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Abstract—Leveraging line features to improve location accuracy of point-based visual-inertial SLAM (VINS) is gaining importance as they provide additional constraint of scene structure regularity, however, real-time performance has not been focused. This paper presents PL-VINS, a real-time optimization-based monocular VINS method with point and line, developed based on state-of-the-art point-based VINS-Mono [1]. Observe that current works use LSD [2] algorithm to extract lines, however, the LSD is designed for scene shape representation instead of specific pose estimation problem, which becomes the bottleneck for the real-time performance due to its expensive cost. In this work, a modified LSD algorithm is presented by studying hidden parameter tuning and length rejection strategy. The modified LSD can run three times at least as fast as the LSD. Further, by representing a line landmark with Plücker coordinate, the line reprojecion residual is modeled as midpoint-to-line distance then minimized by iteratively updating the minimum four-parameter orthonormal representation of the Plücker coordinate. Experiments in public EuRoc benchmark dataset show the location error of our method is down 12-16% compared to VINS-Mono at the same work frequency on a low-power CPU @ 1.1 GHz without GPU parallelization. For the benefit of the community, we make public the source code: https://github.com/cnqiangfu/PL-VINS.

1. INTRODUCTION

Real-time high-accurate 6 degree of freedom (DoF) pose estimation in challenging scene is crucial for many applications [1]–[9], such as robotic navigation, unmanned aerial vehicles, and augmented reality. Monocular visual-inertial SLAM method provides an efficient solution method to solve the pose problem with the minimal sensor number, one camera and one Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU), it has an obvious advantage over lightweight and low-cost [10]–[12].

In the last several years, many monocular VINS methods have been proposed to recover robot motion by tracking point features, such as [1], [13]–[20]. Among them, VINS-Mono is recognized as a non-linear optimization-based benchmark as it yields highly competitive performance with loop closure, pose-graph optimization, and map-merging [12]. However, we observe it may lead to low-accuracy even failed pose estimation due to poor point extraction [22] in some challenging scenes, like Fig. 1 shows. Lately, leveraging line features to improve performance of point-based VINS is gaining concern because the lines provide the additional constraint of scene structure regularity in human-built environments, such as [10], [23]–[25]. These previous works focus on accuracy and robustness improvement, however, omit real-time performance.

Previous works use line segment detector (LSD) algorithm [2] from OpenCV [26] to detect lines, however, the LSD is designed for scene structure representation with no parameter tuning, instead of specific pose estimation problem, which becomes the bottleneck for real-time performance [24] as its high computation. Like Fig. 3 shows, we observe that massive (over 500) short-length lines are detected by the LSD, however they are sensitive to match and hard to be seen in the incoming frame, which does not only waste computation resource to detect, describe and match, but is also easy to produce outliers. Base on the observation, we argue that we do not need to finely describe the scene by lines in terms of pose estimation problem, but rather to detect obvious line segments then reject short-length line segments. For this goal, in this work we modify LSD for the specific problem.

Further, by describing a three dimensional (3D) line landmark with Plücker coordinate, unlike current works model
PL-VINS, in short, its characteristics include: our previous work [7] into VINS-Mono, this paper presents of the Plückert coordinate. Then the line residual can be minimized by iteratively updating the minimum four-parameter orthonormal representation of the Plückert coordinate.

Finally, by integrating the aforementioned processing and our previous work [7] into VINS-Mono, this paper presents PL-VINS, in short, its characteristics include:

- To my best knowledge, PL-VINS is the first real-time optimization-based monocular VINS method with point and line (see also Table I).
- A modified LSD algorithm is presented for the specific pose estimation problem by studying hidden parameter tuning and length rejection strategy, which can run three times at least as fast as the LSD.
- Points, lines, and IMU information are fused efficiently in an optimization-based sliding window for high accuracy pose estimation. The line reprojection residual is modeled as the midpoint-to-line distance then minimized by iteratively updating the minimum four-parameter orthonormal representation of the Plückert coordinate.
- Qualitative and quantitative experiments in benchmark dataset EuRoc show our method achieves higher performance than VINS-Mono at the same work frequency on a low-power CPU Intel Core i7-10710U @1.10 GHz.

For the remainder of the paper: related work is introduced in Section II then the architecture of the proposed PL-VINS system is described in Section III. Section IV introduces how we utilize the line features in the system. The experiment setup is described in Section V. Finally, we conclude remarks and the highlights of future works in Section VI.

II. RELATED WORK

According to the difference of multi-information fusion framework, current VINS methods are divided into:

A. Kalman filter-based VINS methods

The first tightly-coupled Kalman filter (KF)-based VINS method can be tracked back MSCKF [13], a multi-state constraint KF framework. Recently, Patrick et al. proposed OpenVINS, an open-source extend KF (EKF)-based platform for visual-inertial estimation. The former two works both used Shi-Tomasi [22] as visual features. Based on this platform, Yang et al. incorporate line feature [24] or plane feature [27] or line and plane [28] to improve the performance of OpenVINS.

B. Non-linearity optimization-based VINS methods.

Non-linearity optimization-based methods work on bundle adjustment (BA) in practice [12], where the pose is obtained by optimizing multi constraints such as visual and IMU. In this paper the optimization-based VINS methods are focused, they are be divided into:

Point-based methods. The first tightly-coupled non-linearity optimization-based method can be tracked back OKVIS [19] which implements based on keyframes and BA. After that, serveral optimization-based works were proposed, such as [1], [15]–[18]. Among them, VINS-Mono seems be a monocular VINS benchmark as it is high-robustness with feature tracking use Lucas-Kanade tracker (KLT) [29], loop closure using DBoW2 [21], 4 DoF pose-graph optimization, and map-merging. It has been extended to stereo and stereo-inertial recently. Note that current works mostly adopt Shi-Tomasi as feature extractor, KLT as feature tracker, these works may produce low accuracy in challenging scenes because of poor point feature extraction, see also Fig. 4. In this case, the poor corners and IMU information are inadequate for high-accuracy location requirement.

Point and line-based methods. Leverage geometric information into point-based VINS is gaining importance, e.g., lines and planes [30]. Considering real-time application, line features are focused in this paper. The way of leveraging line features into point-based VINS method is the key for the effectiveness. Current works including [10], [23]–[25], [28] directly use the LSD from OpenCV for line extraction however the LSD was designed for environment structure representation instead of pose estimation problem, in which massive lines can be regarded as outliers (see also Fig. 3), which does not waste computation resource but also is easy to produce outliers. Actually, for the specific problem, we do not need to use lines to finely describe the scene, but rather to extract obvious line features. After detecting lines,
LBD and KnnMatch algorithm [31] were used for description and match in these VINS methods. One recent work about the line match problem was [32], where Gomez-Ojeda et al. adopt geometric constraint to match and cull line outliers. Once line correspondences are established, pose estimation can be computed [33]–[35]. With the BA-based optimization framework, camera pose in VINS methods can be estimated by jointly minimizing three residual terms from point, line, and IMU constraint.

Table I shows the comparison of recent representative monocular VINS methods with point, line or plane. Observe that real-time performance has not been focused in previous works, e.g., PL-VIO cannot operate in real time.

III. SYSTEM OVERVIEW

This paper presents PL-VINS, a real-time optimization-based monocular visual-inertial SLAM method with point and line, in which we efficiently leverage line features to improve the performance of the state-of-the-art VINS-Mono method [1]. Naturally, the process of line feature integration is focused in this paper. The general structure of the PL-VINS is depicted in Fig. 2.

Let us define three necessary coordinate frames before introducing the structure. Let $\pi_w$, $\pi_b$, and $\pi_c$ be world frame, IMU body frame, and camera frame, respectively. The gravity direction is aligned with $z$-axis of the world frame $\pi_w$. Camera and IMU motion is considered as 6 DoF rigid motion including rotation and translation. PL-VINS implements the following three threads:

A. Measurement Preprocessing

PL-VINS starts with this thread, whose function is to extract and align two types of raw information measured by the camera and IMU.

For the incoming frame (RGB image) captured by the camera, point and line features are detected, tracked, and refined parallelly in the image. We use Shi-Tomasi [22] to detect point features, KLT [29] to track, RANSAC-based epipolar geometry constraint [36] to refine. As for line features, unlike the works [23], [24], [30], directly use LSD from OpenCV to detect [2], we modify the LSD for real-time application. Line features are tracked based on LBD algorithm (descriptor) [31] and KnnMatch [26] (match). More details about lines are introduced in Section IV-A and IV-B.

For the raw gyroscope and accelerometer information measured by the IMU, we follow VINS-Mono’s work [1], pre-integrate them between two consecutive frames.

Initialization: With the preprocessed measurement information, the system implements initialization to initialize necessary values for triggering next thread. First, a graph structure of up-to-scale camera poses and point and line landmarks are estimated in several frames. Next, the graph is aligned with the IMU pre-integration values including velocity, gravity vector, and gyroscope bias. Note that the extrinsic parameters between the IMU and the camera are given in advance.

B. Local Visual-Inertial Odometry

Since the initialization finished, this thread, a tightly coupled optimization-based Local Visual-Inertial Odometry (VIO), is activated for high-accuracy 6-DoF camera pose estimation by minimizing all measurement residuals.

First, 3 dimensional (3D) point and line landmarks are constructed by triangulating the point and line feature correspondences between new and old frames, and they are parameterized by the inverse depth [40] and Plcker coordinate, respectively, see Section IV-C.

Second, a fixed-size sliding window is adopted to find the optimal state vector including pose, velocity, landmarks, acceleration, and gyroscope bias, see Equation (10), by jointly minimizing multi-residual function, see Equation (12). In which, the line residual is model as midpoint-to-line distance, and the minimal four-parameter orthonormal representation
of the Plücker coordinate is used for updating the iteration increment, more details in Section IV. When inputting a new frame, we marginalize the last frame in the sliding window [38] to maintain the window size.

**Keyframe:** Follow VINS-Mono’s criteria for Keyframe selection: the parallax between current frame and last Keyframe is greater than a certain value or the number of tracked features is smaller than a certain value.

**IV. LINE FEATURE INTEGRATION**

This section introduces the process of line feature integration.

**A. Line Feature Detection**

Current point and line-based VINS methods directly adopt LSD from OpenCV for line extraction, which has become the bottleneck for the real-time application as its high computation, 60~80 ms each frame in our experiments. Observed that the LSD is designed for scene shape representation with no parameter tuning instead of the specific pose estimation problem, like Fig. 3 shows, where massive short-length line segments are detected however they can be directly regarded as outliers in terms of the pose estimation problem.

For the specific problem, we do not need to finely describe the scene by lines but rather to detect obvious line segments. Interestingly, we further find that some hidden parameters in LSD can be tuned to speed up the detection process. In this work, we modify the LSD based on source code in OpenCV, to speed up the extraction process from the following two aspects:

- **Hidden parameter tuning**. Although the LSD is no parameter tuning, there are still some hidden parameters that can be optimized to speed up detection, in this work we make them explicit. Frist, OpenCV uses a N-layer gaussian pyramid generated to represent the original image where the image is downsampled N-1 times, blurred N times, then lines are extracted using the LSD in each layer. We simplify the scale and layer of the pyramid, experimentally, scale = 0.5, and N (layer) = 2 work well. Next, the LSD sets a threshold of minimal density to reject line segments if aligned region points in an enclosing rectangle [2] is less than the threshold, in which we set it 0.6 to speed up the process. Note that the refining process is also time-consuming but it is necessary to culling unreliable lines.

To facilitate the tuning process, all values can be found in our open-source code.

**Length Rejection.** Previous parameter tuning help the algorithm simplify the detection process, we use length constraint to reject some of them. A minimum length \( \text{Len}_{\text{min}} \) is used to reject short-length line segments:

\[
\text{Len}_{\text{min}} = \eta \times \min(W_1, H_1)
\]

where \( \min(W_1, H_1) \) means the smaller value between the width and height of the input image. \( \lfloor \cdot \rfloor \) denotes rounding up to an integer. \( \eta \) is scale factor. For example, \( \min(W_1, H_1) = 480 \) with \( \eta = 0.125 \) means \( \text{Len}_{\text{min}} = 60 \). Experimentally, \( \eta = 0.125 \) is good choice to help system extract suitable lines.

Consequently, the modified LSD can run 3 times at least as fast as the LSD, see also Table IV.

**B. Line Tracking and Inlier Refinement**

After line segments are detected, we follow a popular line tracking strategy that has been adopted in [7], [9], [10], [23]–[25]: use LBD [31] to compute descriptor for each line segment then KnnMatch [26] to match based on the descriptor. After that we can establish initial line feature correspondences between frames. Concerning possible line outliers, we execute inlier refinement, in which the outliers are filtered out based on the geometric constraints.

**C. Line Landmark**

In previous steps, we establish (2D) line feature correspondences in image plane, now we estimate the corresponding 3D line landmarks by triangulating the correspondences.

**Plücker Coordinate:** Given a 3D line \( L_w \in \pi_u \), we describe it with Plücker coordinate \( L_w = (n_w^\top, d_w^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^6 \), where \( n_w \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) denotes the normal vector of the plane determined by the \( L_w \) and the origin in \( \pi_w \), \( d_w \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) denote the direction vector determined by the two endpoints of the \( L_w \). How to initialize the Plücker coordinate \( (n_w^\top, d_w^\top)^\top \) of a 3D line? One-to-one correspondence means that the 3D line \( L_w \) is observed by the two frames, let the two frames’ positions be \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) in \( \pi_w \), now we have two planes determined by the two positions and 3D line: \( \pi_1 = (P_1, L_w) \), \( \pi_2 = (P_2, L_w) \). According to [36], the dual Plücker matrix \( L_w^* \) can be described as:

\[
L_w^* = \begin{bmatrix} [d_w^\top]_\times & n_w^\top \\ -n_w^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \pi_1 \pi_2^\top - \pi_2 \pi_1^\top .
\]

where \([\cdot]_\times \) denotes the the skew-symmetric matrix of \( \cdot \).

**Orthonormal Representation:** Plücker coordinates have 6 DoFs with an obvious constraint \( n_w^\top d_w = 0 \). The DoFs can be reduced for optimization process. Zhang et al. have verified that the Plücker coordinate can be described with a minimal four-parameter orthonormal representation,
which has a superior performance [37]. In this work, we use it for the optimization. Given the Plücker coordinate \(L_w = (n_w^T, d_w^T)^T\), the orthonormal representation \((U, W) \in SO(3) \times SO(2)\) can be obtained using QR decomposition:

\[
[n_w | d_w] = U \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{set} : W = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_2 & -\omega_2 & \omega_1 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(3)

In fact, \(U\) and \(W\) are three and two dimensional rotation matrix, respectively. Let \(R(\theta) = U\) and \(R(\vartheta) = W\) denote the corresponding rotation transformation, we have:

\[
R(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 & u_2 & u_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n_w & d_w & n_w \times d_w \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
R(\vartheta) = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_2 \\ -\omega_2 & \omega_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\vartheta) & -\sin(\vartheta) \\ \sin(\vartheta) & \cos(\vartheta) \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\|n_w\|^2 + \|d_w\|^2)}} \begin{bmatrix} \|n_w\| & -\|d_w\| \\ \|d_w\| & \|n_w\| \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(4)

where \(\theta\) and \(\vartheta\) denote a 3-vector and a scalar, respectively. Now we can define the orthonormal representation by the minimum four parameters’ vector:

\[
o^T = (\theta^T, \vartheta).
\]

(5)

Given the orthonormal representation \((U, W)\), we also can recover its Plücker coordinate by:

\[
L_w = [\omega_1 u_1^T, \omega_2 u_2^T],
\]

(6)

where \(\omega_1, \omega_2, u_1, \) and \(u_2\) can be extracted from Equation (3). Note that the orthonormal representation is only used for minimization process, see Section IV-E.

D. Line Reprojection Residual Model

Line reprojection residual is model as the midpoint-to-line distance: midpoint of line segment to projection to line. First, we define line geometry transformation: Given then transformation matrix \(T_{cw} = [R_{cw}, t_{cw}]\) from \(\pi_w\) to \(\pi_c\), where \(R_{cw} \in SO(3)\) and \(t_{cw} \in \mathbb{R}^3\) denote rotation and translation. With the matrix, we can transform the line \(L_w\) in \(\pi_w\) to \(\pi_c\) by:

\[
L_c = \begin{bmatrix} n_c \\ d_c \end{bmatrix} = T_{cw} L_w = \begin{bmatrix} R_{cw} \times n_w & R_{cw} n_w \\ t_{cw} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n_w \\ d_w \end{bmatrix},
\]

(7)

where \(L_c\) is the Plücker coordinate of \(L_w\) in camera frame.

Next, \(L_c\) is transformed to image plane to obtain the projection line [37]:

\[
i = [l_1, l_2, l_3]^T = K_L n_c.
\]

(8)

where \(K_L\) is the line projection matrix and \(n_c\) can be computed by Equation (7).

Finally, assume that the \(L_w\) is the \(j\)-th line landmark \(L_j\) observed by the \(i\)-th camera frame \(c_i\), the line re-projection error in camera frame can be defined as:

\[
r_L(\mathbf{L}_j^i, \mathbf{X}) = d(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{l}) = \frac{\mathbf{m}^T \mathbf{l}}{\sqrt{l_1^2 + l_2^2}} \in \mathbb{R}^1
\]

(9)

where \(d(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{l})\) denotes the point-to-line distance function. \(\mathbf{m}\) is the homogeneous coordinate of the midpoint \(\mathbf{m}\) of the line segment’s two endpoints. The corresponding Jacobian matrix \(J_L\) is obtained by the chain rule [23].

E. Sliding Window Optimization with Point, Line and IMU

First of all, let us define the full state vector \(\mathbf{X}\) in the sliding window with point, line and IMU:

\[
\mathbf{X} = [x_0 + x_1, \ldots, x_{n_1}, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_l, o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n],
\]

\[
x_k = [p_{b_k}^e, q_{b_k}^e, v_{b_k}^e, b_a, b_g], \quad k \in [0, n_k]
\]

(10)

where \(x_k\) contains the \(k\)-th IMU body position \(p_{b_k}^e\), orientation \(q_{b_k}^e\), velocity \(v_{b_k}^e\) in the world frame \(\pi_w\), acceleration bias \(b_a\), gyroscope bias \(b_g\), \(n_k, n_p\), and \(n_l\) denote the total number of keyframes, point landmarks, and line landmarks in the sliding window, respectively. \(\lambda\) is the inverse distance of point feature from its first observed keyframe. \(o\) is the four-parameter orthonormal representation of a 3D line (See also Equation (5)).

The state vector is optimized to obtain a maximum posterior estimation by minimizing the following object function:

\[
\min_{\mathbf{X}} (\mathbf{I}_{\text{prior}} + e_{\text{imu}} + e_{\text{point}} + e_{\text{line}} + e_{\text{loop}}),
\]

(11)

where \(e_{\text{prior}}\) is the prior information that can be computed as after marginalizing out a frame in the sliding window [38]. \(e_{\text{imu}}\) and \(e_{\text{point}}\) are the IMU measurement residual and point feature measurement residual. \(e_{\text{loop}}\) denotes the loop-closure constraint. The aforementioned four terms have been introduced in [1]. Compare with VINS-Mono, we modified its object function with additional line feature measurement residual \(e_{\text{line}}\), now we define it:

Let \(L\) denote the set of line features observed in the current sliding window, \((i, j) \in L\) denotes the correspondence: \(j\)-th line landmark feature observed by the \(i\)-th camera frame \(c_i\) in the sliding windows, based on the defined line reprojection error in Equation (9), the \(e_{\text{line}}\) can be described as

\[
e_{\text{line}} = \sum_{(i,j) \in L} \left( \rho \| r_L(\mathbf{z}_L, \mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{z}_c \|_2^2 \right)
\]

\[
\rho(s) = \begin{cases} s & s \leq 1 \\ 2\sqrt{s} - 1 & s > 1 \end{cases}
\]

(12)

where \(\rho(s)\) denotes the Huber norm [39], which is used to suppress outliers.

The object function defined by Equation (12) is solved by Levenberg Marquard algorithm. Let \( t \) be the \(t\)-th iteration, \( \delta \) be the increment, then the optimal state vector \(\mathbf{X}\) can be found by iteratively update from an initial guess \(\mathbf{X}_0\) as:

\[
\mathbf{X}_{t+1} = \mathbf{X}_t + \delta \mathbf{X}
\]

(13)

In particular, we introduce the update method about the \(e_{\text{line}}\): A 3D line landmark is represented with the orthonormal representation \((U, W)\) of the Plücker Coordinate in the Section IV-E, we use the minimal four-parameter
representation $\mathbf{o}^\top = (\theta^\top, \theta)$, see also Equation 3-5. to update the $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$ in the optimization process:

$$
\begin{align*}
U_{t+1} &\leftarrow U_t (I + [\delta \theta]_c) \\
W_{t+1} &\leftarrow W_t \left( I + \begin{bmatrix}
0 & -\delta \theta \\
\delta \theta & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\right)
\end{align*}
$$

(14)

where $I$ denote the corresponding identity matrix.

V. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we evaluate the performance of PL-VINS in terms of location accuracy and real-time performance on the public benchmark EuRoc dataset [41]. All experiments were performed on Intel Core i7-10710U CPU @1.10 GHz. PL-VINS was implemented using ubuntu 18.04 with ROS Melodic.

A. Accuracy Comparison

In this subsection, we test the location accuracy of PL-VINS, the accuracy is evaluated by Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) of Absolute Trajectory Error (ATE) and Relative Pose Error (RPE).

ATE: Given PL-SLAM is developed based on VINS-Mono, we first compare them in the most challenging sequences of EuRoc dataset. Table II provides the ATE comparison in which the bold font represents a better result. From this table, we can conclude:

- PL-VINS yields better accuracy except for V1-02-medium. It yields $\sim28\%$ ($0.375 \rightarrow 0.270$) accuracy improvement at most in MH-04-difficult sequence.
- Loop Closure (loop) is one necessary step to eliminate accumulative error, which works in all sequences. Taking VINS-Mono as example, 0.375 is reduced to 0.220 in MH-04-difficult sequence.
- To sum up from the last row, PL-SLAM is the better method as the location error is averagely down 16% w/o loop or 12% error w/ loop compared to VINS-Mono by additionally leveraging line features.

Fig. 4 provides an intuitive comparison in terms of the 3D motion trajectory. Fig. 5 provides a visible example in MH-04-Difficult, in which, PL-VINS additionally rebuilds the line landmark map and recovers motion by tracking it.

RPE: Table III provides the RPE comparison including translation and rotation of PL-VIO, VINS-Mono and PL-VINS, the best value is bold. The result of RPE evaluation depends on the setting of the fixed delta, we set two types including fixed delta $= 1s$, which means the delta of one pair of pose limited to 1s, and no fixed delta. In our experiments, the former usually can find $\sim1000$ pairs of poses while the latter can find over 9000 pairs. From this table, all these values are proximity. The result of ATE seems more direct as it can be presented intuitively by trajectory (see also Fig. 4). However, in terms of the count result from the last row, PL-VINS yields better performance than the other two because...
it obtains 12 (3+9) best results while VINS-Mono 5 (3+2) and PL-VIO 1 (1+0).

### B. Real-Time Analysis

In this subsection, we discuss the real-time of PL-VINS by comparing it to optimization-based Monocular VINS methods: PL-VIO [23] and VINS-Mono [1].

Table II provides the average execution time comparison of the three methods. In which, Thread 1, 2 and 3 represents Measurement Preprocessing, Local VIO, and Loop Closure. “Work Frequency” means this system can output reliable location result regularly with the run frequency (Frequency), the largest time determines the highest rate. Note that PL-VINS can run at 20Hz at almost as our Thread 1 only takes ~50 ms totally, however, it may be not stability [1]. Similarly, VINS-Mono sets its work frequency at 10 Hz although it needs ~42 ms at almost in the optimization process. PL-VIO can not run for real-time in our experiments as its Thread 1 needs ~100, compared with it, we use the modified LSD to extract less but more reliable lines, and one constraint (midpoint-to-line) to represent one pair of line correspondence in the slide window optimization, which makes our system more efficient.

### VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper presents PL-VINS which is the first real-time optimization-based monocular VINS with point and line. In which, a modified LSD algorithm is presented to speed up the line detection process targeting specific pose estimation problem by studying hidden parameter tuning and length rejection strategy. The modified LSD can be used for the existing works that estimate pose from line correspondences. Besides, we efficiently leverage the line constraint in the sliding optimization window for high-accuracy pose estimation by using a four-parameter orthonormal representation and midpoint-to-line distance metric. As a result, PL-VINS can produce higher location accuracy than state-of-the-art VINS-Mono [1] at the same run rate.

However, we cannot say the line features have been exploited fully in this work. At least, the line constraint was not used for Loop Closure to find more loop. Further, we observe that current works all perform frame-to-frame line feature matching between the last and the current frame, which may be lead to a question that many line features in previous several frames before the last frame were ignored whereas they can be probably observed by the current frame. For this observation, we think one high-efficiency strategy is to adopt a frame-to-model strategy: system builds and maintains a local line-based landmark map model then line correspondences are established between the current frame and the model, thus the ignored lines can also be utilized. This strategy is similar to the popular point-based frame-to-model method [12].

For future work, in addition to the above-mentioned questions, we plan to extend the monocular to a stereo system and build experiments in more challenging real environment, such large-scale, low-texture, and low-light indoor scenes, for testing the effect of line constraint further.
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Best value in the five challenging sequences. Bold represents the best Trans. value, bold plus italic represents the best Rot. value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>fixed delta = 1s (1000 pairs)</th>
<th>no fixed delta (over 9000 pairs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH-04-difficult</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>3.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-05-difficult</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1-02-medium</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>5.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1-03-difficult</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2-02-difficult</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>19.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Count 1 3 6 0 2 9

VINS-Mono* and PL-VINS* both run w/o loop as PL-VIO does not include it. All statics are collected from real reproduction test, RPE includes translation (Trans.) [m] and rotation (Rot.) [deg] error. Note that RPE evaluation depends on the setting of the fixed delta. Two types are adopted: “fixed delta = 1s” which usually matches ~ translation (Trans.) [m] and rotation (Rot.) [deg] error. Note that RPE evaluation depends on the setting of the fixed delta. Two types are adopted: “fixed delta = 1s” which usually matches ~

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threads</th>
<th>Modules</th>
<th>Times (ms)</th>
<th>Rate(Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VINS-Mono</td>
<td>PL-VIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Point Detection and Tracking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line Detection</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>70 (LSD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line Tracking</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local VIO</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loop Closure</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

× means the system does not implement it. Loop Closure thread optimizes pose in back-end for non-real time. The bold font represents actual work frequency: VINS-Mono [1] and PL-VINS (ours) run at 10Hz, PL-VIO [23] runs at 5Hz.
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