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Abstract. The problem of finding a time-dependent vector field which warps an initial set of points to a target set is common in shape analysis. It is an example of a problem in the diffeomorphic shape matching regime and can be thought of as a type of spatial discretization of the more general LDDMM framework as it transforms into a finite-dimensional Hamiltonian system. In this paper, we consider landmark matching modified by restricting the set of available vector fields in the sense that vector fields are parametrized by a set of controls. We determine the geometric setting of the problem, referred to as sub-Riemannian landmark matching, and derive equations of motions for the controls. We provide two computational algorithms and demonstrate them in numerical examples. In particular, the experiments highlight the importance of the regularization term. The reason why this is of interest is that sub-Riemannian landmark matching is demonstrated to have connections with neural networks, in particular the interpretation of residual neural networks as time discretizations of continuous control problems. It allows shape analysis practitioners to think about neural networks in terms of shape analysis, thereby providing a bridge between the two fields.

1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the problem of finding an optimal time-dependent vector field transporting a set of initial points on some compact oriented Riemannian manifold \((M, g)\) to some set of targets, i.e. the landmark matching problem of Joshi and Miller [20]. Landmark matching and, more generally, shape analysis have applications in many image analysis problems. In the field of computational anatomy it is used in for instance brain imaging [9, 11], MRI scans of the heart, [7, 24], cancer modelling [12] and to study lung movement [31].

In diffeomorphic shape matching, shapes are warped by diffeomorphisms generated by smooth vector fields. The vector fields are determined by solving an optimization problem. Usually, in shape analysis, one optimizes over all vector fields, but in this paper we consider a “sparse” setting where only some vector fields are allowed. We draw inspiration from the field of neural networks, in which many small components together build up complicated mappings. In practice, this means that we consider only a subset of vector fields, parametrized by some set of controls. This problem is referred to as sub-Riemannian landmark matching [3, 4, 16, 37]. We furthermore assume that the targets are on a metric space \(N\). Points on \(M\) are mapped into \(N\) by a mapping called the forward model (borrowing from the language of inverse problems, cf. Öktem et al. [38]). In the paper, we describe the geometry of the sub-Riemannian landmark
matching problem and derive the equations of motion for the control parameters. The aim of this paper is to serve as a bridge between shape analysis and the study of neural networks.

A main point is that sub-Riemannian landmark matching can be thought of as time-continuous neural networks. Indeed, residual neural networks (ResNets) can be understood as time discretizations of optimal control problems [2, 10, 17, 34]. Diffeomorphic matching problems are also optimal control problems. This allows us to make connections between shape analysis and neural networks. For instance, just as sub-Riemannian landmarks matching warps points that discretize an image in a low-dimensional space, ResNets warps high-dimensional input data such as images which, in complete analogy with landmark matching, discretizes a high-dimensional “meta-image”. Furthermore, training the network can be understood as an analogy of the gradient flow method for computing landmark paths. The concept of families of vector fields generated by iterated Lie brackets offers an interesting way to view sub-Riemannian landmark matching and by extension, neural networks. The richness of the set of mappings that can be obtained is determined by properties of the iterated Lie brackets of the initial vector fields.

By considering for instance so-called deformation modules, one can use the sub-Riemannian approach to shape analysis not only as a way to simplify computations, but also as a powerful modelling tool by incorporating knowledge about the desired deformations into the computations. In this paper, we will approach sub-Riemannian landmark matching from the viewpoint of geometric mechanics, with the goal of being able to describe residual neural networks directly in the presented framework. For this reason, the sub-Riemannian setting is here introduced without making use of deformation modules nor implicit linear constraints on the vector fields.

The inclusion of a forward model has been considered in Öktem et al. [38]. Methods from geometry, mechanics and control have previously been applied to neural networks, both for computational as well as theoretical aspects [2, 14, 27, 32, 34]. In this paper, the emphasis is on parameterized landmark matching from the sub-Riemannian point of view. It is also possible to enhance shape analysis algorithms using neural networks [5], but this point of view is not considered in this paper.

A diffeomorphic shape matching point of view in classification problems has been considered in Younes [36], where a kernel-based method inspired by large deformation diffeomorphic metric mapping (LDDMM) was used for classification. In this paper, we adopt the opposite approach. We first strive to modify and understand landmark matching from a geometric point of view, and later remark on the connections with neural networks. For a general introduction to LDDMM and shape analysis, see Younes [35].

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 some basic concepts from differential geometry are introduced for the convenience of the reader. In Section 3 we remind the reader of the LDDMM setting and landmark matching. Sub-Riemannian landmark matching is introduced in Section 4 where we specify the geometric setting and determine equations of motion of the controls. A specific parametrization is considered, namely control-affine systems. In Section 5 two algorithms for computation of sub-Riemannian landmark matching paths are described. Two computational examples are considered in Section 6. The purpose of the paper is to introduce a modified shape analysis tool to allow for a new point of view of neural networks. Theoretical considerations are therefore emphasized and computational examples are kept short. In Section 7 we describe how shape analysis and neural networks are connected through sub-Riemannian landmark matching. Finally, in Appendix A, an analytical setting
2. Geometric preliminaries

In this section we provide a brief and informal introduction to concepts from differential geometry used in the paper. The reader already familiar with this field can directly skip to Section 3. For a more substantial introduction to geometry, see for instance Lee [22].

We begin with an intuitive idea of what a manifold is. A manifold $M$ of dimension $n$ is a space which locally resembles Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$. One can picture this as a generalization of an embedded surface. The set of vectors tangent to the surface at a point $p \in M$ is a vector space called the tangent space at $p$ and is denoted $T_pM$, and the disjoint union of the tangent spaces at each point of the manifold is called the tangent bundle of $M$ and is denoted by $TM$.

A vector field $v$ on $M$ is an assignment of a vector $v(p) \in T_pM$ to each point $p \in M$. The space of all smooth vector fields is denoted $X(M)$.

A Riemannian manifold is a manifold equipped with a Riemannian metric $g$, i.e., at each point $p \in M$ the metric $g_p$ is an inner product on $T_pM$. A Riemannian metric allows us to define distances, angles, and curvature of the manifold.

A Lie group $G$ is a manifold as well as a multiplicative group with the property that the map from $G \times G$ to $G$ given by $(g, h) \mapsto gh^{-1}$ is smooth. The tangent space of $G$ at the identity $e \in G$ is referred to as the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of $G$. It is equipped with a Lie bracket mapping $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$, denoted by $[v, w]$. A linear subspace closed under the Lie bracket is called a Lie subalgebra.

A distribution $D$ of $M$ is a collection of linear subspaces $D_p \subset T_pM$ at each point $p \in M$. If it is closed under the Lie bracket, then the distribution is said to be integrable and it defines, at least locally, a foliation of $M$. It can be thought of a partition of $M$ into submanifolds called the leaves of the foliation.

Having briefly mentioned the geometric tools needed to read the paper, we can move on to introduce concepts from shape analysis.

3. Diffeomorphic shape matching

In this section we will introduce shape analysis and landmark matching. Let $(M, g)$ be an orientable compact Riemannian manifold, and let $\text{Diff}(M)$ denote the group of diffeomorphisms of $M$. A diffeomorphism $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ acts on $f \in C^\infty(M)$ by $\varphi \cdot f = f \circ \varphi^{-1}$.

Consider now a smooth curve $\gamma(t) \in \text{Diff}(M)$. A class of weak right-invariant Riemannian metrics on $\text{Diff}(M)$ is given by

$$E(v) = \|f_0 \circ \gamma(1)^{-1} - f_1\|^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_0^1 \int_M v(t) \cdot Lv(t)dx dt,$$

where $v = \dot{\gamma} \circ \gamma^{-1}$ and $L: \mathfrak{X}(M) \to \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an elliptic invertible differential operator. A typical example is $L = (1 - \alpha \Delta)^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\alpha > 0$. Here $\Delta$ denotes the Laplace–Beltrami operator acting on vector fields.

The image matching problem in the LDDMM setting concerns the matching of two images, $f_0, f_1 \in C^\infty(M)$. The matching is performed by minimizing the energy functional over time-dependent vector fields $v: [0, 1] \to \mathfrak{X}(M)$.
where $\gamma$ is given by $\dot{\gamma}(t) = v(t) \circ \gamma(t), \gamma(0) = e$. The parameter $\sigma > 0$ is a scalar which determines the regularization strength.

To compute a numerical solution a spatial discretization is needed. One possibility is to use landmark matching. The source and target images are approximated by a selection of points $x_1, ..., x_m \in M$ that discretizes $f_0$, and $c_1, ..., c_m \in M$ that discretizes $f_1$. These points are called landmarks.

The landmark matching problem is to find the time-dependent vector field $v$ solving

$$
\min_{v} \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_M^2(y_i(1), c_i) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{0}^{1} \int_{M} v \cdot L v \, dx \, dt
$$

s.t. $\dot{y}_i(t) = v(t, y_i(t)), \ t \in [0, 1], \ y(0) = x_i.$

Here $d_M: M \times M \to \mathbb{R}$ is the distance function induced by the Riemannian metric on $M$.

As we can choose any smooth vector field, the optimal vector field should warp as little as possible as this results in lower energy. Thus, the energy $\int_M v \cdot L v \, dx$ must be zero outside of the support of optimal the landmark paths $\{y_1(t), ..., y_m(t)\}$. We conclude that $L v_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \delta y_i(t)$ for some momentum variables $p_i$ in the cotangent bundle $T^*M$. This is therefore a spatial discretization of the vector fields, where the problem can be reformulated in terms of a finite-dimensional Hamiltonian system.

### 4. Sub-Riemannian landmark matching

In this section we consider two modifications of the landmark matching problem described in Section 3. The first modification is that the vector field $v$ is parametrized, in the sense that it is determined by some underlying set of variables $U$. The available vector fields are restricted to some subset of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ determined by the parametrization. This subset will not be a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$. By working with parametrized vector fields we are considering a nonlinear control problem where the admissible space of controls are given by a Hilbert space $U$. We point out that while we present sub-Riemannian landmark matching on a compact manifold $M$, it is possible to work with non-compact manifolds, assuming sufficient decay at infinity of the vector fields.

The second modification is that the matching term will include the setting when the target landmarks $c_1, ..., c_m$ are on a metric space $N$ that may be different from $M$. An example is landmark-label pairs, in which case $c_1, ..., c_m$ is in some Euclidean space, the labels being one-hot encoded. To achieve this, we supplement the matching term with a function $h: M \to N$ called the forward model. The new matching term is

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_N^2(h(y_i(1)), c_i).
$$

Note that if $h$ is the identity map, we retain the original setting.

LDDMM and landmark matching admits a dynamical formulation. The source is continuously warped to match the template via a geodesic path of diffeomorphisms. Constrained landmark matching also admits a dynamical formulation. Warps here are governed by sub-Riemannian dynamics thus motivating the name sub-Riemannian landmark matching.

Consider a submanifold of vector fields $S \subset \mathfrak{X}(M)$. By right translation $S$ gives rise to a right-invariant sub-bundle of $T \text{Diff}(M)$ in the category of fiber bundles, see Figure 1a. We denote it $E(S)$. The fiber above $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ is the submanifold of $T_\varphi \text{Diff}(M)$ given by $S \circ \varphi$. 
The submanifold $\mathcal{S}$ is parameterized by some function $F$ mapping from parameters into vector fields,

\begin{equation}
    v \in \mathcal{S} \iff \exists u \in \mathcal{U} \text{ s.t. } v(x) = F(u)(x)
\end{equation}

The minimization problem is therefore

\begin{equation}
    \min_{u : [0,1] \to \mathcal{U}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{N}(h(y_{i}(1),c_{i})) + \int_{0}^{1} \ell(F(u))dt
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
    \text{s.t. } \dot{y}_{i} = F(u)(y_{i}), \; t \in [0,1], \; y_{i}(0) = x_{i}.
\end{equation}

where the regularization term is determined the function $\ell : \mathcal{X}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$.

We continue by studying the dynamics of the sub-Riemannian landmark matching problem. Equation 7 is reminiscent of an action functional in Lagrangian mechanics. In fact, since the shape matching term, Equation 5, only depends on the final point of the landmark paths, an optimal $u$ must follow the dynamics determined by the action functional consisting only of the regularization term. We make the additional assumption that

\begin{equation}
    \ell(v) = \frac{\sigma}{2} \langle v, v \rangle
\end{equation}

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product defined in Equation 1. The dynamics is unaffected by $\sigma$, so in the derivations below we take $\sigma = 1$ without loss of generality. Thus, the Lagrangian for the equations of motion is

\begin{equation}
    (\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{1} \langle \dot{\gamma} \circ \gamma^{-1}, \dot{\gamma} \circ \gamma^{-1} \rangle dt.
\end{equation}

Given that $\gamma$ is parametrized by $u$, we denote the variational derivative of $\gamma$ with respect to $u$ by $\delta_{u} \gamma$. With this observation in mind, we can proceed as in the proof in Marsden and Ratiu [25, Theorem 13.5.3]. Noting that $\frac{\delta \ell}{\delta v} = v$ the variational derivative of the energy functional, $\delta E$, is given by

\begin{equation}
    \delta E = \int_{0}^{1} \langle v, \delta_{u} v \rangle dt = \int_{0}^{1} \langle \dot{w} - ad_{\mathcal{U}}w, w \rangle dt = \int_{0}^{1} \langle -\dot{v} - ad_{\mathcal{U}}v, w \rangle dt,
\end{equation}
where \( \text{ad}_v w = [v, w] \) and \( \text{ad}_v^T \) denotes the transpose of \( \text{ad}_v \) with respect to the inner product. By calculus of variations the condition \( \delta E = 0 \) is equivalent to

\[
\dot{v} = \text{ad}_v^T v + M,
\]

where \( M \in T_v^\perp S = \{ w_1 \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \mid \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } w_2 \in T_v S \} \) can be thought of as a Lagrange multiplier to ensure that we remain on \( S \).

We now assume that the vector fields take values in a Sobolev space \( H^s(M) \) and that \( L: H^s(M) \to H^{s-2k}(M) \). Here \( s > \frac{n}{2} + 1 \) so that \( H^s \) is continuously embedded into the space of continuously differentiable vector fields [8, Section 2.2] meaning that for any \( v \in H^s(M) \) there is a \( C > 0 \) such that

\[
\|v\|_{1,\infty} \leq C \|v\|_{H^s},
\]

where

\[
\|v\|_{1,\infty} = \sup_{x \in M} \left( |v(x)| + \sum_{i=1}^n |\nabla v^i(x)| \right).
\]

The space of continuously differentiable vector fields is denoted by \( C^1(M; TM) \).

With \( m = L v \), Equation 10 is equivalent to

\[
\dot{m} = \nabla_v^T m - \nabla m v + \text{div}(v)m + L M,
\]

where \( \nabla \) denotes the covariant derivative and \( \nabla^T \) its \( L^2 \) adjoint [9]. Let \( D_a m \) denote the derivative of \( m \) with respect to \( u \). By the chain rule we obtain

\[
\dot{m} = D_a m \cdot \dot{u},
\]

and so Equation 11 can be rewritten as

\[
D_a m \cdot \dot{u} = \nabla_v^T m - \nabla m v + \text{div}(v)m + L M.
\]

If \( A(u) := D_a m \circ L^{-1} \circ D_a m \) we have that the equation of motion for \( u \) is

\[
A(u) \dot{u} = (D_a m \circ L^{-1} \left( \nabla_v^T m - \nabla m v + \text{div}(v)m \right)
\]

since \( M \in T_v^\perp S \).

As a concrete example, let \( U = \mathbb{R}^m \) and assume that the vector fields are given by

\[
F(u) = X^0 + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i X^i,
\]

where \( X^i \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \). Vector fields of the form (15) are recognized as control–affine systems. They are often considered within the study of geometric control [21]. The geometric setting is simplified in this setting. In particular, \( \mathcal{E}(S) \) of Section 4 becomes an affine distribution. Note that if \( X^0 = 0 \), this will be a linear sub-bundle of \( T \text{Diff}(M) \). This is due to linear-affine structure of Equation 15 [13]. See Figure 1b for an illustration.

We continue now with the dynamics of \( u \) in the setting of Equation 15 with \( X^0 = 0 \). This amounts to calculating the projection \( D_a m \). We begin by noting that

\[
D_a m : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathfrak{X}(M)^*,
\]
and that $D_u m \cdot \dot{u} = LX^i \dot{u}_i$. Thus, for some $w \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$,

$$\langle D_u m \cdot \dot{u}, w \rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(M)^*, \mathfrak{X}(M)} = \langle LX^i u_i, w \rangle_{L^2(M)} = \dot{u}_i \int_M LX^i \cdot w \, dx = \langle \dot{u}, D_u^T m \cdot w \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m}$$

meaning that $D_u^T m : \mathfrak{X}(M) \to \mathbb{R}^m$ evaluated at $w$ is given by

$$D_u^T m \cdot w = \int_M LX^i \cdot w \, dx e_i,$$

where $(e_i)_{i=1}^m$ is the standard $\mathbb{R}^m$ basis. Since $A(u) = D_u^T \circ L^{-1} \circ D_u m$ we see that

$$A(u) \dot{u} = \dot{u}_j \int_M LX^i \cdot X^j \, dx e_i$$

so the operator $A(u) : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is an $m \times m$ matrix with entries

$$[A(u)]_{ij} = \int_M LX^i \cdot X^j.$$

Due to the linear structure $A$ is in this case independent of $u$.

A natural question is how the vector fields $X^0, \ldots, X^m$ should be chosen. One possible approach is to set $X^0 = 0$ as we did above and choose the remaining vector fields such that the Lie algebra of vector fields generated by the fields is made as large as possible. Concepts from the field of geometric nonlinear control offers a way to make this precise and is an interesting way to view sub-Riemannian landmark matching. As an example, given a family of smooth vector fields $F$, consider $\text{Lie}(F)$, the smallest Lie subalgebra containing $F$. One can show that this will be spanned by the iterated Lie brackets of the vector fields in $F$ and we say that the family is bracket generating for $\text{Lie}(F)$ [1, 18]. In the setting of control-affine systems, the family of vector fields described by Equation 15 is bracket generating if $\{X^1, \ldots, X^m\}$ is. The notion of integrability of the distribution generated by $F$ gives an intuition as for how controllability can be interpreted and why sub-Riemannian landmark matching works. If the distribution is integrable, then at every point it will be tangent to the leaves of a foliation, meaning that if we only can select vector fields from $F$ we are stuck in the leaf of the initial point $x_0$; we cannot connect any two points by an integral curve unless they are in the same leaf. The condition that the family is bracket generating tells us that the distribution behaves in a sense oppositely to this. A guiding principle for selecting the vector fields is therefore to make sure that $\text{Lie}(F)$ is as large as possible.

5. Computation of sub-Riemannian landmark matching

In the case of LDDMM, various computational algorithms such as shooting or gradient flow-based methods are available. Both approaches are viable for computing sub-Riemannian landmark paths.

Due to conservation of kinetic energy along the dynamics, the energy functional can be written

$$\tilde{E} = \frac{\sigma}{2} \langle F(u_0), F(u_0) \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^n d_N^2(h(y_i(1)), c_i).$$
In the case of control-affine systems with \( X^0 = 0 \), the regularization term is given by

\[
\sigma \frac{1}{2} \langle F(u_0), F(u_0) \rangle = \sigma \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} u_i u_j \int_M L X_i \cdot X_j \, dx.
\]

It is particularly simple if the vector fields are the orthogonal eigenfunctions of \( L \).

The dynamics of the control variable, if known, taken together with the landmark dynamics, constitute a dynamical system which can be numerically integrated in order to approximate \( y_i(1) \). We then perform gradient descent on the initial value of the control, \( u_0 \),

\[
(16) \quad u_0^{[j+1]} = u_0^{[j]} - \epsilon \nabla_{u_0^{[j]}} \hat{E},
\]

where \( \epsilon \) denotes the gradient descent step size and the gradient of \( \hat{E} \) with respect to \( u_0 \) can be computed using automatic differentiation. One can use for instance Pytorch in Python or ForwardDiff package in Julia [28, 30]. The shooting method is summarized in Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1:** Shooting method for sub-Riemannian landmark matching.

- **Result:** Optimal initial control \( u_0 \)
- **Initialize:** Suitable guess for initial control \( u_0^{[0]} \), gradient descent step size \( \epsilon \), numerical integration parameters;
- **while** \( u_0 \) changes OR for fixed number of steps **do**
  - Numerically integrate the ODEs for \( u(t) \) and \( y_i(t) \);
  - Calculate \( \hat{E} \) using \( y_i(1) \);
  - Compute \( \nabla_{u_0^{[j]}} \hat{E} \);
  - Set \( u_0^{[j+1]} \leftarrow u_0^{[j]} - \epsilon \nabla_{u_0^{[j]}} \hat{E} \)
- **end**

In cases where the dynamics are not known or not simple to determine, a gradient descent method on the entire path of controls can be used instead. Given a partition of the time interval, \( 0 = t_0 < t_1 < ... < t_n = 1 \), we use gradient descent to determine \( u_{t_0}, ..., u_{t_n} \), a discretization of the entire control path, by

\[
(17) \quad u_{t_k}^{[j+1]} = u_{t_k}^{[j]} - \epsilon \nabla_{u_{t_k}^{[j]}} \hat{E}.
\]

Note that we must perform one additional gradient descent step for each point in the discretization of the time interval. Knowing the dynamics of \( u_t \) therefore reduces the number of variables to one. This would seemingly imply that a shooting method is always preferable,
but we emphasize that in many cases an explicit ODE for $u$ cannot be written down. This can be the case when for instance $A(u)$ cannot be given explicitly.

**Algorithm 2:** Gradient flow method for sub-Riemannian landmark matching.

**Result:** Optimal control path $u_i, i = 0, ..., n$

- Initialize, Time points $t_0, ..., t_n$, suitable guesses for control path $u_0^{[0]}, u_1^{[0]}, ..., u_n^{[0]}$
- gradient descent step size $\epsilon$, numerical integration parameters

while $u_0, ..., u_n$ changes OR for fixed number of steps do
  - Numerically integrate $y_i(1)$ using $u_0, ..., u_n$
  - Calculate $\tilde{E}$
  - for $k = 1, ..., m$ do
    - Numerically approximate $\nabla_{u_k^{[j]}} \tilde{E}$
    - Set $u_k^{[j+1]} \leftarrow u_k^{[j]} - \epsilon \nabla_{u_k^{[j]}} \tilde{E}$
  - end
end

6. Numerical examples

In this section we consider two concrete numerical examples of sub-Riemannian landmark matching on the flat torus $\mathbb{R}^2/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})^2$. We first perform the matching on the classical images of fish from D’Arcy Thompson’s classic book [33] (see Figure 2). The two images in Figure 2
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Figure 2. The left fish is the initial image, and the right one is the target. Note the structural similarities between the fish, implying that it should be possible to warp one to the other.
are discretized using labelled landmarks. The goal is to warp the landmarks approximating
the first image, see Figure 3a, to those approximating the second image, see Figure 3b.

![Initial landmarks](image1)
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**Figure 3.** The images in Figure 2 approximated by landmarks on the flat torus.

We are in the setting of Equation 15 with \( \mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^{16} \). The vector fields \( X^1, \ldots, X^{16} \) consist of eigenfunctions of the toroidal Laplace–Beltrami operator,

\[
X^i = \psi_i(x, y)e_1 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \ldots, 8 \\
X^i = \psi_{i-8}(x, y)e_2 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 9, \ldots, 16
\]

where \( \psi_i(x, y) = 1_{i=1,2} \cos(ix) + 1_{i=3,4} \sin((i-2)x) + 1_{i=5,6} \cos((i-4)y) + 1_{i=7,8} \sin((i-6)y) \).

Note that these vector fields are orthogonal, so \( A(u) \) is invertible. The ODE governing the dynamics of \( u \) will be quadratic. Therefore, we have local existence and uniqueness.

We rewrite Equation 14 as

\[
\dot{u} = A(u)^{-1}(D_u \mathcal{m})^T \circ L \left( \nabla_T \mathcal{m} + \mathcal{m} \text{div} \mathcal{v} + \nabla_m \mathcal{v} \right). 
\]

It is now straightforward to write Equation 18 in coordinates to determine an explicit expression for \( \dot{u} \).

As the dynamics of \( u \) is known, we use the shooting method in Algorithm 1. We use Julia with the package DiffEq [29] to approximate solutions to the ordinary differential equations and ForwardDiff for automatic differentiation of the energy functional.

We initialize \( u_0 \) randomly and use an integration step size of \( 10^{-2} \), a gradient descent learning rate of \( \epsilon = 10^{-3} \) and a regularization strength of \( \sigma = 1/(40\pi^2) \). Applying Algorithm 1 we obtain the moved landmarks in Figure 4a. In Figure 4b the warp is visualized as a grid deformation. The warp is not perfect due to the restriction to only 16 vector fields.

In order to illustrate how the forward model can be used, we consider two artificial data sets. The data sets are generated by considering a band of width \( \pi \) around a function. We consider the two functions

\[
r_1(x) = \pi + \frac{5}{\pi} \sum_{i=1}^6 \sin((2i-1)x), \\
r_2(x) = \pi + \left(\frac{1}{4} \sin(x) + \sin(2x) + \sin(4x)/4 + \sin(6x)/4\right).
\]
(a) The blue hexagons are the initial landmarks, the orange circles are the targets and the green squares are the deformed landmarks.

(b) Grid deformation illustrating the warp.

Figure 4. The result of applying Algorithm 1. We illustrate both how the initial landmarks are transported and the resulting grid deformation.

We generate two sets of initial landmarks with corresponding targets as follows. First, we create the initial landmarks by generating two sets of 1000 uniform random points \((x_j, y_j)_{j=1}^{1000} \subset \mathbb{R}^2/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})^2\). Using the first set of uniform random points, we then create a set of targets by categorizing the point \((x_j, y_j)\) as a one if \(r_1(x_j) - \pi/2 \leq y_j \leq r_1(x_j) + \pi/2\) and zero otherwise. The same procedure is repeated for the second set of initial landmarks using \(r_2\). The two data sets are illustrated in Figure 5. In this case \(N = [0, 1]\) equipped with the usual metric. The forward model is given by

\[
h(x, y) = 16^{-(y-\pi)^2/\pi^2}.
\]

For the dataset generated using \(r_1\), we run the experiment twice. First, we use the same regularization strength as before, \(\sigma = 1/(40\pi^2)\) and then with \(\sigma = 1\). The setting and parameter values are otherwise unchanged from the landmark matching experiment. The results are seen in Figure 6 and Figure 7.

We observe that the warp depicted in Figure 6b, generated with a small regularization parameter, is not well-behaved. Indeed, this result is not computationally stable [26]: small changes in the parameters \(u\) may result in completely different warps. The computational stability is much better with the increased regularization parameter, as depicted in Figure 6d. We conclude that one must balance the regularization strength to find warps that are useful but not too erratic. Note that both transformations result in comparable classification performance. But the less regular transformation lacks computational stability: applying the warp to new points might lead to undesirable results. This outcome highlights the importance of smooth transformations from the diffeomorphic shape matching viewpoint.

7. The ResNet connection

In this section we discuss the connection between ResNets and sub-Riemannian landmark matching. We begin with a brief overview of ResNets and their interpretation as temporal
discretizations of continuous time optimal control problems. It is this interpretation that will allow for a comparison with sub-Riemannian landmark matching.

Given input data $X = (X_1, ..., X_n) = Y^{[0]} = (Y_1^{[0]}, ..., Y_n^{[0]}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and output data $Z = (Z_1, ..., Z_n)$, the supervised learning problem is to find a set of transformation parameters $u$ and classification weights $C = (W, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ so that the function

$$L(h(Y^{[N]}, W), Z) + R(u)$$

is minimised for some loss function $L$, classifier $h$ and regularizer $R$. Here $Y^{[N]}$ is given by warping the initial data. If neural networks are used to parametrize the warp, the so-called neural architecture is determined by the recursive relation between $Y^{[i]}$ and $Y^{[i+1]}$. In the case of a standard feed-forward neural network, see Figure 8a for a depiction of a layer, this relation is typically given by

$$Y_{k}^{[i]} = f(Y_{k}^{[i]}, u^{[i]}),$$

where $u^{[i]}$ are weights and biases of the $(i + 1)$th layer and $f$ denotes some suitable non-linear function, often called the activation function. In the case of ResNets, a skip connection is added between the input layer and its output. A layer is depicted in Figure 8b. In this case, the relation between $Y^{[i+1]}$ and $Y^{[i]}$ will be given by

$$Y_{k}^{[i+1]} = Y_{k}^{[i]} + hf(Y_{k}^{[i]}, u^{[i]}).$$

Skip connections are used to alleviate training issues stemming from the vanishing gradient problem [17].

Combining Equation 19 with the skip connection architecture, we see that a supervised ResNet training problem can be written as an optimization problem,

$$\min_{Y,u,C} \mathcal{L} \left( h \left( Y^{[N]}, C \right), Z \right) + R \left( u \right),$$

s.t. $Y_{k}^{[i+1]} = Y_{k}^{[i]} + hf(Y_{k}^{[i]}, u^{[i]}), \ i = 0, 1, 2, ..., N - 1, Y_{i}^{[0]} = X_i, k = 1, ..., n.$

It is possible to consider the neural architecture of Equation 21 as the forward Euler discretization of the ODE $\dot{y}_i = f(y_i, u)$ [10, 23]. The ResNet training problem can therefore
Note that while the points are moved erratically, the blue points are moved closer to the line $y = \pi$.

Grid deformation illustrating the warp. Note that the warp is very ill-behaved.

With a higher regularization strength, the points are moved in a more orderly manner. Note that the blue points are moved closer to the line $y = \pi$.

Deformation of a grid illustrating the warp. It is evident that increasing the regularization strength gives a vastly smoother transformation.

Figure 6. The result of applying Algorithm 1 to the dataset generated using $r_1$ with different regularization strengths.

be seen as a discrete time version of the optimal control problem

\begin{equation}
\min_{y, u, C} \mathcal{L}(h(y(T), u), Z) + R(u)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{s.t.} \quad \dot{y}_i = f(y_i, u(t)), t \in [0, 1], \quad y_i(0) = X_i.
\end{equation}

Let us now compare with the problem in Equation 7-8. Considering the case where $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_N^2(h(y_i(1)), c_i)$ it is clear that we can interpret sub-Riemannian landmark matching as the continuous-time optimization problem stemming from a deep learning problem with a ResNet architecture.

In the ResNet case $u_t$ will be given by weight and bias curves $(K(t), b(t))$ where

$K : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

and $b : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Letting $f(t, u)(\cdot) = f(K(t) \cdot + b(t))$, we have a map from the set of controls $U = \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ into a set of vector fields on $\mathbb{R}^d$. In a ResNet, the forward model will be the
(a) The blue points are in general moved towards the line $y = \pi$, thus decreasing the distance to 1 after applying the forward model.

(b) Grid deformation illustrating the warp. It is evident that the initial band of landmarks is contracted into two separate areas.

**Figure 7.** The result of applying Algorithm 1 to the artificial dataset generated using $r_2$

(a) A layer in a feed forward neural network.

(b) ResNet layer.

**Figure 8.** Schematic illustration of layers in two different neural network architectures.

The final projection or classification function projecting the landmarks, in this case being images or input data, down to the space of labels.

Assuming that the classification parameters and number of layers are fixed, we note that we are in the setting of Section 4 by considering the operator given by $N_f u = f(\cdot, u)$, as this operator will map from spaces of time-dependent controls to spaces of time-dependent vector fields under some technical continuity and measurability assumptions.

In the sub-Riemannian landmark matching case, we consider no longer a weight and bias curve and a neural architecture given in the usual manner by the activation function, but rather a general curve taking values in $U$. Note for instance, that if we consider the control-affine setting of Equation 15, $U$ will be equal to $\mathbb{R}^m$, and $v_t = X^0 + \sum_{i=j}^n u_j X^j$. Therefore,

$$\dot{y} = X^0 y + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j X^j y.$$
Applying the forward Euler method, we obtain

\[ Y_k^{[i+1]} = Y_k^{[i]} + h \left( X^0 Y_k^{[i]} + \sum_j u_j^{[i]} X_j Y_k^{[i]} \right), \]

which can be interpreted as a neural architecture. A schematic of a layer in the neural network interpretation of sub-Riemannian landmark matching in the setting of control affine systems is seen in Figure 9. This type of network has been studied from a control-theoretic point of view [2].

![Figure 9. A layer in the neural network control-affine case. Note that the layout is dependent on the choice of temporal discretization. In this case forward Euler is used, resulting in a ResNet-like structure.](image)

There are, however, some differences between ResNets and sub-Riemannian landmark matching. Landmarks are typically points in low-dimensional spaces. But the same framework still applies to points in high-dimensional spaces, such as image data. Just as landmarks discretize an image, input data to a ResNet discretizes a larger object. This object is a “meta-image”, consisting of all possible images of the same class. The existence of such an object is the core of the classification problem; shape analysis provides a novel viewpoint. We stress that this interpretation of images is not standard.

Another difference between ResNets and landmark matching is how the optimization is performed. In the deep learning setting forward and back-propagation are often used [6, Chapter 5]. In sub-Riemannian landmark matching one can either use a shooting method or a gradient flow-type approach, as described in Section 5. The gradient flow algorithm is reminiscent of how a neural network is trained. Furthermore, the shooting based method is also similar to novel particle based approaches to neural networks which results in a shooting formulation of ResNets [34].

Note also that ResNets and sub-Riemannian landmark matching differ in the choice of regularization. In the former case, the regularizer is often some matrix norm of the weight matrices [6, Chapter 5.5], whereas in the sub-Riemannian landmark matching case the regularization is not directly on the controls, but on the vector fields they parameterize.

In summary, our observations suggest a dictionary between sub-Riemannian landmark matching and ResNets as in Table 1.

We remark that geometric control theory can be applied to ResNets just as it can be applied to sub-Riemannian landmark matching. ResNets work because of the nonlinearities. If there
Deep Learning  |  Landmark matching
---|---
Images  |  Landmarks
Meta-images  |  Images
Training network  |  Shooting method
Testing  |  Warping new landmarks
Classification layer  |  Forward model
Weights and biases  |  Control parameters in $\mathcal{U}$
Neural architecture  |  ODE Discretization

**Table 1.** Dictionary between sub-Riemannian landmark matching and ResNets.

were none, the generated algebra $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{F})$ would be very small. In fact, it would not contain enough fields to connect two images. The nonlinearities assert that the generated Lie algebra is large.

8. Conclusions

There are two main ideas in this paper. The first is that sub-Riemannian landmark matching can be approached from a geometric point of view and that it is possible to derive equations governing the evolution of the control parameters directly from variational principles. In Appendix A we also prove existence of minimizers.

The second idea concerns the connection between shape analysis and deep learning. Shape analysis offers a view of deep learning as a way to find parameterized warps for moving initial landmarks to target landmarks, a problem with inherent geometry. In particular, it explains the importance of the nonlinearities (activation functions) of a neural network: these ensure that the bracket generated algebra is large so that the range of transformations from input to output is large. An interesting opening here is to investigate more closely how the choice of activation functions affect the bracket generated algebra; to find nonlinearities that maximize it is a plausible network design objective.

The fact that geometric and control-theoretic methods can be applied to understand deep learning methods seem to imply that there is more to be done. A future direction of research could be to further the understanding of deep neural networks as geometric objects in their own right.

**Appendix A. Existence of minimizers**

In this appendix we first formalize the analytical setting, for which we then prove the existence of solutions to the sub-Riemannian landmark matching problem.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be Hilbert spaces. Assume that $\mathcal{U}$ is separable and that $\mathcal{H}$ is continuously embedded into $C^1(M; TM)$. Examples of admissible spaces are the Sobolev spaces of high enough regularity that was used in Section 4.

The variables parameterizing the vector fields will be in the space $H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$, i.e. the space of all functions in $L^2([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$ such that the weak derivatives up to $k \geq 1$ also are in $L^2([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$. Here $L^2([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$ denotes space of Bochner measurable square integrable
functions taking values in $\mathcal{U}$. Note that

$$H^0([0, 1], \mathcal{U}) = L^2([0, 1], \mathcal{U}).$$

See Hytönen et al. [19] for more details on Bochner spaces and Banach space-valued Sobolev spaces.

The vector fields are in $L^2([0, 1], \mathcal{H})$ and will be parameterized by $u \in H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$ via a function

$$F: H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U}) \to L^2([0, 1], \mathcal{H}).$$

We assume that $F$ is weakly continuous.

The set of parametrized vector fields formally determines a subset $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathfrak{X}(M)$ given by Equation 6. In general $\mathcal{S}$ is not a Lie subalgebra since the Lie bracket is not closed on $\mathcal{S}$.

Since $\dot{\gamma}(t) = v(t) \circ \gamma(t)$ and $v(t) = F(u)_t$ the equation governing the trajectory $y(t)$ of points is given by

$$(24) \quad y(t) = y(0) + \int_0^t F(u)_s(y(s)) \, ds.$$  

The integral $\int_0^t F(u)_s(y(s)) \, ds$ is bounded since $\mathcal{H}$ is continuously embedded into $C^1(M; TM)$.

The minimization problem is therefore

$$(25) \quad \min_{u \in H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})} \sum_{i=1}^m d_N(h(y_i)), c_i)^2 + R(u)$$

$$s.t. \quad y_i(t) = x_i + \int_0^t F(u)_s(y_i(s)) \, ds.$$  

where

$$R(u) = \int_0^1 R(u_t) \, dt.$$  

Here $\mathfrak{R}$ is a map from $\mathcal{U}$ into $\mathbb{R}$. Existence of minimizers to problem (25)-(26) is given by the following theorem:

**Theorem A.1.** Assume that $R(u)$ is lower semi-continuous and that $\mathfrak{R}(u_t)$ bounds the $U$-norm for all weak derivatives up to order $k$. If the forward model $h: M \to N$ is continuous, then there exists a minimizer $\tilde{u} \in H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$ to problem (25)-(26).

To prove this theorem we shall use the direct method of variational calculus [8, 15].

**Proof.** Note first that $y_i(1) = \gamma_1(x_i)$, the flow of the time-dependent vector field $F(u)$ at time 1 evaluated at $x_i$. We let $u^n \in H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$ be a minimizing sequence, that is to say,

$$E(u^n) \to \inf_u E(u).$$

By assumption there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $\|u^n\|^2_{H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})} \leq cR(u)$. It holds that

$$\|u^n\|^2_{H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})} \leq cR(u^n) \leq CE(u^n)$$

and so $u^n$ is a bounded sequence in $H^k([0, 1], \mathcal{U})$ and we can extract a subsequence $(u^{n_k})$ converging weakly to $\tilde{u}$. Note that $F$ will define a sequence of vector fields $v^{n_k} = F(u^{n_k})$ in $L^2([0, 1], \mathcal{H})$. The sequence $v^{n_k}$ will converge weakly to $\tilde{v} = F(\tilde{u})$ since $F$ is weakly continuous. It is now possible to proceed as in Glaunes [15, Lemma 5] to obtain pointwise convergence of
the flows. By the assumption that the regularizer $R(u)$ is lower semi-continuous, and that the forward model is continuous, it follows that
\[
\inf_{u \in L^2([0,1])} E(u) \leq E(\tilde{u}) = R(\tilde{u}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_N(h(\gamma_i(x_i)), c_i)^2
\] 
\[
\leq \liminf_{n_k \to \infty} R(u^{n_k}) + \lim_{n_k \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_N(h(\phi_{1}^{n_k}(x_i)), c_i)^2 \leq \inf_{u \in L^2([0,1])} E(u).
\]
This concludes the proof. \hfill \Box
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