

# LAHNet: Local Attentive Hashing Network for Point Cloud Registration

Wentao Qu, Xiaoshui Huang and Liang Xiao

**Abstract**—Most existing learning-based point cloud descriptors for point cloud registration focus on perceiving local information of point clouds to generate distinctive features. However, a reasonable and broader receptive field is essential for enhancing feature distinctiveness. In this paper, we propose a Local Attentive Hashing Network for point cloud registration, called LAHNet, which introduces a local attention mechanism with the inductive bias of locality of convolution-like operators into point cloud descriptors. Specifically, a Group Transformer is designed to capture reasonable long-range context between points. This employs a linear neighborhood search strategy, Locality-Sensitive Hashing, enabling uniformly partitioning point clouds into non-overlapping windows. Meanwhile, an efficient cross-window strategy is adopted to further expand the reasonable feature receptive field. Furthermore, building on this effective windowing strategy, we propose an Interaction Transformer to enhance the feature interactions of the overlap regions within point cloud pairs. This computes an overlap matrix to match overlap regions between point cloud pairs by representing each window as a global signal. Extensive results demonstrate that LAHNet can learn robust and distinctive features, achieving significant registration results on real-world indoor and outdoor benchmarks.

**Index Terms**—Point cloud registration, local attention, locality-sensitive hashing.

## I. INTRODUCTION

GIVEN two partially overlapped point cloud fragments, the goal of point cloud registration is to align them in the same coordinate system by estimating a transformation matrix. It is vital to many downstream tasks, such as autonomous driving, robotics technology and 3D reconstruction [1], [2]. Within existing registration methodologies, descriptor-based methods constitute a pivotal category [3]–[10], attaining state-of-the-art accuracy on extensive real-world datasets. The performance of these descriptor-based methods is contingent upon the feature distinctiveness [5], [7]–[10].

Inspired by deep learning, the representative work FCGF [4] employs a fully convolutional network to learn local features, significantly surpassing hand-crafted descriptors for feature distinctiveness. Building upon this pattern, many learning-based descriptor-based methods focus on optimize local feature extraction [3], [5], [6], [8], [9]. However, while these

This work was supported in part by the Jiangsu Geological Bureau Research Project under Grant 2023KY11, in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62471235, and in part by the Frontier Technologies R&D Program of Jiangsu under grant BF2024070. (Corresponding authors: Xiaoshui Huang; Liang Xiao).

Wentao Qu is with the Nanjing University of Science and Technology, NanJing 210094, China (e-mail: quwentao@njust.edu.cn)

Xiaoshui Huang is with the Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200030, China (e-mail: huangxiaoshui@163.com).

Liang Xiao is with the Nanjing University of Science and Technology, NanJing 210094, China (e-mail: xiaoliang@mail.njust.edu.cn)




Fig. 1. Based on the corresponding position on point cloud pairs,  $p$  corresponds to  $q^1$  (an inlier) correctly, while  $p$  corresponds to  $q^2$  (an outlier) incorrectly. (a) The limited receptive field results in very similar geometric representation between  $q^1$  and  $q^2$ , may letting  $p$  incorrectly match  $q^2$  as an inlier. (b) The reasonable and expansive (non-global) receptive field enables features to more comprehensively perceive geometric information, making  $q^1$  and  $q^2$  express different geometric information. This significant feature distinctiveness enables  $p$  to correctly match  $q^2$  as an outlier.

methods have achieved improved results, they fail to model reasonable long-range dependencies. Fig 1 illustrates the importance of reasonable long-range dependencies for enhancing feature distinctiveness. The limited receptive field results in feature ambiguity, particularly on geometric structures with similar local patterns such as the wall and the floor [7]. In contrast, the expansive (non-global) receptive field significantly enhances features distinctiveness by improving the understanding of point surrounding geometric information.

Along another research avenue, Transformer [11] can naturally provide long-range signals through the self-attention mechanism [12]. However, some studies suggest that **the global receptive field may introduce redundant disturbing information [13] and cause feature averaging [14]**. Moreover, the quadratic computation complexity limits applications of Transformer in point clouds [15], [16]. It is worth noting that Swin Transformer [17] adopting the local attention mechanism using shifted windows, has shown remarkable results in image tasks. Swin Transformer first linearly partitions regular and ordered images into non-overlapping windows, and then performs self-attention within each window using regular and offset patterns. This introduces the inductive bias of locality of convolution-like operators, and enables a significant reduction in memory and computational complexity.

Inspired by the above, to introduce the local attention mechanism into point clouds, a straightforward strategy is to partition disordered point clouds into regular windows without

overlap using voxelization or KNN [18], [19]. However, this often leads to significant memory and computation waste due to numerous empty voxels or faces the quadratic complexity of neighborhood searches. Recently, some methods have utilized octrees for uniform window partitioning to incorporate local attention mechanisms into 3D tasks, achieving remarkable results [20].

Unlike previous window partitioning strategies, in this paper, we attempt to uniformly partition point clouds using locality-sensitive hashing (LSH) [21] with linear costs. We propose a **Local Attentive Hashing Network**, named LAHNet, introducing a local attention mechanism with the inductive bias of locality of convolution-like operators into point cloud descriptors for point cloud registration. Specifically, we design a Group Transformer (GT), which models reasonable long-range dependencies between points to expand the feature receptive field, enhancing feature distinctiveness. To efficiently partition windows, GT uses a simple and effective neighborhood search strategy, LSH, to uniformly partition point clouds into non-overlapping windows. LSH applies a linear function to project point coordinates into corresponding hash values. The close hash values in the hashing domain correspond to the adjacent points in Euclidean space, thereby ensuring the logically reasonable partition for each window. Meanwhile, GT follows the window shifted mechanism of Swin Transformer, adopting an efficient cross-window interaction strategy to further improve the reasonable feature receptive field.

Furthermore, to enhance the information exchange of the overlap regions within point cloud pairs, we propose an Interaction Transformer (IT), which is formally based on multi-head cross-attention. IT first encodes each window as a global signal to compute reasonable matching scores. Then, the overlap matrix is obtained using these matching scores to match overlapping windows. Subsequently, the cross-attention mechanism is applied to the matched window pairs, enhancing the feature distinctiveness on low-overlap point cloud pairs.

In this way, LAHNet can achieve significant registration results on high-overlap (overlap ratio  $> 30\%$ ) [3], low-overlap (overlap ratio  $10\%-30\%$ ) [5] and outdoor [22] point cloud pairs. Our key contributions are as follows:

- We design the Group Transformer, which leverages LSH to introduce the local attention mechanism with the inductive bias of locality of convolution-like operators, expanding the reasonable receptive field, enhancing feature distinctiveness.
- To promote the information interaction of overlap regions within point cloud pairs, we propose the Interaction Transformer, which utilizes the overlap matrix computed from the global representation of each window to accurately match the overlap regions.
- Comprehensive experiments on real-world indoor and outdoor benchmarks demonstrate that LAHNet achieves significant registration results.

## II. RELATED WORKS

### A. Learning-based Point Cloud Descriptors

Leveraging the powerful representation capacity of deep neural networks, directly learning features from 3D data has

become feasible [16], [23]–[25]. This has driven the further development of learning-based point cloud descriptors for point cloud registration. 3DMatch [3] takes the local geometry patches converted by point clouds as input, and learns geometry features by 3D Convolutional Neural Networks (3DCNNs). Meanwhile, similar to 3DMatch, SpinNet [6] transforms point clouds into a voxelized sphere and utilizes 3DCNNs to learn rotation invariant descriptors. However, although 3DCNNs can effectively extract local features from point clouds, this suffers from a significant computational cost. The pioneering work FCGF [4] utilizes 4D sparse convolutions [25] to construct a fully convolutional network for learning local point cloud descriptors. This employs a U-Net network architecture to aggregate multi-scale local features, and utilizes residual connections to preserve more fine-grained information. The combination of sparse convolution and the U-Net network architecture significantly reduces the extraction time of point cloud descriptors. Follow this pattern, subsequent methods [5], [7], [9], [26] have achieved remarkable registration results.

Although these methods have achieved outstanding performance by focusing on optimizing local feature extraction, they fail to model long-range dependencies. This results in these methods still struggling with the feature ambiguity on ambiguous geometric structures, due to the limited feature receptive field. In this paper, we propose a novel point cloud descriptor that establishes reasonable long-range dependencies between points to expand the receptive field, enhancing feature distinctiveness.

### B. Point Cloud Transformers

Transformer, with a powerful capability to model long-range dependencies, has achieved significant success in natural language processing and image vision. Inspired by this, PCT [12] pioneeringly introduces Transformer into 3D tasks while retaining the global self-attention mechanism. However, the global attention may introduce redundant disturbing information [13] and cause feature averaging [14], while the quadratic computational complexity poses scalability challenges. To address this issue, Point Transformer [27] adopts the U-Net network architecture, and performs self-attention within the local neighborhoods of each point. Meanwhile, Voxel Transformer [15] applies Transformer to sparse voxels. Notably, Swin Transformer [17] introduces a windowed self-attention mechanism with inductive bias of locality. This partitions the image into non-overlapping regular windows and performs self-attention within each window with an offset, significantly reducing the computational cost. Motivated by this pattern, in contrast to Voxel Transformer, SST [18] considers each voxel as a regular window to perform self-attention. However, the voxelization process itself can also introduce considerable computational overhead. Recently, some methods uniformly partition point clouds into non-overlapping windows by octrees, achieving remarkable results in 3D tasks [20].

In this paper, we leverage locality-sensitive hashing to introduce the local attention mechanism with inductive bias of locality into point cloud descriptors. This can uniformly partition the disordered point cloud into regular and non-overlapping windows with linear computational costs.

### III. LOCALITY-SENSITIVE HASHING

In this section, we first briefly introduce locality-sensitive hashing (LSH), followed by our approach for window partitioning, along with an effectiveness analysis compared to voxelization, KNN and octree. Our goal is to present LSH as a supplement to the window partitioning strategy.

#### A. Background for LSH

LSH leverages a predefined linear projection function  $T(\cdot)$  to map points ( $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$ ) from the original data space (Euclidean space) to a new data space (hashing domain):

$$|T(\mathbf{p}_1) - T(\mathbf{p}_2)| \begin{cases} = 0, & \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \rightarrow \text{adjacent} \\ > 0, & \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \rightarrow \text{distant} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Eq. 1 reveals two meaningful properties of LSH: (a) If  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are adjacent in the original data space, then  $T(\mathbf{p}_1) = T(\mathbf{p}_2)$ ; otherwise,  $T(\mathbf{p}_1) \neq T(\mathbf{p}_2)$ . (b) According to the linear function property, the more adjacent  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are in the original data space, the closer  $T(\mathbf{p}_1)$  and  $T(\mathbf{p}_2)$  are.




Fig. 2. The window partitioning process by LSH.  $S$  is a random rotation matrix following standard Gaussian distribution.  $F$  is uniformly partitioned into non-overlapping windows based on the hash values of  $P$  from  $m$  bins.

#### B. Window Partitioning by LSH

We apply the predefined hash function [21] to achieve window partitioning. This can preserve the neighbor relationship between points in Euclidean space by projecting the original 3D points onto a unit sphere space (the linear function property, see Sec. III-A). We first obtain the corresponding hash values from point coordinates using LSH. Then, the features are sorted and partitioned by the corresponding hash values. The process is depicted in Fig. 2.

Specifically, given the point set  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 3}$ , the corresponding features  $F \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$  and a randomly generated rotation matrix  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times l \times m/2}$ , we first obtain the corresponding hash values  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$  of  $P$  from  $m$  bins:

$$H = \text{vote}(\text{argmax}(\text{cat}(PS; -PS))) \quad (2)$$

where  $\text{cat}(\cdot)$  represents the channel concatenation. Meanwhile,  $\text{argmax}(\cdot)$  determines the bin index with the highest projected value (probability) as the corresponding hash value. Furthermore,  $\text{vote}(\cdot)$  is a voting function that selects the most frequent hash value from  $l$  rounds of LSH, mitigating the impact of randomness from  $S$ , enhancing the result robustness.

Then,  $F$  is sorted by  $H$  and sequentially uniformly partitioned into multiple non-overlapping windows:

$$FI = \text{partition}(\text{sort}(F; H); n) \quad (3)$$

where  $FI = \{F_i \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times C} | i = 1..n\}$ .  $n$  and  $M$  represents the number of windows and the number of points in each window, respectively. Meanwhile,  $\text{sort}(\cdot)$  means a sorting function.




Fig. 3. Voxelization vs. KNN vs. Octree vs. LSH. (a) Voxelization generates a large number of empty voxels, leading to additional computational costs. (b) KNN introduces quadratic complexity, while challenging to handle for the last window. (c) Octree constructs a z-order curve to uniformly partition the point cloud [20]. (d) LSH can easily partition windows based on hash values.

#### C. Voxelization vs. KNN vs. Octree vs. LSH

In Fig. 3, we provide a preliminary comparison for partitioning point clouds into non-overlapping windows by voxelization, KNN, octree and LSH. (a) Although voxelization can regularly partition point clouds into regular cubic windows, considerable empty voxels lead to additional computational costs. Moreover, the voxelization process also incurs significant computational overhead. (b) KNN has quadratic complexity of neighborhood searches. Meanwhile, the last window is unreasonably formed by the remaining non-adjacent points. (c) The z-order curve is constructed through an  $n$ -depth octree to uniformly partition windows based on segment lengths. (d) LSH can linearly project 3D points to hash values. According to Sec. III-A, we can uniformly partition point clouds into non-overlapping windows by sorting based on hash values, ensuring the reasonableness of the last window. Meanwhile, LSH is simpler to implement compared to an octree.

### IV. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we first provide the problem definition of point cloud registration, with the goal of finding a set of reliable correspondences through **distinctive features**. Then, we gradually introduce the overall framework of LAHNet, which expands the reasonable receptive field by a local attention mechanism to learn **distinctive features**, as shown in Fig. 4.

#### A. Problem Setting

Given two partially overlapped point clouds  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times 3}$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 3}$ , the registration goal is to align  $P$  with  $Q$  by the estimated rigid transformation matrix  $T$  with the rotation matrix  $R \in SO(3)$  and the translation vector  $t \in \mathbb{R}^3$ :

$$\min_{R \in SO(3), t \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{(p_i, q_j) \in C} \|Rp_i + t - q_j\|_2^2 \quad (4)$$

where  $R$  and  $t$  can be estimated using an estimator (such as RANSAC and SVD) based on a set of corresponding points. In other words, it is crucial to find a set of reliable correspondences,  $C = \{(p_i, q_j) | i, j = 1..n\}$ , between point clouds pairs using distinctive descriptors.




Fig. 4. The overall architecture of LAHNet. The source point cloud and target point cloud are as inputs, and the output includes corresponding features,  $F_p$  and  $F_q$ . First, two consecutive Group Transformers in the U-Net encoder are applied to model reasonable long-range dependencies between points. Next, a Interaction Transformer is placed at the U-Net bottleneck stage for feature interaction of overlap regions. Finally, the U-Net decoder focuses on feature scale restoration and aggregates multi-scale information.

### B. Downsample Layer and Upsample Layer

**The downsample layer.** Similar to FCGF [4], we use 4D sparse convolution [25] to achieve downsampling. This includes batch normalization layers and ReLU activation functions, while preserving more fine-grained information through residual connections.

**The upsample layer.** The upsample layer adopts the same configuration as the downsample layer. Differently, the upsampling layers utilize 4D sparse deconvolution [25] to restore feature scales, while aggregating multi-scale information from the downsample layers by long skip connections.

### C. Group Transformer

To establish reasonable long-range dependencies between points, we propose the Group Transformer, adopting a local attention mechanism with a cross-window strategy (see Fig. 4(a)).

**Local attention.** For the point set  $P$  and the corresponding features  $F$  within each window, we follow the standard self-attention design:

$$\begin{aligned} O &= F + MHSA(LN(F)) \\ X &= O + FFN(LN(O)) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $LN(\cdot)$ ,  $MHSA(\cdot)$  and  $FFN(\cdot)$  represent the layer normalization, multi-head self-attention, and feed-forward network, respectively.

**Cross-window interaction.** The shifted window mechanism of Swin Transformer contributes to an enhanced receptive field for features. However, the mechanism is computationally expensive for point clouds, due to the unordered and irregular nature [28]. In this paper, we design a cross-window

interaction strategy. Specifically, we keep  $Q$  unchanged within the current window, while combining points from the current window with points from randomly selected other windows to form  $K$  and  $V$  (see Fig. 4(a)). This simple and effective strategy can further expand the feature receptive field of the current window by overlaying that of other windows, as shown in Fig. 5. We set the cross-window number to 2.




Fig. 5. The process of enhancing feature receptive field through cross-window interaction. (a), (b), and (c) all represent the same point cloud partitioned into  $4 \times 4$  windows. The points (yellow) in (a) can indirectly perceive the information of points (purple and blue) in (c) through points (green) in (b).

### D. Interaction Transformer

Benefiting from the simple and efficient window partitioning strategy (see Sec. III-B), we further propose an effective overlap region interaction module, Interaction Transformer (IT), which is formally based on multi-head cross-attention (see Fig. 4(b)). IT can learn an overlap matrix to match the overlap regions within point cloud pairs based on matching scores computed by global representations of windows. Unlike the global interaction that utilizes superpoint representations and requires additional overlap loss signals [5], [29], this focuses more on local overlap region matching.

**Overlap matrix.** Given the point sets  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times 3}$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 3}$  from the encoder, and the corresponding features  $F_p \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times C}$  and  $F_q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$  respectively, we first utilize LSH to partition  $F_p$  and  $F_q$  into multiple uniform windows. Then, each window is transformed into a global representation by applying max-pooling over the spatial dimension to construct the overlap matrix (the elements in the overlap matrix represent the overlap ratio of the corresponding window pairs):

$$\begin{aligned} G_p &= \max(\text{partition}(\text{sort}(F_p; T(P)); n)) \\ G_q &= \max(\text{partition}(\text{sort}(F_q; T(Q)); n)) \\ W &= G_p G_q^T \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $G_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$ ,  $G_q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$  ( $n$  indicates the window number). Meanwhile,  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  represents the overlap matrix between windows of point cloud pairs.

Subsequently, we match the overlap window pairs  $\{(F_{p_i}, F_{q_j}) | i, j = 1..n\}$  based on the overlap matrix  $W$ .

**Overlap region interaction.** The points in the matching window pair  $(F_{p_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{M' \times C}, F_{q_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{N' \times C})$  are interacted through the cross-attention mechanism:

$$\begin{aligned} O &= F_{p_i} + MHCA(LN(F_{p_i}), LN(F_{q_j})) \\ X &= O + FFN(LN(O)) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $MHCA(\cdot)$  means multi-head cross-attention.

Meanwhile, the interaction of matching window pairs is bidirectional, allowing the information to flow in both directions,  $F_{p_i} \rightarrow F_{q_j}$ ,  $F_{q_j} \rightarrow F_{p_i}$ .

### E. Loss and Training

**Contrastive loss.** We leverage the standard hardest-contrastive loss to learn the constraint of points, as the best performance is shown in FCGF [4]:

$$\begin{aligned} Loss &= \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{P}} \{[D(\mathbf{f}_i, \mathbf{f}_j) - 0.1]_+^2 / |\mathcal{P}| \\ &+ 0.5 I_i([1.4 - \min_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i} D(\mathbf{f}_i, \mathbf{f}_k)]_+^2 / |\mathcal{N}_i|) \\ &+ 0.5 I_j([1.4 - \min_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} D(\mathbf{f}_j, \mathbf{f}_k)]_+^2 / |\mathcal{N}_j|)\} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a set of matched (positive) samples. Meanwhile,  $\mathcal{N}_i$  and  $\mathcal{N}_j$  are randomly sampled sets of non-matched (negative) points.  $\mathbf{f}_i$ ,  $\mathbf{f}_j$  and  $\mathbf{f}_k$  mean the point features.  $D(\cdot)$  represents the  $\mathcal{L}_2$  distance.  $I_i(\cdot)/I_j(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that returns 1 if  $\mathbf{f}_i/\mathbf{f}_j$  and  $\mathbf{f}_k$  form a negative pair, and 0 otherwise.  $[\cdot]_+$  denotes the function  $\max(0, x)$ .

This constrains positive pairs to be close to each other while keeping negative pairs far apart, enabling the model to learn distinctive features and achieve excellent correspondences between point cloud pairs.

**Training.** We train LAHNet for 200 epochs on an NVIDIA 3090 GPU, and the hyperparameter settings are followed FCGF [4]. For LSH, we set the number of bins  $m = 64$  and conduct  $l = 4$  rounds of voting. Meanwhile, for the local attention mechanism in GT and IT, we set the number of points in each window to  $M = [128, 64]$  and  $M = 32$ , the number of heads to  $[2, 4]$  and 4, and the dimension of each head to  $[32, 64]$  and 128, respectively.

## V. EXPERIMENTS

### A. Experiment Setup

**Datasets.** Three public benchmarks, 3DMatch [3], 3DLoMatch [5] and KITTI [22], are used for evaluation. For 3DMatch, we follow the official split strategy, 48 scenes for training, 6 scenes for validation and 8 scenes for testing. Meanwhile, for 3DLoMatch, we conduct training on 3DMatch and testing on the low-overlap counterpart of the 3DMatch test set [5]. Furthermore, for KITTI, we follow the approach in FCGF [4], using 6 sequences for training, 2 sequences for validation, and 3 sequences for testing.

**Metrics.** We utilize several important metrics to evaluate the performance of point cloud descriptors [10]: feature matching recall (FMR), registration recall (RR), inlier ratio (IR), relative rotation error (RRE), and relative translation error (RTE).

TABLE I  
FEATURE MATCHING RECALL (FMR) ON 3DMatch

Method	$\tau_2(5\%)$	std↓	$\tau_2(20\%)$	std↓
FPPH [30]	36.4	13.6	-	-
3DMatch [3]	50.8	-	4.3	-
FCGF [4]	95.3	3.3	67.4	-
D3Feat [31]	95.5	3.5	75.8	-
PREDATOR [5]	96.7	-	86.2	-
SpinNet [6]	97.5	1.5	85.7	-
MS-SVConv [26]	<b>98.4</b>	-	89.9	-
YOHO [32]	98.2	1.5	90.9	4.3
RoReg [9]	98.2	1.6	90.2	4.5
RIGA [10]	98.2	-	-	-
<b>LAHNet</b>	<b>98.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>91.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>

TABLE II  
FEATURE MATCHING RECALL (FMR) ON 3DLoMatch

Method	$\tau_2(5\%)$	std↓	$\tau_2(20\%)$	std↓
FCGF [4]	76.6	0.06	41.0	0.09
D3Feat [31]	67.3	0.06	27.8	0.07
PREDATOR [5]	78.6	0.08	43.9	0.10
SpinNet [6]	75.3	0.11	42.2	0.13
MS-SVConv [26]	71.7	0.07	32.4	0.08
YOHO [32]	79.4	0.09	48.9	0.11
RoReg [9]	82.1	0.07	50.1	0.10
RIGA [10]	<b>85.1</b>	-	-	-
<b>LAHNet</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>52.1</b>	<b>0.06</b>

### B. Evaluation on 3DMatch and 3DLoMatch

**Evaluation for the feature distinctiveness.** We first evaluate the feature distinctiveness of point cloud descriptors on indoor benchmarks. Tab. I shows the results on 3DMatch. LAHNet consistently surpasses all methods. Notably, LAHNet achieves better performance when  $\tau_2 \geq 20\%$ . This demonstrates that LAHNet is more robust than other descriptors under stricter inlier ratio thresholds. This is because, Group Transformer, by establishing reasonable long-range dependencies with the inductive bias of locality, enhances geometric awareness, thus improving feature distinctiveness. Meanwhile, Tab. II demonstrates that LAHNet also achieves significant performance on low-overlap 3DLoMatch when  $\tau_2 \geq 20\%$ , further proving the robustness under stricter thresholds.

**Evaluation for different sampling robustness.** Subsequently, we evaluate the different sampling robustness of point cloud descriptors on 3DMatch and 3DLoMatch. Tab. III






Fig. 6. The visualization of registration results on 3DMatch. LAHNet achieves the high-quality registration result that exhibits the higher inlier ratio.

TABLE III  
DIFFERENT SAMPLING ROBUSTNESS ON 3DMatch

Method	3DMatch [3]					Avg↑
	5000	2500	1000	500	250	
	Feature Match Recall(FMR%)↑					
FCGF [4]	95.2	95.5	94.6	93.0	89.9	93.6
D3Feat [31]	95.8	95.6	94.6	94.3	93.3	94.7
PREDATOR [5]	96.4	96.3	96.0	95.7	95.5	96.0
SpinNet [6]	97.6	97.5	97.3	96.3	94.3	96.6
MS-SVConv [26]	<b>98.4</b>	97.2	96.7	96.4	93.7	96.5
YOHO [32]	<u>98.2</u>	97.6	97.5	97.7	96.0	97.4
RoReg [9]	<u>98.2</u>	97.9	<b>98.2</b>	<u>97.8</u>	97.2	<u>97.9</u>
RIGA [10]	97.9	97.8	97.7	97.7	<b>97.6</b>	97.7
<b>LAHNet</b>	<b>98.4</b>	<b>98.2</b>	<u>97.8</u>	<b>98.0</b>	<u>97.5</u>	<b>98.0</b>
	Registration Recall(RR%)↑					
FCGF [4]	85.1	84.7	83.3	81.6	71.4	81.2
D3Feat [31]	82.2	84.4	84.9	82.5	79.3	82.7
PREDATOR [5]	88.3	88.3	89.0	88.4	<u>84.7</u>	87.7
SpinNet [6]	88.6	86.6	85.5	83.5	70.2	82.9
MS-SVConv [26]	89.7	88.8	87.0	82.6	73.8	84.4
YOHO [32]	90.8	90.3	89.1	88.6	84.5	88.7
RoReg [9]	<u>92.9</u>	<u>93.2</u>	<u>92.7</u>	<b>93.3</b>	<b>91.2</b>	<b>92.7</b>
RIGA [10]	89.3	88.4	89.1	89.0	87.7	88.7
<b>LAHNet</b>	<b>94.2</b>	<b>93.4</b>	<b>93.2</b>	<u>92.7</u>	<u>88.9</u>	<u>92.3</u>
	Inlier Ratio(IR%)↑					
FCGF [4]	56.9	54.5	49.1	43.3	34.7	47.7
D3Feat [31]	40.7	40.6	42.7	44.1	45.0	42.6
PREDATOR [5]	49.9	50.3	49.2	46.3	41.8	47.5
SpinNet [6]	47.5	44.7	39.4	33.9	27.6	38.6
MS-SVConv [26]	<u>80.7</u>	<b>80.3</b>	<u>76.1</u>	68.1	57.2	72.5
YOHO [32]	<u>64.4</u>	60.7	55.7	46.4	41.2	53.9
RoReg [9]	81.6	80.2	75.1	<u>74.1</u>	<b>75.2</b>	<u>77.3</u>
RIGA [10]	68.4	69.7	70.6	70.9	71.0	70.2
<b>LAHNet</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<u>80.0</u>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<u>72.9</u>	<b>78.4</b>

TABLE IV  
DIFFERENT SAMPLING ROBUSTNESS ON 3DLoMatch

Method	3DLoMatch [5]					Avg↑
	5000	2500	1000	500	250	
Feature Match Recall(FMR%)↑						
FCGF [4]	76.6	75.4	74.2	71.7	67.3	73.0
D3Feat [31]	67.3	66.7	67.0	66.7	66.5	66.8
PREDATOR [5]	78.6	77.4	76.3	75.7	75.3	76.7
SpinNet [6]	75.3	74.9	72.5	70.0	63.6	71.2
MS-SVConv [26]	71.7	70.5	69.4	62.7	58.1	66.5
YOHO [32]	79.4	78.1	76.3	73.8	69.1	75.3
RoReg [9]	82.1	82.1	81.7	81.6	80.2	81.5
RIGA [10]	<b>85.1</b>	<b>85.0</b>	<b>85.1</b>	<b>84.3</b>	<b>85.1</b>	<b>84.9</b>
<b>LAHNet</b>	<u>83.3</u>	<u>83.2</u>	<u>82.8</u>	<u>82.5</u>	<u>82.0</u>	<u>82.8</u>
Registration Recall(RR%)↑						
FCGF [4]	40.1	41.7	38.2	35.4	26.8	36.4
D3Feat [31]	37.2	42.7	46.9	43.8	39.1	41.9
PREDATOR [5]	59.8	61.2	62.4	60.8	58.1	60.5
SpinNet [6]	59.8	54.9	48.3	39.8	26.8	45.9
MS-SVConv [26]	43.2	40.0	35.4	31.3	22.2	34.4
YOHO [32]	65.2	65.5	63.2	56.5	48.0	59.7
RoReg [9]	<b>70.3</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>69.5</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>68.6</b>
RIGA [10]	65.1	64.7	64.5	64.1	61.8	64.0
<b>LAHNet</b>	<u>68.2</u>	<u>67.9</u>	<u>65.8</u>	<u>64.5</u>	<u>63.0</u>	<u>65.9</u>
Inlier Ratio(IR%)↑						
FCGF [4]	21.4	20.0	17.2	14.8	11.6	17.0
D3Feat [31]	13.2	13.1	14.0	14.6	15.0	14.0
PREDATOR [5]	26.7	28.1	28.3	27.5	25.8	27.2
SpinNet [6]	20.5	19.0	16.3	13.8	11.1	16.1
MS-SVConv [26]	30.2	28.6	25.7	20.5	13.5	23.7
YOHO [32]	25.9	23.3	22.6	18.2	15.0	21.0
RoReg [9]	<b>39.6</b>	<b>39.6</b>	34.0	31.9	<u>34.5</u>	<u>35.9</u>
RIGA [10]	32.1	33.4	34.3	34.5	<b>34.6</b>	33.8
<b>LAHNet</b>	<u>39.2</u>	<u>38.1</u>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>35.6</b>	32.5	<b>36.6</b>

shows that LAHNet achieves superior results on IR. Benefiting from the long-range modeling capability with inductive bias of locality, LAHNet can more accurately identify inliers, learning distinctive features. This is further demonstrated in Tab. IV, where LAHNet achieves remarkable results in inlier identification on the low-overlap 3DLoMatch.

Fig. 6 visually shows the better registration performance of LAHNet compared to other methods on 3DMatch.

**Evaluation for different threshold settings.** Next, we investigate the performance of point cloud descriptors under different threshold settings. In Fig. 7, LAHNet consistently outperforms all methods, which further demonstrates the robustness and distinctiveness of LAHNet.

### C. Evaluation on KITTI

Furthermore, we also conduct the evaluation of point cloud descriptors on the outdoor benchmark. Tab.V presents the results on KITTI. LAHNet demonstrates significant registra-

TABLE V  
EVALUATION ON KITTI

Method	RTE(cm)		RRE(°)		RR(%)↑
	Avg↓	std↓	Avg↓	std↓	
FCGF [4]	6.47	1.30	<b>0.23</b>	0.23	98.9
D3Feat [31]	6.90	<b>0.30</b>	<u>0.24</u>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>99.8</b>
PREDATOR [5]	6.80	-	0.27	-	<b>99.8</b>
SpinNet [6]	9.88	0.50	0.47	<u>0.09</u>	99.1
RIGA [10]	13.5	-	0.45	-	99.1
<b>LAHNet</b>	<b>6.40</b>	0.39	0.26	0.19	<u>99.3</u>

tion performance in the outdoor scene, particularly achieving remarkable results in terms of RTE. Compared to indoor scenes, the spatial distances between points are usually larger in outdoor point clouds, resulting in heightened data sparsity. This may require the model to build stronger point constraints. D3Feat [31] and PREDATOR [5] enhance the point constraints through additional keypoint detectors and overlap loss functions, respectively. In contrast, LAHNet learns an overlap matrix to accurately match overlap regions of point cloud




Fig. 7. The results of different threshold settings (the default settings for FMR are  $\tau_1 \leq 10\text{cm}$  and  $\tau_2 \geq 5\%$  [10]) on 3DMatch. (a) The smaller  $\tau_1$  ( $\tau_2 \geq 5\%$ ), the more stringent the conditions, as  $\tau_1$  means the inlier distance threshold between two points. (b) The larger  $\tau_2$  ( $\tau_1 \leq 10\text{cm}$ ), the more stringent the conditions, as  $\tau_2$  indicates the inlier ratio threshold in two point clouds. LAHNet demonstrates more significant performance compared to other methods.




Fig. 8. The visualization of registration results on KITTI. LAHNet demonstrates the outstanding registration result with the lower RTE and RRE.

pairs through Interaction Transformer, perceiving reasonable correspondences between points in low-overlap and sparse scenarios.

Fig. 8 visualizes the registration results of LAHNet and other methods.

TABLE VI  
ABLATION STUDY FOR GROUP TRANSFORMER (GT) AND INTERACTION TRANSFORMER (IT) ON 3DMatch AND 3DLoMatch

GT	IT	3DMatch(%)			3DLoMatch(%)		
		FMR $\uparrow$	RR $\uparrow$	IR $\uparrow$	FMR $\uparrow$	RR $\uparrow$	IR $\uparrow$
$\times$	$\times$	97.5	89.9	76.7	77.5	63.4	34.2
$\checkmark$	$\times$	98.1	93.7	80.4	81.5	67.8	38.6
$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	<b>98.4</b>	<b>94.2</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>68.2</b>	<b>39.2</b>

#### D. Ablation Study

**With/Without Group Transformer and Interaction Transformer.** We verify the effectiveness of Group Transformer (GT) and Interaction Transformer (IT) in LAHNet on 3DMatch and 3DLoMatch. As shown in Tab. VI, the registration performance is decreased significantly, when Group Transformer and Interaction Transformer are removed from LAHNet. In this case (the first row in Tab. VI), similar to most existing methods, this focuses on learning local features but lacks reasonable long-range dependency modeling. The limited receptive field causes a significant decrease in feature distinctiveness. Meanwhile, the lack of overlap region inter-

action makes features to hardly build high-quality correspondences between low-overlap point cloud pairs [5].

TABLE VII  
ABLATION STUDY FOR ROUNDS OF LSH ON 3DMatch

Rounds	FMR(%) $\uparrow$	RR(%) $\uparrow$	IR(%) $\uparrow$	FES(s/point) $\downarrow$
$l = 1$	98.3	94.0	81.1	$9.25 \times 10^{-6}$
$l = 2$	98.3	94.1	81.0	$9.29 \times 10^{-6}$
$l = 3$	<u>98.4</u>	<b>94.2</b>	<u>81.2</u>	$9.35 \times 10^{-6}$
$l = 4$	98.4	<b>94.2</b>	<b>81.3</b>	$9.41 \times 10^{-6}$
$l = 5$	98.3	94.1	81.1	$9.54 \times 10^{-6}$
$l = 6$	<b>98.5</b>	<u>94.1</u>	<u>81.2</u>	$9.66 \times 10^{-6}$

TABLE VIII  
ABLATION STUDY FOR CROSS-WINDOW NUMBER (CWN) ON 3DMatch

Cross-Window	FMR(%) $\uparrow$	RR(%) $\uparrow$	IR(%) $\uparrow$	FES(s/point) $\downarrow$
$CWN = 0$	98.1	93.9	81.0	$9.01 \times 10^{-6}$
$CWN = 1$	98.2	94.0	81.1	$9.23 \times 10^{-6}$
$CWN = 2$	<u>98.4</u>	<b>94.2</b>	<b>81.3</b>	$9.41 \times 10^{-6}$
$CWN = 3$	<b>98.5</b>	<u>94.1</u>	<b>81.3</b>	$9.59 \times 10^{-6}$
$CWN = 4$	<u>98.4</u>	<b>94.2</b>	<u>81.2</u>	$9.75 \times 10^{-6}$

**The rounds of LSH.** We conduct ablation experiments for rounds of LSH, as the randomness introduced by  $S$  may lead to non-adjacent points with the same hash value. Tab. VII shows that 3 or 4 rounds of LSH achieves the best trade-off between performance and feature extraction speed (FES). Meanwhile, as the rounds of LSH increases, the performance has reached saturation. This means that 3 or 4 rounds of LSH are sufficient to mitigate the randomness introduced by  $S$ . Moreover, the stable FES demonstrates that the efficient matrix multiplication

operation ensures that multiple rounds of LSH incur minimal computational cost.

**The cross-window number.** We further conduct ablation experiments for the cross-window number (CWN) in Group Transformer. As shown in Tab. VIII, additional window interactions can further improve the performance. Meanwhile, 2 or 3 additional windows achieve the best trade-off between performance and efficiency. Moreover, we can observe in the experiments that as the number of merged windows further increases, the performance tends to saturate. This indicates that 2 or 3 window interactions provide a sufficient feature receptive field.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we first analyzed the effectiveness of a reasonable and broader (non-global) receptive field in learning distinctive descriptors for point cloud registration. Subsequently, we proposed Group Transformer, which models reasonable long-range dependencies between points through the local attention mechanism using LSH. Meanwhile, similar to the shifted window mechanism of Swin Transformer, we employed a cross-window interaction strategy to further enhance the feature receptive field. Furthermore, leveraging this efficient window partitioning strategy, we proposed Interaction Transformer to enhance the feature interaction of the overlap regions within point cloud pairs. On real-world indoor and outdoor benchmarks, we demonstrated that our method achieves remarkable registration performance.

## REFERENCES

- [1] X. Huang, W. Qu, Y. Zuo, Y. Fang, and X. Zhao, "Gmf: General multimodal fusion framework for correspondence outlier rejection," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 12 585–12 592, 2022.
- [2] W. Qu, G. Mei, J. Wang, Y. Wu, X. Huang, and L. Xiao, "Robust single-stage fully sparse 3d object detection via detachable latent diffusion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03252*, 2025.
- [3] A. Zeng, S. Song, M. Nießner, M. Fisher, J. Xiao, and T. Funkhouser, "3dmatch: Learning local geometric descriptors from rgb-d reconstructions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 1802–1811.
- [4] C. Choy, J. Park, and V. Koltun, "Fully convolutional geometric features," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 8958–8966.
- [5] S. Huang, Z. Gojcic, M. Usvyatsov, A. Wieser, and K. Schindler, "Predator: Registration of 3d point clouds with low overlap," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 4267–4276.
- [6] S. Ao, Q. Hu, B. Yang, A. Markham, and Y. Guo, "Spinnet: Learning a general surface descriptor for 3d point cloud registration," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 11 753–11 762.
- [7] X. Huang, W. Qu, Y. Zuo, Y. Fang, and X. Zhao, "Imfnet: Interpretable multimodal fusion for point cloud registration," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09624*, 2021.
- [8] F. Poiesi and D. Boscaini, "Learning general and distinctive 3d local deep descriptors for point cloud registration," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 3979–3985, 2022.
- [9] H. Wang, Y. Liu, Q. Hu, B. Wang, J. Chen, Z. Dong, Y. Guo, W. Wang, and B. Yang, "Roreg: Pairwise point cloud registration with oriented descriptors and local rotations," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 10 376–10 393, 2023.
- [10] H. Yu, J. Hou, Z. Qin, M. Saleh, I. Shugurov, K. Wang, B. Busam, and S. Ilic, "Riga: Rotation-invariant and globally-aware descriptors for point cloud registration," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [11] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [12] M.-H. Guo, J.-X. Cai, Z.-N. Liu, T.-J. Mu, R. R. Martin, and S.-M. Hu, "Pct: Point cloud transformer," *Computational Visual Media*, vol. 7, pp. 187–199, 2021.
- [13] Z. Xia, X. Pan, S. Song, L. E. Li, and G. Huang, "Vision transformer with deformable attention," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 4794–4803.
- [14] N. Park and S. Kim, "How do vision transformers work?" in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [15] J. Mao, Y. Xue, M. Niu, H. Bai, J. Feng, X. Liang, H. Xu, and C. Xu, "Voxel transformer for 3d object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 3164–3173.
- [16] W. Qu, Y. Shao, L. Meng, X. Huang, and L. Xiao, "A conditional denoising diffusion probabilistic model for point cloud upsampling," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 20 786–20 795.
- [17] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo, "Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 10012–10022.
- [18] L. Fan, Z. Pang, T. Zhang, Y.-X. Wang, H. Zhao, F. Wang, N. Wang, and Z. Zhang, "Embracing single stride 3d object detector with sparse transformer," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 8458–8468.
- [19] W. Qu, J. Wang, Y. Gong, X. Huang, and L. Xiao, "An end-to-end robust point cloud semantic segmentation network with single-step conditional diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 27 325–27 335.
- [20] P.-S. Wang, "Octformer: Octree-based transformers for 3d point clouds," *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 1–11, 2023.
- [21] A. Andoni, P. Indyk, T. Laarhoven, I. Razenshteyn, and L. Schmidt, "Practical and optimal lsh for angular distance," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [22] A. Geiger, P. Lenz, and R. Urtasun, "Are we ready for autonomous driving? the kitti vision benchmark suite," in *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 3354–3361.
- [23] C. R. Qi, H. Su, K. Mo, and L. J. Guibas, "Pointnet: Deep learning on point sets for 3d classification and segmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 652–660.
- [24] C. R. Qi, L. Yi, H. Su, and L. J. Guibas, "Pointnet++: Deep hierarchical feature learning on point sets in a metric space," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [25] C. Choy, J. Gwak, and S. Savarese, "4d spatio-temporal convnets: Minkowski convolutional neural networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 3075–3084.
- [26] S. Horache, J.-E. Deschaud, and F. Goulette, "3d point cloud registration with multi-scale architecture and unsupervised transfer learning," in *2021 international conference on 3D vision (3DV)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1351–1361.
- [27] H. Zhao, L. Jiang, J. Jia, P. H. Torr, and V. Koltun, "Point transformer," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 16 259–16 268.
- [28] Z. Liu, X. Yang, H. Tang, S. Yang, and S. Han, "Flatformer: Flattened window attention for efficient point cloud transformer," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 1200–1211.
- [29] Z. Qin, H. Yu, C. Wang, Y. Guo, Y. Peng, S. Ilic, D. Hu, and K. Xu, "Geotransformer: Fast and robust point cloud registration with geometric transformer," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 9806–9821, 2023.
- [30] R. B. Rusu, N. Blodow, and M. Beetz, "Fast point feature histograms (fpfh) for 3d registration," in *2009 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 3212–3217.
- [31] X. Bai, Z. Luo, L. Zhou, H. Fu, L. Quan, and C.-L. Tai, "D3feat: Joint learning of dense detection and description of 3d local features," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 6359–6367.
- [32] Wang, Haiping and Liu, Yuan and Dong, Zhen and Wang, Wenping, "You only hypothesize once: Point cloud registration with rotation-equivariant descriptors," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2022, pp. 1630–1641.