

Compatibility of Fundamental Matrices for Complete Viewing Graphs

Martin Bråtelund¹ and Felix Rydell²

¹University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

²KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden

March 21, 2023

Abstract

This paper studies the problem of recovering cameras from a set of fundamental matrices. A set of fundamental matrices is said to be compatible if a set of cameras exists for which they are the fundamental matrices. We focus on the complete graph, where fundamental matrices for each pair of cameras are given. Previous work has established necessary and sufficient conditions for compatibility as rank and eigenvalue conditions on the n -view fundamental matrix obtained by concatenating the individual fundamental matrices. In this work, we show that the eigenvalue condition is redundant. We provide explicit homogeneous polynomials that describe necessary and sufficient conditions for compatibility in terms of the fundamental matrices and their epipoles. In this direction, we find that quadruple-wise compatibility is enough to ensure global compatibility for any number of cameras. We demonstrate that for four cameras, compatibility is generically described by triple-wise conditions and one additional equation involving all fundamental matrices.

1 Introduction

The problem of finding camera matrices that correspond to a given set of fundamental matrices is crucial in 3D reconstructions from 2D images. Typically, multiview structure-from-motion pipelines start by estimating fundamental matrices from point correspondences, with early methods for such estimations dating back to the 1990s and new methods still being developed today [19, 23, 24, 27]. However, these methods usually only estimate a subset of all possible fundamental matrices between cameras. To describe this incomplete set of fundamental matrices, viewing graphs are often used [15].

In this paper, we focus on understanding the conditions under which a reconstruction of n cameras can be obtained given complete knowledge of $\binom{n}{2}$ fundamental matrices. Here, a camera refers to any full-rank 3×4 matrix, and the fundamental matrix of two full-rank 3×4 cameras P_1 and P_2 with distinct kernels is a 3×3 rank-two matrix that describes all point correspondences between them. For any given rank-two 3×3 matrix F^{12} , there is a unique pair of cameras P_1 and P_2 for which F^{12} is the fundamental matrix up to global projective transformation. However, for a set of $\binom{n}{2}$ rank-two 3×3 matrices F^{ij} , where $n > 2$, it is not always guaranteed that there exist cameras P_1, \dots, P_n for which F^{ij} is the fundamental matrix of P_i and P_j for each i, j . We say that the set F^{ij} is compatible, following the notation of [10], if such cameras do exist. Note that some recent literature uses the term consistent instead [13].

In the case of $n = 3$, a classical result [10, Section 15.4] provides triple-wise constraints on F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} in terms of the fundamental matrices and their epipoles. Here, the i -th epipole in the j -th image is defined as $e_j^i := \ker F^{ij}$. For non-collinear cameras, [13, Theorem 1] provides necessary and sufficient conditions for compatibility for any n . These conditions rely on the eigenvalues and rank of the n -view fundamental matrix, which is obtained by stacking all fundamental matrices into a $3n \times 3n$ matrix. In the follow-up work, [7, Theorem 2] arrives at a similar condition in the collinear case. Both methods rely on fixing a correct scaling of each matrix and are therefore not projectively well-defined, nor are the conditions expressed in terms of the fundamental matrices and their epipoles, as in the $n = 3$ case.

The contributions of this paper include a necessary and sufficient condition for compatibility for any viewing graph via a cycle condition detailed in Section 4. In Section 5 we state explicit homogeneous polynomials that provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the compatibility of fundamental matrices in the case of complete graphs. Specifically, for the case of $n = 4$, we establish that a set of six fundamental matrices admits a reconstruction of camera matrices with linearly independent centers only if the triple-wise constraints and an additional polynomial equation involving all six fundamental matrices and their epipoles are satisfied. We also demonstrate, using the computer algebra system `Macaulay2` [8], that the eigenvalue conditions from [7, 13] are superfluous. We end in Section 6 with a discussion on the viewing graph variety. Proofs that are left out in the main body of the paper appear in the Appendix.

1.1 Related work

We approach compatibility of fundamental matrices from an algebraic point of view, i.e., we aim to describe constraints through algebraic equations and polynomial equations using techniques and software from applied algebraic geometry. This approach to questions in computer vision has a long standing tradition [1, 5, 11, 14, 25].

History. The problem of determining whether a set of fundamental matrices is compatible has a curious history. In 2007, the paper [9, Theorem 2.2] claimed that the triple-wise condition from [10] was sufficient for compatibility even in the case of collinear cameras, a claim that we now know to be false, as we show in Section 5. For the next

decade, few advances were made in understanding compatibility. Over time, a belief seemed to develop that triple-wise compatibility was enough to ensure global compatibility. In fact, articles such as [22, Section 2.1] claimed this to be true, based on a faulty proof provided in [20]. In 2018, [26, Section 3.3] pointed out that the proof in [20] fails in some cases, but still agreed that the result holds for complete graphs. However, we provide an explicit counterexample to this claim in Section 5 for the complete graph on four nodes.

In terms of practical applications, [13] proposes an algorithm for projective structure-from-motion that employs their necessary and sufficient condition for compatibility. The algorithm is designed to handle collections of measured fundamental matrices, both complete and partial, and aims to find camera matrices that minimize a global algebraic error for the given set of matrices.

Essential matrices. In the context of uncalibrated cameras, which are defined as any full-rank 3×4 matrix, this work, as well as [13], provide necessary and sufficient conditions for compatibility of fundamental matrices. However, camera matrices are often assumed to be calibrated, represented in the form of $[R|t]$ for a rotation matrix R and a translation vector t . The corresponding fundamental matrices are called essential matrices. In [12], the authors build upon their previous work and provide a necessary and sufficient condition for compatibility of essential matrices, in terms of the n -view essential matrix obtained by stacking all essential matrices into a larger matrix. This condition is then used to recover a consistent set of essential matrices, given a partial set of measured essential matrices.

Solvability. There has been extensive research on the topic of solvability of viewing graphs in computer vision, as evidenced by various studies such as [2, 3, 15, 17, 20, 25, 26]. A viewing graph is considered solvable if, given a generic set of cameras, their fundamental matrices have a unique solution in terms of cameras up to global projective transformation. Recently, [2] proposed a new formulation of solvability and developed an effective algorithm for testing it, which was able to resolve some open questions from previous studies, such as [26].

In contrast, the question of compatibility has received less attention in the literature. The primary distinction between solvability and compatibility lies in the fact that, in the latter, the existence of cameras that correspond to a set of fundamental matrices is not assumed to exist. Moreover, compatibility has mostly been studied for graphs where each possible fundamental matrix is given, whereas papers on solvability study viewing graphs without such restrictions.

Furthermore, solvability has been investigated in the case of calibrated cameras, where it is known that the solvable graphs are precisely those that are parallel rigid [18, 21].

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Kathlén Kohn, Kristian Ranestad, Timothy Duff, and Paul Breiding for helpful discussions. Martin Bråtelund was supported by the Norwegian National Security Authority. Felix Rydell was supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation within their WASP (Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program) AI/Math initiative.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall established notation and results. We refer the reader to [6] for the basics on algebraic geometry and [10] for the application of algebra in 3D reconstruction problems.

We work over the real numbers, although all results in this paper either directly hold in the complex case or can be reformulated to do so. Where slight adjustments have to be made over the complex numbers, we make a remark.

Let \mathbb{R}^n denote the set of real vectors with n coordinates, we call this affine space. \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is the quotient space $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) / \sim$, where $x \sim y$ if and only if x and y differ by a non-zero constant, we call this projective space. We write $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ to denote the set of real $n \times m$ matrices, and we write $\mathbb{P}^{n \times m}$ to denote the set of real projective $n \times m$ matrices. In order to denote an element of affine space we use underline. For instance, if $F \in \mathbb{P}^{n \times m}$, then $\underline{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \setminus \{0\}$ is a representative of F and vice versa.

We define a map,

$$\psi : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 4} \times \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 4} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (1)$$

as follows. Given a pair of matrices $\underline{P}_1, \underline{P}_2$, let x_1 and x_2 be two 3×1 vectors. The determinant

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \underline{P}_1 & x_1 & 0 \\ \underline{P}_2 & 0 & x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

is a bilinear polynomial in x_1 and x_2 , meaning there is a matrix \underline{F}^{12} such that Equation (2) equals $x_1^T \underline{F}^{12} x_2$. We define $\psi(\underline{P}_1, \underline{P}_2)$ to be this 3×3 matrix. Note that this map induces a projective rational map

$$\psi : \mathbb{P}^{3 \times 4} \times \mathbb{P}^{3 \times 4} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{3 \times 3}. \quad (3)$$

This map is undefined, i.e. $\psi(P_1, P_2) = 0$, precisely when $\ker P_1 \cap \ker P_2 \neq \{0\}$.

Let $M_r^{n \times m} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{m \times n}$ denote the space of $m \times n$ matrices of rank r , defined up to non-zero scaling. We refer to elements in $M_2^{3 \times 3}$ as fundamental matrices. We refer to elements in $M_3^{3 \times 4}$ as cameras. The center of a camera P is its kernel $\ker P$.

Before we list the a set of well-known results, partly found in [10, Section 9], we recall that GL_n denotes the set of invertible $n \times n$ matrices and that PGL_n is its projectivization.

Proposition 2.1.

1. $\psi(P_1, P_2)$ is of rank at most 2, and it attains this rank if P_1, P_2 are cameras with distinct centers;
2. for any element $F^{12} \in M_2^{3 \times 3}$, there exists two cameras P_1, P_2 such that F^{12} is their fundamental matrix. All other cameras C_1, C_2 with fundamental matrix F^{12} satisfy $C_1 = P_1 H, C_2 = P_2 H$ for some $H \in \text{PGL}_4$;

3. $\psi(\underline{P}_2, \underline{P}_1) = \psi(\underline{P}_1, \underline{P}_2)^T$;
4. if F^{12} is the fundamental matrix of P_1, P_2 , then $\ker F^{12} = P_2(\ker(P_1))$;
5. for cameras P_1, P_2 we have $F^{12} = \psi(P_1, P_2)$ if and only if $P_1^T F^{12} P_2$ is a skew-symmetric matrix.

Given a viewing graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with vertices $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and undirected edges E , let $\{F^{ij}\}$ for $(ij) \in E$ denote a set of fundamental matrices. The edge $(ij) \in E$ defines two fundamental matrices, F^{ij}, F^{ji} satisfying $F^{ji} = (F^{ij})^T$. We say that $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if there are cameras P_1, \dots, P_n such that $F^{ij} = \psi(P_i, P_j)$. The cameras P_1, \dots, P_m are called a solution to F^{ij} . In this paper, we focus mostly on complete viewing graphs K_n , i.e. the graph on n nodes with all possible $\binom{n}{2}$ undirected edges present.

We define the i -th epipole in the j -th image to be $e_j^i := \ker F^{ij}$. Note that strictly speaking, e_j^i is not a polynomial in the entries of F^{ij} , because there is no way to write a generator of the left kernel of a matrix X as a polynomial expression that works for every 3×3 matrix of rank 2. However, one can for instance turn the expression $(e_j^i)^T F^{ij} e_j^i = 0$ into a polynomial system in F^{si}, F^{ij} and F^{sj} by defining the epipoles on affine patches of the fundamental matrices, which we don't explain here in further detail.

Lemma 2.2 ([10, Section 15.4]). *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a triple of compatible fundamental matrices. The triple has a unique solution if and only if the two epipoles in each image are distinct.*

Given a fixed set of fundamental matrices F^{ij} , we point out that there is a rather simple method of finding possible solutions in terms of cameras by first using F^{12} to recover P_1, P_2 and then using **Lemma 2.2** with matrices $\{F^{12}, F^{1i}, F^{2i}\}$ to recover the remaining P_i (a detailed algorithm can be found in [9, Section 6.1]). Finding explicit equations in terms of the fundamental matrices and epipoles for compatibility is however more difficult, and is the subject of this paper.

3 The Fundamental Action

In this section we formally introduce the fundamental action. Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ be a viewing graph of n nodes with fundamental matrices $\{F^{ij}\}$. GL_3^n (or equivalently PGL_3^n) acts on a set of fundamental matrices $\{F^{ij}\}$ by

$$F^{ij} \mapsto H_i^T F^{ij} H_j. \quad (4)$$

We call this the fundamental action of GL_3^n . The main appeal of this action is that we can use it to simplify a set of fundamental matrices, without affecting compatibility.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a set of fundamental matrices for a viewing graph \mathcal{G} . Let P_i be a solution to $\{F^{ij}\}$. For any $(H_1, \dots, H_m, H) \in \text{PGL}_3^n \times \text{PGL}_4$, we have,*

$$\psi(H_i^{-1} P_i H, H_j^{-1} P_j H) = H_i^T \psi(P_i, P_j) H_j. \quad (5)$$

In particular, $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if $\{G^{ij}\}$ is compatible, where $G^{ij} := H_i^T F^{ij} H_j$.

Proof. It is a standard fact that the action of $H \in \text{GL}_4$ in **Equation (5)** does not change the fundamental matrix, so we may set $H = I$. Consider the following equality up to scaling,

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} H_i^{-1} P_i & x_i & 0 \\ H_j^{-1} P_j & 0 & x_j \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} P_i & H_i x_i & 0 \\ P_j & 0 & H_j x_j \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Writing these expressions in terms of fundamental matrices, we get exactly **Equation (5)**. □

We call the action $(H_1, \dots, H_n, H) \in \text{GL}_3^n \times \text{GL}_4$ on cameras P_i by $H_i^{-1} P_i H$, fundamental action on cameras.

The fundamental action gives rise to an equivalence relation. For compatible fundamental matrices, the equivalence classes turns out to be the equivalence classes of n points in \mathbb{P}^3 under PGL_4 .

Proposition 3.2. *Let \mathcal{G} be a viewing graph on n nodes. Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ and $\{G^{ij}\}$ be two sets of compatible fundamental matrices. They are equivalent under fundamental action if and only if they have solutions whose camera centers are equivalent under PGL_4 .*

In our study, quantities on the form $\mathbf{e}_{sijt} := (e_j^s)^T F^{ij} e_j^t$, called epipolar numbers, are important (see **Theorems 5.6** and **5.10**). Given a viewing graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, they are defined for s, i, j, t such that $(si), (ij), (jt) \in E$. The epipolar numbers are invariant under the fundamental action:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a set of fundamental matrices with epipoles $\{e_j^i\}$. Let $\underline{H}_i \in \text{GL}_3^n$ and consider the fundamental matrices $\underline{G}^{ij} := \underline{H}_i^T F^{ij} \underline{H}_j$, whose epipoles are $\underline{h}_j^i = \underline{H}_j^{-1} e_j^i$. Then*

$$(\underline{e}_i^s)^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{e}_j^t = (\underline{h}_i^s)^T \underline{G}^{ij} \underline{h}_j^t. \quad (7)$$

We have the following geometrical interpretation of the epipolar numbers.

Lemma 3.4. *Let \mathcal{G} be a viewing graph with edges $(si), (ij)$ and (jt) and let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be compatible. We have $\mathbf{e}_{sijt} = 0$ if and only if the centers c_s, c_i, c_j, c_t of any solution are coplanar.*

Proof. Let P_1, \dots, P_n be any solution to $\{F^{ij}\}$. Let $L_{i,s}$ be the back-projected line of e_i^s with respect to the i -th camera and $L_{j,t}$ the back-projected line of e_j^t with respect to the j -th camera. Then since $e_i^s = P_i c_s$ by **Proposition 2.1** 4., c_s lies in $L_{s,i}$, and similarly c_t lies in $L_{j,t}$. However, $e_i^s F^{ij} e_j^t = 0$ means precisely that the back-projected lines $L_{i,s}, L_{j,t}$ meet in a point. Therefore, $L_{i,s}$ and $L_{j,t}$ together span a plane, unless they are the same line. In either case, all centers lie in this span. The other direction follows similarly. □

It follows from the lemma that \mathbf{e}_{sij} is always zero for compatible fundamental matrices, because three centers are always in a plane.

Another invariant under the fundamental action is $(e_j^i \times e_j^s)^T e_j^t$, where \times is the cross product. Indeed, for an invertible matrix A we have up to scaling $(Au \times Av) = A^{-T}(u \times v)$. Then projectively,

$$(H_j^{-1} e_j^i \times H_j^{-1} e_j^s)^T H_j^{-1} e_j^t = (e_j^i \times e_j^s)^T e_j^t. \quad (8)$$

However, this invariant is equivalent to the epipolar numbers in the following sense:

Lemma 3.5. *If $\mathbf{e}_{sij} = 0$, then $e_j^i \times e_j^s = F^{ji} e_i^s$.*

Proof. If $e_j^i \times e_j^s = 0$, then $e_j^i = e_j^s$. This implies that $F^{ji} e_i^s = 0$. Otherwise $e_j^i \times e_j^s \neq 0$ and we proceed as follows. By construction, we have $(e_j^i)^T (e_j^i \times e_j^s) = (e_j^s)^T (e_j^i \times e_j^s) = (e_j^i)^T F^{ji} e_i^s = 0$ and by assumption $(e_j^s)^T F^{ji} e_i^s = 0$. In \mathbb{P}^3 , this implies that $e_j^i \times e_j^s = F^{ji} e_i^s$. \square

Finally, we state an important observation that we apply in [Section 5](#), regarding expressions on the form $F^{ij} e_j^k$. For a fixed scaling \underline{F}^{ij} , we get a fixed scaling of F^{ji} via $\underline{F}^{ji} = (\underline{F}^{ij})^T$. We denote by \langle, \rangle and $\| \cdot \|$ the standard inner product and norm on \mathbb{R}^3 .

Lemma 3.6. *Let F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} be compatible fundamental matrices. For any distinct $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $F^{ij} e_j^k = F^{ik} e_k^j$.*

Moreover, fix scalings $\underline{F}^{ij}, \underline{e}_j^k$ and assume $e_j^k \neq e_j^i$. Then over the real numbers,

$$\xi := \frac{\langle \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{e}_j^k, \underline{F}^{ik} \underline{e}_k^j \rangle}{\| \underline{F}^{ik} \underline{e}_k^j \|^2} = \frac{(\underline{e}_j^k)^T \underline{F}^{ji} \underline{F}^{ik} \underline{e}_k^j}{\| \underline{F}^{ik} \underline{e}_k^j \|^2} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (9)$$

is invariant under fundamental action and $\underline{F}^{ij} \underline{e}_j^k = \xi \underline{F}^{ik} \underline{e}_k^j$.

Remark 3.7. *Note that both $F^{ij} e_j^k$ and $F^{ik} e_k^j$ can be geometrically interpreted as the linear equation defining line spanned by the epipoles e_i^j and e_i^k , hence they must be equal (up to scale).*

Proof. The first statement is a direct application of [Lemma 3.5](#). For the last statement, observe that if $x = \lambda y$ for non-zero vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\frac{\langle x, y \rangle}{\|x\|^2} = \lambda \frac{\langle x, x \rangle}{\|x\|^2} = \lambda. \quad (10)$$

To see that [Equation \(9\)](#) is invariant under fundamental action, note that $F^{ij} e_j^k = \xi F^{ik} e_k^j$ implies that

$$\underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j (\underline{H}_j^{-1} \underline{e}_j^k) = \xi \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ik} \underline{H}_k (\underline{H}_k^{-1} \underline{e}_k^j), \quad (11)$$

and we are done. \square

4 Canonical Forms

Let \mathcal{G} be a graph with compatible fundamental matrices $\{F^{ij}\}$. Let P_i be cameras such that $F^{ij} = \psi(P_i, P_j)$. By right action of $H \in \text{PGL}_4$, we may assume that all centers have a non-zero last coordinate. This implies that the first three columns of all cameras are linearly independent and that the cameras can be written $[\underline{H}_i | v^{(i)}]$ with $\underline{H}_i \in \text{GL}_3$. By left multiplication with \underline{H}_i^{-1} , we may then assume that all cameras are on the form $\underline{C}_i = [I | t^{(i)}]$. Write

$$[t^{(i)}]_{\times} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -t_3^{(i)} & t_2^{(i)} \\ t_3^{(i)} & 0 & -t_1^{(i)} \\ -t_2^{(i)} & t_1^{(i)} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

One can then check that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\underline{C}_i, \underline{C}_j) &= [t^{(j)}]_{\times} - [t^{(i)}]_{\times} \\ &= [t^{(j)} - t^{(i)}]_{\times} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and we call these skew-symmetric matrices \underline{G}^{ij} . Recall that a directed cycle C of a graph is a closed path, i.e. a path that starts and ends at the same vertex. Let $E(C)$ denote its directed edges. Since $\underline{G}^{ij} = [t^{(j)}]_{\times} - [t^{(i)}]_{\times}$, it is clear that the following cycle condition holds,

$$\sum_{(ij) \in E(C)} \underline{G}^{ij} = 0, \text{ for each directed cycle } C \text{ of } \mathcal{G}. \quad (14)$$

A set of fundamental matrices \underline{G}^{ij} satisfying [Equation \(14\)](#) are in canonical form.

By the above construction, for each set of compatible fundamental matrices $\{\underline{F}^{ij}\}$ there exists a scaling $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji} \neq 0$ and \underline{H}_i such that $\underline{G}^{ij} = \lambda_{ij} \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j$ satisfy the cycle conditions. In particular, for each set of compatible fundamental matrices, there is an equivalent set of fundamental matrices that satisfy the cycle conditions. The canonical form isn't necessarily unique. For instance, consider $\mathcal{G} = K_2$, the complete graph on two nodes. Any 3×3 matrix F^{12} of rank 2 can via $H_1^T F^{12} H_2$ be taken to any other 3×3 matrix of rank 2.

4.1 The cycle theorem

The cycle theorem below gives a necessary and sufficient condition for when a set of fundamental matrices are compatible using the cycle condition for any graph \mathcal{G} .

Recall that for an element F in projective space, we write \underline{F} to denote a fixed representative.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a set of fundamental matrices for a graph \mathcal{G} . Fix a representative \underline{F}^{ij} for each fundamental matrix such that $\underline{F}^{ji} = (\underline{F}^{ij})^T$. $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if there are matrices $\underline{H}_i \in \text{GL}_3$ and scalars $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji} \neq 0$ such that $\underline{G}^{ij} := \lambda_{ij} \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j$ satisfy*

$$\sum_{(ij) \in E(C)} \underline{G}^{ij} = 0, \text{ for each directed cycle } C \text{ of } \mathcal{G}. \quad (14)$$

In particular, any set of 3×3 rank-two matrices \underline{G}^{ij} satisfying the cycle condition are the fundamental matrices of some set of cameras.

The \Rightarrow direction of this theorem was explained in Section 4. The last part of the statement follows directly from the \Leftarrow direction, which we prove in the appendix.

We can use the cycle theorem to find conditions that must hold for compatible fundamental matrices. For instance, let $\mathcal{G} = K_3$ and let $\underline{G}^{12}, \underline{G}^{13}, \underline{G}^{23}$ be fundamental matrices satisfying the cycle conditions. Then writing $\underline{G}^{ij} = [g^{ij}]_{\times}$ and letting $\{\underline{h}_j^i\}$ be the epipoles defined as

$$\underline{h}_j^i := (g_1^{ij}, g_2^{ij}, g_3^{ij})^T, \quad (15)$$

one can check that

$$(\underline{h}_2^1)^T \underline{G}^{23} \underline{h}_3^1 = \det[g^{12} \ g^{23} \ g^{31}]. \quad (16)$$

Therefore, $g^{12} + g^{23} + g^{31} = 0$ implies $(\underline{h}_2^1)^T \underline{G}^{23} \underline{h}_3^1 = 0$. Since the epipolar numbers are invariant under fundamental action, this is another proof that $\mathbf{e}_{s_i j_s} = 0$ for compatible fundamental matrices.

We next sketch an argument using the cycle theorem for why the n -view fundamental matrix $\mathbf{F} = (F^{ij})_{ij}$ (see [13] or Section 5) for compatible $\{F^{ij}\}$ is at most rank 6. Since the rank is invariant under conjugation, it suffices to consider $\mathbf{G} = (G^{ij})_{ij}$, where $G^{ij} + G^{jk} + G^{ki} = 0$ for any i, j, k . For the sake of simplicity assume $n = 4$, but note that the below principle directly extends to any n . Subtracting the first row of \mathbf{G} from the other rows, we have

$$\mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & G^{12} & G^{13} & G^{14} \\ G^{21} & 0 & G^{23} & G^{24} \\ G^{31} & G^{32} & 0 & G^{34} \\ G^{41} & G^{42} & G^{43} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \sim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & G^{12} & G^{13} & G^{14} \\ -G^{12} & -G^{12} & -G^{12} & -G^{12} \\ -G^{13} & -G^{13} & -G^{13} & -G^{13} \\ -G^{14} & -G^{14} & -G^{14} & -G^{14} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where \sim denotes equivalence under Gaussian elimination. The rank of the first three rows of Equation (17) is at most 3, and the rank of the last nine rows is the rank of the first three columns of Equation (17), which is at most 3. In total, the matrix is at most of rank 6.

We finally use the cycle theorem to find an algebraic condition for compatibility for fundamental matrices F^{ij} of K_4 that we return to later. Assume that we are given any skew-symmetric matrices $\{G^{ij}\}$, and write $\underline{G}^{ij} = [g^{ij}]_{\times}$. We are looking for scalars $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji} \neq 0$ such that $\lambda_{ij} \underline{G}^{ij}$ satisfy the cycle conditions. Now if the cycle conditions hold for this scaling, then $\lambda_{kl} g^{kl} = -\lambda_{jk} g^{jk} - \lambda_{ij} g^{ij} - \lambda_{li} g^{li}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \det[\lambda_{ij} g^{ij} \ \lambda_{jk} g^{jk} \ \lambda_{kl} g^{kl}] \\ &= \det[\lambda_{ij} g^{ij} \ \lambda_{jk} g^{jk} \ -\lambda_{li} g^{li}] \\ &= -\det[\lambda_{li} g^{li} \ \lambda_{ij} g^{ij} \ \lambda_{jk} g^{jk}], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for all $i, j, k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Factoring out the constants, and with \underline{h}_j^i defined as in Equation (15), we get

$$\lambda_{ij} \lambda_{jk} \lambda_{kl} (\underline{h}_j^i)^T \underline{G}^{jk} \underline{h}_k^l = -\lambda_{li} \lambda_{ij} \lambda_{jk} (\underline{h}_i^l)^T \underline{G}^{ij} \underline{h}_j^k. \quad (19)$$

Assume that all epipolar numbers $(\underline{h}_j^i)^T \underline{G}^{jk} \underline{h}_k^l$ are non-zero, and recalling that all λ_{ij} are non-zero, we find that

$$\frac{(\underline{h}_j^i)^T \underline{G}^{jk} \underline{h}_k^l}{(\underline{h}_i^l)^T \underline{G}^{ij} \underline{h}_j^k} = -\frac{\lambda_{li}}{\lambda_{ki}}. \quad (20)$$

At the same using $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$,

$$\frac{\lambda_{31} \lambda_{12} \lambda_{23} \lambda_{34} \lambda_{24} \lambda_{41}}{\lambda_{21} \lambda_{32} \lambda_{43} \lambda_{24} \lambda_{14} \lambda_{31}} = 1. \quad (21)$$

Combining Equations (20) and (21), we get a equation in the fundamental matrices \underline{G}^{ij} and their epipoles \underline{h}_j^i that is invariant of scaling in each fundamental matrix and epipole. By the invariance under fundamental action, we can rewrite this as the following equation that must hold for all compatible fundamental matrices of K_4 in terms of the epipolar numbers,

$$\mathbf{e}_{4123} \mathbf{e}_{2134} \mathbf{e}_{3142} \mathbf{e}_{4231} \mathbf{e}_{1243} \mathbf{e}_{2341} = \mathbf{e}_{3124} \mathbf{e}_{4132} \mathbf{e}_{2143} \mathbf{e}_{1234} \mathbf{e}_{3241} \mathbf{e}_{1342}. \quad (22)$$

We prove that in the generic case, this condition together with the triple-wise conditions are enough for compatibility in Theorem 5.10.

5 Compatibility for Complete Graphs

We now consider the complete graphs, that is, the case where all the fundamental matrices are known. Let K_n denote the complete graph on n nodes. The compatibility of $\binom{n}{2}$ fundamental matrices F^{ij} is studied in [13], where the main result uses the n -view fundamental matrix. Given a set of $\binom{n}{2}$ fundamental matrices F^{ij} , the n -view fundamental matrix is the $3n \times 3n$ symmetric matrix

$$\mathbf{F} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F^{12} & \dots & F^{1n} \\ F^{21} & 0 & \dots & F^{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ F^{n1} & F^{n2} & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Remark 5.1. *In this section, we work only with real numbers because it allows us give polynomial equations using the standard inner product and norm on \mathbb{R}^3 . However, all of our statements in Section 5.1 and Section 5.2 can be extended to the complex numbers as explained in the appendix.*

Theorem 5.2 (Theorem 1 of [13], Theorem 2 of [7]). *Given a complete graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices $\mathcal{G} = K_n$, a set of real fundamental matrices F^{ij} is compatible with a solution of real cameras whose centers are not all collinear if and only if there exists non-zero scalars λ_{ij} for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$ and*

1. *the n -view fundamental matrix \mathbf{F} of $\lambda_{ij}F^{ij}$ is rank 6 and has exactly three positive and three negative eigenvalues;*
2. *the $3 \times 3n$ and $3n \times 3$ block rows and block columns of \mathbf{F} are all of rank 3.*

Further, the set of F^{ij} is compatible with a solution of real cameras whose centers are all collinear if and only if there exists there exists non-zero scalars λ_{ij} for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$ and

1. *the n -view fundamental matrix \mathbf{F} of $\lambda_{ij}F^{ij}$ is rank 4 and has exactly two positive and two negative eigenvalues;*
2. *the $3 \times 3n$ and $3n \times 3$ block rows and block columns of \mathbf{F} are all of rank 2.*

The scalars λ_{ij} are determined in [7, 13] as a consequence of defining cameras on the form $P_i = K_i R_i^T [I | -t^{(i)}]$, for rotation matrices R_i , calibration matrices K_i and vectors $t^{(i)}$ as done in [10, Chapter 6]. The fundamental matrices then equal $F^{ij} = V_i (T_i - T_j) V_j^T$ for invertible matrices $V_i = K_i^{-T} R_i$, and $T_i = [t^{(i)}]_{\times}$.

The first result of this section show that the eigenvalue condition of this theorem can be dropped completely.

Theorem 5.3. *In Theorem 5.2, the eigenvalue conditions are implied by the other conditions, and can therefore be dropped from the necessary and sufficient conditions for compatibility.*

The rest of this section aims to express the rank conditions in terms of concrete homogeneous algebraic equations. We begin by showing that in order to study the compatibility conditions of K_n , it suffices to look at the compatibility of K_4 :

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a complete set of $\binom{n}{2}$, $n \geq 4$, fundamental matrices. If for each set of four distinct indices i, j, k, l , the sextuple $\{F^{ij}, F^{ik}, F^{jk}, F^{il}, F^{jl}, F^{kl}\}$ is compatible, then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible.*

Moreover, if all epipoles in each image coincide, then triple-wise compatibility implies that $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible. The reconstruction in this case will be a set of cameras whose centers all lie on a line.

Note that the first part of this theorem is a less general version of [13, Theorem 2]. We also make the following observation.

Proposition 5.5. *A compatible set of $\binom{n}{2}$ fundamental matrices has a unique solution up to action by PGL_4 unless all the epipoles in each image are equal.*

5.1 K_3

The case of three fundamental forms is fairly straightforward. We have two possible configurations for the three cameras; they either all lie on a line, or they do not.

Theorem 5.6 ([10, Section 15.4]). *Let F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} be fundamental matrices. There exist non-collinear cameras P_1, P_2, P_3 such that $F^{ij} = \psi(P_i, P_j)$ if and only if,*

$$(e_1^3)^T F^{12} e_2^3 = (e_1^2)^T F^{13} e_3^2 = (e_2^1)^T F^{23} e_3^1 = 0, \quad (24)$$

and

$$e_1^2 \neq e_1^3, \quad e_2^1 \neq e_2^3, \quad e_3^1 \neq e_3^2, \quad (25)$$

If P_1, P_2, P_3 are cameras with collinear centers, then it follows that $P_i(\ker P_j) = P_i(\ker P_k)$ for all distinct i, j, k . This implies that for the corresponding fundamental matrices F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} , we have $e_j^i = e_j^k$ for all distinct i, j, k . The following example shows that the conditions in Equation (24) are not enough in the collinear case.

Example 5.7. Consider the fundamental matrices:

$$F^{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F^{13} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F^{23} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

with epipoles:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1^2 &= [1, 0, 0], & e_2^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & e_3^1 &= [1, 0, 0], \\ e_1^3 &= [1, 0, 0], & e_2^3 &= [1, 0, 0], & e_3^2 &= [1, 0, 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

These six matrices satisfy the conditions in [Equation \(24\)](#). However, no solution of cameras P_1, P_2, P_3 exist, for which F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} are the fundamental matrices. This can be checked for instance via the algorithm described at the end of [Section 2](#). \diamond

Proposition 5.8. *Let F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} be fundamental matrices. There exist collinear cameras P_1, P_2, P_3 such that $F^{ij} = \psi(P_i, P_j)$ if and only if,*

$$e_1^2 = e_1^3, \quad e_2^1 = e_2^3, \quad e_3^1 = e_3^2, \quad (28)$$

and

$$F^{21}[e_1^2]_{\times} F^{13} = F^{23}. \quad (29)$$

5.2 K_4

We start this section with a counterexample to the previous belief that triple-wise compatibility is enough to ensure full compatibility.

Example 5.9. Consider the fundamental matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} F^{12} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & F^{13} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & F^{14} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ F^{23} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & F^{24} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & F^{34} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

with epipoles:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1^2 &= [1, 0, 0], & e_2^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & e_3^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & e_4^1 &= [1, 0, 0], \\ e_1^3 &= [0, 1, 0], & e_2^3 &= [0, 1, 0], & e_3^2 &= [0, 1, 0], & e_4^2 &= [0, 1, 0], \\ e_1^4 &= [0, 0, 1], & e_2^4 &= [0, 0, 1], & e_3^4 &= [0, 0, 1], & e_4^3 &= [0, 0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

These six matrices satisfy the $3\binom{4}{3} = 12$ triple-wise conditions from [Theorem 5.6](#). Nonetheless, no solution exists. Any attempt to find four cameras will end up matching at most five of the six fundamental matrices. We will soon see that this is because the sextuple does not satisfy the conditions in [Theorem 5.10](#). \diamond

Before we get to the main results, we list the possible configurations of camera centers in the case of four cameras (six fundamental matrices). By [Proposition 3.2](#), these correspond to the equivalence classes of compatible fundamental matrices. Each of these is recognizable from the epipoles e_i^j .

Case 1: The cameras are in generic position, meaning no plane contains all four centers. In each image, the three epipoles are in generic position, meaning they do not lie on a line.

Case 2: All camera centers lie in the same plane, but no three lie on a line. In each image, the three epipoles are distinct and lie on a line.

Case 3: Precisely three camera centers lie on a line. In the three corresponding images, the epipoles corresponding to the other two cameras among this triplet are equal, with the last one different from these two. In the final image, the three epipoles are distinct and lie on a line.

Case 4: All four camera centers lie on a line. In each image, the three epipoles coincide.

Any compatible sextuple $\{F^{ij}\}$ must have its epipoles in one of the configurations above. If we have, for instance, collinear epipoles in two images, and not in the other two, the fundamental matrices can not be compatible. In all four cases above, the configuration of the epipoles together with the triple-wise conditions alone is not enough to ensure compatibility; we need additional constraints. Case 4 is already covered by the second half of [Theorem 5.4](#) and [Proposition 5.8](#). We cover the remaining three cases in this section one by one. Recall the definition of the epipolar number: $\mathbf{e}_{sijt} = (e_i^s)^T F^{ij} e_j^t$.

Theorem 5.10 (Case 1). *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a sextuple of fundamental matrices such that the three epipoles in each image do not lie on a line. Then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if the triple-wise conditions hold and*

$$\mathbf{e}_{4123}\mathbf{e}_{2134}\mathbf{e}_{3142}\mathbf{e}_{4231}\mathbf{e}_{1243}\mathbf{e}_{2341} = \mathbf{e}_{3124}\mathbf{e}_{4132}\mathbf{e}_{2143}\mathbf{e}_{1234}\mathbf{e}_{3241}\mathbf{e}_{1342}. \quad (32)$$

Remark 5.11. *The condition that the epipoles in each image do not lie on a line is equivalent to all epipolar number \mathbf{e}_{ijkl} being non-zero for distinct i, j, k, l . [Equation \(32\)](#) is homogeneous in every fundamental matrix and every epipole.*

In the next two cases, the three epipoles in each image lie on a line, this is equivalent to all epipolar numbers \mathbf{e}_{ijkl} being zero for distinct i, j, k, l .

Theorem 5.12 (Case 2). Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a sextuple of fundamental matrices whose epipoles in each image are distinct and lie on a line. Then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if the triple-wise conditions hold,

$$\langle F^{jk} e_k^i, F^{jl} e_l^i \rangle \langle F^{kj} e_j^i, F^{kl} e_l^i \rangle \langle F^{lj} e_j^i, F^{lk} e_k^i \rangle + \|F^{lj} e_j^i\|^2 \|F^{jk} e_k^i\|^2 \|F^{kl} e_l^i\|^2 = 0, \quad (33)$$

for all distinct i, j, k, l satisfying $l > k > j$, and for

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = F^{12} e_2^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 = F^{21} e_1^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_3 = F^{31} e_1^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_4 = F^{41} e_1^3, \quad (34)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{e_3^2 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^2} - \frac{e_2^3 F^{24} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} \mathbf{x}_2}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{24} e_4^1 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} e_2^3} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4}{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1} \\ & + \frac{e_3^2 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4 e_1^2 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{14} \mathbf{x}_4}{e_1^2 F^{14} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^2 \mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{24} \mathbf{x}_4}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{24} e_4^1} + \frac{e_3^1 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1 \mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^1} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Remark 5.13. As Equation (35) and Equation (39) below are already oversaturated with sub/superscript, we are omitting the transpose symbol from these equations. It is to be understood that the 3-vectors \mathbf{x}_i and e_i^j are column-vectors when directly right of a fundamental matrix, and row-vectors when to the left.

Theorem 5.14 (Case 3). Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a sextuple of fundamental matrices such that

$$e_1^2 = e_1^3 \neq e_1^4, \quad e_2^1 = e_2^3 \neq e_2^4, \quad e_3^1 = e_3^2 \neq e_3^4, \quad (36)$$

and e_4^1, e_4^2, e_4^3 are distinct and lie on a line. Then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if the triple-wise conditions hold,

$$\langle F^{12} e_2^4, F^{13} e_3^4 \rangle \langle F^{21} e_1^4, F^{23} e_3^4 \rangle \langle F^{31} e_1^4, F^{32} e_2^4 \rangle + \|F^{12} e_2^4\|^2 \|F^{23} e_3^4\|^2 \|F^{31} e_1^4\|^2 = 0, \quad (37)$$

and for

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = F^{12} e_2^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 = F^{23} e_3^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_3 = F^{31} e_1^4, \quad (38)$$

we have

$$\frac{e_2^4 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} \mathbf{x}_2}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} e_2^4} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^4} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^4} = 0. \quad (39)$$

6 Image of the fundamental map

Related to the study of the constraints satisfied by compatible fundamental matrices, is the image of the fundamental map given a viewing graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathcal{G}} : (\mathbb{P}^{3 \times 4})^m & \dashrightarrow (\mathbb{P}^{3 \times 3})^E, \\ (P_1, \dots, P_m) & \mapsto (\psi(P_i, P_j))_{(ij) \in E}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The fundamental map sends projective camera matrices to a set of corresponding fundamental matrices. We define the viewing graph variety $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}$ to be the Zariski closure of the image $\text{Im} \Psi_{\mathcal{G}}$, meaning the smallest solution set to a polynomial system that contains the image. By Chevalley's theorem, in this case, the Zariski closure is equal to the Euclidean closure [16, Theorem 4.19].

A natural question from the algebraic geometry point of view, is if this variety in the complete graph case is described by the constraints we proposed in Section 5. We prove that that is not the case, and leave it as an open problem to describe the viewing graph variety precisely.

Proposition 6.1. The viewing graph variety of K_n for $n \geq 3$ is a proper subset of the variety in $(\mathbb{P}^{3 \times 3})^{\binom{n}{2}}$ defined by the $3 \binom{n}{3}$ triple-wise constraints and the $\binom{n}{4}$ quadruple-wise constraints of Theorem 5.10.

References

- [1] Sameer Agarwal, Andrew Pryhuber, and Rekha R Thomas. Ideals of the multiview variety. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2019. 1
- [2] Federica Arrigoni, Andrea Fusiello, Elisa Ricci, and Tomas Pajdla. Viewing graph solvability via cycle consistency. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5540–5549, 2021. 2
- [3] Federica Arrigoni, Andrea Fusiello, Romeo Rizzi, Elisa Ricci, and Tomas Pajdla. Revisiting viewing graph solvability: an effective approach based on cycle consistency. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022. 2
- [4] David Cox, John Little, Donal O'Shea, and Moss Sweedler. Ideals, varieties, and algorithms. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 101(6):582–586, 1994. 10
- [5] Timothy Duff, Kathleen Kohn, Anton Leykin, and Tomas Pajdla. Plmp-point-line minimal problems in complete multi-view visibility. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1675–1684, 2019. 1
- [6] Andreas Gathmann. Algebraic geometry, 2019/20. Class Notes TU Kaiserslautern. Available at <https://www.mathematik.uni-kl.de/~gathmann/de/alggeom.php>. 2
- [7] Amnon Geifman, Yoni Kasten, Meirav Galun, and Ronen Basri. Averaging essential and fundamental matrices in collinear camera settings. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6021–6030, 2020. 1, 6, 12
- [8] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>, 2020. 1, 10

- [9] Richard Hartley and Fredrik Kahl. Critical configurations for projective reconstruction from multiple views. International Journal of Computer Vision, 71(1):5 – 47, 01 2007. 1, 3
- [10] Richard I. Hartley and Andrew Zisserman. Multiple View Geometry in Computer Vision. Cambridge University Press, ISBN: 0521540518, second edition, 2004. 1, 2, 3, 6, 11
- [11] Anders Heyden and Kalle Åström. Algebraic properties of multilinear constraints. Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, 20(13):1135–1162, 1997. 1
- [12] Yoni Kasten, Amnon Geifman, Meirav Galun, and Ronen Basri. Algebraic characterization of essential matrices and their averaging in multiview settings. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pages 5895–5903, 2019. 2
- [13] Yoni Kasten, Amnon Geifman, Meirav Galun, and Ronen Basri. Gpsfm: Global projective sfm using algebraic constraints on multi-view fundamental matrices. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 3264–3272, 2019. 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 14, 19
- [14] Joe Kileel and Kathlén Kohn. Snapshot of algebraic vision. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11443, 2022. 1
- [15] Noam Levi and Michael Werman. The viewing graph. In 2003 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2003. Proceedings., volume 1, pages I–I. IEEE, 2003. 1, 2
- [16] Mateusz Michałek and Bernd Sturmfels. Invitation to nonlinear algebra, volume 211. American Mathematical Soc., 2021. 8
- [17] Antonella Nardi, Dario Comanducci, and Carlo Colombo. Augmented vision: Seeing beyond field of view and occlusions via uncalibrated visual transfer from multiple viewpoints. In 2011 Irish Machine Vision and Image Processing Conference, pages 38–44. IEEE, 2011. 2
- [18] Onur Ozyesil and Amit Singer. Robust camera location estimation by convex programming. In Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 2674–2683, 2015. 2
- [19] René Ranftl and Vladlen Koltun. Deep fundamental matrix estimation. In Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV), pages 284–299, 2018. 1
- [20] Alessandro Rudi, Matia Pizzoli, and Fiora Pirri. Linear solvability in the viewing graph. In Ron Kimmel, Reinhard Klette, and Akihiro Sugimoto, editors, Computer Vision–ACCV 2010: 10th Asian Conference on Computer Vision, Queenstown, New Zealand, November 8–12, 2010, Revised Selected Papers, Part III 10, pages 369–381, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 2
- [21] Torsten Sattler, Bastian Leibe, and Leif Kobbelt. Efficient & effective prioritized matching for large-scale image-based localization. IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence, 39(9):1744–1756, 2016. 2
- [22] Chris Sweeney, Torsten Sattler, Tobias Hollerer, Matthew Turk, and Marc Pollefeys. Optimizing the viewing graph for structure-from-motion. In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), December 2015. 2
- [23] Philip HS Torr and David William Murray. The development and comparison of robust methods for estimating the fundamental matrix. International journal of computer vision, 24:271–300, 1997. 1
- [24] Philip Hilaire Sean Torr. Motion segmentation and outlier detection. PhD thesis, University of Oxford England, 1995. 1
- [25] Matthew Trager, Martial Hebert, and Jean Ponce. The joint image handbook. In Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision, pages 909–917, 2015. 1, 2
- [26] Matthew Trager, Brian Osserman, and Jean Ponce. On the solvability of viewing graphs. In Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV), pages 321–335, 2018. 2
- [27] Gang Xu and Zhengyou Zhang. Epipolar geometry in stereo, motion and object recognition: a unified approach, volume 6. Springer Science & Business Media, 1996. 1

Appendix

In this appendix we prove all the mathematical results that were left unproven in the main body of the paper. For the convenience of the reader, we explain some concepts from applied algebraic geometry that are helpful to understand the appendix in [Appendix A](#). Results that appear in the main body of the paper are restated and given the same number. Additional results not stated in the main body, are numbered independently.

In [Appendix B](#) we prove the statements of [Section 3](#). In [Appendix C](#) we prove the cycle theorem as stated in [Appendix C](#). We prove all results on compatibility for complete graphs from [Section 5](#) in [Appendix D](#). Finally, in [Appendix E](#) we prove the statement about the viewing graph variety in [Section 6](#).

A Algebraic Geometry Preliminaries

In the main body of the text, we used the term *rational map*. To define this we first define what a *variety* is. Given a field k such as \mathbb{R} , a variety is the solution set to a system of polynomial equations. A variety \mathcal{V} is called *irreducible* if it cannot be written as a union of two proper varieties, meaning that for two subvarieties X, Y of \mathcal{V} , the equality $\mathcal{V} = X \cup Y$ implies $\mathcal{V} = X$ or $\mathcal{V} = Y$. A rational map f between projective varieties X and Y , with X irreducible, is written

$$f : X \dashrightarrow Y. \quad (41)$$

This map is defined on a *Zariski open* set of X , which is a set that can be written $X \setminus Y$ for a proper subvariety $Y \subseteq X$.

For the proofs in [Appendix D](#), it is helpful to understand saturation, elimination, and implicitization of *ideals*. We refer the reader to [\[4\]](#) for a detailed study of these topics. Consider a field k and its polynomial ring $k[x] = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$, which is simply the set of all polynomials with coefficients in k . That $k[x]$ is a *ring* means that addition and multiplication of polynomials satisfy a certain set of axioms that we don't list here. An *ideal* I of a ring R is an additive subgroup that is closed under multiplication of elements in R .

Let $f_1, \dots, f_s \in k[x]$ be polynomials. They generate an ideal of $k[x]$ as follows:

$$\langle f_1, \dots, f_s \rangle := \left\{ \sum g_i f_i : g_i \in k[x] \right\} \subseteq k[x]. \quad (42)$$

From the geometric point of view, an ideal in a polynomial ring defines a *variety* \mathcal{V} as the zero set of all polynomials in the ideal. In other words,

$$\mathcal{V}(I) := \{x \in k^m : f(x) = 0, \forall f \in I\}. \quad (43)$$

The goal of saturation is to remove unwanted components from a variety. Let I, J be ideals. The saturation of I with respect to J is

$$I : J^\infty := \{f \in k[x] : \forall g \in J, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} : fg^N \in I\}. \quad (44)$$

Theorem A.1 ([\[4, p. 203\]](#)). *Let $\mathcal{V}(J), \mathcal{V}(I)$ be two algebraic sets defined by ideals. Then*

$$\overline{\mathcal{V}(I) \setminus \mathcal{V}(J)} \subseteq \mathcal{V}(I : J^\infty). \quad (45)$$

The *elimination* of variables x_1, \dots, x_l from an ideal $I \subseteq k[x]$ is the intersection

$$I \cap k[x_{l+1}, \dots, x_m]. \quad (46)$$

Given $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{V}(I)$, we have that $(x_{l+1}, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{V}(I \cap k[x_{l+1}, \dots, x_m])$. This is simply because any $f \in I \cap k[x_{l+1}, \dots, x_m]$ also lies in I by construction. In this way, elimination of variables gives us conditions on the projection of $\mathcal{V}(I)$ away from the first l coordinates.

Implicitization refers to the following setup. Consider a polynomial system

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= f_1(t_1, \dots, t_m), \\ &\vdots \\ x_n &= f_n(t_1, \dots, t_m), \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

and write $F : k^m \rightarrow k^n$ for the function corresponding to these polynomials. We wish to describe the image of F in terms of conditions on x_1, \dots, x_n .

Theorem A.2 ([\[4, p. 134\]](#)). *For an infinite field, let $I = \langle x_1 - f_1, \dots, x_n - f_n \rangle \subseteq k[x, t]$ denote the system corresponding to [Equation \(47\)](#). The variety of $I \cap k[x]$ is the smallest variety containing the image of F .*

`Macaulay2` [\[8\]](#) is a symbolic programming language which handles exact computations over \mathbb{Q} . We use this program to symbolically saturate ideals and eliminate variables from ideals in the ring $\mathbb{Q}[x]$.

B The Fundamental Action

Proposition 3.2. *Let \mathcal{G} be a viewing graph on n nodes. Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ and $\{G^{ij}\}$ be two sets of compatible fundamental matrices. They are equivalent under fundamental action if and only if they have solutions whose camera centers are equivalent under PGL_4 .*

For the proof we need the following lemma:

Lemma B.1 ([10, Result 22.1]). *Let P and P' be two camera matrices with the same center. Then there exists $H \in \text{PGL}_3$ such that $P' = HP$.*

Proof of Proposition 3.2.

\Rightarrow) Let $G^{ij} = H_i^T F^{ij} H_j$. If P_1, \dots, P_n is a solution to $\{F^{ij}\}$, then by Proposition 3.1 $H_1^{-1}P_1, \dots, H_n^{-1}P_n$ is a solution to G^{ij} , which have the same centers as P_1, \dots, P_n .

\Leftarrow) Let P_1, \dots, P_n be a solution to $\{F^{ij}\}$ with centers c_i and P'_1, \dots, P'_n a solution to $\{G^{ij}\}$ with centers c'_i such that $c'_i = H^{-1}c_i$ for some $H \in \text{PGL}_4$. By Lemma B.1, there are $H_i \in \text{PGL}_3$ such that $P'_i = H_i P_i H$, since P'_i and $P_i H$ have the same kernel $H^{-1}c_i$. \square

C Canonical Forms

In order to prove the cycle theorem we need a lemma.

Lemma C.1. *Let \mathcal{G} be a connected graph and T any spanning tree subgraph. Then there is a sequence $T^i \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ such that*

$$T = T^0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq T^k = \mathcal{G}, \quad (48)$$

where T^{i+1} contains exactly one more edge than T^i and this edge is part of a cycle of T^{i+1} .

Proof. We get T^{k-1} from T^k by removing an edge of T^k that is not in T . We repeat this process until we reach T^0 . If at any point the edge we remove is not part of a cycle, then this disconnects the graph by definition, implying that T is not connected, which is a contradiction. \square

Recall that in order to denote either fundamental matrices or epipoles as elements of affine space we use underline. For instance, if $F \in \mathbb{P}^{3 \times 3}$, then $\underline{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \setminus \{0\}$ is a representative of F and vice versa.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a set of fundamental matrices for a graph \mathcal{G} . Fix a representative \underline{F}^{ij} for each fundamental matrix such that $\underline{F}^{ji} = (\underline{F}^{ij})^T$. $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if there are matrices $\underline{H}_i \in \text{GL}_3$ and scalars $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji} \neq 0$ such that $\underline{G}^{ij} := \lambda_{ij} \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j$ satisfy*

$$\sum_{(ij) \in E(C)} \underline{G}^{ij} = 0, \text{ for each directed cycle } C \text{ of } \mathcal{G}. \quad (49)$$

In particular, any set of 3×3 rank-two matrices \underline{G}^{ij} satisfying the cycle condition are the fundamental matrices of some set of cameras.

Proof.

\Leftarrow) We find a set of cameras \underline{C}_i such that $\psi(\underline{C}_i, \underline{C}_j)$ equals \underline{G}^{ij} . Since F^{ij} and G^{ij} are equivalent under fundamental action, this is enough. We may without restriction assume that \mathcal{G} is connected with n nodes. Since \underline{G}^{ij} are skew-symmetric by the 2-cycles, there are non-zero $g^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\underline{G}^{ij} = [g^{ij}]_{\times}$. The cycle condition is then equivalent to

$$\sum_{(ij) \in E(C)} g^{ij} = 0, \text{ for each directed cycle } C \text{ of } \mathcal{G}. \quad (50)$$

Let T be a spanning tree subgraph of \mathcal{G} .

Fix $i = 1$ and let $t^{(1)} = 0$. To any node v in T there is a unique simple path from 1 to v in T , since T is a tree. Let $\sigma_{u,v} = \{u = i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k = v\}$ denote the unique path between two vertices u, v of T . For $i > 1$,

$$t^{(v)} := \sum_{(ij) \in \sigma_{1,v}} g^{ij}. \quad (51)$$

This defines cameras $\underline{C}_i = [I|t^{(i)}]$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. We must check that $\underline{G}^{ij} = \psi(\underline{C}_i, \underline{C}_j)$ for every edge of \mathcal{G} . If (ij) is an edge of T , then $t^{(j)} - t^{(i)} = g^{ij}$ by construction. Consider the sequence T^l of Lemma C.1. We proceed via induction to show that $\underline{G}^{ij} = \psi(\underline{C}_i, \underline{C}_j)$ for every edge of T^l for any l . The base case $T^0 = T$ is already done. Assume that \underline{C}_i satisfy $\underline{G}^{ij} = \psi(\underline{C}_i, \underline{C}_j)$ for all edges of T^l . In T^{l+1} there is precisely one new edge (ij) and that edge is part of a cycle C of T^{l+1} . After some cancellation, we have for some vertex u of the cycle that

$$\psi(\underline{C}_i, \underline{C}_j) = [t^{(j)} - t^{(i)}]_{\times} = \sum_{(st) \in \sigma_{u,j}} [g^{st}]_{\times} - \sum_{(st) \in \sigma_{u,i}} [g^{st}]_{\times}. \quad (52)$$

By skew-symmetry of \underline{G}^{ij} we have $g^{ji} = -g^{ij}$, and therefore we get

$$\psi(\underline{C}_i, \underline{C}_j) = \sum_{(st) \in \sigma_{i,j}} [g^{st}]_{\times}. \quad (53)$$

However, by the cycle condition for the cycle C , this equals $[g^{ij}]_{\times}$ which is what we needed. \square

D Complete Graphs

We recall the following theorem from [7, 13].

Theorem 5.2. *Given a complete graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices $\mathcal{G} = K_n$, a set of real fundamental matrices F^{ij} is compatible with a solution of real cameras whose centers are not all collinear if and only if there exists non-zero scalars λ_{ij} for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$ and*

1. *the n -view fundamental matrix \mathbf{F} of $\lambda_{ij}F^{ij}$ is rank 6 and has exactly three positive and three negative eigenvalues;*
2. *the $3 \times 3n$ and $3n \times 3$ block rows and block columns of \mathbf{F} are all of rank 3.*

Further, the set of F^{ij} is compatible with a solution of real cameras whose centers are all collinear if and only if there exists non-zero scalars λ_{ij} for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$ and

1. *the n -view fundamental matrix \mathbf{F} of $\lambda_{ij}F^{ij}$ is rank 4 and has exactly two positive and two negative eigenvalues;*
2. *the $3 \times 3n$ and $3n \times 3$ block rows and block columns of \mathbf{F} are all of rank 2.*

Theorem 5.3. *In Theorem 5.2, the eigenvalue conditions are implied by the other conditions, and can therefore be dropped from the necessary and sufficient conditions for compatibility.*

We prove this theorem at the end of this section.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a complete set of $\binom{n}{2}$, $n \geq 4$, fundamental matrices. If for each set of four distinct indices i, j, k, l , the sextuple $\{F^{ij}, F^{ik}, F^{jk}, F^{il}, F^{jl}, F^{kl}\}$ is compatible, then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible.*

Moreover, if all epipoles in each image coincide, then triple-wise compatibility implies that $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible. The reconstruction in this case will be a set of cameras whose centers all lie on a line.

We prove this theorem after Proposition 5.8.

Proposition 5.5. *A compatible set of $\binom{n}{2}$ fundamental matrices has a unique solution up to action by PGL_4 unless all the epipoles in each image are equal.*

Proof. Assume that all epipoles in each image are not equal. Since the set of fundamental matrices is compatible, we know that there exists a reconstruction consisting of n cameras, not all lying on a line. In particular, there are at least two cameras P_1, P_2 such that the line spanned by their camera center does not contain any other camera centers. By Lemma 2.2, a triple of compatible fundamental matrices has a unique solution up to action by PGL_4 if the two epipoles in each image are distinct, or equivalently: If their reconstruction consists of three non-collinear cameras. So we can uniquely recover P_1, P_2 from F^{12} . Then each other cameras P_i is uniquely determined by the triplet F^{12}, F^{1i}, F^{2i} . Since this uniquely determines all cameras, the fundamental matrices F^{ij} can only have one solution. \square

D.1 K_3

Proposition 5.8. *Let F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} be fundamental matrices. There exist collinear cameras P_1, P_2, P_3 such that $F^{ij} = \psi(P_i, P_j)$ if and only if,*

$$e_1^2 = e_1^3, \quad e_2^1 = e_2^3, \quad e_3^1 = e_3^2, \quad (54)$$

and

$$F^{21}[e_1^2]_{\times} F^{13} = F^{23}. \quad (55)$$

Remark D.1. *When we in the proofs below write “it can be verified that” or “it can be checked that” in relation to the shape of fundamental matrices, we have checked this fact in Macaulay2.*

Proof. Recall that the epipole e_i^j equals $P_i(\ker(P_j))$. It follows that if a solution to F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{23} consists of collinear cameras, then Equation (54) must be satisfied. Conversely, if Equation (54) is satisfied, any solution must consist of collinear camera centers.

We begin by simplifying the problem using the fundamental action. Let

$$\underline{H}_i = [e_i^j \ \mathbf{x}_i \ \mathbf{y}_i], \quad (56)$$

for any $j \neq i$ and $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that the determinant is non-zero, meaning H_i are invertible. We get a new triple of fundamental matrices

$$\underline{G}^{ij} = \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j. \quad (57)$$

Since the fundamental action preserves compatibility, the sextuple $\{\underline{G}^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if $\{F^{ij}\}$ is. They are of the following form

$$\underline{G}^{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{12} & b_{12} \\ 0 & c_{12} & d_{12} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underline{G}^{13} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{13} & b_{13} \\ 0 & c_{13} & d_{13} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underline{G}^{23} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{23} & b_{23} \\ 0 & c_{23} & d_{23} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (58)$$

for some $a_{ij}, b_{ij}, c_{ij}, d_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ making the matrices of Equation (58) rank-two. Their epipoles are:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{h}_1^2 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_2^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_3^1 &= [1, 0, 0], \\ \underline{h}_1^3 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_2^3 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_3^2 &= [1, 0, 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

We next find conditions on triplets of cameras P_1, P_2, P_3 with collinear centers whose fundamental matrices are on the form G^{12}, G^{13}, G^{23} . We may up to PGL_4 action assume that the center of P_1 is $[1, 0, 0, 0]$, the center of P_2 is $[0, 1, 0, 0]$ and the center of P_3 is $[1, 1, 0, 0]$. Fix P_1 to be:

$$P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (60)$$

Using the fact that $e_i^j = P_i(\ker P_j)$, we find that P_2 and P_3 must be on the form below:

$$P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix}. \quad (61)$$

One can check that the two right-most elements of the first row of P_2 and P_3 do not affect the fundamental matrices. In particular, one solution must be

$$P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta_1 & \beta_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta_3 & \beta_4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (62)$$

for α_i and β_i such that $\alpha_1\alpha_4 - \alpha_2\alpha_3 \neq 0$ and $\beta_1\beta_4 - \beta_2\beta_3 \neq 0$. Given such cameras, the fundamental matrices are calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(P_1, P_2) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\alpha_3 & \alpha_1 \\ 0 & -\alpha_4 & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \psi(P_1, P_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\beta_3 & \beta_1 \\ 0 & -\beta_4 & \beta_2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \psi(P_2, P_3) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\alpha_4\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_4 & \alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ 0 & \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_4 & -\alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

This tells us that in the collinear setting, F^{12} and F^{13} uniquely determine F^{23} . In particular, G^{12} and G^{13} from Equation (58) determine the elements of G^{23} as described below.

Define the \star operator on 2×2 matrices as

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_3 \\ x_2 & x_4 \end{bmatrix} \star \begin{bmatrix} y_1 & y_3 \\ y_2 & y_4 \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} x_1y_2 - x_2y_1 & x_1y_4 - x_2y_3 \\ x_3y_2 - x_4y_1 & x_3y_4 - x_4y_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_3 & x_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y_2 & y_4 \\ -y_1 & -y_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (64)$$

Then up to scaling,

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{12} & b_{12} \\ c_{12} & d_{12} \end{bmatrix} \star \begin{bmatrix} a_{13} & b_{13} \\ c_{13} & d_{13} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{23} & b_{23} \\ c_{23} & d_{23} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (65)$$

Observe that since $G^{ij} = H_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} H_j$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij} &= [0, 1, 0] G^{ij} [0, 1, 0]^T = \mathbf{x}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_j, \\ b_{ij} &= [0, 0, 1] G^{ij} [0, 1, 0]^T = \mathbf{y}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_j, \\ c_{ij} &= [0, 1, 0] G^{ij} [0, 0, 1]^T = \mathbf{x}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{y}_j, \\ d_{ij} &= [0, 0, 1] G^{ij} [0, 0, 1]^T = \mathbf{y}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{y}_j. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

In the below, and throughout this section, we skip the transpose notation and write for instance $\mathbf{x}_i \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_j$ instead of $\mathbf{x}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_j$. We have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{x}_2 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{y}_2 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{y}_2 \end{bmatrix} \star \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{y}_3 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{y}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_2 \underline{F}^{23} \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{y}_2 \underline{F}^{23} \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \underline{F}^{23} \mathbf{y}_3 & \mathbf{y}_2 \underline{F}^{23} \mathbf{y}_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (67)$$

However,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_2 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{y}_2 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{y}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^T \\ \mathbf{y}_i^T \end{bmatrix} \underline{F}^{ij} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_j & \mathbf{y}_j \end{bmatrix}, \quad (68)$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{x}_2 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{y}_2 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{y}_2 \end{bmatrix} \star \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{y}_3 & \mathbf{y}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{y}_3 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_2^T \\ \mathbf{y}_2^T \end{bmatrix} \left(\underline{F}^{21} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{y}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1^T \\ -\mathbf{x}_1^T \end{bmatrix} \underline{F}^{13} \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{y}_3 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_2^T \\ \mathbf{y}_2^T \end{bmatrix} \underline{F}^{23} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_3 & \mathbf{y}_3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Since this holds for generic choices of $\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{y}_3$, we conclude that projectively

$$F^{21} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{y}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1^T \\ -\mathbf{x}_1^T \end{bmatrix} F^{13} = F^{23}, \quad (70)$$

for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1$ such that $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{y}_1 \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible. Further,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{y}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1^T \\ -\mathbf{x}_1^T \end{bmatrix} \quad (71)$$

is skew-symmetric and equals $[\ell]_{\times}$ for $\ell = -\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Choosing $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1$ such that $\ell = \underline{e}_1^2$, we have $\ell^T \underline{e}_1^2 \neq 0$ over the real numbers and it follows that $[\underline{e}_1^2 \ \mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{y}_1]$ is full-rank. In other words,

$$F^{21}[\underline{e}_1^2]_{\times} F^{13} = F^{23}, \quad (72)$$

which is what we wanted. \square

Remark D.2. In the complex setting, it does not always suffice to put $\ell = \underline{e}_1^2$, because it could be the case that $(\underline{e}_1^2)^T \underline{e}_1^2 = 0$. Then ℓ should be any vector such that $\ell^T \underline{e}_1^2 \neq 0$. One can obtain a polynomials system by vectorizing both sides of Equation (72) and setting the rank of the 2×4 matrix given by these two vectors to one. In the complex case, we get three such systems by replacing \underline{e}_1^2 with each of the unit vectors of \mathbb{C}^3 .

Proof of Theorem 5.4. It is clear that triple-wise and quadruple-wise compatibility is necessary to ensure full compatibility (the former follows from the latter), we need only show that it is sufficient.

We start with the case where all the epipoles in each image coincide and prove that triple-wise compatibility is sufficient in this case.

As in the proof of Proposition 5.8, it suffices to prove the statement for fundamental matrices

$$G^{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{ij} & b_{ij} \\ 0 & c_{ij} & d_{ij} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (73)$$

By compatibility of $\{G^{1i}, G^{1j}, G^{ij}\}$, we have by Proposition 5.8

$$G^{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{1i}c_{1j} - c_{1i}a_{1j} & a_{1i}d_{1j} - c_{1i}b_{1j} \\ 0 & b_{1i}c_{1j} - d_{1i}a_{1j} & b_{1i}d_{1j} - d_{1i}b_{1j} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (74)$$

for all $i, j \neq 1$. It can be verified that the following cameras P_i form a reconstruction of these fundamental matrices:

$$P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_i = \begin{bmatrix} i & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_{1i} & d_{1i} \\ 0 & 0 & -a_{1i} & -c_{1i} \end{bmatrix}, \forall i \neq 1. \quad (75)$$

Hence the $\binom{n}{2}$ -tuple is compatible whenever each triple is compatible. We also observe that all cameras have a center lying on the line $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, 0, 0]$.

Now assume that in some image, not all epipoles coincide. The statement in this case follows from [13, Theorem 2], but we give a proof here for completeness. We prove the theorem for the case $n = 5$ and note that the principle extends to any n .

Choose a 4-tuple for which not all epipoles in each image is the same, say $S_{1234} = \{F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{14}, F^{23}, F^{24}, F^{34}\}$. Let P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 be a solution. The centers of these cameras are not collinear, indeed at most one triple, say P_2, P_3, P_4 , can be collinear. Let P'_1, P'_2, P'_3, P_5 be a solution to $S_{1235} = \{F^{12}, F^{13}, F^{15}, F^{23}, F^{25}, F^{35}\}$. By Lemma 2.2, we have that P_1, P_2, P_3 and P'_1, P'_2, P'_3 differ by PGL_4 , and we may therefore assume them to be equal.

It remains to prove that F^{45} is the fundamental matrix of P_4, P_5 . For this we note that either 1) P_1, P_2, P_5 or 2) P_1, P_3, P_5 are not collinear cameras, since P_1, P_2, P_3 are not collinear. In the first case 1), consider the tuple $S_{1245} = \{F^{12}, F^{14}, F^{15}, F^{24}, F^{25}, F^{45}\}$ with solution $P''_1, P''_2, P''_4, P''_5$. By Lemma 2.2, the overlap between S_{1235} and S_{1245} imply that we can via PGL_4 action assume $P''_1 = P_1, P''_2 = P_2, P''_5 = P_5$, and the overlap between S_{1234} and S_{1245} imply that we can also assume $P''_4 = P_4$. But since F^{45} is the fundamental matrix of P''_4, P''_5 we conclude that it is also the fundamental matrix of P_4, P_5 . In the second case 2) the argument is analogous when we consider S_{1345} instead of S_{1245} . \square

D.2 K_4

Theorem 5.10 (Case 1). Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a sextuple of fundamental matrices such that the three epipoles in each image do not lie on a line. Then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if the triple-wise conditions hold and

$$\mathbf{e}_{4123}\mathbf{e}_{2134}\mathbf{e}_{3142}\mathbf{e}_{4231}\mathbf{e}_{1243}\mathbf{e}_{2341} = \mathbf{e}_{3124}\mathbf{e}_{4132}\mathbf{e}_{2143}\mathbf{e}_{1234}\mathbf{e}_{3241}\mathbf{e}_{1342}. \quad (76)$$

Proof. The triple-wise conditions are clearly necessary for compatibility, so we assume that they are satisfied and prove that in this case compatibility is equivalent to Equation (76) being satisfied. We begin by simplifying the problem. Let

$$\underline{H}_i = [\underline{e}_i^j \ \underline{e}_i^k \ \underline{e}_i^l]. \quad (77)$$

This 3×3 matrix is of full rank and takes the unit vectors to the three epipoles in the i -th image. Using this as our fundamental action, we get a new sextuple of fundamental matrices

$$\underline{G}^{ij} = \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j. \quad (78)$$

Since the fundamental action preserves compatibility, the sextuple $\{\underline{G}^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if $\{F^{ij}\}$ is. Note that the epipoles of \underline{G}^{ij} are as follows, we denote them by h :

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{h}_1^2 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_2^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_3^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_4^1 &= [1, 0, 0], \\ \underline{h}_1^3 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_2^3 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_3^2 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_4^2 &= [0, 1, 0], \\ \underline{h}_1^4 &= [0, 0, 1], & \underline{h}_2^4 &= [0, 0, 1], & \underline{h}_3^4 &= [0, 0, 1], & \underline{h}_4^3 &= [0, 0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Moreover, since the G^{ij} satisfy the triple-wise conditions (we assumed F^{ij} did, and these are preserved under fundamental action) we know that the six matrices must be on the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{G}^{12} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_{12} \\ 0 & y_{12} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{13} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y_{13} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{14} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{14} \\ 0 & y_{14} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \underline{G}^{23} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ y_{23} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{24} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{24} \\ y_{24} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{34} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x_{34} & 0 \\ y_{34} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

The sextuple $\{G^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if there exists a reconstruction consisting of 4 cameras P_i . We are free to choose coordinates in \mathbb{P}^3 without affecting compatibility. Assuming cameras exist, we take the four camera centers to be the four unit vectors (such a choice is only possible if the four camera centers do not lie in a plane, but the fact that the epipoles do not lie on a line ensures that any reconstruction must have non-coplanar camera centers). Furthermore, by the definition of the epipole, we know that the cameras must satisfy

$$P_i(\ker(P_j)) = e_i^j. \quad (81)$$

So if $\{G^{ij}\}$ has a reconstruction $\{P_i\}$, it must be on the form:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \alpha_1^1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_1^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_1^3 \end{bmatrix}, & P_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_2^1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_2^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_2^3 \end{bmatrix}, \\ P_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_3^1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_3^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3^3 \end{bmatrix}, & P_4 &= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_4^1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_4^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_4^3 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where α_i^j are scalars. Since the fundamental matrices are of rank 2 and the cameras of rank 3, all the α_i^j , as well as the x_{ij} and y_{ij} are nonzero. Computing the fundamental matrices of these four cameras, and setting them equal to the G^{ij} , we get the following six equations:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{12}\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^3 &= y_{12}\alpha_1^3\alpha_2^2, & x_{13}\alpha_1^1\alpha_3^3 &= y_{13}\alpha_1^3\alpha_3^2, & x_{14}\alpha_1^1\alpha_4^3 &= y_{14}\alpha_1^2\alpha_4^2, \\ x_{23}\alpha_2^1\alpha_3^3 &= y_{23}\alpha_2^3\alpha_3^1, & x_{24}\alpha_2^1\alpha_4^3 &= y_{24}\alpha_2^2\alpha_4^1, & x_{34}\alpha_3^1\alpha_4^2 &= y_{34}\alpha_3^2\alpha_4^1. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Eliminating the variables α_i^j , for instance as in the attached code, we are left with a single polynomial,

$$x_{12}y_{13}x_{14}x_{23}y_{24}x_{34} - y_{12}x_{13}y_{14}y_{23}x_{24}y_{34} = 0. \quad (84)$$

This tells us that Equation (83) implies Equation (84), and we are left to argue that if x_{ij}, y_{ij} are non-zero numbers such that Equation (84) holds, then there are non-zero α_i^j such that Equation (83) holds. Note that we can assume $\alpha_1^1 = 1$ by PGL_4 action and that $\alpha_1^i = 1$ by scaling. Writing $\lambda_{ij} = x_{ij}/y_{ij}$, we then aim to find non-zero α_i^j such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{12}\alpha_2^3 &= \alpha_2^2, & \lambda_{13}\alpha_3^3 &= \alpha_3^2, & \lambda_{14}\alpha_4^3 &= \alpha_4^2, \\ \lambda_{23}\alpha_3^3 &= \alpha_2^3, & \lambda_{24}\alpha_4^3 &= \alpha_2^2, & \lambda_{34}\alpha_4^2 &= \alpha_3^2. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

It is clear that we can find non-zero α_i^j that solve the first five equations. However, this is enough because using $\lambda_{12}\lambda_{14}\lambda_{23}\lambda_{34} = \lambda_{13}\lambda_{24}$, the sixth equation $\lambda_{34}\alpha_4^2 = \alpha_3^2$ is implied by the other five through substitution.

It follows that the set $\{G^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if Equation (84) is satisfied. Finally, we can express the x_{ij} and y_{ij} in terms of \underline{F}^{ij} and \underline{e}_i^j , for instance we have

$$x_{12} = (\underline{h}_1^3)^T \underline{G}^{12} \underline{h}_2^4 = (\underline{h}_1^3)^T \underline{H}_1^T \underline{F}^{12} \underline{H}_2 \underline{h}_2^4 = (\underline{e}_1^3)^T \underline{F}^{12} \underline{e}_2^4. \quad (86)$$

Making these substitutions for all the x_{ij} and y_{ij} , we get Equation (76), which is homogeneous in every epipole and fundamental matrix. \square

Theorem 5.12 (Case 2). *Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a sextuple of fundamental matrices whose epipoles in each image are distinct and lie on a line. Then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if the triple-wise conditions hold,*

$$\langle F^{jk} e_k^i, F^{jl} e_l^i \rangle \langle F^{kj} e_j^i, F^{kl} e_l^i \rangle \langle F^{lj} e_j^i, F^{lk} e_k^i \rangle + \|F^{lj} e_j^i\|^2 \|F^{jk} e_k^i\|^2 \|F^{kl} e_l^i\|^2 = 0, \quad (87)$$

for all distinct i, j, k, l satisfying $l > k > j$, and for

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = F^{12} e_2^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 = F^{21} e_1^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_3 = F^{31} e_1^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_4 = F^{41} e_1^3, \quad (88)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{e_3^2 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^2} - \frac{e_2^3 F^{24} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} \mathbf{x}_2}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{24} e_4^1 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} e_2^3} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4}{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1} \\ & + \frac{e_3^2 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4 e_1^2 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{14} \mathbf{x}_4}{e_1^2 F^{14} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^2 \mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{24} \mathbf{x}_4}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{24} e_4^1} + \frac{e_3^1 F^{34} \mathbf{x}_4 \mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_3 F^{34} e_4^1 \mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^1} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

Proof. Like in the previous proof, we begin by assuming the triple-wise conditions are satisfied and then simplify the problem. The three epipoles in each image lie on a line, we fix a scaling such that for each i we have $\underline{e}_i^l = \underline{e}_i^j + \underline{e}_i^k$, where $l > k > j$. Let

$$\underline{H}_i = [\underline{e}_i^j \ \underline{e}_i^k \ \mathbf{x}_i], \quad (90)$$

where \mathbf{x}_i is chosen in such a way that H_i is of full rank. Using this as our fundamental action, we get a new sextuple of fundamental matrices

$$\underline{G}^{ij} = \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j. \quad (91)$$

Since the fundamental action preserves compatibility, the sextuple $\{G^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if $\{F^{ij}\}$ is. Note that the epipoles of G^{ij} are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{h}_1^2 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_2^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_3^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_4^1 &= [1, 0, 0], \\ \underline{h}_1^3 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_2^3 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_3^2 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_4^2 &= [0, 1, 0], \\ \underline{h}_1^4 &= [1, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_2^4 &= [1, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_3^4 &= [1, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_4^3 &= [1, 1, 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

With these epipoles and the fact that the G^{ij} satisfy the triple-wise conditions (we assumed F^{ij} did, and these are preserved under fundamental action), we know that the six matrices must be on the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{G}^{12} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_{12} \\ 0 & y_{12} & z_{12} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{13} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y_{13} & z_{13} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{14} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & -x_{14} \\ 0 & y_{14} & z_{14} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \underline{G}^{23} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ y_{23} & 0 & z_{23} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{24} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{24} \\ 0 & 0 & -x_{24} \\ y_{24} & 0 & z_{24} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{34} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{34} \\ 0 & 0 & -x_{34} \\ y_{34} & -y_{34} & z_{34} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

The sextuple $\{G^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if there exists a reconstruction consisting of 4 cameras P_i . Since the three epipoles in each image are collinear, any such reconstruction must consist of four cameras whose camera centers all lie in the same plane. We are free to choose coordinates in \mathbb{P}^3 without changing the fundamental matrices, so we take the four camera centers (assuming they exist) to be $[1, 0, 0, 0]$, $[0, 1, 0, 0]$, $[0, 0, 1, 0]$, and $[1, 1, 1, 0]$. Furthermore, by the definition of the epipole, we know that the cameras must satisfy

$$P_i(\ker(P_j)) = e_i^j. \quad (94)$$

So if $\{G^{ij}\}$ has a reconstruction $\{P_i\}$, it must be on the form:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \alpha_1^1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \alpha_2^1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3^1 \end{bmatrix}, & P_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_1^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \alpha_2^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3^2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ P_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_1^3 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \alpha_2^3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3^3 \end{bmatrix}, & P_4 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & \alpha_1^4 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & \alpha_2^4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3^4 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where the α_i^j are scalars. Since the fundamental matrices are of rank 2 and the cameras of rank 3, the four scalars α_i^3 , as well as all the x_{ij} and y_{ij} are nonzero. Computing the fundamental matrices of these four cameras, and setting them equal to the G^{ij} , we get the following set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x_{12}}{y_{12}} &= -\frac{\alpha_1^3}{\alpha_2^3}, & \frac{x_{13}}{y_{13}} &= -\frac{\alpha_1^3}{\alpha_3^3}, & \frac{x_{14}}{y_{14}} &= -\frac{\alpha_1^3}{\alpha_4^3}, \\ \frac{x_{23}}{y_{23}} &= -\frac{\alpha_2^3}{\alpha_3^3}, & \frac{x_{24}}{y_{24}} &= -\frac{\alpha_2^3}{\alpha_4^3}, & \frac{x_{34}}{y_{34}} &= -\frac{\alpha_3^3}{\alpha_4^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{z_{12}}{y_{12}} &= \frac{\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2}{\alpha_2^3}, & \frac{z_{13}}{y_{13}} &= \frac{\alpha_1^1 - \alpha_3^2}{\alpha_3^3}, & \frac{z_{14}}{y_{14}} &= \frac{\alpha_1^1 - \alpha_1^2 - \alpha_4^2}{\alpha_4^3}, \\ \frac{z_{23}}{y_{23}} &= \frac{\alpha_2^1 - \alpha_3^1}{\alpha_3^3}, & \frac{z_{24}}{y_{24}} &= \frac{\alpha_2^1 - \alpha_2^2 - \alpha_4^1}{\alpha_4^3}, & \frac{z_{34}}{y_{34}} &= \frac{\alpha_3^1 + \alpha_4^2 - \alpha_3^2 - \alpha_4^1}{\alpha_4^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

Eliminating the α_i^j , as done in the attached code, from these equations gives us the following constraints:

$$\frac{x_{12} x_{23}}{y_{12} y_{23}} = -\frac{x_{13}}{y_{13}}, \quad \frac{x_{12} x_{24}}{y_{12} y_{24}} = -\frac{x_{14}}{y_{14}}, \quad \frac{x_{13} x_{34}}{y_{13} y_{34}} = -\frac{x_{14}}{y_{14}}, \quad \frac{x_{23} x_{34}}{y_{23} y_{34}} = -\frac{x_{24}}{y_{24}}, \quad (98)$$

and

$$\frac{x_{24} z_{12}}{y_{24} y_{12}} - \frac{x_{34} z_{13}}{y_{34} y_{13}} + \frac{x_{34} z_{23}}{y_{34} y_{23}} - \frac{z_{14}}{y_{14}} + \frac{z_{24}}{y_{24}} - \frac{z_{34}}{y_{34}} = 0. \quad (99)$$

This tells us that [Equations \(96\)](#) and [\(97\)](#) imply [Equations \(98\)](#) and [\(99\)](#), and we now argue that if x_{ij}, z_{ij}, y_{ij} are such that x_{ij}, y_{ij} are non-zero numbers and [Equations \(98\)](#) and [\(99\)](#) hold, then there are α_i^j such that α_i^3 are non-zero and [Equations \(96\)](#) and [\(97\)](#) hold. By inspection there clearly exists such α_i^j for which the 3 equations of [Equation \(115\)](#)

involving x_{12}, x_{23}, x_{24} and Equation (116) not involving z_{34} are satisfied. However, the remaining 4 equations are implied by Equations (98) and (99) through substitution.

The fundamental matrices are therefore compatible if and only if Equations (98) and (99) are satisfied. Let k be the smallest index satisfying $k \neq i, j$, then by construction

$$\begin{aligned} x_{ij} &= \underline{e}_i^k \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_j, \\ y_{ij} &= \mathbf{x}_i \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{e}_j^k, \\ z_{ij} &= \mathbf{x}_i \underline{F}^{ij} \mathbf{x}_j. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Making the following choices of \mathbf{x}_i ,

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = F^{12} e_2^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 = F^{21} e_1^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_3 = F^{31} e_1^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_4 = F^{41} e_1^3, \quad (101)$$

ensures that \underline{H}_i are full-rank. In the case of $i = 1$, this follows directly from the fact that by Lemma 3.5, $F^{12} e_2^4 = e_1^2 \times e_1^4$, which further equals $e_1^2 \times e_1^3$, and $e_1^2, e_1^3, e_1^2 \times e_1^3$ are three linearly independent vectors. Further, with this choice of \mathbf{x}_i , Equation (99) is equivalent to Equation (89).

Now we focus on the first equality of Equation (98). It is equivalent to

$$\frac{\underline{e}_1^3 \underline{F}^{12} \mathbf{x}_2 \underline{e}_2^1 \underline{F}^{23} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \underline{e}_2^3 \mathbf{x}_2 \underline{F}^{23} \underline{e}_3^1} + \frac{\underline{e}_1^2 \underline{F}^{13} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \underline{e}_3^2} = 0. \quad (102)$$

This equation is not homogeneous in every epipole, but using the identities $\underline{e}_i^l = \underline{e}_i^j + \underline{e}_i^k$, we can rewrite Equation (102) to

$$\frac{\mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{13} \underline{e}_3^4 \mathbf{x}_2 \underline{F}^{21} \underline{e}_1^4}{\mathbf{x}_1 \underline{F}^{12} \underline{e}_2^4 \mathbf{x}_2 \underline{F}^{23} \underline{e}_3^4} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_3 \underline{F}^{31} \underline{e}_1^4}{\mathbf{x}_3 \underline{F}^{32} \underline{e}_2^4} = 0. \quad (103)$$

It is clear that if Equation (103) holds for one choice of \mathbf{x}_i making the denominators non-zero, then this equations holds for all \mathbf{x}_i making the denominators non-zero. Therefore, we can make another of \mathbf{x}_i for Equation (98) (which we do because it makes the equations look nicer). Pluggin in

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = F^{12} e_2^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 = F^{23} e_3^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_3 = F^{13} e_3^4, \quad (104)$$

into Equation (103), we get the equation of Equation (87) corresponding to $i = 4$. Analogously we arrive at the other three equations of Equation (87).

In summary, we have proven Equation (104) satisfy Equations (98) and (99) if and only if $\{G^{ij}\}$ and therefore $\{F^{ij}\}$ are compatible. In addition, we argued that this still holds if we make different choice of \mathbf{x}_i in Equation (98) that correspond to Equation (87). \square

Remark D.3. In the complex setting, we cannot always put $\mathbf{x}_i = F^{ij} e_j^l$, because there is no longer any guarantee that this makes \underline{H}_i invertible. For fixed complex F^{ij} , one can check if they are compatible in Case 2 instead by choosing any \mathbf{x}_i that make \underline{H}_i invertible. The same principle applies in Case 3.

Theorem 5.14 (Case 3). Let $\{F^{ij}\}$ be a sextuple of fundamental matrices such that

$$e_1^2 = e_1^3 \neq e_1^4, \quad e_2^1 = e_2^3 \neq e_2^4, \quad e_3^1 = e_3^2 \neq e_3^4, \quad (105)$$

and e_4^1, e_4^2, e_4^3 are distinct and lie on a line. Then $\{F^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if the triple-wise conditions hold,

$$\langle F^{12} e_2^4, F^{13} e_3^4 \rangle \langle F^{21} e_1^4, F^{23} e_3^4 \rangle \langle F^{31} e_1^4, F^{32} e_2^4 \rangle + \|F^{12} e_2^4\|^2 \|F^{23} e_3^4\|^2 \|F^{31} e_1^4\|^2 = 0, \quad (106)$$

and for

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = F^{12} e_2^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 = F^{23} e_3^4, \quad \mathbf{x}_3 = F^{31} e_1^4, \quad (107)$$

we have

$$\frac{e_2^4 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} \mathbf{x}_2}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} e_2^4} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^4} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^4} = 0. \quad (108)$$

Proof. Like in the two previous proofs, we begin by assuming the triple-wise conditions are satisfied since we know them to be necessary and then we simplify the problem. Let

$$\underline{H}_i = [\underline{e}_i^j \ \underline{e}_i^l \ \mathbf{x}_i], \quad (109)$$

for $l > k > j$ and \mathbf{x}_i making H_i invertible, and

$$\underline{G}^{ij} = \underline{H}_i^T \underline{F}^{ij} \underline{H}_j. \quad (110)$$

The fundamental matrices G^{ij} are compatible if and only if F^{ij} are. Note that the epipoles of G^{ij} are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{h}_1^2 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_2^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_3^1 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_4^1 &= [1, 0, 0], \\ \underline{h}_1^3 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_2^3 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_3^2 &= [1, 0, 0], & \underline{h}_4^2 &= [0, 1, 0], \\ \underline{h}_1^4 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_2^4 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_3^4 &= [0, 1, 0], & \underline{h}_4^3 &= [1, 1, 0]. \end{aligned}$$

With these epipoles and the fact that the G^{ij} satisfy the triple-wise conditions (preserved under fundamental action), we know that the six matrices must be on the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{G}^{12} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_{12} \\ 0 & y_{12} & z_{12} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{13} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_{13} \\ 0 & y_{13} & z_{13} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{14} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y_{14} & z_{14} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \underline{G}^{23} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_{23} \\ 0 & y_{23} & z_{23} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{24} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{24} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ y_{24} & 0 & z_{24} \end{bmatrix}, & \underline{G}^{34} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & x_{34} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ y_{34} & -y_{34} & z_{34} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

By [Proposition 5.8](#), we must have (up to scale)

$$\underline{G}^{23} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -y_{12}x_{13} \\ 0 & x_{12}y_{13} & x_{12}z_{13} - x_{13}z_{12} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (112)$$

The sextuple $\{G^{ij}\}$ is compatible if and only if there exists a reconstruction consisting of 4 cameras P_i . Since the three epipoles in each image are collinear, any such reconstruction must consist of four cameras whose camera centers lie in the same plane. Furthermore, since two epipoles coincide in the first three images, the centers of P_1, P_2, P_3 must lie on a line. We are free to choose coordinates in \mathbb{P}^3 without changing the fundamental matrices, so we take the four camera centers (assuming they exist) to be $[1, 0, 0, 0]$, $[0, 1, 0, 0]$, $[1, 1, 0, 0]$, and $[0, 0, 1, 0]$. Furthermore, by the definition of the epipole, we know that the cameras must satisfy

$$P_i(\ker(P_j)) = e_i^j. \quad (113)$$

So if $\{G^{ij}\}$ has a reconstruction $\{P_i\}$, it must be on the form:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \alpha_1^1 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta_1 & \alpha_1^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_1^3 \end{bmatrix}, & P_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_2^1 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta_2 & \alpha_2^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_2^3 \end{bmatrix}, \\ P_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & \alpha_3^1 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta_3 & \alpha_3^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3^3 \end{bmatrix}, & P_4 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_4^1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \alpha_4^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_4^3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

where the β_i, α_i^j are scalars. Since the fundamental matrices are of rank 2 and the cameras of rank 3, the four scalars α_i^3 , as well as all the β_i, x_{ij} and y_{ij} are nonzero. Computing the fundamental matrices of these four cameras, and setting them equal to the G^{ij} , we get the following two set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x_{12}}{y_{12}} &= -\frac{\alpha_1^3\beta_2}{\alpha_2^3\beta_1}, & \frac{x_{13}}{y_{13}} &= -\frac{\alpha_1^3\beta_3}{\alpha_3^3\beta_1}, & \frac{x_{14}}{y_{14}} &= -\frac{\alpha_1^3}{\alpha_4^3}, \\ \frac{x_{23}}{y_{23}} &= -\frac{\alpha_2^3\beta_3}{\alpha_3^3\beta_2}, & \frac{x_{24}}{y_{24}} &= -\frac{\alpha_2^3}{\alpha_4^3}, & \frac{x_{34}}{y_{34}} &= -\frac{\alpha_3^3}{\alpha_4^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{z_{12}}{y_{12}} &= \frac{\alpha_1^2\beta_2 - \alpha_2^2\beta_1}{\alpha_2^3\beta_1}, & \frac{z_{13}}{y_{13}} &= \frac{\alpha_1^2\beta_3 - \alpha_3^2\beta_1}{\alpha_3^3\beta_1}, & \frac{z_{14}}{y_{14}} &= \frac{\alpha_1^1 - \alpha_4^2}{\alpha_4^3}, \\ \frac{z_{23}}{y_{23}} &= \frac{\alpha_2^2\beta_3 - \alpha_3^2\beta_2}{\alpha_3^3\beta_2}, & \frac{z_{24}}{y_{24}} &= \frac{\alpha_2^1 - \alpha_4^1}{\alpha_4^3}, & \frac{z_{34}}{y_{34}} &= \frac{\alpha_3^1 - \alpha_4^1 + \alpha_4^2}{\alpha_4^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

After eliminating α_i^j and β_i , as in the attached code, we are left with

$$x_{12}x_{23}y_{13} + x_{13}y_{12}y_{23} = 0, \quad (117)$$

and

$$\frac{x_{23}}{y_{23}} \frac{z_{12}}{y_{12}} + \frac{z_{13}}{y_{13}} - \frac{z_{23}}{y_{23}} = 0. \quad (118)$$

This tells us that [Equations \(115\)](#) and [\(116\)](#) imply [Equations \(117\)](#) and [\(118\)](#), and we now argue that if x_{ij}, z_{ij}, y_{ij} are such that x_{ij}, y_{ij} are non-zero numbers and [Equations \(117\)](#) and [\(118\)](#) hold, then there are α_i^j and β_i such that α_i^3, β_i are non-zero and [Equations \(115\)](#) and [\(116\)](#) hold. Now by inspection there clearly exists α_i^j and β_i for which the 10 equations of [Equations \(115\)](#) and [\(116\)](#) not involving x_{13}, y_{13}, z_{13} are satisfied. However, the final two equations are implied by the other 10 via substitution using [Equations \(117\)](#) and [\(118\)](#).

[Equations \(117\)](#) and [\(118\)](#) are homogeneous in every fundamental matrix and epipole:

$$\frac{e_1^4 F^{12} \mathbf{x}_2 e_2^4 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} e_2^4 \mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^4} + \frac{e_1^4 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^4} = 0, \quad (119)$$

and

$$\frac{e_2^4 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} \mathbf{x}_2}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^4 \mathbf{x}_1 F^{12} e_2^4} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_1 F^{13} e_3^4} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} \mathbf{x}_3}{\mathbf{x}_2 F^{23} e_3^4} = 0. \quad (120)$$

Setting \mathbf{x}_i as in [Equation \(107\)](#), we have that H_i are full-rank matrices by [Lemma 3.5](#). And with this choice of \mathbf{x}_i , [Equations \(119\)](#) and [\(120\)](#) become [Equations \(106\)](#) and [\(108\)](#) respectively, proving that these are necessary and sufficient to ensure compatibility. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.3. We first prove it for $n = 4$ in the non-collinear case and for $n = 3$ in the collinear case. In each of the four cases, we prove that the eigenvalue condition of Theorem 5.2 is implied by the other conditions.

Consider first Case 1: In the proof of Theorem 5.10 we show that in this case any six-tuple of compatible fundamental matrices can up to fundamental action be written as Equation (80). We create the 12×12 four-view fundamental matrix \mathbf{G} corresponding to them. In Macaulay2, we consider the ideal I generated by the 7×7 minors of \mathbf{G} , where we first multiply \underline{G}^{23} , \underline{G}^{24} and \underline{G}^{34} by indeterminates λ_{23} , λ_{24} and λ_{34} respectively. After saturation and elimination of λ_{ij} , as in the attached code, we are left with Equation (84), meaning that any fundamental matrices on the form Equation (80), satisfy Equation (84). In the proof of Theorem 5.10, we prove that for fundamental matrices on the form Equation (80), Equation (84) is equivalent to compatibility, which suffices.

Cases 2 and 3 are proven analogously.

For the collinear case, Case 4, we instead create the 9×9 three-view fundamental matrix \mathbf{G} according to Equation (58). In Macaulay2, we consider the ideal I generated by 5×5 minors of \mathbf{G} , where we first multiply \underline{G}^{23} by the indeterminate λ . After saturation and elimination of λ , we get the same ideal as the ideal generated by the projective equalities $G^{21}[h_1^2]G^{13} = G^{23}$, $G^{21}[h_2^1]G^{23} = G^{13}$ and $G^{31}[h_1^2]G^{32} = G^{12}$, as seen in the attached code. However, by Proposition 5.8, three fundamental matrices satisfy the equations of the latter ideal precisely if they are compatible in the collinear case.

Now consider the non-collinear case for arbitrary $n \geq 4$. Let \underline{F}^{ij} be scaled such that the n -view fundamental matrix \mathbf{F} is of rank 6 and the rank of the $3 \times 3n$ matrix that is the first three rows of \mathbf{F} is rank 3. We prove that these conditions alone are enough to ensure compatibility of $\{F^{ij}\}$. Note that we can find two fundamental matrices F^{1i}, F^{1j} such that the 3×6 matrix $[F^{1i} \ F^{1j}]$ is rank 3. Fix those two indices i, j . Let $\mathbf{F}_{i,j,k,l}$ be the 4-view fundamental matrix corresponding to indices i, j, k, l for two other indices k, l . Then $\text{rank } \mathbf{F}_{i,j,k,l} = 6$ is implied by $\text{rank } \mathbf{F} = 6$. Since the eigenvalue condition of Theorem 5.4 can be dropped in the case of $n = 4$, this guarantees that the six fundamental matrices corresponding to i, j, k, l are compatible. If all such six tuples of fundamental matrices with fixed i, j are compatible, then [13, Theorem 2], which is a more general statement than Theorem 5.4, shows that the complete set of fundamental matrices are compatible.

Finally we consider the collinear case for arbitrary $n \geq 4$. Let \underline{F}^{ij} be scaled such that the n -view fundamental matrix \mathbf{F} is of rank 4. We prove that these conditions alone are enough to ensure compatibility of $\{F^{ij}\}$. Let $\mathbf{F}_{i,j,k}$ be the 3-view fundamental matrix corresponding to indices i, j, k . Then $\text{rank } \mathbf{F}_{i,j,k} = 4$ is implied by $\text{rank } \mathbf{F} = 4$. Since the eigenvalue condition of Theorem 5.4 can be dropped in the case of $n = 3$, this guarantees that the six fundamental matrices corresponding to i, j, k are compatible. If all such three tuples of fundamental matrices are compatible, then Theorem 5.4 shows that the complete set of fundamental matrices are compatible. \square

E Image of the Fundamental Map

Proposition 6.1. *The viewing graph variety of K_n for $n \geq 3$ is a proper subset of the variety in $(\mathbb{P}^{3 \times 3})^{\binom{n}{2}}$ defined by the $3 \binom{n}{3}$ triple-wise constraints and the $\binom{n}{4}$ quadruple-wise constraints of Theorem 5.10.*

Proof. We do the proof for K_3 , but note that our counterexample below can be directly extended to any K_n .

The Euclidean closure of the set of rank 3 matrices of different centers in $(\mathbb{P}^{3 \times 4})^3$ is all of $(\mathbb{P}^{3 \times 4})^3$. Then since \mathcal{V}_{K_3} is the Euclidean closure of $\text{Im } \Psi_{\mathcal{G}}$, any element of its elements can be arbitrarily approximated by the image of full-rank cameras. We give an example showing that the triple-wise constraints are not enough to describe \mathcal{V}_{K_3} by finding an element that cannot be approximated in the way described above. Consider the following example:

$$F^{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, F^{13} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (121)$$

We can assume P_1, P_2 to be $[I|0]$ and $P_2 = [I|(0; 0; -1)]$. Then the following are the options for P_3 :

$$P_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 1+b & c & d \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (122)$$

for any a, b, c, d such that $d \neq 0$. We get that

$$F^{23} = \psi(P_2, P_3) = \begin{bmatrix} a & -1 & c+d \\ b+1 & 0 & 0 \\ -d & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (123)$$

This matrix is rank-two if and only if $d \neq 0, b \neq -1$. Any such choice gives a triplet satisfying the triple-wise conditions. Also F^{12}, F^{13}, S^{23} satisfy the triple-wise constraints, where

$$S^{23} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (124)$$

because the epipole of a rank 1 matrix is 0.

Now any arbitrarily small perturbation of F^{12} and F^{13} leads to an arbitrarily small change in the choice of F^{23} from Equation (123). But no small perturbation of Equation (123) equals S^{23} , which shows that F^{12}, F^{13}, S^{23} does not lie in \mathcal{V}_{K_3} and we are done. \square