

Hierarchical Spatial Mamba Framework for Point Cloud Classification: Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis

Elliott Hayes, Felix Coleman, Graham Richardson | Review Article | Published 2026-08-27

ABSTRACT

Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis reveal whether a reported conclusion survives plausible changes in measurement, preprocessing, assumptions, and parameter choices. This structured evidence review evaluates "Hierarchical Spatial Mamba Framework for Point Cloud Classification" alongside nine author-disjoint, topically matched publications in three-dimensional perception. It compares construct definitions, evaluation choices, operating assumptions, and reported limitations instead of treating bibliographic similarity as empirical equivalence. Viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis, the map separates claims supported by the available record from questions that still require full-text extraction, replication, or new experiments. The synthesis is interpretive rather than meta-analytic and therefore does not present a pooled effect estimate or a new causal result. The resulting agenda varies measurement choices and assumptions systematically, reports uncertainty, and identifies conclusions that are not robust.

KEYWORDS

three-dimensional perception; measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis; evidence synthesis; reproducibility; research evaluation

Research Context

Sun et al. (2026) [1] provides the focal point for this review. Its topic is consequential because progress in three-dimensional perception depends not only on a proposed method, material, dataset, or workflow, but also on the credibility of the evidence chain that connects design decisions to reported outcomes. The present article therefore asks a deliberately bounded question: how should the focal work be interpreted when the primary lens is measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis? This framing supports comparison while avoiding claims that cannot be established from bibliographic records alone.

The review follows a structured evidence-mapping protocol. First, the focal work defines the problem boundary. Second, nine adjacent publications are selected by controlled topical terms. Third, complete author sets are normalized and screened so that no two references in this manuscript share an author. Fourth, each item is assigned an explicit analytical role. This protocol makes the inclusion logic inspectable and prevents a long bibliography from masquerading as a coherent synthesis.

Evidence Map

Evidence node 2 is Usami et al. (2018) [2], which addresses "Synchronizing 3D point cloud from 3D scene flow estimation with 3D Lidar and RGB camera". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 3 is Guo et al. (2024) [3], which addresses "Multi-Layer Fusion 3D Object Detection via Lidar Point Cloud and Camera Image". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 4 is Wang et al. (2018) [4], which addresses "Fusing Bird's Eye View LIDAR Point Cloud and Front View Camera Image for 3D Object Detection". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 5 is Abdelgawad (2025) [5], which addresses "Unveiling the Depths: A Comprehensive Comparison of Monocular Depth Models and LiDAR-Camera 3D Perception". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 6 is Sadakuni et al. (2019) [6], which addresses "Construction of Highly Accurate Depth Estimation Dataset Using High Density 3D LiDAR and Stereo Camera". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 7 is Du et al. (2024) [7], which addresses "3D Target Detection Based on Image and Lidar Point Cloud Fusion Under Depth Complementation". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 8 is Pal et al. (2017) [8], which addresses "3D point cloud generation from 2D depth camera images using successive triangulation". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 9 is Liu et al. (2026) [9], which addresses "MF-BEV Fusion: multiscale depth estimation and fully dynamic fusion for camera-LiDAR BEV 3D object detection". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Evidence node 10 is Konno et al. (2022) [10], which addresses "Improvement of 3D-SLAM Accuracy by Removing Moving Objects on 3D-LiDAR Point Cloud Using Image Recognition in Web Camera". Its controlled title terms place it directly within three-dimensional perception; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

Taken together, references [1]-[10] form a compact, conflict-free map rather than a vote count. They span the focal contribution, adjacent methods, evaluation settings, and implementation considerations. Their value lies in triangulation: agreement can identify stable design assumptions, while differences reveal where metrics, datasets, populations, hardware, or operating conditions limit direct comparison.

Analytical Framework

The first analytical layer is construct alignment. A useful comparison requires that the outcome named in one study correspond to the outcome measured in another. For manuscript 02-P13-047, this means distinguishing nominally similar terms from operationally equivalent measures. The second layer is evidence strength. Peer-reviewed articles, conference papers, and preprints may all contribute, but their claims should be weighted by methodological transparency, sample or benchmark coverage, and the availability of uncertainty estimates.

The third layer concerns transfer. A result can be methodologically coherent yet fragile outside its original setting. Under the lens of measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis, transfer should be tested along at least four axes: data composition, task definition, resource envelope, and decision cost. The fourth layer is failure analysis. Aggregate performance alone cannot show whether errors concentrate in rare classes, difficult operating conditions, minority subgroups, boundary cases, or high-cost decisions. A credible research program therefore reports both central tendency and structured failure slices.

The fifth layer is reproducibility. At minimum, readers need a precise description of inputs, preprocessing, comparison baselines, evaluation metrics, and exclusion rules. Where code or data cannot be released, a procedural specification and sensitivity analysis can still make the work more auditable. This is especially important when the focal contribution is recent or when a formal venue record is still evolving.

Implications for Research and Practice

For researchers, the evidence map recommends designing experiments backward from the decision that the system or scientific claim is intended to support. That approach clarifies which baselines are meaningful, which uncertainty measures matter, and which ablations can attribute gains to specific components. It also discourages benchmark-only conclusions when the application depends on latency, reliability, calibration, manufacturing variation, environmental exposure, or human interpretation.

For practitioners, the key implication is staged adoption. A promising result should first be reproduced in a controlled environment, then stress-tested under shifted conditions, and finally monitored after deployment. Decision thresholds should reflect asymmetric costs rather than headline accuracy alone. Documentation should preserve data provenance, versioned configurations, and known failure conditions so that later changes can be traced.

Limitations and Research Agenda

This article is a structured evidence synthesis, not a new empirical trial. The adjacent works were selected for topical relevance and author independence; those criteria do not make their datasets or outcomes interchangeable. The next step is full-text extraction of study design, sample characteristics, effect estimates, uncertainty intervals, and implementation details. A preregistered comparison matrix would strengthen the analysis further.

Three questions follow. First, does the focal claim remain stable under alternative datasets or populations? Second, which component contributes most when cost and uncertainty are evaluated jointly? Third, what monitoring signal would reveal degradation early enough for intervention? Answering these questions would turn the present evidence map into a cumulative research program centered on measurement uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

References

1. Sun, Y., Zia, A., Long, Z., Qiu, Z., Xiang, W., & Zhou, J. (2026). Hierarchical Spatial Mamba Framework for Point Cloud Classification. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 402-417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-4395-328>
2. Usami, H., Saito, H., Kawai, J., & Itani, N. (2018). Synchronizing 3D point cloud from 3D scene flow estimation with 3D Lidar and RGB camera. *Electronic Imaging*, 30(18), 426-1-426-6. <https://doi.org/10.2352/issn.2470-1173.2018.18.3dipm-426>
3. Guo, Y., & Hu, H. (2024). Multi-Layer Fusion 3D Object Detection via Lidar Point Cloud and Camera Image. *Applied Sciences*, 14(4), 1348. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14041348>
4. Wang, Z., Zhan, W., & Tomizuka, M. (2018). Fusing Bird's Eye View LIDAR Point Cloud and Front View Camera Image for 3D Object Detection. 2018 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ivs.2018.8500387>
5. Abdelgawad, Y. (2025). Unveiling the Depths: A Comprehensive Comparison of Monocular Depth Models and LiDAR-Camera 3D Perception. . <https://doi.org/10.58445/rars.2821>
6. Sadakuni, Y., Kusakari, R., Onda, K., & Kuroda, Y. (2019). Construction of Highly Accurate Depth Estimation Dataset Using High Density 3D LiDAR and Stereo Camera. 2019 IEEE/SICE International Symposium on System Integration (SII), 554-559. <https://doi.org/10.1109/sii.2019.8700333>
7. Du, Y., & Zheng, G. (2024). 3D Target Detection Based on Image and Lidar Point Cloud Fusion Under Depth Complementation. 2024 IEEE 4th International Conference on Software Engineering and Artificial Intelligence (SEAI), 117-122. <https://doi.org/10.1109/seai62072.2024.10674495>
8. Pal, B., Khaiyum, S., & Kumaraswamy, Y.-S. (2017). 3D point cloud generation from 2D depth camera images using successive triangulation. 2017 International Conference on Innovative Mechanisms for Industry Applications (ICIMIA), 129-133. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icimia.2017.7975586>
9. Liu, J., Yue, S., Hao, W., & Cai, Y. (2026). MF-BEV Fusion: multiscale depth estimation and fully dynamic fusion for camera-LiDAR BEV 3D object detection. *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, 35(02). <https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jei.35.2.023009>
10. Konno, J., & Ando, Y. (2022). Improvement of 3D-SLAM Accuracy by Removing Moving Objects on 3D-LiDAR Point Cloud Using Image Recognition in Web Camera. 2022 22nd International Conference on Control, Automation and Systems (ICCAS), 527-531. <https://doi.org/10.23919/iccas55662.2022.10003848>