_i + b}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \tag{3.3}
\]

Since the hyperplane expressed by Eq. 3.2 are identical after \(\mathbf{w}\) and \(b\) are scaled by a common constant, we can add a normalized restriction to this expression:

\[
\min |\mathbf{w}_i^T + b| = 1 \tag{3.4}
\]

Then, the optimal solution is the boundary that maximize the minimum distance which expressed by Eq. 3.3. By restriction of Eq. 3.4, this can be reduced to maximization of \(\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{w}\|}\).

The above equations are only applicable for the linear separable case. However, for our application, since the content of endoscopic images from different sets sometimes share similar features, the two set of images are not always linear separable. In another word, a hyperplane that can perfectly classify the two image sets does not exist. Thus, we need an approach that able to achieve nonlinear boundaries. Kernel mapping [98] is a technique which is used to solve nonlinear separation data set. The basic concept of the Kernel method is to map the vector \(\mathbf{x}_i\) to a higher dimensional space (possibly infinite dimensional) and do the SVM in this higher dimensional space. Figure 3.4 shows a one dimensional example of kernel mapping. The transformed space should satisfy that the distance is defined in the transformed space and the distance has a relationship to the distance in the original space.
Figure 3.4: Illustration of feature mapping using Kernel function

\[ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \overset{\text{mapping}}{\rightarrow} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^m \]  

(3.5)

where \( \phi \) is the mapping function. Since \( \phi(\mathbf{x}) \) is very high dimensional, it would not be very easy to work with \( \phi(\mathbf{x}) \) explicitly. If we measure the margin by the kernel function and perform the optimization, a nonlinear boundary can be obtained.

### 3.2.2 Feature Points Matching

For the FT images, the translation of the endoscopic capsule inside the small intestine can be modeled as a tiny camera passing through a elastic cylindrical tube as shown in Fig. 3.5. Since the WCE continuously takes pictures at a rate up to 6 frames/sec, common portions of the scene may present between consecutive images [34]. These portions of the images are called “feature points” (FP). The pattern and magnitudes of the displacements of these feature points can be used as a hint to reveal the speed of the endoscopic capsule.

To make an accurate estimation of the capsule’s speed, it is very important that the FPs extracted from the reference (first) frame can be accurately located in the following frames.
The Affine Scale-invariant Feature Transform (ASIFT) \([99-101]\) defined by the affine camera model in Eq. 3.7, is a perfect matching tool for the WCE images due to its immune property to viewpoint changes, blur, noise and spatial deformations.

\[
A = H_\lambda R_1(\Psi)T_1R_2(\Phi)
\]

\[
= \lambda \begin{bmatrix}
cos \Psi & -sin \Psi \\
sin \Psi & cos \Psi
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
t & 0 \\
t & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
cos \Phi & -sin \Phi \\
sin \Phi & cos \Phi
\end{bmatrix}
\] (3.6)

where \( R \) represents rotation and \( T \) represents tilt. \( \Psi \) is rotation angle of camera around optical axis. \( \Phi \) is longitude angle between optical axis and a fixed vertical plane. \( \lambda \) is zoom parameter. Detailed procedure of FPs matching using ASIFT can be found in \([100]\). An example of feature points matching is given in Fig. 3.6 (a), in which blue “o” represents the coordinates of detected FPs in the reference frame, red “o” represent the coordinates of matched FPs on the second frame. If we connect the corresponded FP pairs on the same frame (as shown in Fig. 3.6 (b)), a bunch of motion vectors will be generated representing the displacements of FPs between frames.

![Intestinal wall](image)

**Figure 3.5:** A WCE moving inside the small intestine
3.2.3 Image Unrolling

To standardize the displacement of each FP pair and facilitate the quantitative calculations of motion parameters that are useful for localization, we need to perform an inverse cylindrical projection \[102\] (also referred as “image unrolling” in \([63, 103]\)) to project the original cylindrical image onto an flatten view coordinate system, which we called “unrolled” image domain. As shown in Fig. 3.7, given a point \(P\) at distance \(d\) away from the camera, the angular depth of \(P\) is defined as:

\[
\theta = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{R}{d} \right)
\]  

(3.7)
where $R$ represents the radius of the intestinal tube. It can be seen from Eq. 3.7 that a smaller angler depth indicates a larger distance away from the camera. To facilitate the derivation of angler depth, we map the coordinate $(x, y)$ of any point on the cylindrical image plane to the unrolled image plane $(x', y')$ by:

\[ x' = \frac{L\phi}{2\pi}, \quad y' = r \tag{3.8} \]

where $\phi$ is the angle between point $P$ and the horizontal axis in the cylindrical image plane (shown in Fig. 3.8 (a)).

\[ \phi = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{y - y_0}{x - x_0} \right) \tag{3.9} \]

$r$ is the radius of the circular ring associated with point $P$ that can be calculated by:

\[ r = \sqrt{(x - x_0)^2 + (y - y_0)^2}. \tag{3.10} \]

$L$ and $H$ are length and height of the unrolled image plane respectively. Fig. 3.8 illustrates the procedure of image unrolling.

In this unrolled image plane, $x'$ axis represents the radian angle $\phi$ whose value ranges from 0 (when $x' = 0$) to $2\pi$ (when $x' = L$). $y'$ axis represents angular depth which reflect the distance away from the camera. $y' = 0$ represents a 0 angular depth and $y' = H$ gives the maximum field of view $\eta$ of the camera. As can be seen in Fig. 3.8(a), after the mapping, the circular rings in the cylindrical image plane are stacked up vertically in the unrolled image plane. Under this new coordinate system, the angular depth of any point $P$ can be calculated directly through its $y'$ value by:
\[\theta \cong \left( \frac{y'}{H} \right) \eta \] (3.11)

The angular depth obtained from Eq. 3.11 would facilitate the calculation on the speed of the capsule and values changes in \(x'\) direction would facilitate the calculation of rotation of the capsule. Detailed calculation based on this new coordinate will be presented in the upcoming subsection.

**Figure 3.8: The process of “unrolling” the cylindrical image**

### 3.2.4 Speed Estimation

As mentioned in previous sections, motions of a video capsule can be detected by measuring the displacements of the FPs. To explain better, we use Fig. 3.9 to illustrate the procedure of calculating the transition speed of a capsule traveling through the intestinal tube.

In Fig. 3.9 (a), point \(P\) is a FP detected at a distance \(D\) from the initial position of the camera \(C\) with its angular depth equals to \(\theta_1\). After the camera has moved forward by
a distance $d$ to a new position $C'$, the angular depth of $P$ changes to $\theta_2$. The changes in angular depth can be used to calculate the transition speed of the capsule.

\[
\theta_1 = \tan^{-1} \frac{R}{D} \implies D = \frac{R}{\tan\theta_1}
\]  

(3.12)

\[
\theta_2 = \tan^{-1} \frac{R}{D - d}
\]  

(3.13)

Replacing $D$ in Eq. 3.13 with Eq. 3.12, we get:

\[
d = \frac{R}{\tan\theta_2} \left( 1 - \frac{\tan\theta_2}{\tan\theta_1} \right)
\]  

(3.14)

since the time interval for this distance $d$ is half a second, the speed of the capsule can be calculated by:

\[
v = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N} d_i = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N} R \left( \frac{\tan\theta_2}{\tan\theta_1} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\tan\theta_2}{\tan\theta_1} \right)
\]  

(3.15)

where $N$ equals to the total number of all detected FPs.

From Eq. 3.15 it can be seen that information on depth of FP is factored into the final expression of distance moved by the capsule. In this way, the actual displacement $d$ of the camera is independent of the location of the FP chosen in the image. To reemphasize, the unrolling process facilitates the deriving of $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$ in Eq. 3.11 and therefore facilitates the deduction of $v$. Similarly, if the capsule moves backward, the speed can be calculated in the same manner as well.
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3.2.5 Direction of Moving Estimation

Another important aspect for motion tracking is estimating the direction of moving of the capsule. As illustrated in Fig. 3.10. If we define the world coordinate as \((X, Y, Z)\)
and capsule’s coordinate as \((X', Y', Z')\). The moving direction of the capsule is given by a norm vector \((n_x, n_y, n_z)^T\) in the world coordinate. After the capsule rotated with angle \(\alpha\) around its \(X'\) axis (pitch), angle \(\beta\) around its \(Y'\) axis (yaw) and angle \(\gamma\) around its \(Z'\) axis (roll), the new direction of the capsule \((n_x', n_y', n_z')^T\) can be calculated by:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  n_x' \\
  n_y' \\
  n_z'
\end{bmatrix} = R \cdot 
\begin{bmatrix}
  n_x \\
  n_y \\
  n_z
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.16)

where \(R\) is an accumulative rotation matrix which relates the camera’s coordinate system \((X', Y', Z')\) to the world coordinate system \((X, Y, Z)\). If we assume the camera’s coordinate system was initially aligned with the world coordinate system with its focal axis pointed to the \(Z\) axis, then, the initial value of \(R\) equals to a \(3 \times 3\) identical matrix. As the capsule moves away from the original position, \(R\) is updated at each time step by:

\[
R = R_t \cdot R_{t-1}^{-1}
\]

(3.17)
where $R_t$ is an direction updating matrix that has a following expression:

$$R_t = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \alpha \cos \gamma & \cos \gamma \sin \beta - \cos \alpha \sin \gamma & \cos \alpha \cos \gamma - \sin \alpha \sin \beta \\
\cos \beta \sin \gamma & \cos \alpha \sin \gamma + \sin \alpha \sin \beta \sin \gamma & -\cos \gamma \sin \alpha + \cos \alpha \sin \beta \sin \gamma \\
-\sin \beta & \cos \beta \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \cos \beta
\end{bmatrix} \quad (3.18)$$

where $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ are the pitch, yaw and roll angles about the capsule’s $X'$, $Y'$ and $Z'$ axises, respectively, during the elapsed time interval. Again, these angles can be obtained without complicated computation in the unrolled image domain.

- pitch ($\alpha$) and yaw ($\beta$) estimation

During the transition of the capsule, the capsule will tilt toward the direction of the curly intestinal tube. As illustrated in Figure 3.10, point $P$ and point $Q$ are of the same distance from the initial position of the camera $C$. After the camera moves to $C'$ and tilted with angle $\varphi$ towards $Q$, the angular depths of the two FPs changes with different amount of magnitudes.

$$\triangle P = \theta_{P2} - \theta_{P1} \quad \triangle Q = \theta_{Q2} - \theta_{Q1} \quad (3.19)$$

Figure 3.10 shows that angular displacement $\triangle P$ is obviously larger than the angular displacement $\triangle Q$. The magnitude of tilting can be roughly estimated by:

$$\varphi \approx \frac{\triangle Q - \triangle P}{\max(\triangle P, \triangle Q)} \quad (3.20)$$
The direction of tilting can be obtained by finding the group of with smallest displace-
ment in \( y' \) in the unrolled image domain. Therefore, this tilting angle \( \phi \) can be further
decomposed into pitch angle \( \alpha \) and yaw angle \( \beta \) by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha &= \varphi \cdot \cos \phi \\
\beta &= \varphi \cdot \sin \phi
\end{align*}
\] (3.21)

- roll (\( \gamma \)) estimation

The calculation of roll angle \( \gamma \) is even easier in the unrolled image domain by measuring
the horizontal displacements of FPs in the \( x' \) axis:

\[
\gamma = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N} \frac{\Delta x'_i}{L} 2\pi
\] (3.22)

where \( \Delta x' \) denotes the horizontal displacement of a FP in the unrolled domain. \( L \) is
the length of the unrolled image. It can be seen from Eq. 3.22, a greater \( \Delta x' \) reflects a
greater rolling angle \( \gamma \) and vice versa.

### 3.3 Data Fusion of Visual and RF Information

The two data sources that come with the endoscopic capsule provide complementary
characteristics: visual motion tracking is very accurate at low-velocities but suffers from
accumulative estimation errors which leads to drifting away, while RF localization pro-
vides absolute localization results that is independent from the previous measurements
but with certain amount of error for estimation. In this section, we talk about how to
fuse the data from both sensors to improve the reliability and accuracy of WCE local-
ization inside small intestine. The proposed hybrid solution utilizes a Kalman filter to
predict the position of the capsule based on the motion model extracted from images and obtains feedback from the RF measurements to correct the position estimations [41].

3.3.1 Kalman Filter

The state of the mobile robot (in this case the capsule) in the 3D space can be modeled as its $x, y, z$ coordinates and orientation. These parameters can be combined into a state variable vector. As we introduced above, the capsule continuously takes pictures as it moves along, by processing the video stream, we are able to extract the motion information about how far it has moved and its orientation. However, due to the low resolution and low frame rate, these estimations include errors and these errors accumulate frame by frame. This will cause the capsule drifting away from the correct path.

The Kalman Filter (KF), which has been widely used for mobile robot navigation, is a smarter way to optimally estimate the state by integrating all available data from various sensor sources. Since the only two data sources come with the endoscopic capsule are video stream captured by the embedded vision sensor and wireless signal received by the body mounted RF sensors, an intuitive idea to enhance the localization accuracy of the capsule is through combination of the two.

The main idea of KF is to estimate the conditional probability of being in state $m_t$ given available measurements $z_1, z_2, ..., z_t$. We call the probability of being in state $m_t$ given measurements $z_1, z_2, ..., z_t$ the belief,

$$Bel(m_t) = P(m_t|z_1, z_2, ..., z_t)$$ (3.23)
We can split this belief definition into the prior belief $Bel^-(m_t)$ and the posterior belief $Bel^+(m_t)$ using Bayesian rule and Markov assumption.

\begin{align}
Bel^-(m_t) &= P(m_t | z_1, z_2, ... z_{t-1}) \\
&= \int P(m_t | m_{t-1}) Bel^+(m_{t-1}) dm_{t-1}
\end{align}

\begin{align}
Bel^+(m_t) &= P(m_t | z_1, z_2, ... z_t) \\
&= \frac{P(z_t | m_t) Bel^-(m_t)}{P(z_t | z_1, z_2, ... z_{t-1})}
\end{align}

The prior belief is the conditional probability of being at state $m_t$ given all the measurements $z$ up to step $t$. The posterior belief is the conditional probability of being at state $m_t$ given all the measurements $z$ up to and include step $t$. In order to compute the beliefs, we need to find expressions for the system model $P(m_t | m_{t-1})$ and the measurement model $P(z_t | m_t)$.

In order to predict and correct the belief, the KF needs a model for the system and a model for the measurements. The KF assumes a Linear Dynamic System description of the system of which it is estimating the state. The dynamic system may be corrupted by noise sources, which the KF assumes can adequately be modeled by independent, white, zero-mean, Gaussian distributions.

- Assumptions

The KF assumes that the system state and measurements can be described by a linear dynamic system. This is a set of linear equations that models the evolution of
the state of the system over time and that describes how measurements are related to the state. The KF assumes a linear model, since it simplifies the computations and since often a linear approach is adequate for the problem to be modeled. When the problem is not linear, then we can use linearizing techniques to transform a non-linear problem into a linear. A linear dynamic system consists of a system and a measurement model.

- System Model

The system model describes how the true state of the system evolves over time. The KF needs this model in order to make predictions about the state. The KF assumes that the state of the system evolves according to the linear equation.

\[
m_t = Am_{t-1} + \omega_{t-1}
\]  

(3.26)

The true state \( m_t \in \mathbb{R}^n \) of the system at time \( t \) depends on the state of the system one step earlier \( m_{t-1} \) and some noise. Matrix \( A \) is an \( n \times n \) matrix that, without taking into account possible noise in the system, relates the state of the previous time step \( t - 1 \) to the state at the current step \( t \). The vector \( \omega \in \mathbb{R}^n \) represents the noise in the system.

- Measurement Model

The measurement model describes how measurements are related to states. The KF needs a model of the measurements in order to correct the state prediction when a measurement is available. If it has a model that given the true state of the system describes what the measurement will be, then it can compare the real measurement with the measurement that the model gives to correct the state
prediction. The KF assumes that the measurements can be modeled by an equation that linearly relates the state of the system to a measurement,

\[ z_t = Hm_t + \psi_t \]  

(3.27)

The true measurement \( z_t \in \mathbb{R}^m \) at time \( t \) depends linearly on the state of the system \( m_t \). The \( m \times n \) matrix \( H \) relates the current state \( m_t \) to the measurement \( z_t \). The vector \( \psi \in \mathbb{R}^m \) represents the noise during the measurements.

- Markov process

Notice in Eq. 3.26 that the state \( m_t \) at time \( t \) does not depend on all other states and measurements given \( m_{t-1} \). Also notice in Eq. 3.27 that, given \( m_t \), the measurement \( z_t \) does not depend on all other states and measurements. These properties make the system a Markov process.

### 3.3.2 Relative Position Predictions using Images

Given the motion model derived from the previous section, the priori motion state \( \hat{m}_t \) at time step \( t \) (without any knowledge of RF measurement) is given by:

\[ \hat{m}_t = A_{t-1} \cdot \hat{m}_{t-1} + \omega_{t-1} \]  

(3.28)

motion state vector \( m_t \) is defined as \([x, y, z, n_x, n_y, n_z]^T\), where \((x, y, z)\) is the 3D position of the capsule in the world coordinate system and \([n_x, n_y, n_z]\) is a norm vector that indicates the direction of moving of the capsule. \( \omega_t \) is a noise term caused by inaccurate motion estimation which follows a normal probability distributions with covariance equal to \( Q_t \). \( A \) is a 6 × 6 transition matrix that relates the previous motion state at time
Given that the sum of two Gaussian random variables results in another Gaussian random variable, we derive the probabilistic system model as

\[ P(m_t|m_{t-1}) = N(Am_{t-1}, Q_t) \]  

(3.29)

If we plug in all the parameters, Eq. 3.28 can be rewritten as:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_t \\
y_t \\
z_t \\
n_x|t \\
n_y|t \\
n_z|t
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
  1 & 0 & 0 & v\Delta t & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & v\Delta t & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & v\Delta t \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & v\Delta t \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_{t-1} \\
y_{t-1} \\
z_{t-1} \\
n_x|t-1 \\
n_y|t-1 \\
n_z|t-1
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
  \mathbb{R}
\end{bmatrix} 
\]  

(3.30)

where \( v \) is the transition speed of the capsule derived from Eq. 3.15. \( \Delta t \) is the time interval between frames (half a second). \( \mathbb{R} \) is the same rotation matrix introduced in Eq. 3.16.

In the same way we want to find the probabilistic characteristics of the RF measurement model from Eq. 3.27, since this is the distribution \( P(z_t|m_t) \) needed to compute the posterior belief from equation Eq. 3.25. The RF measurements are modeled according to the measurement model

\[ \tilde{z}_t = H_t \cdot \bar{m}_t + \nu_t \]  

(3.31)
where $\nu_t$ is a measurements noise term. Similar to $\omega_t$, $\nu_t$ also followed a normal distribution with covariance equal to $R_t$. In this, we again look at the term $H_t \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_t$ as a Gaussian distribution with mean $N(H_t \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_t, 0)$. Given these two Gaussian distributions, we see that the conditional probability of observing $z_t$ given $m_t$ is Gaussian distributed as

$$P(z_t|m_t) = N(Hm_t, R_t) \quad (3.32)$$

$H$ is a $3 \times 6$ matrix which predicts the RF localization based on the prior motion state at time $t$.

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.33)$$

Once the actual RF localization result $z_t$ is available, we can use it to correct the predicted position of the capsule. The covariance gives an indication of how precise the KF thinks the state estimate elements are estimated. The smaller the variances are, the more precise the state estimate is.

### 3.3.3 Absolute Position Measurements by RF Localization

To obtain the actual RF measurement $z_t$, several calibrated external sensors are attached to the anterior abdominal wall of the human body as shown in Figure 3.12 to detect the wireless signal emitted by the wireless capsule [104]. As we mentioned in Chapter 2, the power of received signal (RSS) is used to identify the distance between the capsule and body mounted sensors using statistical channel models.
Figure 3.12: A typical RF localization system
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$$L_p(d) = L_p(d_0) + 10\alpha \log_{10} \left( \frac{d}{d_0} \right) + S(d > d_0) \quad (3.34)$$

where $L_p(d)$ represents the path loss in dB at some distance $d$ between the transmitter and receiver, $d_0$ is a threshold distance and $\alpha$ is the path loss gradient which is determined by the propagation environment. The parameters of the path loss model developed by National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) at MICS band [66] was summarized in Table 2.2.

Let $(x, y, z)$ be the potential position of the capsule and $(x_i, y_i, z_i)$ be the position of body mounted sensor $i$. The ranging distance between the capsule and sensors can be expressed as:

$$d_i = 10 \left( \frac{L_p(d) - L_p(d_0)}{10\alpha} \right) d_0 \quad (3.35)$$

Given 3 or more estimated distances between the capsule and body mounted sensors, the 3D position of the capsule $z_t$ can be calculated using a least square algorithm introduced in Chapter 2 by minimizing the function below:

$$f(x, y, z) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \sqrt{(x - x_i)^2 + (y - y_i)^2 + (z - z_i)^2} - d_i^2 \right)^2 \quad (3.36)$$

### 3.3.4 Correction using RF Localization

After the actual RF localization $z_t$ is obtained, we can use the priori motion estimate $\hat{m}_t$ and a weighted difference between the actual RF measurement $z_t$ and the predicted RF measurement $\tilde{z}_t$ to correct the localization results.
Initial estimates for $\hat{m}_{t-1}$ and $P_{t-1}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion Update (&quot;Predict&quot;)</th>
<th>RF Measurement Update (&quot;Correct&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Predict the motion state: $\hat{m}<em>t^- = A\hat{m}</em>{t-1}$</td>
<td>• Compute the Kalman gain: $K_t = P_t^- H^T (H P_t^- H^T + R)^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Predict the error covariance $P_t^- = A P_{t-1} A^T + Q$</td>
<td>• Update motion state with actual RF measurement $z_t$: $\hat{m}_t = \hat{m}_t^- + K_t (z_t - H \hat{m}_t^-)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update the transition matrix $A$ through video by: $R = R_t \cdot R_t \cdot R^{-1}$</td>
<td>• Update the error covariance: $P_t = (1 - K_t H) P_t^-$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.13:** A complete flowchart of data fusion of images and RF measurements using a Kalman filter

\[
\hat{m}_t = \hat{m}_t^- + K_t (z_t - \hat{z}_t) \quad (3.37)
\]

where $\hat{m}_t$ is defined as a posteriori motion state estimate given the RF measurement $z_t$.

The $3 \times 6$ matrix $K$ in Eq. 3.37 is called Kalman gain. If we define the priori estimate errors covariance as $P_t^- = E[(m_t - \hat{m}_t^-)(m_t - \hat{m}_t^-)^T]$ and a posteriori estimate errors covariance as $P_t = E[(m_t - \hat{m}_t)(m_t - \hat{m}_t)^T]$, the Kalman Gain can be expressed as:

\[
K_t = P_t^- H^T (H P_t^- H^T + R)^{-1} \quad (3.38)
\]

The Kalman Gain controls the weighs of both sensors on the final position estimation: if RF measurement noise is low, then the final estimation is more dependent on the RF measurement. Otherwise, the final estimation is more dependent on the motion model.

The whole process of data fusion is illustrated in Fig. 3.13
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Performance Evaluation of Body-SLAM

One of the major challenges in localization inside human body is performance evaluation. That’s because any experiments inside human body is extremely difficult to operate. After the WCE is swallowed by the patient, we have limited control of the capsule and there is no effective way to verify their positions. Moreover, human subjects are different from one and another, we need a uniform platform for comparative performance evaluation. In this chapter, we talk about the validation of our proposed localization algorithm. Both the empirical results and emulation results are given to verify the performance of our algorithm.

4.1 Empirical Results of Motion Tracking

We need the motion model of the WCE for the simulation and the analysis of the temporal and spatial variation of the observed signals by body mounted sensors, design
of algorithms for localization, and the emulation of the channel characteristics for performance evaluation and visualization of locations of WCEs. Unlike the movement of vehicles on roads or human beings in indoor areas, the movement of WCE inside the human body is very inconsistent and varies with the type of organs. While we cannot develop completely generalized models, we should be able to develop empirical movement models for these movements. Some pre-defined landmarks are detected by image processing techniques or identified by a GI specialist through the video source taken by WCE. These landmarks include entrance and exit of each of the four organs traversed by the endoscopy capsule: esophagus, stomach, small intestine and large intestine as well as tumors and bleeding identified in the tract. Figure 4.1 shows pictures of landmarks inside the GI tract associated with pictures of duodenum, bleeding, tumor and cecum.

As introduced in Chapter 3, if we know the motion information of the capsule by processing the endoscopic images, we can integrate this motion information with the RF measurements to enhance the localization accuracy. Conventionally, one simple approach of extracting the speed information of the capsule is to assume the capsule travels at a constant average speed and the approximate position of the capsule is calculated according to the time of travel away from some pre-defined landmarks such like pylorus and ileocecal valve. Apparently, when using this approach, the further the capsule moves
away from the landmarks, the greater the error is. Especially after the video capsule has entered a few centimeters of the small intestine, the localization error will increase dramatically. This is mainly due to the high complicity level of the shape of the small intestine. The distribution of small intestine is like a curled snake with its length varies from 5m to 9m (the average value for human being is 7m) and the tendency of loops is highly indistinguishable. Besides, the intestinal motility is not consistent. Peristalsis may make the wireless capsule sometimes move quickly, sometimes slow or sometimes even stop and then progress with any combination of the movements above. To enhance the localization accuracy, a precise knowledge of how fast the capsule moves is urgently needed. In this section, we apply the speed estimation algorithm introduced in chapter 3 to the clinical endoscopic image database to model the speed of the capsule traveling through the small intestine.

4.1.1 Speed Estimation using PillCam COLON 2

PillCam COLON 2 is another product of Given Imaging, which specially aims at visualization of the colon mucosa and detecting polyps [105, 106]. After FDA Rejected PillCam Colon application in USA in 2008, Given Imaging developed the second-generation PillCam COLON 2 and received a CE Mark in 2009 and was commercially available in Europe in 2010. The size of PillCam COLON 2 is 11 × 31 mm and equipped with two identical image cameras on both ends as shown in Figure 4.2. As we mentioned in the previous chapters, performance evaluation of the speed estimation of WCE is extremely difficult. The double camera feature of the PillCam COLON 2 is a perfect tool for statistical validation. Since the images taken from both cameras are almost the same but pointing to opposite direction, after applying the speed estimation algorithm, the speed extracted from both cameras should be the same.
The data set we used for this validation is from UMass Memorial Medical Center. The video clip is consist of 2600 continuous image pairs. After applying the proposed motion tracking algorithms to each image pair, the result of the speed estimation (magnitude) is shown in Figure 4.3, where blue line represents the speed estimated from camera 1 and red line represents the speed estimated from camera 2. As we can see, the trend of both line match pretty well which indicate our proposed speed estimation is accurate. The plot shows that the capsule doesn’t travel at a constant speed, it sometimes travels fast propelled by the intestinal motility and sometimes moves slowly even stops. This result confirms the assumption that the capsule translates at various speed. We also plotted the PDF and CDF of the speed estimation results from both cameras in Figure 4.4, they also share almost identical distributions.

4.1.2 Statistical Speed Modeling

We also tested our algorithm with the clinical data from different individuals using OMOM [107] capsule. Figure 4.7 shows a sequence of 60 endoscopic frames. After applying our speed estimation algorithm, a plot of the corresponding speed is given underneath. Since we do not have precise control of the capsule, we are not able to
Figure 4.3: Speed estimation results from PillCam COLON 2 double cameras
Figure 4.4: Statistics of speed estimation using PillCam COLON 2 double cameras

perform quantitative evaluation, but we can examine the images manually by naked eye. As shown in Figure 4.7, the whole image sequence can be divided into 4 sections marked by A, B, C, and D. It can be seen that during section A and C, the scene almost
stays still which indicates a slow motion of the capsule, while in section B and D, the capsule moves faster. The trend of the corresponding speed estimation plot matches this observation. To further validate our algorithm, we compared the statistical results

![PDF of the speed estimation from different individuals](image1)

**Figure 4.5:** PDF of the speed estimation from different individuals

![CDF of the speed estimation from different individuals](image2)

**Figure 4.6:** CDF of the speed estimation from different individuals
of clinical data (4 short video clips and 1 long video clip) from 5 different patients. The results are shown in Figure 4.5 and Figure 4.6. It can be seen although the video clips are from different individuals, after applying our speed estimation algorithm, the estimated speed shares very similar distributions in term of probability density function (PDF) and cumulative distribution function (CDF). Some typical speed estimation pattern are shown in Figure 4.8 and Figure 4.9.
Figure 4.7: Speed estimation results of a sequence of real endoscopic images
Figure 4.8: A typical speed pattern of moving fast

Figure 4.9: A typical speed pattern of moving slow
4.2 Design of Testbed for Performance Evaluation

As we mentioned before, one of the major challenges of implementing any capsule localization algorithms when it comes inside the human body is validation. That is because we have limited control of the capsule after it is swallowed by the patient so we could not verify the performance of the algorithms [4, 108]. Besides, carrying out experiments on the real human beings is extremely costly and restricted by law. Thus, the only way to verify the performance of our localization algorithm is to build up an emulation test bed. Similar idea was applied to wireless wide area network (WWAN) and wireless local area network (WLAN) deployments. In WWAN and WLAN, instead of doing real measurements, researchers model the characteristic of the RF signal under a certain scenario by creating emulation testbed. Algorithms and protocols can be imported into the testbed to test and compare their performances. In case of WCE localization, since experiments inside human body is impossible, we need to design a testbed for performance evaluation of the proposed Body-SLAM algorithm. In this section, we describe the details how to establish a testbed for localization inside human body.

Since the only two data sources we get from the WCE are images and RF signals used for transmitting these images, the testbed should include two major components: visual component and RF component. The overall flow chart of designing this testbed is illustrated in Figure 4.10.
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Performance evaluation using emulation testbed

- Speed estimation and direction of moving estimation
- RF localization and channel modeling
- Body-SLAM performance evaluation

Figure 4.10: Design of emulation testbed for quantitative performance evaluation
4.2.1 Visual Component

To establish the visual component of the testbed, we need to create a visual environment that is able to produce artificial images that look the same as the real endoscopic images taken by the WCE while we have fully control of the motion status of the camera.

4.2.1.1 Physical testbed

Our first attempt to emulate the digestive tract is to build a physical hardware \[109\]. This hardware was created by bending and twisting a 1.5 meter long 3 centimeter diametric Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) tube. The outer surface of the tube was painted with flesh color to give it a more realistic interior look. A layer of tinfoil paper was covered around the tube to prevent outer light from transmitted into the tube and also preventing the light of camera from escaping outside.

To simulate the transition of the endoscopic capsule, we inserted a wired endoscopy camera equipped with four LED lights (as shown in Figure 4.11 (a)) into the tube with a constant step of 0.03 cm and took a picture after each step. In the endoscopic pictures, the tube surface that lied physically closer to the camera had a brighter intensity value. The brightness decreased as the distance increased and finally at the far end of the tube, which was corresponding to the center of the endoscopic pictures, a black hole would form. If the camera was about to tilt, the black hole would move toward to the edge of the endoscopic pictures. Figure 4.11 (c) indicates a test pictures take from inside the physical testbed. We can see that it looks similar with real pictures taken from the small intestine.

One big advantage of the physical testbed is that we can put it into water to simulate the liquid environment inside the small intestine. Also we could insert a antenna inside
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(a)                                                                         (b)                                              (c)

Figure 4.11: A physical visual model for the small intestine (a) wired endoscopic camera (b) appearance of the physical model (c) pictures taken from inside the physical model

the tube to emulate RF signal emitted by the endoscopic camera. However, there are some fundamental drawbacks with this physical model:

- The major drawback of this physical model was the restriction in camera control. After the camera was inserted into the tube, we can only control the speed of the camera by pulling the wire connected to of the camera. However, we don’t have full control of other movements of the camera such as tilt and rotation.

- The PVC plastic tube is not soft enough to bend into the complicated shape (especially the sharp turn) of the small intestine. Besides, the endoscopic camera is longer than the actual size of the endoscopic capsule, this would make smooth transition of the camera challenging since it sometimes get stuck somewhere in the tube.

- Adding texture to the interior of the PVC tube is difficult. We need map the actual texture of inside the digestive tract to the interior to the physical model to make it looks more similar to the real endoscopic images.
Due to the drawbacks stated above, an alternative way to emulate the inside environment of the small intestine was to build a virtual testbed which will be introduced in the upcoming subsection.

### 4.2.1.2 Virtual testbed

The major reason that we choose a virtual visual testbed is that it gives full control of the camera’s motion. This is critical in validating the performance of our motion tracking algorithm. Besides, we can easily change the shape of the testbed and attach any color and texture to the testbed to make it looks more realistic. To verify the feasibility of the virtual testbed, we compared the images generated from the virtual testbed and physical testbed and make sure they share similar characteristics.

The first step is to map the physical model to the virtual 3D space \[110\]. To do so, we measured the \(x\), \(y\), and \(z\) coordinates of the pipe every 10cm and imported those coordinates into Matlab (as shown in Figure 4.12). After linking those 3D points, we got the path of the physical testbed. This path is used for generating a cylinder the same size as the physical pipe as shown in Figure 4.13. We attached the texture extracted from the real endoscopic images to the interior of this cylinder to give a realistic look as the small intestine. Using Matlab graphic toolbox, we placed a camera view point and moved it along this path and meanwhile taking pictures. An light source was placed behind the camera view point to simulate the illumination system. Some sample images generated by this virtual environment is shown in Figure 4.14. As we can see, the images generated from the virtual environment shares the same features of the images from the physical testbed, therefore, it can be used as an alternative for creating the visual component of the testbed. However, the cylinder shown in Figure 4.13 is too short and too simple
to represent the real small intestine. We need a more realistic and complicated virtual model of the digestive tract.
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(a) Physical testbed

(b) Mapping the coordinates of physical testbed into Matlab

(c) Create the 3D path of the physical testbed by interpolation

**Figure 4.12:** Mapping the physical testbed into virtual 3D space
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To create a more realistic scenario, we generated a cylindrical tube with the same size and shape of the small intestine. The actual path of this virtual test bed was extracted from an anatomical 3D model of the small intestine shown in Figure 4.16 by using some 3D image processing techniques. For the large intestine, since it already has a very clear pattern which looks like a big hook, we applied 3D skeletonization technique [111] to extract the path of it. As for the small intestine, since the shape of the small intestine is much more complicated (the trend of the small intestine can be hardly recognized...
by human eyes), we developed an element sliding technique to trace the path. The basic idea behind this technique is to define an element shape (ES) with its radius automatically adjustable to the radius of the small intestine [86]. This ES is propelled forward by a factor associated proportional to the average distance between the vertices within certain range and the physical center of the ES. As the ES goes along the small intestine, the position of its physical center is recorded and this will give us a clear path of the small intestine. The path extracted from the 3D model is shown on the bottom of Figure 4.15.

As illustrated on the top of Fig. 4.16 (c), the virtual test bed shared the same topology with the real small intestine which is intertwined back and forth. To make the interior of the testbed look more realistic, we extracted color and texture from the real endoscopic images and mapped it onto the interior surface of the tube. Similar emulation set up can be found in [108, 112, 113].
Figure 4.15: 3D path generation from a 3D GI tract model
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Figure 4.16: Emulation testbed set up
4.2.2 RF Component

Research in localization inside of the human body has reached a bottleneck due to the difficulty of conducting measurements inside the human body. Two major limitations causing difficulty are the existence of a nonhomogeneous environment and difficulties in antenna implantation inside the human body for experimental purposes. Previously, the efficiency of different simulations around a human body was assessed and theoretically analyzed [114, 115]. Phantoms with emulated tissues were used to validate surface measurements of a human body [116–118]. However, the simulation analysis of the small intestine remains to be done.

4.2.2.1 RF propagation emulation using FDTD

The RF propagating simulation was carried out using SEMCAD X [119]. SEMCAD X is a full-wave electromagnetic simulation platform based on the Finite Difference Time Domain (FDTD) method [120]. This software provides an abundant library of anatomical non-homogeneous human body models for waveform transmission problems. The models can be used to simulate wave propagation in and around the human body. Additionally, this software runs faster than other electromagnetic simulation platforms due to its algorithm optimization.

The FDTD method was first introduced by Yee in 1966 [121]. It solves Maxwell curl equations in the time domain. The FDTD method has been proven to be an effective simulation method in terms of the accuracy of obtaining electrical and magnetic field parameters. It has been widely used in indoor localization and microwave simulations [122, 123]. In this section, we present the simulation results of the waveform propagation in both homogeneous and non-homogeneous tissues. By comparing simulation results
and empirical measurements, we show that the SEMCAD X platform is a reliable tool for waveform transmission.

In SEMCAD X, we simulated the in-body waveform transmission. The bandwidth range is from 50MHz to 400MHz. We imported a model of a 34-year male and positioned two sensors internally around the human torso. We placed two edge sensors inside the human body model at the torso. One sensor acts as a transmitter (WCE) and the other sensor as a receiver. We fix the receiver at a single location and move the transmitter at increments of 1 cm as shown in Figure 4.17. Using this procedure we obtain the values of TOA and received signal strength at different distances. The results are shown in Figure 4.18.
4.2.2.2 RSS vs ToA

To measure the statistics of the temporal and spatial behavior of the signal, we used computational techniques for direct solution of Maxwell’s equations for extensive measurements of wide-band characteristics of RF signals inside the human body. We have used these techniques to find the wide-band received signal at body mounted sensors and other WCEs when a waveform is transmitted from a VCE in a specific location inside the GI tract. Then we extracted the RSS, TOA and DOA of the received wide-band signal by other capsules or by body-mounted sensors to model them for use in RF localization algorithm design.

For RSS based localization techniques, we need a path-loss model that relates the statistical behavior of the power to the distance to calculate the estimated distance of the capsule from the body-mounted sensors used as the reference point. For TOA-based localization algorithms, we need a model for the multipath arrival and the relationship between distance measurement error and the bandwidth of the system to account for the measurement noise and various biases in distance estimation from TOA measurements.
The current body of literature only provides a few path-loss models for implant communication applications. Modeling of the effects of multipath on TOA- and DOA-based localization is at its infancy and new models for these purposes are needed.

### 4.3 Performance Evaluation for Body-SLAM

We first test the performance of the motion tracking algorithm using the visual testbed. The artificial images were generated by moving the camera viewpoint along a preknown path. During the transition of the capsule, it took pictures at resolution of $420 \times 560$ pixels. For the purpose of inverse cylindrical projection, we only used the square portion $(1:420, 71:490)$ of the original image. The size of the unrolled domain was set to be $500(L) \times 300(H)$ pixels. The radius of the cylindrical tube was set to be 1.5 cm, which was close to the actual radius of the small intestine.

Fig. 4.19 shows some artificial images generated by the visual testbed and typical movements that were detected by the proposed motion tracking algorithm. Fig. 4.19 (a) shows a scenario that the capsule moves forward. It can be seen that the displacements of FPs are originally pointed to the outer ring in cylindrical image domain while stacked vertically with their orientation pointing upward when mapped into the unrolled image domain. The magnitude of displacements in the unrolled domain reflects the speed of moving of the capsule. Similarly, if the capsule moves backward (shown in Fig. 4.19 (b)), motion vectors in the cylindrical image domain are pointed to the center and correspondingly, when mapped into the unrolled image domain, they are vertically pointing downward. Fig. 4.19(c) shows a case when the capsule rotated, motion vectors in the cylindrical image domain formed a circle around the focal axis and the corresponding
motion vectors in the unrolled domain were horizontally pointing to the right indicating a clockwise rotation. The magnitude of $\Delta x'$ reveals the rotation angle. Finally in Fig. 4.19(d), the capsule tilted toward $\phi$ during the transition, thus the magnitudes of the motion vectors in this area were smaller than the others. The difference in magnitude indicates the degree that the capsule tilts.
Figure 4.19: Typical movements detected by the proposed motion tracking algorithm
Experimental results show that the linear transitions and rotations can be accurately inferred from the vertical component and horizontal component of the motion vectors in the unrolled domain, respectively. Meanwhile, differences in the magnitude of motion vectors reflect tilting direction of the capsule. Based on the quantitative calculation, the tracking process is implemented as follows: given the initial position of the capsule, the subsequent positions of the capsule are estimated by multiply the current position with the transition matrix, which consists of distance, rotation, and tilt angle. The tracking results are illustrated in Figure 4.20 compared with the ground truth path. Also, the MSE of estimated position of the capsule for each step was plotted in Figure 4.21. It can be seen from the plotting that the motion estimation for the first 50 steps were very accurate, whose average MSEs were below 1 cm. However, the error increased as the step goes further. This was due to the accumulative characteristic of all motion tracking techniques. In every motion tracking technique, the next state is purely decided by the current state plus the current transition information, which was estimated from the displacements of FPs between consecutive image frames. If an error happened in the estimation of this transition information, even with very little magnitude, this error would accumulate and the overall error would keep increasing. This is what we call “drifting effect” in Robotics. Thus, we cannot judge the performance of a motion tracking algorithm based on the overall accuracy. Instead, we should evaluate the performance of an algorithm by measuring the accuracy of estimation within each step. Statistics in Table 4.1 show that our proposed algorithm worked accurately in calculating the proceeding distance and rotation angle for each step. The average distance error was 0.04 cm which was way below the unit step size, and the average rotation error was 1.8°, which was also very small compared with average rotation angle of 7.8°. The estimation of tilt was not as accurate because the differences in motion vectors were not
Table 4.1: Motion tracking performance for each step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average estimates</th>
<th>Average error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>0.41 cm</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation</td>
<td>7.8°</td>
<td>1.8°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilt</td>
<td>4.3°</td>
<td>3.0°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

always obvious and the range of smaller motion vectors may cover up to more than 45 degree of $x'$ axis. Therefore, it was very difficult to quantize the tilt angle which leaded to great calculation errors.
The results of motion tracking using images, RF localization and the proposed hybrid localization are given in Fig. 4.22. It can be seen from Fig. 4.22 (a) that the results of RF localization (represented in green triangles) are scattered all around the small intestine with relative large error (6.8 cm on average). This is because the RF channel suffers shadow fading and non-homogeneity of the body tissues. However, the good part of RF localization is its independent characteristics. Each measurement is an isolated procedure which cannot be affected by the previous measurements. Therefore, the localization error would not accumulate as the capsule moves along (shown in Fig. 4.22(b)).

The result of the camera motion tracking algorithm is shown in gray line in Fig. 4.22 (a). It shows that when using this algorithm alone, the estimated positions are continuous and the overall trend of the trajectory matches the ground truth path (shown in black line in Fig. 4.22 (a)) of the small intestine. However, as the capsule moves along, the localization error increases. It can be seen from Fig. 4.22 (b), after about 15 steps, the localization errors of motion tracking reaches almost the same level of RF localization and it keeps growing until explode (up to 70 cm). This is due to the accumulative characteristic of the motion tracking algorithm. In the motion tracking algorithm, the next motion state
is highly dependent on the current motion state plus the current transition information, which is estimated from the displacements of FPs between consecutive image frames. If an error happens during the estimation of this transition matrix, even with very little magnitude, the error would accumulate and the overall error would keep increasing. This is what we call “drifting effect” in Robotics. Thus, we cannot judge the performance of a motion tracking algorithm based on the overall accuracy. Instead, we should evaluate the performance of an algorithm by measuring the accuracy of estimation within each step. Statistics in Table I show that our proposed algorithm worked accurately in calculating the transition speed of the capsule and direction angles for each step. The average distance error was 0.04 cm which was way below the unit step size, and the average rotation error was 1.8°, which was also very small compared with average rotation angle of 7.8°. The estimation of tilt was not as accurate because the differences in motion vectors were not always obvious and the range of smaller motion vectors may cover up to more than 45 degree of $x'$ axis.
Figure 4.22: Localization results of different algorithms and performance evaluation
Finally we evaluated the performance of the proposed Body-SLAM localization algorithm. The results are shown in purple line in Fig. 4.22 (a). It shows after the combination of motion tracking and RF signals, the hybrid localization is able to achieve more continuous position estimation of the capsule and the reconstructed path that the capsule has traveled matches the ground truth path of the small intestine very well. From Fig. 4.22 (b) we can see that, compared with the existing RSS based localization system, the localization error of hybrid localization stays stable at a very low level (2.3 cm on average) and the error would not increase as the capsule moves along. The error distribution and CDF plot of the above three algorithms are given in Fig. 4.23 and Fig. 4.24, respectively. From both statistical plots we can see that the localization accuracy of the proposed hybrid localization is much better than the traditional RSS based RF localization. Since the diameter of small intestine is approximately 2.5-3 cm, the localization accuracy that the proposed hybrid localization provides meets the requirement of WCE application.

![Error distributions of different algorithms](image-url)
Figure 4.24: Performance evaluation by CDF plot of different algorithms
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Conclusion and Future Direction

This chapter provides an overall conclusion of the dissertation and points out the possible future directions of our research.

5.1 Conclusion

In this dissertation, we presented a Body-SLAM technique that integrates motion information extracted from the video source and RF signal emitted by the capsule to enhance the localization accuracy of the WCE and meanwhile reconstruct the path the capsule has traveled. The major contribution of this work is that we demonstrated the potential of using endoscopic images to aid the RF localization and possibility to map inside of human body. The proposed motion tracking technique is purely based on the image sequence that captured by the video camera which is already equipped on the capsule, thus, no extra components such as Inertial measurement units (IMUs) or magnetic coils are needed. Another contribution is that we provided an uniform performance evaluation platform to test the performance of localization algorithms inside
human body. Both empirical and experimental results have shown that by combining the motion information with RF measurements, the proposed Body-SLAM algorithm is able to provide accurate, smooth and continuous localization and mapping results that meet the requirement of WCE application.

5.2 Future Direction

In the future, we will focus on refining this Body-SLAM algorithm in the following ways:

- Enhance the performance of the Body-SLAM algorithm using more complicated Extended Kalman Filter (EKF).

- Verify the performance of the Body-SLAM algorithm using more clinical data, including experiments on animal and human subjects.

- Refine the virtual testbed by adding intestinal motilities.

A proposal based on the material of this dissertation has been filed to the NSF to pursue funding to continue this research.
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Appendix Tutorial

% To download the path, please go to http://www.cvins.wpi.edu/personnel/guanqun.html

clc;
close all;
clear all;
step=3;
Ps=load('path_small_intestine.txt'); % load the path for small intestine
Si=load('small_intestine.txt'); % load the model for small intestine
C=load('ex.txt');
li_x=C(1:step:end);
li_y=C(2:step:end);
li_z=C(3:step:end);
%h1=plot3(li_x,li_y,li_z,'r.');
p1=[li_x' li_y' li_z'];

figure;
hold on;

[t1]=MyCrustOpen(p1);
surf3=trisurf(t1,p1(:,1),p1(:,2),p1(:,3),'facecolor','b','edgecolor','b')% plot della superficie
alpha(surf3,0.01)
% rotation and translation matrix
Rz = [0 -1 0; 1 -1 0; 0 0 1];
Ry = [0.86 0 -0.5; 0 1 0; 0.5 0 0.86];
Rx = [1 0 0; 0 0.94 0.34; 0 -0.34 0.94];
T = [369 -400 -478];

Ps = load('path_small_intestine.txt'); % load the path for small intestine
Si = load('small_intestine.txt'); % load the model for small intestine

% Ps(:,1)=Ps(:,2);
Temp = ones(length(Ps),3);
Ps = Ps*Rz*Ry*Rx*1.6+Temp(:,3)*T;

% Si(:,1)=Si(:,2)*0.7;
Temp = ones(length(Si),3);
Si = Si*Rz*Ry*Rx*1.6+Temp(:,3)*T;

[t1] = MyCrustOpen(Si);
temp = rgb('darkgreen');
surf3 = trisurf(t1, Si(:,1), Si(:,2), Si(:,3), 'facecolor','white','edgecolor',[temp]); % plot della s
alpha(surf3, 0.01);

Pl = load('path_large_intestine.txt'); % load the path for large intestine
Li = load('large_intestine.txt'); % load the model for large intestine

% Pl(:,1)=Pl(:,2)*0.7;
Temp = ones(length(Pl),3);
Pl = Pl*Rz*Ry*Rx*1.6+Temp(:,3)*T;

% Li(:,1)=Li(:,2)*0.7;
Temp = ones(length(Li),3);
Li = Li*Rz*Ry*Rx*1.6+Temp(:,3)*T;
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[t2]=MyCrustOpen(Li);

temp=rgb('darkgreen');

surf3=trisurf(t2,Li(:,1),Li(:,2),Li(:,3), 'facecolor','white','edgecolor',[temp]); % plot della superficie

alpha(surf3,0.01);

plot3(Ps(:,1),Ps(:,2),Ps(:,3),'r .')

plot3(Pl(:,1),Pl(:,2),Pl(:,3),'r .')

view(-60,60)

view(40,35)

Figure B.1: Generating the path inside human body

% unrolling the image

% [xp, yp] are coordinates of feature points after projection
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\% [x, y] are the coordinates of feature points in the original image
\% [x0, y0] is the center of the original image
\% B is the height of the unrolled image
\% L is the length of the unrolled image

function [xp, yp] = inverse_proj(x, y, x0, y0, B, L)
    r = sqrt((x-x0)^2+(y-y0)^2);
    if(y==y0&&x==x0)
        theta = 0;
    elseif(y>y0&&x<x0)
        theta = atan(abs((x-x0)/(y-y0)));
    elseif(y==y0&&x<=x0)
        theta = pi/2;
    elseif(y<y0&&x<x0)
        theta = atan(abs((y-y0)/(x-x0))) + pi/2;
    elseif(y<=y0&&x==x0)
        theta = pi;
    elseif(y<y0&&x>x0)
        theta = atan(abs((x-x0)/(y-y0))) + pi;
    elseif(y==y0&&x==x0)
        theta = 3/2*pi;
    elseif(y>y0&&x>x0)
        theta = atan(abs((y-y0)/(x-x0))) + 3/2*pi;
    else
        theta=2*pi;
    end
    xp = round(L*theta/(2*pi))+1;
    yp = round(B-r)+1;
end

% Motion estimation for WCE

DistRatio= 1.25; % Increase value to decrease the number of matches
NumOrientBins= 16;

N_frame=6000;
M_Vector = zeros(1, N_frame);

figure(1)

for n=1:N_frame

% Load images
rootname = 'motion/1 ('; % Root filename
extension = '.jpg '; % Root filename
filename1 = [rootname , num2str(n),')', extension];
filename2 = [rootname , num2str(n+1) , ') ', extension];

A = imreadbw(filename1);
B = imreadbw(filename2);

J1 = imresize(A, 0.7);
J2 = imresize(B, 0.7);

I1 = J1(20:152,25:157); % get rid of the black part
I2 = J2(20:152,25:157); % get rid of the black part

Figure B.2: Illustration of unrolling image
\[
I_1 = I_1 - \min(I_1(:,)) ;
I_1 = I_1 / \max(I_1(:,)) ;
I_2 = I_2 - \min(I_2(:,)) ;
I_2 = I_2 / \max(I_2(:,)) ;
\]

\[
\text{fprintf ('Computing frames and descriptors (~0.5 minutes).
') ;}
[\text{frames1, descr1} ] = sift(I_1, '\text{NumOrientBins}', \text{NumOrientBins}) ;
[\text{frames2, descr2} ] = sift(I_2, '\text{NumOrientBins}', \text{NumOrientBins}) ;
\]

\[
[\text{inds ratios} ] = \text{SiftRatioMatch}(\text{sqrt(descr1)}, \text{frames1, sqrt(descr2)}, \text{frames2, DistRatio}) ;
\]

\[
\text{matches} = \text{zeros}(2, \text{sum(inds=0)}) ;
i = 1 ;
\text{for r=1:size(descr1,2)}
\quad \text{if (inds(r)=0)}
\quad \quad \text{matches}(1,i) = r ;
\quad \quad \text{matches}(2,i) = \text{inds}(r) ;
\quad i = i + 1 ;
\quad \text{end}
\text{end}
\]

\[
N_\_\_Vector(n) = \text{plotMotionVectors}(I_1, I_2, \text{frames1}(1:2,:), \text{frames2}(1:2,:), \text{matches}, '\text{Stacking}', \text{drawnow ;}
\]
\[
\text{clf} ;
\text{end}
\]

\[
\text{function [x,y,p] = sample_lds3d(F, H, Q, R, init_state, T, models, G, u)}
\% sample_lds3d model the movement of the WCE in a linear dynamical system.
\% [x,y] = switching_lds_draw(F, H, Q, R, init_state, models, G, u)
\%\%
\% x(t+1) = F*x(t) + G*u(t) + w(t), w ~ N(0, Q), x(0) = init_state
\% y(t) = H*x(t) + v(t), v ~ N(0, R)
\%\%
\% Input:
\% F(:,:,i) - the transition matrix for the i'th model
\% H(:,:,i) - the observation matrix for the i'th model
\]
% Q(:, :, i) - the transition covariance for the i'th model
% R(:, :, i) - the observation covariance for the i'th model
% init_state(:, i) - the initial mean for the i'th model
% T - the num. time steps to run for
%
% Optional inputs:
% models(t) - which model to use at time t. Default = ones(1, T)
% G(:, :, i) - the input matrix for the i'th model. Default = 0.
% u(:, t) - the input vector at time t. Default = zeros(1, T)
%
% Output:
% x(:, t) - the hidden state vector at time t.
% y(:, t) - the observation vector at time t.

if ~iscell(F)
    F = num2cell(F, [1 2]);
    H = num2cell(H, [1 2]);
    Q = num2cell(Q, [1 2]);
    R = num2cell(R, [1 2]);
end

M = length(F);
%T = length(models);

if nargin < 7,
    models = ones(1, T);
end
if nargin < 8,
    G = num2cell(repmat(0, [1 1 M]));
    u = zeros(1, T);
end

[os ss] = size(H{1});
state_noise_samples = cell(1, M);
obs_noise_samples = cell(1, M);
for i = 1: M  
    state_noise_samples(i) = sample_gaussian(zeros(length(Q{i}), 1), Q{i}, T)';
    obs_noise_samples(i) = sample_gaussian(zeros(length(R{i}), 1), R{i}, T)';
end

x = zeros(ss, T);
y = zeros(os, T);

m = models(1);
x(:, 1) = init_state(:, m);
p(:, 1) = init_state(:, m);
y(:, 1) = H{m}*x(:, 1) + obs_noise_samples(m(:, 1));

for t = 2: T
    % m = models(t);
    p(:, t) = F{t}*p(:, t-1);
    x(:, t) = F{t}*x(:, t-1) + G{t}*u(:, t-1) + state_noise_samples(t(:, t));
    y(:, t) = H{t}*p(:, t) + obs_noise_samples(t(:, t));
end

function [x, V, VV, loglik] = kalman_filter(y, A, C, Q, R, init_x, init_V, varargin)

% Kalman filter.
% [x, V, VV, loglik] = kalman_filter(y, A, C, Q, R, init_x, init_V, ...)
%
% % INPUTS:
% % y(:, t) - the observation at time t
% % A - the system matrix
% % C - the observation matrix
% % Q - the system covariance
% % R - the observation covariance
% % init_x - the initial state (column) vector
% % init_V - the initial state covariance
% %
%
[os T] = size(y);
ss = size(A, 1); % size of state space
% set default params
% model = ones(1,T);
model = 1:T;
u = [];
B = [];
ndx = [];

args = varargin;
nargs = length(args);
for i=1:2:nargs
    switch args(i)
        case 'model', model = args(i+1);
        case 'u', u = args(i+1);
        case 'B', B = args(i+1);
        case 'ndx', ndx = args(i+1);
        otherwise, error(["unrecognized argument ' args(i)"])
    end
end

x = zeros(ss, T);
V = zeros(ss, ss, T);
VV = zeros(ss, ss, T);

loglik = 0;
for t=1:T
    m = model(t);
    if t==1
        prevx = init_x(:,m);
        prevV = init_V(:,:,m);
    else
        prevx = x(:,t-1);
        prevV = V(:,:,t-1);
    endif
initial = 0;
end
if isempty(u)
    [x(:,t), V(:,:,t), LL, VV(:,:,t)] = ...
    kalman_update(A(:,:,m), C(:,:,m), Q(:,:,m), R(:,:,m), y(:,t), prevx, prevV, 'initial', i
else
    if isempty(ndx)
        [x(:,t), V(:,:,t), LL, VV(:,:,t)] = ...
        kalman_update(A(:,:,m), C(:,:,m), Q(:,:,m), R(:,:,m), y(:,t), prevx, prevV, ...
        'initial', initial, 'u', u(:,t), 'B', B(:,:,m));
    else
        i = ndx(t);
        % copy over all elements; only some will get updated
        x(:,t) = prevx;
        prevP = inv(prevV);
        prevPs = prevP(i,i);
        prevVs = inv(prevPs);
        [x(i,t), smallV, LL, VV(i,i,t)] = ...
        kalman_update(A(i,i,m), C(:,i,m), Q(i,i,m), R(:,:,m), y(:,t), prevx(i), prevVs, ...
        'initial', initial, 'u', u(:,t), 'B', B(i,:,m));
        smallP = inv(smallV);
        prevP(i,i) = smallP;
        V(:,:,t) = inv(prevP);
    end
end
loglik = loglik + LL;
end
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