BILTS: A novel bi-invariant local trajectory-shape descriptor for rigid-body motion

Arno Verduyn^{1,2,†}, Erwin Aertbeliën^{1,2,†}, Glenn Maes¹, Joris De Schutter^{1,2} and Maxim Vochten^{1,2}

Abstract-Measuring the similarity between motions and established motion models is crucial for motion analysis, recognition, generation, and adaptation. To enhance similarity measurement across diverse contexts, invariant motion descriptors have been proposed. However, for rigid-body motion, few invariant descriptors exist that are bi-invariant, meaning invariant to both the body and world reference frames used to describe the motion. Moreover, their robustness to singularities is limited. This paper introduces a novel Bi-Invariant Local Trajectory-Shape descriptor (BILTS) and a corresponding dissimilarity measure. Mathematical relationships between BILTS and existing descriptors are derived, providing new insights into their properties. The paper also includes an algorithm to reproduce the motion from the BILTS descriptor, demonstrating its bidirectionality and usefulness for trajectory generation. Experimental validation using datasets of daily-life activities shows the higher robustness of the BILTS descriptor compared to the bi-invariant ISA descriptor. This higher robustness supports the further application of biinvariant descriptors for motion recognition and generalization.

Index Terms—Invariance, Trajectory similarity, Screw theory, Rigid-body motion, Recognition, Generation

I. INTRODUCTION

N cognitive robotics and human-robot interaction there is a need to measure the similarity between new motions and previously established motion models to facilitate motion analysis and recognition, as well as robot motion generation. This paper focuses on *rigid-body motion*. Such motions are of practical interest in robotics since they include the motions of manipulated objects, end-effectors attached to robot manipulators, and segments in a kinematic chain. In this paper, we represent a rigid-body motion by its spatio-temporal trajectory, resulting in a rich and complete representation of the motion.

In dynamic and diverse environments, assessing the similarity between motion trajectories is challenging due to the impact of *diverse contexts*. Diverse contexts include different *world* frames in which the trajectory coordinates are expressed, different *body* frames to express the relative orientation and location of the moving body, and different time profiles of the performed motions. When the context is unknown and differs between executions of the same motion, the context can be considered as an undesired aspect (disturbance) that negatively affects the effective recognition of motions and the building of simple generic motion models.

A. Research focus, approach and objectives

To address the challenge of dealing with unknown and diverse contexts when assessing the similarity between motions, several approaches have been developed in the literature. We divide them into three main categories: *machine learning*, *context alignment*, and *invariant descriptor* approaches, of which Section II-A provides a brief overview.

In this paper, we focus on the invariant descriptor approach. This approach removes the context to obtain *context-invariant motion descriptors*. Descriptors that describe motions in a local way while being invariant to both the world and body reference frames are referred to as *local bi-invariant* descriptors. The advantage of leveraging such descriptors lies in their ability to describe the motion in a bi-invariant way, thereby facilitating superior generalization across diverse contexts, while still preserving the local details of the motion.

To our knowledge, the ISA descriptor [1] is the only local bi-invariant descriptor that has been applied for motion recognition, reproduction and generalization applications. However, its drawbacks include possibly unbounded values, sensitivity to sensor noise near singularities in the motion trajectory, and a limited descriptive richness, since it provides only a partial trajectory-shape description. Hence, our objective was to alleviate these drawbacks by introducing a novel local biinvariant descriptor with superior properties.

B. Paper contributions

The main contribution of this paper is the introduction of a novel *Bi-Invariant Local Trajectory Shape descriptor* (BILTS) for rigid-body motion and a corresponding dissimilarity measure. The BILTS descriptor is defined by combining the twelve instantaneous invariants in [2] based on a local Taylor series expansion of the trajectory and by introducing intuitive scaling factors. Compared to the ISA descriptor, the advantages of the BILTS descriptor include always-bounded numerical values, reduced sensitivity to sensor noise near singularities in the motion trajectory, and higher descriptive richness, since it provides a complete trajectory-shape description up to third order. Due to this richer description, ambiguity can be reduced when assessing the similarity between motions.

As an additional contribution, mathematical relationships are derived between the proposed BILTS descriptor and the invariants in [1], [2], leading to new insights in the properties of these existing descriptors. Lastly, this paper ensures that the proposed descriptor is applicable to motion recognition and reproduction. To this end, the proposed BILTS descriptor and dissimilarity measure are validated in motion recognition

This result is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 788298).

¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, KU Leuven, 3001 Leuven, Belgium.

²Flanders Make at KU Leuven, 3001 Leuven, Belgium.

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

email corresponding author: arno.verduyn@kuleuven.be

experiments based upon extensive datasets. It is shown how the BILTS descriptor outperforms the recognition performance of the ISA descriptor in [3], [4]. To prove bidirectionality, an algorithm to reproduce the original motion is provided.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II-A provides a brief literature review on the three main approaches to deal with motion similarity measurement across diverse contexts. Section II-B provides a more detailed review on local invariant trajectory-shape descriptors. Section III reviews mathematical preliminaries so that in Section IV the novel BILTS descriptor and corresponding dissimilarity measure can be introduced. Section V discusses properties and relations of the proposed descriptor. Section VI proposes a method for calculating the descriptor from trajectory coordinates and introduces an algorithm to reproduce the trajectory from its descriptor. The proposed descriptor and dissimilarity measure are experimentally validated in recognition experiments in Section VII, while Section VIII provides a discussion and conclusion.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Similarity measurement approaches

To deal with motion similarity measurement across diverse contexts, several approaches have been developed in the literature. We divide them into three main categories.

1) Machine learning approaches aim to learn general motion models from different example motions, identifying consistent salient features while disregarding variable contextual features. In these approaches, a motion is deemed similar to the learned model if it shares the same salient features. Machine learning approaches are particularly effective when abundant data is available. A drawback of these approaches is the limited extrapolation capability of the learned models, hindering generalization to contexts that are not represented in the examples. This issue can be mitigated by providing the learning algorithm with abundant motion examples in various contexts. For example, generalization across different camera viewpoints can be achieved using a multi-camera setup [5], or by mimicking different viewpoints by artificially rotating the motion examples [6]. Despite the potential, generating abundant motion examples can be laborious, especially within a robot Learning-from-Demonstration (LfD) framework, in which a limited number of demonstrations is highly desired.

2) Context alignment approaches aim to learn motion models by initially aligning the contexts of the example motions and subsequently deriving models from these aligned examples. The similarity between a new motion and the learned model is assessed by first aligning the context of the novel motion with that of the learned model and afterwards comparing the aligned motions.

Common alignment methods include *spatial alignments* to address different viewpoints and locations, and *temporal alignments* to handle different time scales and time profiles. Spatial alignment often relies on finding an affine transformation that optimally maps one motion onto another. For example, the approach in [7] searches for projection matrices to align 2D motion features, while the approach in [8] seeks orthogonal transformations to align 3D motion features. Temporal alignment involves finding the optimal time-warping path. Common algorithms include Dynamic Time Warping (DTW), Edit Distance, Longest Common Subsequence, and Fréchet Distance, with recent overviews provided in [9] and [10]. DTW appears to be the most widely used option given its implementation in many recent works [3], [4], [8], [11]–[17].

However, simultaneously aligning both spatial and temporal features poses a complex problem. For example, [18] addresses aligning two curves under scaling, Euclidean transformation, and occlusion(s), with the proposed alignment method requiring search space pruning and heuristic search methods due to computational challenges. Another drawback is that assessing the similarity of a motion with previously established motion models requires pairwise context alignments with each model. This results in long computation times, particularly when dealing with a large number of motion models. Hence, context alignment methods are particularly effective when only a small amount of data is available and the total computation cost to assess the similarity between motions is not prohibitive.

3) Invariant descriptor approaches remove the context from the example motions to obtain *context-invariant motion descriptors* from which an invariant motion model is derived. The similarity between a new motion and the invariant model is assessed by comparing the invariant description of the new motion to this model. An important advantage of this approach is that the invariant descriptor of one example motion can already be considered as a general motion model. This allows to significantly reduce the number of example motions to learn a model that can generalize across diverse contexts. For example, in [19], the reproduction of numerous motion variants from one individual invariant descriptor is shown.

Invariant descriptor methods can be classified in *global* and local approaches. The global approach aims to find a global data-driven reference frame in which to express the motion data in an invariant way, for example using a singular value decomposition [17] or least-squares optimization [20]. Global invariant approaches are particularly effective when only a small amount of data is available, the available data is segmented, and a low computation cost to evaluate the similarity between motions is required. The local approach aims to find a local invariant description of the trajectory by describing its local shape. Local approaches are particularly effective when only a small amount of data is available, the data is unsegmented, and they offer versatility for handling occlusions and performing segmentation tasks [21]. A downside of local descriptors is their sensitivity to sensor noise and singularities in the trajectory, such as a straight line part or an inflection point, making them difficult to calculate in these situations.

Originally, invariant descriptors were proposed for motion analysis and recognition applications [3], [4]. Recently, there is more attention to their use for motion reproduction [15] and adaptation applications. Descriptors that contain sufficient information to reproduce of the original trajectory from the invariant descriptor are also referred to as *complete* [1], *generative* [19], or *bidirectional* [22] descriptors. Their benefit lies in the formulation of similarity measures that are applicable to both motion recognition and generation applications.

The above three approaches to measure motion similarity

across diverse contexts are not mutually exclusive. A lot of strategies in recent works combine above approaches to cope with some of the mentioned downsides. As a first example, the approaches in [23] and [24] use invariant descriptors to decouple the context-alignment problem. That is, the temporal alignment between the curves is first found using features that are invariant to spatial transformations. Afterwards, based on the found temporal correspondence, the spatial alignment is found. As a second example, invariant descriptors are also used for dataset augmentation [25] in machine learning, such as in [19] and [26]. As a final example, the invariant descriptor approach can also be used for feature engineering, meaning the conversion of raw data into a feature vector containing invariant and contextual features, providing a richer description of the motion compared to raw data. The method in [16] combined invariant and contextual features and showed an increase in motion recognition performance, especially when motions with similar invariant features had to be distinguished.

To conclude, the three approaches (machine learning, context alignment, and invariant descriptor) have their respective requirements, advantages, and drawbacks. In this paper, we focus on the invariant descriptor approach and aim to alleviate some of its drawbacks. The benefit of alleviating the drawbacks of the invariant descriptor approach is twofold. It supports the further application of the invariant descriptor approach for motion recognition and generation in diverse contexts. Additionally, it supports the further combination with other approaches (machine learning, context alignment) to alleviate some of their mentioned drawbacks.

B. Local invariant trajectory-shape descriptors

Local trajectory-shape descriptors for point trajectories are based on separating the spatio-temporal trajectory into a spatial curve and a time profile along this curve. Fundamentals of the description of spatial curves were established in the 19th century by Frenet [27] and Serret [28], leading to the wellknown *Frenet-Serret (FS) formulas*. The FS formulas show that a complete description of a curve up to congruence can be found by defining a pair of functions, i.e., the *curvature* and *torsion*, along the curve. These functions are obtained by defining a moving reference frame, referred to as the *FS frame*, along the curve. The curvature and torsion are then obtained by differentiating this frame.

Based on the FS frame, Cartan [29] introduced *the method* of the moving frame in differential geometry for the local examination of submanifolds of various homogeneous spaces. The aim of this method is to provide the submanifold and all its geometrical objects with the most general moving frame. By differentiating this frame, *differential invariants* are obtained that characterize the submanifold apart from transformations embedding it in the surrounding homogeneous space.

Bishop [30] defined another moving frame along a spatial curve as a more robust alternative to the Frenet-Serret frame. The resulting frame is referred to as the *Bishop frame* or *rotation-minimizing frame*, since it minimizes the rotation of the frame along the curve. However, the Bishop frame is not a true *local* frame since it depends on the curve's history.

The FS invariants are best known to describe the trajectory of a moving point in Euclidean space. Nevertheless, similar invariants can be derived for the description of the orientation trajectory of a rotating body. This extension is proposed in [13], where the *extended FS invariants* for rigid-body motion are introduced. This extension consists of the definition of two FS frames, one for rotation and one for translation.

The descriptor in [13] is a *left-invariant* descriptor [31]. That is, it is invariant to the viewpoint, but it still depends on a user-selected reference point to define the translational velocity of the body. This requires some knowledge of the user about the type of motion and the points of interest on the moving body. Another downside of this descriptor is that a high dissimilarity might be detected between similar rigid-body motions with different reference points.

The dependency on the reference point for translation can be removed by making use of *screw theory* [32] such that the descriptor becomes both left- and right-invariant, also referred to as *bi-invariant* [31]. From the work of Chasles [33], it is known that the first-order kinematics of a moving body can be described in a bi-invariant way by its rotation and translation along the *instantaneous screw axis (ISA)*. The location and orientation of the ISA in space can be represented in multiple ways, including *Plücker coordinates* and *dual numbers*.

Based on dual numbers, the author of [34] derived a biinvariant moving frame for rigid-body motion. This moving frame has the same orientation as the FS-frame for orientation in [13], while its origin coincides with the *striction point* on the ISA. Differentiating this moving frame results in a set of four differential invariants. Two invariants describe the rotation of the moving frame, while the other two describe its translation.

De Schutter [1] observed that above four differential invariants can be augmented with two additional invariants, describing the rotation and translation of the body along the ISA, to form the *minimal and complete* ISA descriptor for rigid-body trajectories. The ISA descriptor is *complete* since it completely describes the evolution of the moving frame and contains just enough information to reproduce the original trajectory of the rigid body up to congruence. In [4] and [3] it is shown how the ISA descriptor can be used to define a similarity measure for motion recognition applications. However, the recognition performance of the ISA descriptor remained limited due to its sensitivity to singularities [13].

Veldkamp [35] and Bottema and Roth [2] observed that above moving frame can also be used as a local reference frame to characterize the kinematics of any point on the moving body in an invariant way. Modeling the kinematics of these points up to first order requires two invariants, the second order requires four additional invariants, and the third require six additional invariants. These twelve invariants are referred to as the *instantaneous invariants for spatial motion* and provide a *complete* description of the trajectory shape up to third order. However, in [35] and [2], no corresponding similarity measures were devised and an approach to reproduce the original motion from the invariants was not discussed.

Recent works [3], [4], [11]–[14], [19], [22], [36]–[39] propose approaches based on local trajectory-shape descriptors for the recognition and generation of trajectories in diverse

contexts. Aimed at practical applications, multiple methods have been developed to robustly calculate the differential invariants in the presence of sensor noise and singularities. In [11], [12], the calculation of higher-order derivatives is avoided by approximating the differential invariants using finite differences [40]. In [3], [4], [13] Kalman smoothers are used to robustly estimate higher-order derivatives from noisy measurement data. In [22], discretized invariants are introduced as an alternative to differential invariants by describing the relation between subsequent moving frames using Denavit-Hartenberg parameters. In [14], [36], [37], integral invariants are used to approximate the differential invariants for point trajectories. Integral invariants are found by calculating area integrals on the osculating and rectifying planes, which are locally determined by the Frenet-Serret frame. The domain of integration is restricted to a local region based on a ball kernel centered at the moving point. In [38], [39], differential invariants are calculated by formulating an optimization problem over a window of measurements. This approach ensures a smooth solution for the moving frame by minimizing corresponding regularization terms, and guarantees a driftless trajectory reconstruction by additionally limiting the trajectory reconstruction error.

To conclude, recent approaches apply invariant descriptors for the recognition and generation of trajectories in diverse contexts. However, the performance of these invariant descriptors is typically limited due to their sensitivity to singularities. Furthermore, to our knowledge, the ISA descriptor is the only bi-invariant descriptor for rigid-body motion that has been applied for trajectory recognition, reproduction and generalization applications.

III. MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES AND NOTATION

A rigid body is an idealized object that cannot be deformed. The body's location in space is commonly described by the relative position and orientation (together: *pose*) between two Cartesian reference frames. One frame $\{b\}$ is rigidly attached to the body (*body frame*) while the other frame $\{w\}$ is fixed with respect to another body, e.g. the world (*spatial frame*).

From Lie group theory [41], it is known that the relative pose in 3D of frame $\{b\}$ with respect to frame $\{w\}$ can be written using a 4×4 homogeneous transformation matrix ${}_w^b T$ with the following structure:

$${}^{b}_{w}T = \begin{bmatrix} Q & p \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } \begin{array}{c} Q \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, p \in \mathbb{R}^{3}, \\ Q^{T}Q = I, \ \det(Q) = 1. \end{array}$$
(1)

Q is referred to as the *rotation matrix* while p is the *position vector*. The set of all such homogeneous transformation matrices T is referred to as the *special Euclidean group* SE(3) [41].

To describe *rigid-body trajectories*, we parameterize the homogeneous transformation matrix T(s) in function of a *progress* variable *s*. Often, the time *t* is chosen as the progress *s* for the parameterization of T(s), resulting in a *temporal* trajectory. Nevertheless, other measures of progress can be chosen. For example, by expressing the trajectory in function of a *geometric* progress, a *geometric* trajectory is obtained. That is, the evolution along the trajectory only depends on the geometry of the trajectory.

The derivative of T(s) is considered an element of the tangent space to SE(3). The tangent space at group identity is formally known as the *Lie algebra* of the Lie group. The Lie algebra of SE(3), denoted as se(3), is characterized by 4×4 matrices with the following structure:

$$[\mathbf{t}\times] = \begin{bmatrix} [\omega\times] & v \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } \omega \in \mathbb{R}^3, v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \qquad (2)$$

having the matrix commutator as the Lie bracket.

The skew-symmetric matrix $[\omega \times]$ is associated with the rotational vector ω as follows:

$$[\omega \times] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\omega_z & \omega_y \\ \omega_z & 0 & -\omega_x \\ -\omega_y & \omega_x & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (3)

The matrix $[\mathbf{t} \times]$ in se(3) is characterized by six independent coordinates in the rotation vector ω and translation vector v. We introduce the notation $\mathbf{t} = (\omega^T \quad v^T)^T$ and refer to this 6×1 vector as the *screw twist*. The notation $_b \mathbf{t}$ represents the *body-fixed* screw twist. It consists of the rotational velocity of $\{b\}$ and the translational velocity of the origin of $\{b\}$, both expressed in $\{b\}$. The notation $_w \mathbf{t}$ represents the *spatial* screw twist. It consists of the rotational velocity of $\{b\}$ and the translational velocity of a reference point rigidly attached to $\{b\}$ which instantaneously coincides with the origin of $\{w\}$, both expressed in $\{w\}$.

The derivative ${}^{b}_{w}T'(s) = \frac{d}{ds} ({}^{b}_{w}T(s))$ can be written in function of the body-fixed screw twist ${}_{b}t$:

$${}^{b}_{w}T'(s) = {}^{b}_{w}T \ [{}^{b}\mathbf{t}\times].$$

$$\tag{4}$$

By pre-multiplying (4) with an arbitrary constant homogeneous transformation matrix ${}_{v}^{w}T$, it can be seen that ${}_{b}t$ is not influenced by the choice of reference frame $\{w\}$:

$${}^{w}_{v}T{}^{b}_{w}T'(s) = {}^{w}_{v}T{}^{b}_{w}T\left[{}_{b}\mathbf{t}\times\right],\tag{5}$$

$${}_{v}^{b}T'(s) = {}_{v}^{b}T \left[{}_{b}\mathbf{t}\times\right],\tag{6}$$

The body-fixed screw twist $_b$ t is said to be a *left-invariant* representation of the motion [41].

Similarly, the derivative ${}_{w}^{b}T'(s)$ can be written in function of the *spatial* screw twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}$:

$${}^{b}_{w}T'(s) = [{}^{w}\mathbf{t} \times] {}^{b}_{w}T, \qquad (7)$$

By post-multiplying (7) with an arbitrary constant homogeneous transformation matrix ${}_{b}^{c}T$, it can be seen that ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}$ is not influenced by the choice of frame $\{b\}$:

$${}^{b}_{w}T'(s){}^{c}_{b}T = \left[{}^{w}\mathbf{t}\times\right]{}^{b}_{w}T{}^{c}_{b}T, \tag{8}$$

$${}_{v}^{c}T'(s) = \left[{}_{w}\mathbf{t} \times \right] {}_{w}^{c}T, \tag{9}$$

The spatial screw twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}$ is referred to as a *right-invariant* representation of the motion [41].

Using (4) and (7), the screw twist transformation from $\{b\}$ to $\{w\}$ is written as the following *adjoint action*:

$$\begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t} \times \end{bmatrix} = {}^{b}_{w} T \begin{bmatrix} b \mathbf{t} \times \end{bmatrix} {}^{b}_{w} T^{-1}.$$
(10)

Alternatively, this relation is directly written in function of the screw twists:

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t} = S({}_{w}{}^{b}T) {}_{b}\mathbf{t}, \tag{11}$$

using the 6×6 screw transformation matrix S(T):

$$S(T) = \begin{bmatrix} Q & 0\\ [p\times] Q & Q \end{bmatrix},$$
 (12)

which is also referred to as the *adjoint representation* of ${}_{w}^{b}T$. By taking the derivative of the above and further algebraic manipulation, the derivative $S'({}_{w}^{b}T)$ of a screw twist transformation $S({}_{w}^{b}T)$ can be written as:

$$S'({}^{b}_{w}T) = S({}^{b}_{w}T) \left[{}^{b}_{b}\mathbf{t} \times \times \right], \tag{13}$$

with $[_{b}\mathbf{t}\times\times]$ defined as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} b \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{X} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} [\omega \times] & 0 \\ [v \times] & [\omega \times] \end{bmatrix}.$$
(14)

It can be proven that there exists a relationship for $[_b \mathbf{t} \times \times]$ very similar to (10):

$$[_{w}\mathbf{t}\times\times] = S\binom{b}{w}T\left[_{b}\mathbf{t}\times\times\right]S\binom{b}{w}T^{-1}.$$
(15)

IV. A NOVEL BI-INVARIANT LOCAL SHAPE DESCRIPTOR

This section introduces the BILTS descriptor, a novel descriptor that completely describes the local shape of a rigidbody trajectory up to third order in a bi-invariant way. First, a right-invariant trajectory shape descriptor is derived based on a Taylor series expansion expressed in the spatial frame. Then, the BILTS descriptor is derived by transforming this right-invariant descriptor to a moving bi-invariant frame.

A. A right-invariant descriptor for the local trajectory shape

In general, the local shape of a trajectory ${}^{b}_{w}T(s)$ at a certain progress value s can be described by the derivative ${}^{b}_{w}T'(s)$ and higher-order derivatives of the trajectory. As indicated by (4) and (7), the trajectory derivative at a certain pose T is completely described by the screw twist t. We can therefore also describe the local shape of the trajectory through the screw twist t and its derivatives, instead of the pose derivatives. This will lead to a simpler derivation of the descriptor. In this subsection, we describe the local trajectory shape through the spatial screw twist wt and its derivatives.

To describe the local shape of the trajectory at s, it is necessary to define a local region $[s - \delta s, s + \delta s]$ in which the shape will be described. The value of δs is a parameter indicating the scale at which the trajectory shape is considered. Such a choice of *progress scale*, either implicitly or explicitly, is always necessary when comparing trajectory shapes, since shapes can look similar at one scale, but can look quite different on a smaller scale due to small local variations. The progress scale δs can have different units, consistent with the chosen progress variable s, i.e., [time] if progress is chosen.

To describe the local trajectory shape within the region $[s - \delta s, s + \delta s]$, we consider the following three successive twists: $w \mathbf{t}(s - \delta s)$, $w \mathbf{t}(s)$, and $w \mathbf{t}(s + \delta s)$. The first and third twist can be approximated using a second-order Taylor series expansion involving the twist $w \mathbf{t}(s)$ at s and its first and second order derivatives (see Figure 1a):



Fig. 1. The local shape of a rigid-body trajectory at progress value s is characterized in a region $[s - \delta s, s + \delta s]$ by a sequence of three screw twists, which are approximated by a second-order Taylor series expansion. (a) The right-invariant shape descriptor consisting of three spatial screw twists. (b) The BILTS descriptor consisting of the same three twists but now transformed to a moving frame based on the instantaneous screw axis.

$$w\mathbf{t}(s-\delta s) = w\mathbf{t}(s) - w\mathbf{t}'(s)\delta s + w\mathbf{t}''(s)\frac{\delta s^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\delta s^3),$$
$$w\mathbf{t}(s+\delta s) = w\mathbf{t}(s) + w\mathbf{t}'(s)\delta s + w\mathbf{t}''(s)\frac{\delta s^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\delta s^3).$$

The three successive twists can be written more compactly by stacking them into a 6×3 matrix A_d :

$$A_d(s,\delta s) = \begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t}(s-\delta s) & w \mathbf{t}(s) & w \mathbf{t}(s+\delta s) \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (16)

The Taylor series expansion of A_d can then be written as:

$$A_d(s,\delta s) = A(s) \ X(\delta s) + \mathcal{O}(\delta s^3), \tag{17}$$

where A(s) contains the twist and its derivatives:

$$A(s) = \begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t}(s) & w \mathbf{t}'(s) & w \mathbf{t}''(s) \end{bmatrix},$$
(18)

while $X(\delta s)$ contains the discretization effect due to δs :

$$X(\delta s) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -\delta s & 0 & \delta s \\ \frac{\delta s^2}{2} & 0 & \frac{\delta s^2}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (19)

The matrix $A_d(s, \delta s)$ can be interpreted as a complete description of the *local* shape of the trajectory up to $\mathcal{O}(\delta s^3)$. Since spatial screw twists were used, this local descriptor is *right-invariant*, i.e., independent of the orientation and location of the body frame $\{b\}$. However, the above descriptor is not *left-invariant*, i.e., not invariant to changes in orientation and location of the spatial frame $\{w\}$.

B. A bi-invariant local trajectory shape descriptor

To obtain a bi-invariant shape descriptor from the rightinvariant descriptor, we first consider again the matrix A(s)in (18), which holds the screw twist, the screw acceleration and the screw jerk at s. These screws can be transformed to another reference frame using the screw transformation matrix S in (11). We now aim to define a moving reference frame $\{mf\}$ with pose matrix $\tilde{T}(s)$ so that the screw matrix A(s)can be related to a matrix R(s) as follows:

$$A(s) = S(T(s)) R(s), \qquad (20)$$



Fig. 2. Construction of the moving frame $\{mf\}$ that is used to define the BILTS descriptor. (a) The x-axis is chosen along the ISA so that the rotational velocity vector ω and the translational velocity vector v are uniquely represented by the invariants r_{11} and r_{41} along the x-axis. (b) The y-axis is chosen such that the rotational acceleration vector ω' is uniquely represented by the invariants r_{12} and r_{22} in the xy-plane. (c) The origin p of $\{mf\}$ is chosen on the line of the ISA such that the translational acceleration vector v' is uniquely represented by the invariants r_{42} and r_{52} in the xy-plane. The z-axis is defined by being orthogonal to the x- and y-axis.

where R(s) has the following canonical form:

$$R(s) = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & r_{13} \\ 0 & r_{22} & r_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & r_{33} \\ r_{41} & r_{42} & r_{43} \\ 0 & r_{52} & r_{53} \\ 0 & 0 & r_{63} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} r_{11} \ge 0 \\ r_{22} \ge 0 \end{cases}.$$
(21)

Equation (20) can be interpreted as a *decomposition* or *factorization* of *a matrix of screw twists* A into the product of a screw transformation matrix $S(\tilde{T})$ and a canonical matrix R. The numbers r_{ij} of R(s) are also referred to as the *instantaneous invariants* for spatial motion [2] which are biinvariant. The columns of R(s) can be interpreted as the screw twist, the screw acceleration and the screw jerk at progress s, but now expressed in the moving frame $\{mf\}$ instead of the spatial frame $\{w\}$. The homogeneous matrix $\tilde{T}(s)$ is a shorthand notation for ${}^{mf}_w T$, where $\{mf\}$ refers to *moving frame*, since, in general, the reference frame is not fixed to the spatial frame $\{w\}$ or the body frame $\{b\}$. The canonical form of R(s) is achieved by constructing the pose of the moving frame $\tilde{T}(s)$ as follows [2]:

- Orient the y-axis perpendicular to the x-axis such that the rotational acceleration vector ω' possesses only non-zero x- and y-components (see Figure 2b). The sign of the y-axis is chosen such that r₂₂ ≥ 0.
- Position the origin of T(s) precisely at the *striction* point [2] on the ISA. This positioning ensures that the translational acceleration vector v' possesses only non-zero x- and y-components (see Figure 2c).

This procedure determines the complete frame T(s) since the z-axis follows from the x- and y-axis through orthogonality. To calculate $\tilde{T}(s)$ from trajectory data, we introduce an extended QR-decomposition algorithm in Section VI. Applying the matrix decomposition (20) to the rightinvariant shape descriptor (17) results in:

$$A_d(s,\delta s) = S(\tilde{T}(s)) \ R(s) \ X(\delta s) + \mathcal{O}(\delta s^3).$$
(22)

From this decomposition, we define the *BILTS matrix descriptor* $B(s, \delta s)$ as the following 6×3 matrix:

$$B(s,\delta s) = R(s)X(\delta s) = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_x^- & \omega_x & \omega_x^+ \\ \omega_y^- & 0 & \omega_y^+ \\ \omega_z^- & 0 & \omega_z^+ \\ v_x^- & v_x & v_x^+ \\ v_y^- & 0 & v_y^+ \\ v_z^- & 0 & v_z^+ \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where the - and + superscripts indicate the evaluation at $s - \delta s$ and $s + \delta s$, respectively. The matrix $B(s, \delta s)$ describes the trajectory shape within the local region $[s - \delta s, s + \delta s]$ up to third order in a bi-invariant way. Figure 1b visualizes the BILTS descriptor in the moving frame.

C. Local trajectory-shape dissimilarity measure

The dissimilarity between the local shapes of two trajectories can now be defined in a bi-invariant way using the BILTS descriptor $B(s, \delta s)$, assuming the same progress scale δs for both trajectory shapes.

Suppose that the first trajectory shape is described at progress s_1 using $B_1(s_1, \delta s)$ and the second trajectory-shape is described at s_2 using $B_2(s_2, \delta s)$. The dissimilarity d between the two local trajectory-shapes at s_1 and s_2 is then defined as:

$$d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|B_1(s_1, \delta s) - B_2(s_2, \delta s)\|_W,$$
(24)

where $\|...\|_W$ represents a weighted Frobenius norm with $W = \text{diag}(L^2, L^2, L^2, 1, 1, 1)$, such that:

$$d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\operatorname{trace}\left\{ \left(B_1 - B_2\right)^T W \left(B_1 - B_2\right) \right\}}.$$
 (25)

The geometric scale L has units [length]. The value d quantifies the dissimilarity between the local shapes of two rigid-body trajectories and has units [length] per unit of progress.

D. Global trajectory dissimilarity measure

The previously defined local trajectory-shape dissimilarity measure d can be used to calculate a global trajectory dissimilarity measure between two rigid-body trajectories. We assume the trajectories are represented using corresponding descriptors $B_1(s, \delta s)$ and $B_2(s, \delta s)$, and both trajectories are parameterized using the same definition for the progress s.

The global trajectory dissimilarity measure \overline{d} is defined by calculating the mean of the local trajectory-shape dissimilarity measure (24) over a given progress interval, starting from the initial progress value s_0 until the final progress value s_f :

$$\bar{d} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{s_f - s_0} \int_{s_0}^{s_f} \|B_1(s, \delta s) - B_2(s, \delta s)\|_W \, ds.$$
(26)

In practice however, the two trajectories are often not perfectly aligned in progress s due to variations in the execution. In that case, a trajectory alignment algorithm can be used. We apply Dynamic Time Warping [42] here to compute this

$$\bar{d} = \frac{1}{N+M} \quad \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{(i,j) \in \pi} \|B_1[i] - B_2[j]\|_W.$$
(27)

Here, π is a sequence of pairs of monotonically increasing indices (i, j) starting from (1, 1) and ending with (N, M), and Π is the set of all possible sequences π .

The use of a trajectory shape descriptor inside the DTW algorithm is also motivated by previous work on Dynamic Time Warping [43]–[46] where it was observed that taking derivatives (or other local shape information) of the time series into consideration improves the DTW alignment and improves the recognition rate during time series classification.

V. BILTS PROPERTIES AND RELATIONS

A. Properties

1) Degrees of freedom: All elements of the matrix A_d in (17) can vary freely. Therefore, there are 18 degrees of freedom (DOFs) on the left-hand side of (22). On the righthand side, these DOFs are split up into 6 DOFs for the screw transformation $S(\tilde{T})$ and 12 DOFs for R. Therefore, even though the BILTS descriptor B in (23) has 14 elements, it has 12 DOFs.

2) Uniqueness: In the regular case where r_{11} and r_{22} are strictly larger than zero, the decomposition in (20) is uniquely determined by an *extended QR-decomposition*. This is shown in Section VI-A2. Therefore, the moving frame \tilde{T} , the matrix descriptor R and the BILTS descriptor B (for a chosen δs) are unique in the regular case.

3) Boundedness: The canonical matrix R is essentially the twist \mathbf{t} , acceleration twist \mathbf{t}' , and jerk twist \mathbf{t}'' viewed from another (instantaneous) frame on the ISA. Hence, if \mathbf{t} , \mathbf{t}' , and \mathbf{t}'' are bounded, then the elements r_{ij} of R are also bounded, and so is the BILTS matrix $B(s, \delta s)$.

4) Completeness: The complete screw twist trajectory ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s)$ can be reconstructed from the BILTS descriptor $B(s, \delta s)$ for successive samples of $s = [s_1, \dots, s_N]$, if the pose of the initial moving frame $\tilde{T}(s_1)$ with respect to the reference frame $\{w\}$ is provided. This initial pose $\tilde{T}(s_1)$ has to be provided since $B(s, \delta s)$ is invariant to changes of the reference frame $\{w\}$ in which the trajectory is expressed. More details about this reconstruction can be found in Section VI-C.

5) Time-invariance of the moving frame: In Appendix A, it is shown that the moving frame $\tilde{T}(s)$ at an instance s is independent of the choice of progress function $\dot{s}(t)$ as long as we have a strictly monotonic progress, i.e., $\dot{s}(t) > 0$. In other words, the configuration of the moving frame at an instance s is independent of the local progress evolution $\dot{s}(t)$.

6) Bi-invariance for spatial and body reference frames: To verify left-invariance, consider transforming the spatial screw twist $w\mathbf{t}(s)$ and its derivatives to another constant spatial reference frame $\{u\}$, resulting in $_{u}\mathbf{t}(s)$ using the screw transformation matrix $S(_{u}^{w}T)$ in (11):

$$[{}_{u}\mathbf{t}(s) {}_{u}\mathbf{t}'(s) {}_{u}\mathbf{t}''(s)] = S({}_{u}^{w}T) [{}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s) {}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s) {}_{w}\mathbf{t}''(s)].$$
(28)

Substituting $w \mathbf{t}(s)$ and its derivatives using (20) results in:

$$\begin{bmatrix} {}_{u}\mathbf{t}(s) \ {}_{u}\mathbf{t}'(s) \ {}_{u}\mathbf{t}''(s) \end{bmatrix} = S \begin{pmatrix} {}_{u}^{w}T \end{pmatrix} S (\tilde{T}(s)) R(s),$$
$$= S \begin{pmatrix} {}_{u}^{w}T \tilde{T}(s) \end{pmatrix} R(s).$$
(29)

Equation (29) has the same form as the decomposition (20) applied to ${}_{u}\mathbf{t}(s)$. Therefore, due to the uniqueness property, the matrix R(s) for ${}_{u}\mathbf{t}(s)$ necessarily results in the same matrix as given by (29). The matrix R(s) is therefore left-invariant.

Because the spatial screw twist $w\mathbf{t}(s)$ is by itself rightinvariant, it can be concluded that the matrix R(s) is biinvariant, and so is the BILTS matrix $B(s, \delta s) = R(s)X(\delta s)$.

B. Relations

1) Viewpoint relations: A trajectory described by ${}^{b}_{w}T(s)$ from a viewpoint attached to $\{w\}$, i.e., describing the motion of $\{b\}$ with respect to $\{w\}$, can also be described by ${}^{w}_{b}T(s)$ from a viewpoint attached to $\{b\}$, i.e., describing the motion of $\{w\}$ with respect to $\{b\}$. A simple relationship exists between the BILTS descriptors for these two viewpoints.

Equation (20) can be written down for the two viewpoints:

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s) {}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s) {}_{w}\mathbf{t}''(s)] = S({}^{mf1}_{w}T)R_{w}(s),$$
 (30)

$$\left[{}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}(s) {}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}'(s) {}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}''(s)\right] = S({}^{mf2}{}_{b}T)R_{b}(s), \tag{31}$$

where ${}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}(s)$ and its derivatives are screws of the motion of $\{w\}$ with respect to $\{b\}$, expressed in the frame $\{b\}$, i.e., ${}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}} = -{}_{b}\mathbf{t}$. Appendix B proves that the R_{w} matrix can be written in terms of the elements r_{bij} of the R_{b} matrix as follows:

$$R_w(s) = \begin{bmatrix} r_{b11} & r_{b12} & r_{b13} \\ 0 & r_{b22} & r_{b23} \\ 0 & 0 & -r_{b33} + r_{b11}r_{b22} \\ r_{b41} & r_{b42} & r_{b43} \\ 0 & r_{b52} & r_{b53} \\ 0 & 0 & -r_{b63} + r_{b11}r_{b52} + r_{b22}r_{b41} \end{bmatrix},$$
(32)

and that the moving frames ${}^{mf1}_wT$ and ${}^{mf2}_wT$ are related by a rotation of 180 degrees around the *z*-axis:

$${}^{mf1}_{w}T = \operatorname{Rot}(z, 180^{\circ}) {}^{mf2}_{w}T.$$
 (33)

The relation between the BILTS descriptors B_w and B_b is obtained by right-multiplying both sides of (32) with $X(\delta s)$.

2) Relation with the ISA invariant descriptor: Relations exist between the elements of the canonical matrix R(s) and the numbers within other local invariant descriptors, including the ISA invariant descriptor [1], the FS invariant descriptor for translation and rotation [13], and the Bishop frame [30] approach for point trajectories. All these descriptors are captured by the following generalized model that splits up the motion of the rigid body into a screw twist i of the moving frame \tilde{T} expressed in the moving frame, and a screw twist r_1 of the body, also expressed in the moving frame [39]:

$$\tilde{T}' = \tilde{T} [\mathbf{i} \times]$$
 and ${}_{w}\mathbf{t} = S(\tilde{T}) \mathbf{r}_{1}.$ (34)

Following the same convention for the axes of the moving frame as explained in Section IV-B, the six ISA invariants $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, v_1, v_2, v_3)$ relate to the twists *i* and r_1 as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_3 & 0 & \omega_2 & v_3 & 0 & v_2 \end{bmatrix}^T,$$
(35)

$$\boldsymbol{r}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T.$$
(36)

Remark that this definition of r_1 is equivalent to the definition of the first column of R in (21).

To establish the relation of the ISA invariants with the BILTS descriptor, we first need to obtain the derivative of the twist in (34) by using (13) and factoring out $S(\tilde{T})$:

$$_{w}\mathbf{t}' = S(\tilde{T})\left(\left[\mathbf{i}\times\times\right]\mathbf{r}_{1} + \mathbf{r}_{1}'\right).$$
(37)

Using the same procedure on (37) results in:

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t}^{\prime\prime} = S(\tilde{T})\left(\left[\mathbf{i}\times\times\right]^{2}\mathbf{r}_{1} + 2\left[\mathbf{i}\times\times\right]\mathbf{r}_{1}^{\prime} + \left[\mathbf{i}^{\prime}\times\times\right]\mathbf{r}_{1} + \mathbf{r}_{1}^{\prime\prime}\right).$$
 (38)

Substituting i and r_1 in equations (34), (37) and (38) leads to $A = \begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t} & w \mathbf{t'} & w \mathbf{t''} \end{bmatrix}$ being equal to:

$$A = S(\tilde{T}) \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_1' & -\omega_1 \omega_2^2 + \omega_1'' \\ 0 & \omega_1 \omega_2 & \omega_1 \omega_2' + 2\omega_1' \omega_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \\ v_1 & v_1' & -2\omega_1 \omega_2 v_2 - v_1 \omega_2^2 + v_1'' \\ 0 & \omega_1 v_2 + v_1 \omega_2 & \omega_1 v_2' + v_1 \omega_2' + 2v_1' \omega_2 + 2\omega_1' v_2 \\ 0 & 0 & v_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 + \omega_1 v_2 \omega_3 + \omega_1 \omega_2 v_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(39)

Hence, the screw transformation $S(\tilde{T})$ transforms $[_{w}\mathbf{t}_{w}\mathbf{t}'_{w}\mathbf{t}'']$ into a twice upper-triangular form. By taking an appropriate choice of the sign of the ISA invariants, the decomposition satisfies the conditions of Section IV-B, and is therefore unique and equal to the decomposition in (20)-(21).

The relation (39) can be used to write the ISA invariants in terms of the elements r_{ij} of the canonical matrix R:

$$\omega_1 = r_{11} \qquad v_1 = r_{41} \tag{40}$$

$$\omega_2 = \frac{r_{22}}{r_{11}} \qquad \qquad v_2 = \frac{r_{52}}{r_{11}} - \frac{r_{22}r_{41}}{r_{2}^2} \qquad (41)$$

$$\omega_3 = \frac{r_{33}}{r_{22}} \qquad \qquad v_3 = \frac{r_{63}}{r_{22}} - \frac{r_{33}r_{52}}{r_{22}^2} \qquad (42)$$

Similar relationships exist for the Frenet-Serret invariant descriptor for translation and orientation [13], and for the Bishop frame for point trajectories [30]. The appendices C, D and E elaborate on these relationships.

From (39) it also becomes clear that the ISA-invariants for a single value of the progress s are a poor description of the trajectory shape. They provide only a constant approximation of the twist in the neighborhood of s. The derivatives $\omega'_1, \omega''_1, \omega'_2, v'_1, v''_1$ and v'_2 are needed to obtain an approximation of the twist in the neighborhood of s up to $\mathcal{O}(\delta s^3)$. Hence, we conclude that the BILTS descriptor provides a richer and more complete description of the trajectory shape compared to the ISA descriptor.

The ISA descriptor explicitly describes the motion of the moving frame. This motion *i* is described using ω_2 , ω_3 , v_2 and v_3 and (35). Of course, *i* can be computed from the BILTS descriptor using the inverse relationship (40)-(42).

As explained in Section V, the elements r_{ij} of R(s) are always bounded. However, the same cannot be said of the ISA invariants since from (40)-(42), it can be seen that the invariants ω_2 , v_2 , ω_3 , and v_3 can become very large when ω_1 and/or ω_2 are small. This explains why the ISA descriptor behaves less "smoothly" compared to the BILTS descriptor.

VI. BILTS COMPUTATION AND MOTION REPRODUCTION

A. BILTS numerical computation

This subsection details a three-step procedure for the calculation of the BILTS descriptor $B(s, \delta s)$ starting from a rigidbody trajectory. This trajectory is assumed to be available as an equidistantly sampled sequence of poses ${}_{w}^{b}T(s_{k})$ with $s_{k} = k\Delta s$, Δs the progress step, and k ranging from zero to the total number of progress samples N.

1) Twist and twist-derivatives estimation: The screw twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k})$ and its derivatives ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s_{k})$ and ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}''(s_{k})$ along the trajectory are estimated from the rigid-body trajectory ${}_{w}^{b}T(s_{k})$.

One option is to compute the spatial screw twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k})$ from subsequent poses ${}_{w}^{b}T(s_{k})$ and ${}_{w}^{b}T(s_{k+1})$ using the matrix logarithm [47] on SE(3):

$$[_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k})\times] = \frac{1}{\Delta s} \log \left({}_{w}^{b}T(s_{k+1}) {}_{w}^{b}T^{-1}(s_{k}) \right).$$
(43)

The twist derivatives ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s_k)$ and ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}''(s_k)$ then directly correspond to the first- and second-order numerical derivatives of the spatial screw twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_k)$.

Another option is to decouple rotation and translation by calculating the rotational velocity ${}_{w}\omega(s_{k})$ from the orientation trajectory ${}_{w}^{b}Q(s_{k})$ and the translational velocity ${}_{w}v^{b}(s_{k})$ from the position trajectory ${}_{w}p^{b}(s_{k})$ of the origin of the body frame $\{b\}$ with coordinates expressed in the world frame $\{w\}$. The spatial screw twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k})$ is then found by transforming the reference point for translation to the world frame $\{w\}$ using:

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k}) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times3} \\ [wp^{b}(s_{k})\times] & I_{3\times3} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w\omega(s_{k}) \\ wv^{b}(s_{k}) \end{pmatrix} .$$
(44)

The twist derivatives ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s_k)$ and ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}''(s_k)$ are found by applying the product differentiation rule to (44).

In case of noise on the measurement data, a state estimator such as a Kalman Filter should be used in both options to improve the estimation of the twist derivatives.

The resulting twist $w \mathbf{t}(s_k)$ and its derivatives $w \mathbf{t}'(s_k)$ and $w \mathbf{t}''(s_k)$ are then stacked into the 6×3 matrix $A(s_k)$.

2) Calculation of $R(s_k)$ from $A(s_k)$: This section explains the calculation of the canonical matrix R and moving frame \tilde{T} from the A matrix in equations (20) and (21) using an *extended QR-decomposition*.

Expanding the screw transformation matrix in (20) using (12), the decomposition of matrix A becomes:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Q & 0 \\ [p \times] Q & Q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_1 \\ R_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (45)

The first three rows of this equation are:

$$A_1 = QR_1, \tag{46}$$

where the orthonormal matrix Q and upper triangular matrix R_1 can be found using a standard QR-decomposition [48].

We first consider a *regular* descriptor, i.e., the case where the diagonal elements r_{11} and r_{22} are non-zero. Note that this is a less restrictive definition than the commonly used definition for regular matrices, since r_{33} is still allowed to be zero. Furthermore, we impose that $r_{11} > 0$ and $r_{22} >$ 0. This can always be achieved by flipping the sign of the diagonal element and the corresponding column of Q. The sign of the third diagonal element r_{33} and the third column of Q is determined by imposing that det(Q) = 1, so that the resulting orthonormal matrix Q is always a rotation matrix. In this case, this choice of Q is unique. After pre-multiplication with Q^T , the last three rows of (45) can be written as:

$$Q^{T}A_{2} = \left(Q^{T}\left[p\times\right]Q\right)R_{1} + R_{2},\tag{47}$$

$$= \left(\left[Q^T p \times \right] \right) R_1 + R_2, \tag{48}$$

$$= [p^* \times] R_1 + R_2. \tag{49}$$

where $p^* = Q^T p$ represents the position vector from the origin of the spatial frame to the origin of the moving frame, with coordinates $(x \ y \ z)^T$ expressed in the moving frame. From the below-diagonal elements in (49) and by imposing an uppertriangular matrix R_2 , three scalar equations can be obtained that do not depend on the unknown upper-triangular R_2 :

$$(Q^T A_2)_{21} = r_{11} z, (50)$$

$$(Q^T A_2)_{31} = -r_{11}y, (51)$$

$$(Q^T A_2)_{32} = r_{22}x - r_{12}y, (52)$$

out of which the coordinates x, y, z of p^* can be uniquely determined for a regular descriptor where the diagonal elements $r_{11} > 0$ and $r_{22} > 0$. Now that Q and R_1 are known from the QR-decomposition (46) and p^* is solved from (50)–(52), the moving frame \tilde{T} is determined by Q and $p = Qp^*$, while R_2 is then solved from (49):

$$\tilde{T} = \begin{bmatrix} Q & Qp^* \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},\tag{53}$$

$$R_2 = Q^T A_2 - [p^* \times] R_1.$$
 (54)

The matrix $R(s_k) = \begin{bmatrix} R_1^T & R_2^T \end{bmatrix}^T$ is now fully determined.

In the *singular* case, either one or both of the first two diagonal elements of R_1 are zero, while the orthonormal matrix Qis only unique up to one or more rotations. With an appropriate choice of Q, equations (50)-(52) still have a solution for p^* . However, without further imposing regularizing constraints on R, the solution for R is not unique. A discussion on a possible way to handle singular cases is provided in Section VIII.

3) Calculation of the BILTS descriptor: the BILTS descriptor is found by computing $B(s_k, \delta s) = R(s_k)X(\delta s)$ using (19). The BILTS descriptor at successive progress samples $s_k = s_1 \cdots s_N$ is then concatenated into a $6 \times 3 \times N$ matrix.

B. Numerical examples

The outcome of the BILTS computation procedure is illustrated for two synthetic rigid-body trajectories: a screw motion about a fixed axis (Figure 3) and a general motion (Figure 5).

The progress s along the trajectories was chosen to correspond to time t, resulting in *time-based* BILTS descriptors. The screw twist $_w$ t and its derivatives were calculated from subsequent poses $_w^b T(s_k)$ using the matrix logarithm on SE(3), as explained in Sec. VI-A. To avoid the occurrence of *exact* singularities ($r_{11} = 0$ or $r_{22} = 0$), noise with negligible amplitude was added to the synthetic trajectory data. The calculated BILTS descriptors are shown in Figures 4 and 6.



Fig. 3. Example screw motion (rotation + translation) about a fixed axis. The xyz-axes of the body frame are depicted in red, green, blue, respectively.



Fig. 4. Calculated time-based BILTS descriptor for the screw motion shown in Figure 3, for different values of δs .

To illustrate the effect of the progress scale δs in the BILTS descriptor $B(s, \delta s)$, different choices for δs were evaluated, shown in Figures 4 and 6. A smaller or larger value for δs can be interpreted as a "zoom in" or "zoom out" on the local trajectory shape, respectively. For example, choosing $\delta s = 0$ results in an infinite zoom in, such that it seems that the tangent along the trajectory does not change in direction and the magnitude of the velocity remains constant. This is why for $\delta s = 0$ in Figures 4 and 6, $\omega_x^- = \omega_x = \omega_x^+$ and $v_x^- = v_x = v_x^+$, while the other elements are zero.

The BILTS descriptor of the screw motion about a fixed axis, shown in Figure 4, has only non-zero components in its first and fourth row. This means that the tangent along the trajectory does not change in direction, which corresponds to the screw axis being fixed. Remark that all the elements of the BILTS descriptor remain well-defined and bounded for this motion. On the contrary, the ISA descriptor suffers from a singularity in this case. That is, the two ISA invariants ω_2 and v_2 that quantify the rotational and translational velocity of the screw axis are zero for this motion. Because of this, the invariants ω_3 and v_3 are ill-defined.

C. Trajectory reconstruction

The complete trajectory ${}^{b}_{w}T(s_{k})$ can be reconstructed from the BILTS descriptor $B(s_{k}, \delta s)$ for successive samples $s = [s_{1}, \dots, s_{N}]$, if an initial moving frame $\tilde{T}(s_{1})$ and body frame ${}^{b}_{w}T(s_{1})$ are provided. First, $R(s_k)$ is retrieved by inverting $X(\delta s)$:

$$R(s_k) = B(s_k, \delta s) X^{-1}(\delta s)$$
(55)

$$= B(s_k, \delta s) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{-\delta s^{-1}}{2} & \delta s^{-2} \\ 1 & 0 & -2\delta s^{-2} \\ 0 & \frac{\delta s^{-1}}{2} & \delta s^{-2} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (56)

Subsequently, the initial screw twist $w \mathbf{t}(s_1)$ and its derivatives can be retrieved using (20) and the initial moving frame $\tilde{T}(s_1)$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t}(s_1) & w \mathbf{t}'(s_1) \end{bmatrix} = S(\tilde{T}(s_1)) R(s_1).$$
(57)

The complete screw twist trajectory can then be retrieved by iterating in the following way, where k refers to the iteration step. The first two columns of $A(s_{k+1})$ can be found by integrating one progress step ahead:

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k+1}) = {}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k}) + \Delta s {}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s_{k}) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta s^{2} {}_{w}\mathbf{t}''(s_{k}), \quad (58)$$

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s_{k+1}) = {}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s_{k}) + \Delta s {}_{w}\mathbf{t}''(s_{k}).$$
⁽⁵⁹⁾

The procedure described in equation (46) to (54) can then be applied to obtain the next moving frame $\tilde{T}(s_{k+1})$ because the orthonormal matrix Q in the QR-decomposition (46) only depends on the first two columns of A_1 , and (50) to (52) also only depend on the first two columns of A_2 .

With $T(s_{k+1})$ found and $R(s_{k+1})$ retrieved from applying (55) to the known $B(s_{k+1}, \delta s)$, enough information is then available to find the third column of $A(s_{k+1})$ from (57) and to start the next iteration step from (58). Using this procedure the whole screw twist trajectory can be reconstructed. This trajectory reconstruction procedure also shows that choosing the Taylor expansion (17) up to the second order of w t(s)gives us just enough information to reconstruct the screw twist trajectory from the BILTS descriptor.

Using the reconstructed twist trajectory and an initial value for the body frame ${}_{w}^{b}T(s_{1})$, the rigid-body trajectory can be reconstructed by integration using the *exponential map* [41]:

$${}_{w}^{b}T(s_{k+1}) = {}_{w}^{b}T(s_{k})\exp\left(\left[{}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s_{k})\times\right]\Delta s_{k}\right).$$
(60)

Using the explained reconstruction procedure, the two synthetic trajectories shown in figures 3 and 5 were reconstructed from their respective BILTS descriptors given the initial moving frame $\tilde{T}(s_1)$ and object frame ${}^{b}_{w}T(s_1)$. Exactly the same trajectories were obtained up to the precision of MATLAB.

D. Trajectory prediction

The BILTS descriptor has particular advantages for trajectory prediction thanks to its local and bi-invariant properties. These advantages are illustrated with an example. We take the initial part of the general motion in Fig. 5 and apply transformations to the trajectory by changing the location and orientation of both the world frame and the body frame. The result is shown in Fig. 7a. The goal is to predict the remainder of this trajectory given the BILTS descriptor of the complete original trajectory, without knowing which transformations were applied and how much progress s has already elapsed.

Thanks to the independence to both the world frame and body frame, the BILTS descriptor of the initial part of the



Fig. 5. Example general motion. The position trajectory is depicted in black. The xyz-axes of the body frame are depicted in red, green, blue, respectively.



Fig. 6. Calculated time-based BILTS descriptor for the general motion shown in Figure 5, for different values of δs .

transfromed trajectory can be directly matched with the BILTS descriptor of the original trajectory. This matching can be performed using, for example, the DTW algorithm as explained in Section IV-D. The resulting warping path aligns the progress along both trajectories, and is visualized in Fig. 8. Once the progress alignment is found, the BILTS descriptor of the original trajectory can be used to predict the remainder of the transformed trajectory using the previously explained reconstruction procedure. To start this prediction, the initial pose of the moving frame $T(s_1)$ has to be known, but this can be calculated from the transformed trajectory. The calculated pose of the moving frame at the end of the transformed trajectory is visualized in Fig. 7a. The predicted trajectory is shown in Fig. 7b. Comparison of the predicted trajectory with the original trajectory, on which the same transformations of world and body frame were applied, confirmed that this prediction was accurate up to the precision of MATLAB.

This application shows the benefit of local invariant descriptors since the prediction succeeds when only part of the trajectory is available and works when there are unknown transformations on the trajectory. Doing the same with a noninvariant descriptor would result in a complex problem involving simultaneous progress alignment and spatial alignment.



Fig. 7. Example of trajectory prediction for the general motion of Fig. 5 under unknown transformations. (a) Observed first part of the trajectory after transforming the position and orientation of both the world frame and body frame. The moving frame at the end of this part is depicted in magenta. (b) Prediction of the remaining part of the trajectory.



Fig. 8. Dynamic time warping path between the original trajectory (blue) shown in Fig. 5 and the first part of the trajectory (red) shown in Fig. 7a. Only three elements of the BILTS descriptor are depicted. The vertical offset between the red and blue curves has no physical meaning, but aims to visualize the DTW alignment between the samples along the trajectory.

VII. EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION AND COMPARISON

This section compares the proposed BILTS descriptor to other trajectory descriptors for the application of motion recognition. Since the aim is to compare descriptors, the same standard recognition algorithm was used for all descriptors, consisting of a *1-Nearest Neighbor* (1-NN) classifier [49] with *Dynamic Time Warping* (DTW) [42] alignment.

We employ two datasets: the Daily Life Activities (DLA) dataset¹ and the Daily Interactive Manipulation (DIM) dataset [50]. Both the DLA and DIM datasets consist of object manipulation tasks in daily life activities, such as scooping, pouring, or cutting. We used the DLA dataset to validate the BILTS descriptor and determine its scale factors L and δs . This dataset was purposefully designed to have a large variation in the context, including changes in viewpoint, time duration, velocity profile, and spatial scale. Therefore, this dataset poses the challenge of dealing with diverse contexts. In the DIM dataset, no variations in the context were introduced. Hence, the DIM dataset does not pose the same challenge to the descriptors. Nevertheless, we used this dataset to test and compare the performance of the descriptors on unseen data.

A. Trajectory descriptors and dissimilarity measures

We validated and compared the recognition rates of four different trajectory descriptors.

The first two trajectory descriptors consist of the spatial screw twist wt and the body-fixed screw twist bt as a function

of time along the trajectory and serve as baselines. It is important to note that these twists are not bi-invariant descriptors of the trajectory. More specifically, the spatial screw twist is not left-invariant, and the body-fixed twist is not right-invariant.

For these twist descriptors, a local dissimilarity measure d based on a direct comparison of twists was used:

$$d = \|\mathbf{t}_1(s_1) - \mathbf{t}_2(s_2)\|_W,$$
(61)

where $\|...\|_W$ now represents a weighted Euclidean norm with weighting matrix $W = \text{diag}(L^2, L^2, L^2, 1, 1, 1)$.

The *third trajectory descriptor* is the bi-invariant ISA descriptor [1] with geometric progress s as defined in [51]. A local trajectory-shape dissimilarity measure d_{ISA} was used based on a direct comparison of the ISA-invariants $\boldsymbol{x} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, v_1, v_2, v_3)$:

$$d_{ISA} = \|\boldsymbol{x}_1(s_1) - \boldsymbol{x}_2(s_2)\|_W, \qquad (62)$$

with W the same as in (61) so that every invariant has the same weight after scaling.

The *fourth trajectory descriptor* is the BILTS descriptor with geometric progress s as defined in [51]. The trajectory-shape dissimilarity measure introduced in (24) was used.

For each descriptor, the corresponding trajectory-shape dissimilarity measures were implemented within DTW algorithms to determine the global dissimilarity between two trajectories, similar to what was done for BILTS in Sec. IV-D.

To evaluate the effect of using only lower-order shape features to assess the similarity between motions, we introduced additional "reduced" forms of the ISA and BILTS descriptors. For example, for the BILTS descriptor, this was done by using only the first column r_1 of the canonical matrix R (first order), the first and second column r_1 and r_2 (second order), or all columns r_1 , r_2 and r_3 (third order).

The four different descriptors ($_w$ t, $_b$ t, ISA, and BILTS), with their respective progress domains and reduced forms, are listed in the first column of Table I.

Given that the input data consists of discrete time-based pose trajectories ${}^{b}_{w}T(t)$ with time step Δt , we reparameterized these input pose trajectories to *geometric* pose trajectories ${}^{b}_{w}T(s)$ prior to computing the geometric ISA and BILTS descriptors. To do this, the traveled rotation angle along the trajectory was chosen as the geometric progress, such as in [51]. This progress can be defined in terms of its timederivative, i.e. the *progress rate* $\dot{s}(t)$ as follows:

$$\dot{s}(t) = \|\omega(t)\|$$
. (63)

This progress rate is bi-invariant and is closely related to the *Killing form* on se(3) [52].

Numerically, the progress at each time sample k was determined by: $s(t_k) = \sum_{j=0}^k \|\omega(t_j)\| \Delta t$. The rotational velocity ω_k at each time sample k was obtained from the twist $w \mathbf{t}_k$ that was calculated from subsequent poses ${}_w^b T_k$ and ${}_w^b T_{k+1}$ using the *matrix logarithm* on SE(3), such as in (43).

Given the geometric progress $s(t_k)$, an interpolating function was defined that maps each sample ${}_w^bT(t_k)$ to ${}_w^bT(s(t_k))$ using *screw linear interpolation* (ScLERP) [53], a generalization of SLERP to SE(3). This interpolation function was then

¹We made the Daily Life Activities (DLA) dataset publicly available: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10940364

 TABLE I

 TOTAL AND PER-CONTEXT RECOGNITION RATE (%) OF EACH TRAJECTORY DESCRIPTOR FOR THE DLA DATASET.

Descriptors	parameters					recognition rates (%) for different contexts									total $\pm \sigma$ (%)
	L	Δs	VP1	norma VP2	l VP3	larger VP1	spatia VP2	l scale VP3	diff. VP1	vel. p VP2	vrofile VP3	long VP1	er duration VP2 VP	n 13	
Time based															
spatial screw twist ${}_{w}t$ body-fixed screw twist ${}_{b}t$	0.5m 0.5m	0.05s 0.05s	20.2 69.7	-	74.5 79.8	15.8 51.6	97.0 71.2	80.0 75.8	13.3 42.2	98.6 68.1	60.8 72.2	11.0 37.0	83.2 56. 77.9 58.	0 0	$55.5 \pm 34.5 \\ 63.9 \pm 14.6$
Geometric															
$ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{ISA descriptor} \\ (\omega_1, v_1) \\ (\omega_1, \omega_2, v_1, v_2) \\ (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, v_1, v_2, v_3) \end{array} $	2.0m 2.0m 2.5m	2° 2° 2°	83.8 77.8 50.5	- - -	97.9 85.1 52.1	90.5 81.1 49.5	95.5 87.9 51.5	93.7 91.6 50.5	88.9 68.9 45.6	92.8 69.6 47.8	84.8 78.5 46.8	93.0 83.0 47.0	90.5 84. 77.9 79. 52.6 48.	0 0 0	$\begin{array}{c} 90.5 \pm 4.7 \\ 80.0 \pm 6.9 \\ 49.3 \pm 2.4 \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{BILTS descriptor} \\ ({\bm r}_1) \\ ({\bm r}_1, {\bm r}_2) \\ ({\bm r}_1, {\bm r}_2, {\bm r}_3) \end{array}$	2.0m 1.0m 1.0m	2° 4° 4°	83.8 87.9 89.9	- - -	97.9 97.9 97.9	90.5 94.7 95.8	95.5 97.0 97.0	93.7 97.9 96.8	88.9 92.2 92.2	92.8 97.1 97.1	84.8 84.8 86.1	93.0 94.0 95.0	90.5 84. 92.6 91. 92.6 91.	0 0 0	$\begin{array}{c} 90.5 \pm 4.7 \\ 93.4 \pm 4.3 \\ \textbf{93.8} \pm 3.7 \end{array}$

sampled to obtain the discrete trajectory ${}^{b}_{w}T(s_{i})$ at equidistant geometric progress samples $s_{i} = i\Delta s$, with *i* ranging from zero to the total number of geometric samples M. We considered the progress step Δs as a parameter to be determined during classification, signifying the resolution of the considered geometric trajectory.

The BILTS descriptor allows to additionally tune the progress scale δs . To more fairly compare the BILTS descriptor to the ISA descriptor, we chose the unknown progress scale δs of the BILTS descriptor in (23) to be equal to the progress step Δs since it has a similar meaning.

The geometric screw twist $w\mathbf{t}(s_i)$ and its derivatives $w\mathbf{t}'(s_i)$ and $w\mathbf{t}''(s_i)$ were estimated as explained in (44) while using a linear Kalman smoother with a constant jerk-derivative model to deal with measurement noise. Given the screw twist and its derivatives, the ISA and BILTS descriptors were calculated. The ISA descriptor was calculated using the analytical formulas in [1]. The BILTS descriptor was calculated using the numerical computation method as explained in Section VI.

B. Descriptor validation and parameter tuning

We used the DLA dataset to validate the different descriptors and finetune the parameters L and Δs . This dataset was previously used in [3] and consists of ten classes of activities. During the recordings, variations in the context were introduced. That is, the activities were repeatedly executed with respect to three different viewpoints², and, for every viewpoint, the demonstrator was instructed to perform the motion using four different execution styles: (1) normal; (2) with a larger spatial scale; (3) with a different time profile; and (4) with a longer duration. This resulted in $3 \times 4 = 12$ different contexts. Using this dataset, classification results were obtained in three steps:

1) Selection of the training set: To showcase the ability of the trajectory descriptors to generalize across different contexts, we selected training examples from only a single context. For every motion class, all the trials from the context *normal: viewpoint 2* were selected as the training examples, constituting the *training set* of the motion class. 2) Classification: All other trials from the remaining 11 contexts were classified based on their distance to the *training examples* using a 1-NN classifier using the above defined similarity measures with DTW. The classification results were used to calculate the total recognition rate.

3) Variation of the parameters L and Δs : The classification was repeated over a 5 × 5 uniform grid for different values of L and Δs . The geometric scale L ranged from 0.5 m to 2.5 m. The progress step Δs ranged from 2° to 10°. The parameters corresponding to the best classification results were retained.

C. Results for the DLA dataset

Table I reports the highest total recognition rate for each descriptor and the corresponding values for the obtained parameters L and Δs . It also reports the recognition rate per context and the standard deviation σ over the contexts. No recognition results are reported for the trials in the context *normal: viewpoint 2* since these trials were in the training set.

1) Evaluation of the baseline twist descriptors: As expected, the time-based twist descriptors showed poor performance on the DLA dataset due to contextual variations. While the spatial screw twist descriptor generally performed well in contexts with viewpoint 2 (corresponding to the viewpoint of the training data), it dropped off significantly in the other two viewpoints due to its lack of left-invariance.

Although the body-fixed twist is left-invariant, its recognition performance also remained limited. The reason for this is more nuanced and can be explained as follows. Within the DLA dataset, trials were recorded using a Krypton K600 camera from NIKON Metrology by tracking up to nine LED markers attached to the manipulated object. For each trial, a body frame was extracted from three LED markers that remained visible during motion execution, with their average position serving as the frame's origin. The body frame's orientation was extracted from the LED markers using a Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization algorithm. However, due to changes in the sensor viewpoint and varying LED occlusions, different body frames were extracted across trials, leading to significant variations in the body frame across trials. Since the body-fixed screw twist lacks right-invariance, these variations in the body frame limited its overall recognition rate.

 $^{^{2}}$ We additionally reversed the directions of the *y*- and *z*-axis for the first viewpoint to showcase the impact of variations in the viewpoint even more.



Fig. 9. Confusion matrix for the DLA dataset obtained with the ISA descriptor using only first-order trajectory invariants. The parameters L and Δs were set to 2 m and 2°, respectively.



Fig. 10. Confusion matrix for the DLA dataset obtained with the BILTS descriptor using the complete third-order trajectory-shape descriptor. The parameters L and Δs were set to 1 m and 4°, respectively.

This lack of invariant properties explains the overall low recognition rates of 55.5% and 63.9% for the spatial screw twist and body-fixed twist, respectively. Hence, neither a left-nor a right-invariant descriptor achieved satisfying results, showcasing the need for a descriptor with more invariant properties for this dataset.

2) Evaluation of the bi-invariant descriptors: The ISA descriptor achieved its highest recognition rate (90.5%) when using only the first-order shape features (with parameters L = 2 m and $\Delta s = 2^{\circ}$). The corresponding confusion matrix is shown in Figure 9. The BILTS descriptor performed better, achieving the highest overall recognition rate of 93.8% when using the complete third-order trajectory-shape features (with parameters L = 1 m and $\Delta s = \delta s = 4^{\circ}$). The corresponding confusion matrix is shown in Figure 10.

As expected, the geometric bi-invariant descriptors are more robust to changes in the viewpoint and time profile along the trajectory compared to the time-based twist descriptors. This is reflected by the higher recognition accuracies and lower standard deviations shown in the last column of Table I.

Remark that the recognition rates in Table I for the firstorder ISA descriptor (ω_1, v_1) are exactly the same as those for the first-order BILTS descriptor (r_1) . This is unsurprising because, as explained in Section V-B2, the definitions of r_1 for both descriptors are the same.

3) Third-order versus lower-order descriptors: Including higher-order shape features was detrimental in case of the ISA descriptor. The results in Table I indicate that including second-order shape features next to first-order features resulted in a decrease from 90.5% to 80.0%. Including third-order features resulted in an additional decrease to only 49.3%.

In contrast, the BILTS descriptor benefited from including higher-order shape features. Including up to third-order features resulted in a consistent increase in recognition rate from 90.5% to 93.8%, and a decrease in standard deviation σ from 4.7% to 3.7%. These results confirm our expectation that the BILTS descriptor provides a more robust description of the trajectory shape compared to the ISA descriptor.

The BILTS descriptor is more robust since its elements are always bounded, as explained in Section V-B2. The ISA descriptor lacks this property. In addition, the use of the progress scale δs allows to appropriately weight the influence of higher-order trajectory features versus lower-order features.

Although including up to third-order shape features resulted in an increase of recognition rate from 90.5% to 93.8%, the increase remained limited. This is likely because the DLA dataset consists of relatively simple motions, were the object rotates primarily in a single plane. We expect that for more complex motions, the added value of including third-order trajectory-shape features will be more significant.

4) Influence of scaling parameters: For the ISA descriptor, the highest recognition rate was obtained for a relatively large value of L = 2 m and for the smallest value of $\Delta s = 2^{\circ}$. A larger value for L increases the weight on the rotational components ω_1 , ω_2 and ω_3 with respect to the translational components v_1 , v_2 and v_3 in the ISA descriptor. From the closed-form expressions in [1], it is known that the translational components v_2 and v_3 have a higher sensitivity to singularities in the trajectory compared to the rotational components ω_2 and ω_3 . This explains why for the ISA descriptor choosing a larger value for L was beneficial.

A smaller value for Δs during reparameterization preserves higher-frequency components within the trajectories, which were apparently important for this recognition experiment. However, since the computation cost of the DTW algorithm for similarity assessment grows quadratically with the sequence length [54], halving the stepsize would result in a four times longer computation time. Hence, given the average length of the trajectories, we considered 2° as a practical lower bound.

For the BILTS descriptor, the optimal parameters are L = 1 m and $\Delta s = 4^{\circ}$. Unlike the ISA descriptor, the BILTS descriptor uses Δs as the *progress scale* within $B(s, \delta s)$ since $\delta s = \Delta s$. A larger value for δs emphasizes more the higher-order shape features, which explains why the highest recognition rate was obtained for $\Delta s = 4^{\circ} > 2^{\circ}$. It can again be concluded that including the higher-order shape features was beneficial. Interestingly, the complete BILTS descriptor shows limited sensitivity to parameter tuning. The recognition rate across the 5×5 grid for values of L and Δs varied from

a minimum of 89.9% to a maximum of 93.8%, resulting in a small range of only 3.9%.

5) Confusion between classes: The confusion matrices in Figures 9 and 10 show that there is a lot of confusion between the invariant descriptors of the scooping and pouring and the scooping food motion classes. This confusion happens because both classes consist of scooping motions. Further analysis revealed that the confusion between the classes mainly happened for trials of the first context (normal: viewpoint 1). After inspecting the plots of the invariant descriptors, it was discovered there was a lot more variation in the invariant descriptors in the first context compared to the other contexts. This means that the scooping motions performed in the other contexts, which were recorded later in time, were more consistent. Probably this was due to the habituation of the demonstrator to performing these motions.

6) Choice of training set: Having more than one example in the training set allows to capture (human) variability in the execution of the motions. For the experiments, we chose to use all the trials from the context normal: viewpoint 2 as the training examples. However, we can also perform the same recognition experiment using fewer training examples. We did such an additional experiment by using only five, three and one trial(s) from the context normal: viewpoint 2 as the training examples for each motion class. As expected, the total recognition rate for the BILTS descriptor then decreased, from 93.8% to 92.7%, 90.9% and 88.7%, respectively. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that using only one example from one context for each motion class ($\approx 1\%$ of the total dataset) still results in a relatively high total recognition rate of 88.7%.

D. Results for the DIM dataset

We used the DIM dataset [50] to test how well the ISA and BILTS descriptors generalize towards unseen data using the parameters learned from the DLA dataset.

The DIM dataset contains a total of 32 motion classes but the number of trials per class varies significantly. Additionally, some motions were performed by multiple subjects while others only by one. To create a more balanced dataset where every class is equally represented in the results, we proceeded as follows. We first selected motion classes that contained at least ten trials performed by the first subject. From these selected motion classes, the last ten trials performed by the first subject were selected. This resulted in a dataset with 28 different motion classes, each containing 10 trials. For each motion class, the first five trials were selected as the training set to model the class in the NN-classifier, while the last five trials were considered as the test set to be classified.

Table II reports the classification results for the BILTS descriptor and the first-order ISA descriptor using the same parameters L and Δs as in Table I. The BILTS descriptor obtained a recognition rate of 81.4%, an improvement of 14.3% compared to the first-order ISA descriptor (67.1%). These test results confirm that the BILTS descriptor outperforms the existing ISA descriptor.

Interestingly, this 14.3% improvement is much larger than the 3.3% improvement reported in Table I. This supports

TABLE II RECOGNITION RATES (%) FOR THE DIM DATASET.

Descriptors	paran	neters	total (%)		
	L	Δs			
ISA descriptor (ω_1, v_1)	2m	2°	67.1		
BILTS descriptor $(\boldsymbol{r}_1, \boldsymbol{r}_2, \boldsymbol{r}_3)$	1m	4°	81.4		

our earlier claim that higher-order trajectory-shape features become more valuable for recognizing more complex motions.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper introduces the novel *Bi-Invariant Local Trajectory Shape descriptor* (BILTS) for rigid-body motion together with a corresponding dissimilarity measure to evaluate similarity between trajectories. The BILTS descriptor is defined by first representing the local shape of the trajectory using a Taylor series approximation of the spatial screw twist, and then transforming this representation to a local moving frame based on the instantaneous screw axis.

Relations were derived between the BILTS descriptor and existing invariant descriptors from the literature. Compared to the ISA descriptor [1], which is also bi-invariant, the BILTS descriptor offers a richer representation. It consists of fourteen numbers that completely describe the local trajectory shape up to third order. It can be interpreted as a combination of twelve instantaneous invariants, also described in [2], and two intuitive scale factors. In contrast, the ISA descriptor consists of six numbers that describe the local trajectory only partially up to third order. By providing a richer description, the BILTS descriptor reduces ambiguity when assessing the similarity between motions.

The BILTS descriptor is also more robust against singularities than the ISA descriptor. In singular cases, when the rotational velocity is zero or constant, both the BILTS and ISA descriptors lose their uniqueness property. However, the BILTS descriptor is always bounded, which is not the case for the ISA descriptor.

The dissimilarity measure based on the BILTS descriptor enables us to evaluate the similarity between trajectories in a bi-invariant manner. However, it is important to note that, while this measure is bi-invariant, it should not be interpreted as a bi-invariant distance metric on SE(3). Such a metric is known not to exist [31], [55]. Instead, our measure focuses on comparing the shapes of rigid-body trajectories.

We achieved the bi-invariant similarity measure by representing the object's trajectory in a bi-invariant moving frame that is uniquely defined by the object's kinematics. A practical advantage of this approach is that it does not require calibration of the spatial or body frame when comparing motions. In addition, the trajectory representation generalizes beyond the type of object that is being used. This means that the similarity between motions performed with different objects (such as pouring with a *cup*, *jug*, or *kettle*) can be detected.

Alternatively, we could have defined an invariant frame based on the object's shape or inertial properties, though this would have required body frame calibration. This approach is inspired by [56], where it is shown that the *kinetic energy* is a frame-invariant metric when calculated from the body-fixed twist, where a mass density function serves as a weight for each point of the body. However, this frame depends on the type of object used and is not unique for objects with rotational symmetry. Additionally, using this frame, a high dissimilarity might be detected between similar motions performed with different objects.

We validated the BILTS descriptor and dissimilarity measure in motion recognition experiments using extensive datasets, showing that the BILTS descriptor outperformed the existing ISA descriptor in [3] and [4]. The results also demonstrated that bi-invariant trajectory-shape descriptors exhibit robustness with respect to variations in the context.

However, it is possible that these shape descriptors may not always contain sufficient information to distinguish similar motion classes. For instance, in Section VII-C, confusion occurred between the *scooping food* and *scooping and pouring* motions due to their similar trajectory shapes. To address this, including additional context information beyond the trajectory shape becomes necessary.

When distinguishing motions with similar trajectory shape but different motion profiles, it is obvious that the motion profile contains useful information. However, in the DLA dataset, there was a large variation in the motion profile by design. This is why we chose to remove the motion profile from the demonstrations by expressing the trajectories in function of a geometric progress. In other datasets, such as the DIM dataset, the motion profile can be more consistent within each motion class, and hence contains useful information to distinguish the classes. In such cases, it might be beneficial to use time as the progress. In general, when choosing an invariant description, it is a good idea to only remove context, such as the motion profile, so far as is required for the envisioned application.

A downside of the local BILTS descriptor is its dependency on higher-order trajectory derivatives. Hence, care has to be taken when applying the descriptor in practical applications. For the experiments, a Kalman smoother with a constant jerkderivative model was used to robustly estimate higher-order twist derivatives in the presence of sensor noise.

Alternatively, the explicit estimation of higher-order twist derivatives and the Taylor series expansion in (17) can be avoided. It is possible to approximate the BILTS descriptor by directly applying the matrix decomposition (20) to a matrix with three successive twists $A_d = [w\mathbf{t}(s - \Delta s) \ w\mathbf{t}(s) \ w\mathbf{t}(s + \Delta s)]$, where Δs is the sampling interval (or progress step size):

$$A_d(s,\Delta s) = S(T_d(s)) \ R_d(s,\Delta s), \tag{64}$$

 $R_d(s, \Delta s)$ is an approximation of the BILTS descriptor $B(s, \delta s)$, if δs is chosen equal to Δs . The columns of $R_d(s, \Delta s)$ represent the three twists expressed in a moving frame \tilde{T}_d . This frame bears a strong relation with the moving frame \tilde{T} of the BILTS descriptor. That is, the moving frame \tilde{T}_d is an approximation of \tilde{T} when delayed with the sampling interval Δs , as shown in Appendix F. Since \tilde{T}_d is just an approximation of \tilde{T} , in the experiments, we chose to only show the performance of the BILTS descriptor based on \tilde{T} .

The numerical computation of the BILTS descriptor assumes rigid-body trajectories that are *regular*, i.e., the rotational velocity vector is not zero or constant. This assumption was not a problem for the motions within the DLA and DIM datasets since they were performed by humans and sensor noise was present, meaning that *exact* singularities in the trajectories never occurred. Dealing with *irregular* trajectories and *exact* singularities is part of future work. Since the moving frame becomes undefined instantaneously, a possible approach is calculate the descriptor in a window along the trajectory using geometric optimal control while minimizing the motion

Finally, since the BILTS descriptor is bidirectional, it is also applicable to trajectory generation applications, such as motion reconstruction and prediction. To prove this, an algorithm to reconstruct the original trajectory from the BILTS descriptor was introduced in Section VI-C. For trajectory reconstruction, the initial pose of the object and the moving frame have to be provided. However, for trajectory prediction, no additional information has to be provided since the necessary frames can be calculated from the already available trajectory data.

of the moving frame in the window, such as in [39].

In conclusion, we introduced a novel *bi-invariant local trajectory-shape descriptor* (BILTS) and a corresponding dissimilarity measure for rigid-body motion. Mathematical relationships between this descriptor and existing invariant descriptors were derived. The BILTS descriptor is richer and more robust to singularities than the existing bi-invariant ISA descriptor. The performance of the BILTS descriptor was experimentally validated in motion recognition experiments. Bidirectionality of the BILTS descriptor was proven by providing an algorithm for exact reconstruction.

Appendix

A. Invariance of moving frame for the motion profile: proof

In regular cases, the moving frame \tilde{T} at a given time instant t is independent of the choice of progress function s(t) as long as there is a strictly monotonic progress, i.e., $\dot{s}(t) > 0$. The moving frame then only depends on the shape of the trajectory.

This property is proven as follows. The time-evolution of a rigid-body trajectory ${}_{w}^{b}T(s(t))$ can be written using (7):

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \begin{pmatrix} {}^{b}T(s(t)) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s} \begin{pmatrix} {}^{b}T(s) \end{pmatrix} \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} = {}^{b}wT'(s(t))\dot{s},$$
$$= \left[{}^{w}\mathbf{t}(s)\dot{s} \times \right] {}^{b}wT(s(t)).$$
(65)

The resulting spatial screw twist $w \mathbf{t}(s) \dot{s}$ in the time domain is differentiated twice:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}({}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s)\dot{s}) = {}_{w}\mathbf{t}'(s)\dot{s}^{2} + {}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s)\ddot{s},\tag{66}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}t^2} \left({}_w \mathbf{t}(s)\dot{s} \right) = {}_w \mathbf{t}''(s)\dot{s}^3 + 3 {}_w \mathbf{t}'(s)\dot{s}\ddot{s} + {}_w \mathbf{t}(s)\ddot{s}.$$
 (67)

From (66) and (67) it follows that the relations between the twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s)\dot{s}$ and its derivatives in the time domain, on the one hand, and the twist ${}_{w}\mathbf{t}(s)$ and its derivatives in the geometric domain, on the other hand, are given by:

$$\begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t}(s) \dot{s} & \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left(w \mathbf{t}(s) \dot{s} \right) & \frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}t^2} \left(w \mathbf{t}(s) \dot{s} \right) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t} & w \mathbf{t}' & w \mathbf{t}'' \end{bmatrix} M,$$
(68)

where M is an upper-triangular matrix:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{s} & \ddot{s} & \ddot{s} \\ 0 & \dot{s}^2 & 3\dot{s}\ddot{s} \\ 0 & 0 & \dot{s}^3 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (69)

Applying this relation in (20) by post-multiplying the left- and right-hand side by M leads to:

$$AM = S(T)RM. (70)$$

Since a product of upper-triangular matrices is also upper-triangular, and the canonical matrix R is regular and $det(M) \neq 0$, (70) represents a unique decomposition in the form of (20), with the same moving frame \tilde{T} . Because all diagonal elements of (69) are strictly positive due to $\dot{s} > 0$, the signs of the diagonal elements of RM are not influenced by the motion profile. Therefore, using the uniqueness property in Section V-A2, it can be concluded that the motion profile by which the progress s is evolving does not influence the obtained moving frame \tilde{T} .

B. Changing the viewpoint of a BILTS descriptor: proof

This appendix proves the relationship between the BILTS descriptor from the viewpoint attached to the spatial frame $\{w\}$ in (30) and the BILTS descriptor from the viewpoint attached to the body frame $\{b\}$. The screw twists $_w \mathbf{t}$ from the viewpoint attached to $\{w\}$ relate to the screw twists $_b \mathbf{\bar{t}}$ from the viewpoint attached to $\{b\}$ as:

$$_{w}\mathbf{t} = S(_{w}^{b}T) _{b}\mathbf{t} = -S(_{w}^{b}T) _{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}.$$
 (71)

Substituting the definition of the canonical matrices R_w and R_b of (30) and (31) into (71) gives:

$$S\binom{mf_{1}T}{w}\mathbf{r}_{w1} = -S\binom{bT}{w}S\binom{mf_{2}T}{b}\mathbf{r}_{b1},$$

$$S\binom{mf_{1}T}{w}\mathbf{r}_{w1} = -S\binom{mf_{2}T}{w}\mathbf{r}_{b1},$$
(72)

where the notation \mathbf{r}_{wi} and \mathbf{r}_{bi} indicates the i-th column of R_w and R_b . Taking the derivative of both the left- and righthand side of (71) and using (13) to compute the derivative of the screw transformation matrix while simplifying using $[_b \mathbf{t} \times \times]_b \mathbf{t} = 0$ gives:

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t}' = S({}_{w}^{b}T)\big(-{}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}'\big). \tag{73}$$

Substituting the definition of R_w and R_b into (73) gives:

$$S\binom{mf1}{w}T\mathbf{r}_{w2} = S\binom{mf2}{w}T(-\mathbf{r}_{b2})$$
(74)

Similarly, deriving (73) again using (13) gives:

$${}_{w}\mathbf{t}'' = S({}_{w}{}^{b}T)\big([{}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}\times\times] {}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}' - {}_{b}\bar{\mathbf{t}}''\big); \tag{75}$$

and substituting the definition of R_w and R_b into (75) gives:

$$S\binom{mf1}{w}T\mathbf{r}_{w3} = S\binom{mf2}{w}T\big)\big(\left[\mathbf{r}_{b1}\times\times\right] \mathbf{r}_{b2} - \mathbf{r}_{b3}\big).$$
(76)

Combining (72), (74), and (76) while exploiting the twice upper-triangular structure of R_b gives:

$$S\binom{mf1}{w}TR_{w}(s) = S\binom{mf2}{w}TR_{b}(s),$$
(77)

with $\bar{R}_b(s)$ equal to:

$$\begin{bmatrix} -r_{b11} & -r_{b12} & & -r_{b13} \\ 0 & -r_{b22} & & -r_{b23} \\ 0 & 0 & & -r_{b33} + r_{b11}r_{b22} \\ -r_{b41} & -r_{b42} & & -r_{b43} \\ 0 & -r_{b52} & & -r_{b53} \\ 0 & 0 & & -r_{b63} + r_{b11}r_{b52} + r_{b22}r_{b41} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (78)

The definition of the BILTS descriptor in Section IV.B requires that $r_{b11} > 0$ and $r_{b22} > 0$. $\bar{R}_b(s)$ does not satisfy this requirement, therefore we rotate the moving frame $\{mf2\}$ 180° around its z-axis, such that the first, second, fourth and fifth row of \bar{R}_b change sign. The redefined $\bar{R}_b(s)$ becomes:

$$\begin{bmatrix} r_{b11} & r_{b12} & r_{b13} \\ 0 & r_{b22} & r_{b23} \\ 0 & 0 & -r_{b33} + r_{b11}r_{b22} \\ r_{b41} & r_{b42} & r_{b43} \\ 0 & r_{b52} & r_{b53} \\ 0 & 0 & -r_{b63} + r_{b11}r_{b52} + r_{b22}r_{b41} \end{bmatrix}.$$
(79)

Noticing that R_b has a twice upper-triangular structure with the first two diagonal elements of R_b strictly positive, we conclude that the decompositions on the left- and right-hand side of (77) are unique according to the uniqueness property in Section V-A2, such that:

$${}^{mf1}_{w}T = \operatorname{Rot}(z, 180^{\circ}) {}^{mf2}_{w}T,$$
 (80)

$$R_w(s) = \bar{R}_b(s),\tag{81}$$

which proves the viewpoint relations in (32) and (33).

Ì

C. Relation with FS invariant descriptor for orientation

For orientation trajectories, the Frenet-Serret invariants describe rotational velocities, and i and r_1 are defined by:

$$\boldsymbol{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_3 & 0 & \omega_2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \tag{82}$$

$$\boldsymbol{r}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T.$$
(83)

Substituting i and r_1 in equations (34), (37) and (38) leads to $A = \begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t} & w \mathbf{t'} & w \mathbf{t''} \end{bmatrix}$ equal to:

$$A = S(T) \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_1' & -\omega_1 \omega_2^2 + \omega_1'' \\ 0 & \omega_1 \omega_2 & \omega_1 \omega_2' + 2\omega_1' \omega_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (84)

Comparing the above equation with (39) shows that the moving frame of the rotational Frenet-Serret invariants corresponds to the moving frame of the descriptor in (20) when applied to screw twists with no translational velocity component.

The inverse relationship between the FS invariant descriptor for orientation and the elements of the canonical matrix in (21) is given by:

$$\omega_1 = r_{11}, \quad \omega_2 = \frac{r_{22}}{r_{11}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_3 = \frac{r_{33}}{r_{22}}.$$
 (85)

D. Relation with FS invariant descriptor for translation

For point trajectories, the Frenet-Serret invariants describe translational velocities, and i and r_1 are defined by:

$$\boldsymbol{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_3 & 0 & \omega_2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \quad (86)$$

$$\boldsymbol{r}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$$
. (87)

Substituting *i* and r_1 in equations (34), (37), and (38) leads to $A = \begin{bmatrix} w\mathbf{t} & w\mathbf{t'} & w\mathbf{t''} \end{bmatrix}$ equal to:

$$A = S(T) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ v_1 & v'_1 & -v_1 \, \omega_2^2 + v''_1 \\ 0 & v_1 \, \omega_2 & 2 \, v'_1 \, \omega_2 + v_1 \, \omega'_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_2 \omega_3 \, v_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (88)

As can be seen in the above equation, this decomposition also results in the twice upper-triangular form of Section IV-B. However, when considering twists with zero rotational velocity, (45) is not regular and does not result in a unique decomposition without making additional assumptions. Because in the absence of rotational velocity, the only valid choice for R_1 in (45) is zero, the choice for p in (49) is arbitrary. The orientation of this frame corresponds to the orientation of the very well-known *Frenet-Serret frame*. Q can still be determined using a QR-decomposition of A_2 :

$$A_2 = QR_2, \tag{89}$$

which is unique when the first two upper-triangular elements of R_2 are non-zero.

The inverse relationship between the FS invariant descriptor for point trajectories and the elements of the canonical matrix in (21) is given by:

$$v_1 = r_{41}$$
, $\omega_2 = \frac{r_{22}}{r_{11}}$, and $\omega_3 = \frac{r_{33}}{r_{22}}$. (90)

Similarly to the ISA-invariants, it can also be concluded that the FS descriptors for translation and rotation are a poor description of trajectory shape when only considered at a single value of the progress. They only provide a constant approximation of the translational or rotational velocity. However, they can still be used when considering these invariants over a continuous interval of progress values.

E. Relation with Bishop frames for point curves

Bishop [30] proposed another way to associate a frame with a point curve. The resulting frame is referred to as a *Bishop frame* or also as a *rotation-minimizing frame*, since it minimizes the rotation of the moving frame over the whole trajectory. Bishop's approach can be represented in the general model of (34) using the following values for i and r_1 :

$$\boldsymbol{i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega_2 & \omega_3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \tag{91}$$

$$\boldsymbol{r}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$$
. (92)

Substituting *i* and r_1 in equations (34), (37), and (38) leads to $\begin{bmatrix} w \mathbf{t} & w \mathbf{t'} & w \mathbf{t''} \end{bmatrix}$ equal to:

$$S(T) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ v_1 & v'_1 & -\omega_2^2 v_1 - \omega_3^2 v_1 + v''_1 \\ 0 & \omega_3 v_1 & 2\omega_3 v'_1 + v_1 \omega'_3 \\ 0 & -\omega_2 v_1 & -2\omega_2 v'_1 - v_1 \omega'_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (93)

Clearly, this does not result in an upper-triangular matrix for R_2 . This is expected because Bishop's frame is not unique and depends on initial conditions [30].

F. Relation with BILTS descriptor based on successive twists

Similarly to (17), the columns of A_d in (64) can be approximated from the columns of A in (17) at instance $s-\Delta s$ using the second-order forward integration scheme $X_d(\Delta s)$:

$$A_d(s,\Delta s) \approx A(s-\Delta s)X_d(\Delta s),$$
 (94)

with $X_d(\Delta s)$ the following upper-triangular matrix:

$$X_d(\Delta s) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & \Delta s & 2\Delta s \\ 0 & 0 & 2\Delta s^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (95)

such that:

$$A(s - \Delta s)X_d(\Delta s) \approx S(\tilde{T}_d(s)) \ R_d(s).$$
(96)

Right multiplication with $X_d^{-1}(\Delta s)$ gives:

$$A(s - \Delta s) \approx S(\tilde{T}_d(s)) \ R_d(s) \ X_d^{-1}(\Delta s).$$
(97)

Since $X_d(\Delta s)$ is an upper-triangular matrix with strictly positive diagonal elements, its inverse exists and is also uppertriangular. Since the product of upper-triangular matrices is also upper-triangular, the uniqueness property in Sec. V-A2 can be applied. Hence, the moving frame $\tilde{T}_d(s)$ is an approximation of the moving frame $\tilde{T}(s - \Delta s)$.

REFERENCES

- J. De Schutter, "Invariant description of rigid body motion trajectories," *ASME Journal of Mechanisms and Robotics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 011004– 1, 2010.
- [2] O. Bottema and B. Roth, *Theoretical kinematics*. Courier Corporation, 1990, vol. 24.
- [3] T. Delabie, O. Cigdem, J. F. DeS chutter, R. Matthysen, T. De Laet, and J. De Schutter, "Invariant representations to reduce the variability in recognition of rigid body motion trajectories," in 2012 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC), 2012, pp. 1658–1663.
- [4] J. De Schutter, E. Di Lello, J. F. De Schutter, R. Matthysen, T. Benoit, and T. De Laet, "Recognition of 6 dof rigid body motion trajectories using a coordinate-free representation," in 2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, 2011, pp. 2071–2078.
- [5] A. Iosifidis, A. Tefas, and I. Pitas, "View-invariant action recognition based on artificial neural networks," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks* and Learning Systems, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 412–424, 2012.
- [6] P. Wang, W. Li, Z. Gao, J. Zhang, C. Tang, and P. O. Ogunbona, "Action recognition from depth maps using deep convolutional neural networks," *IEEE Trans. on Human-Machine Systems*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 498–509, 2016.
- [7] C. Rao, A. Yilmaz, and M. Shah, "View-invariant representation and recognition of actions," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 50, pp. 203–226, 11 2002.
- [8] Y. Guo, Y. Li, and Z. Shao, "Dsrf: A flexible trajectory descriptor for articulated human action recognition," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 76, pp. 137–148, 2018.

- [9] Y. Tao, A. Both, R. I. Silveira, K. Buchin, S. Sijben, R. S. Purves, P. Laube, D. Peng, K. Toohey, and M. Duckham, "A comparative analysis of trajectory similarity measures," *GIScience & Remote Sensing*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 643–669, 2021.
- [10] H. Su, S. Liu, B. Zheng, X. Zhou, and K. Zheng, "A survey of trajectory distance measures and performance evaluation," *The VLDB Journal*, vol. 29, pp. 1–30, 01 2020.
- [11] S. Wu and Y. Li, "On signature invariants for effective motion trajectory recognition," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 895–917, 2008.
- [12] S. Wu and Y. F. Li, "Flexible signature descriptions for adaptive motion trajectory representation, perception and recognition," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 194–214, 2009.
- [13] M. Vochten, T. De Laet, and J. De Schutter, "Comparison of rigid body motion trajectory descriptors for motion representation and recognition," in 2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2015, pp. 3010–3017.
- [14] Z. Shao and Y. Li, "Integral invariants for space motion trajectory matching and recognition," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 2418– 2432, 2015.
- [15] S. Wu and Y. Li, "Motion trajectory reproduction from generalized signature description," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 204–221, 2010.
- [16] J. Yang, Y. Li, K. Wang, Y. Wu, G. Altieri, and M. Scalia, "Mixed signature: An invariant descriptor for 3d motion trajectory perception and recognition," *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, vol. 2012, 01 2012.
- [17] Y. Guo, Y. Li, and Z. Shao, "Rrv: A spatiotemporal descriptor for rigid body motion recognition," *IEEE Trans. on Cybernetics*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 1513–1525, 2018.
- [18] Y. Gdalyahu and D. Weinshall, "Flexible syntactic matching of curves and its application to automatic hierarchical classification of silhouettes," *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 1312–1328, 1999.
- [19] M. Vochten, T. De Laet, and J. De Schutter, "Generalizing demonstrated motion trajectories using coordinate-free shape descriptors," *Robotics* and Autonomous Systems, vol. 122, p. 103291, Dec 2019.
- [20] A. Ancillao, A. Verduyn, M. Vochten, E. Aertbeliën, and J. De Schutter, "A novel procedure for knee flexion angle estimation based on functionally defined coordinate systems and independent of the marker landmarks," *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2023.
- [21] N. Kehtarnavaz and R. deFigueiredo, "A 3-d contour segmentation scheme based on curvature and torsion," *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis* and Machine Intelligence, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 707–713, 1988.
- [22] D. Lee, R. Soloperto, and M. Saveriano, "Bidirectional invariant representation of rigid body motions and its application to gesture recognition and reproduction," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 42, pp. 1–21, 01 2018.
- [23] M. R. Daliri and V. Torre, "Robust symbolic representation for shape recognition and retrieval," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 1782–1798, 2008. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/article/pii/S0031320307004694
- [24] C.-H. Lo and H.-S. Don, "Invariant representation and matching of space curves," *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic Systems*, vol. 28, pp. 125– 149, 2000.
- [25] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- [26] R. Burlizzi, M. Vochten, J. De Schutter, and E. Aertbeliën, "Extending extrapolation capabilities of probabilistic motion models learned from human demonstrations using shape-preserving virtual demonstrations," in 2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS). IEEE, 2022, pp. 10772–10779.
- [27] F. Frenet, "Sur les courbes à double courbure," Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 437–447, 1852.
- [28] J. Serret, "Mémoire sur une classe d'équations différentielles simultanées qui se rattachent à la théorie des courbes à double courbure," *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–40, 1853.
- [29] E. Cartan, La Théorie Des Groupes Finis Et Continus Et La Géométrie Différentielle, Traitées Par La Méthode Du Repère Mobile. Gauthier-Villars, 1937.
- [30] R. L. Bishop, "There is more than one way to frame a curve," *The American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 246–251, 1975.
- [31] F. C. Park, "Distance Metrics on the Rigid-Body Motions with Applications to Mechanism Design," *Journal of Mechanical Design*, vol. 117, no. 1, pp. 48–54, 03 1995.

- [32] J. K. Davidson, K. H. Hunt, and G. R. Pennock, "Robots and screw theory: applications of kinematics and statics to robotics," *J. Mech. Des.*, vol. 126, no. 4, pp. 763–764, 2004.
- [33] M. Chasles, "Note sur les propriétés génerales du système de deux corps semblables entr'eux et placés d'une manière quelconque dans l'espace; et sur le déplacement fini ou infiniment petit d'un corps solide libre," *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques, Férussac*, vol. 14, pp. 321–26, 1830.
- [34] H. Stachel, "Instantaneous spatial kinematics and the invariants of the axodes," in *Proc. Ball 2000 Symposium, Cambridge*, no. 23, 2000, p. 14.
- [35] G. Veldkamp, "Canonical systems and instantaneous invariants in spatial kinematics," *Journal of Mechanisms*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 329–388, 1967.
- [36] S. Manay, D. Cremers, B. W. Hong, A. J. J. Yezzi, and S. Soatto, "Integral invariants for shape matching," *IEEE Trans. on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 28, no. 10, p. 1602–1618, 2006.
- [37] B.-W. Hong and S. Soatto, "Shape matching using multiscale integral invariants," *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 151–160, 2015.
- [38] M. Vochten, T. De Laet, and J. De Schutter, "Robust optimization-based calculation of invariant trajectory representations for point and rigidbody motion," in 2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2018, pp. 5598–5605.
- [39] M. Vochten, A. M. Mohammadi, A. Verduyn, T. De Laet, E. Aertbeliën, and J. De Schutter, "Invariant descriptors of motion and force trajectories for interpreting object manipulation tasks in contact," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics*, vol. 39, no. 6, p. 4892–4912, Dec. 2023.
- [40] M. Boutin, "Numerically invariant signature curves," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 40, pp. 235–248, 2000.
- [41] R. M. Murray, Z. Li, and S. S. Sastry, A mathematical introduction to robotic manipulation. CRC press, 1994.
- [42] H. Sakoe and S. Chiba, "Dynamic programming algorithm optimization for spoken word recognition," *IEEE Trans. on acoustics, speech, and signal processing*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 43–49, 1978.
- [43] T. Górecki and M. Łuczak, "Using derivatives in time series classification," *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 26, pp. 310–331, 03 2013.
- [44] T. Górecki and M. Łuczak, "First and second derivatives in time series classification using dtw," *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, vol. 43, no. 9, pp. 2081–2092, 2014.
- [45] T. Górecki and M. Łuczak, "Multivariate time series classification with parametric derivative dynamic time warping," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 2305–2312, 2015.
- [46] J. Zhao and L. Itti, "shapediw: Shape dynamic time warping," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 74, pp. 171–184, 2018.
- [47] K. M. Lynch and F. C. Park, *Modern robotics*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [48] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix computations*, 4th ed. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- [49] T. Cover and P. Hart, "Nearest neighbor pattern classification," *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 21–27, 1967.
- [50] Y. Huang and Y. Sun, "A dataset of daily interactive manipulation," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 879–886, 2019.
- [51] B. Roth, "Finding geometric invariants from time-based invariants for spherical and spatial motions," *Journal of Mechanical Design*, vol. 127, no. 2, pp. 227–231, 2005.
- [52] M. Žefran, V. Kumar, and C. Croke, "Choice of Riemannian Metrics for Rigid Body Kinematics," ser. International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference, vol. Volume 2B: 24th Biennial Mechanisms Conference, 08 1996, p. V02BT02A030. [Online]. Available: https: //doi.org/10.1115/96-DETC/MECH-1148
- [53] L. Kavan, S. Collins, J. Žára, and C. O'Sullivan, "Geometric skinning with approximate dual quaternion blending," ACM Trans. on Graphics (TOG), vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 1–23, 2008.
- [54] M. Yadav and M. A. Alam, "Dynamic time warping (dtw) algorithm in speech: a review," *International Journal of Research in Electronics and Computer Engineering*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 524–528, 2018.
- [55] J. Loncaric, Geometrical analysis of compliant mechanisms in robotics (euclidean group, elastic systems, generalized springs). Harvard University, 1985.
- [56] Q. Lin and J. W. Burdick, "Objective and frame-invariant kinematic metric functions for rigid bodies," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 612–625, 2000.