Polarimetric Camera Calibration Using an LCD Monitor

Zhixiang Wang Supervisor: Yung-Yu Chuang, Ph.D.

January 15, 2020









National Taiwan University

CMLab, National Taiwan University, since 1991

Polarization











7





Polarization Imaging

Shape from Polarization



[Miyazaki et al. PAMI'04] [Saito et al. CVPR'99]

[Smith et al. ECCV'16] [Yu et al. ICCV'17]

Polarization Imaging



Challenges: - unknown polarimetry

Polarization Imaging



Challenges: - unknown polarimetry + radiometry

Polarization Imaging



Challenges: - unknown polarimetry + radiometry Calibration

Polarization Imaging

Shape from Polarization



Challenges: - unknown polarimetry + radiometry Calibration - ambiguity

Polarization Imaging

Solve Ambiguity



+ Multi-View Stereo

[Cui et al. CVPR'17]



+ Depth Sensors + Binocular Stereo

[Kadambi et al. IJCV'17]



[Berger et al. ICRA'17]

Challenges: - unknown polarimetry + radiometry Calibration

Polarization Imaging

Solve Ambiguity

+ Multi-View Stereo + Depth Sensors + Binocular Stereo



[Cui et al. CVPR'17]



[Kadambi et al. IJCV'17]



[Berger et al. ICRA'17]

Challenges: - unknown polarimetry + radiometry - require extra geometric parameters

Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera



Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera



Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera







[Zhang et al. PAMI'00]

Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera



Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera





Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera







[Debevec et al. Siggraph'97]

Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera







[McCamy et al. 76]

Goal: Calibrate a polarimetric camera



Main idea: Using an LCD monitor



Main idea: Using an LCD monitor



Typical interior structure of LCD monitors



LCD monitors

Viewed by a polarimetric camera



LCD monitors

Characteristics A. In-plane rotation



LCD monitors

Characteristics A. In-plane rotation



LCD monitors

Characteristics A. In-plane rotation



30

LCD monitors

Characteristics B. Complete linear polarization



Introduction – Motivation ³¹

Pattern-based calibration



Overview



$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p)$$

???????????????

Overview










on





on













$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2 \left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p \right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2 \left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p \right)$$

Overview



Method – Known CRF



Method – Known CRF



46

Overview









 $\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2 \phi_k$ $\hat{\psi}_p ig)$ 2





Spatial inconsistency





Overview







Decompose Euler Angle (Yaw)



Decompose Euler Angle (Yaw)



Recall: in-plane rotation





Decompose Euler Angle (Yaw)

 $\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2 \left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p \right)$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2 \left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p \right)$$

where $egin{pmatrix} t_p = (I_{\max}(p) + I_{\min}(p))/2 \ a_p = (I_{\max}(p) - I_{\min}(p))/2 \end{bmatrix}$





$$\operatorname{let} t_p = a_p = I_{\max}(p)/2$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + lpha_{\mathbf{x}} \cos 2ig(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_pig)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2 \left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p \right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + t_p \cos 2\left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + \frac{\cos 2\psi_k}{\cos 2\phi_k} + \frac{\sin 2\psi_k}{\sin 2\phi_k} \sin 2\phi_k\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + t_p \cos 2\left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + \frac{\cos 2\psi_k}{\cos 2\phi_k} + \frac{\sin 2\psi_k}{\sin 2\phi_k} \sin 2\phi_k\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + lpha_p \cos 2 \phi_k + eta_p \sin 2 \phi_k
ight)
onumber \ \hat{g}(M_{1,p}) = t_p \left(1 + lpha_p \cos 2 \phi_1 + eta_p \sin 2 \phi_1
ight)$$



$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + t_p \cos 2\left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + \frac{\cos 2\psi_k}{\cos 2\phi_k} + \frac{\sin 2\psi_k}{\sin 2\phi_k} \sin 2\phi_k\right)$$

$$rac{\hat{g}(M_{k,p})}{\hat{g}(M_{1,p})} = rac{1+lpha_p\cos 2\phi_k+eta_p\sin 2\phi_k}{1+lpha_p\cos 2\phi_1+eta_p\sin 2\phi_1}$$

where
$$\hat{g}(M_{1,p}) \neq 0$$
 $\phi_1 \neq \hat{\psi}_p \pm \pi/2$



$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + t_p \cos 2\left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + \frac{\cos 2\psi_k}{\cos 2\phi_k} + \frac{\sin 2\psi_k}{\sin 2\phi_k} \sin 2\phi_k\right)$$

$$rac{\hat{g}(M_{k,p})}{\hat{g}(M_{1,p})} = rac{1+lpha_p\cos 2\phi_k+eta_p\sin 2\phi_k}{1+lpha_p\cos 2\phi_1+eta_p\sin 2\phi_1}$$



$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + t_p \cos 2\left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + \frac{\cos 2\psi_k}{\cos 2\phi_k} + \frac{\sin 2\psi_k}{\sin 2\phi_k} \sin 2\phi_k\right)$$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = \frac{1 + \alpha_p \cos 2\phi_k + \beta_p \sin 2\phi_k}{1 + \alpha_p \cos 2\phi_1 + \beta_p \sin 2\phi_1}$$

$$I_{k,p} - I_{1,p} = I_{1,p} \alpha_p \cos 2\phi_k + I_{1,p} \beta_p \sin 2\phi_k$$

$$- I_{k,p} \alpha_p \cos 2\phi_1 + I_{k,p} \beta_p \sin 2\phi_1$$

$$\text{ where } I_{k,p} = \hat{g}(M_{k,p})$$



$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a_p \cos 2 \left(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_p
ight)$$












Solve linear system

$\mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{O}^T \mathbf{O})^{-1} \mathbf{O}^T \mathbf{D}$



Polarimetry

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p + a \cos 2ig(\phi_k - \hat{\psi}_pig)$$



Overview







$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + lpha_p \cos 2\phi_k + eta_p \sin 2\phi_k
ight)$$

 $KP data \geq P+K unknown$

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + lpha_p \cos 2 \phi_k + eta_p \sin 2 \phi_k
ight)$$

$KP data \geq P+K unknown$



At least - 2 object points - 2 polarizing channels

$$\hat{g}(M_{k,p}) = t_p \left(1 + lpha_p \cos 2 \phi_k + eta_p \sin 2 \phi_k
ight)$$

$KP data \geq P+K unknown$



Experiments – Simulation⁸²

Known CRF



- 1. Our method performs well
- 2. Schechner's method is sensitive to initialization
- 3. Schechner's method is less reliable when # phi is small, but our method is still robust

Experiments – Simulation⁸³

Unknown CRF



- 1. Our method performs well
- 2. Teo's method is sensitive to initialization
- 3. Teo's method is less reliable when # phi is small, but our method is still robust

Setup



84

Environment illumination

	Kno	wn ICRF	Unknown ICRF		
	CRF err. Ang. err.		CRF err.	Ang. err.	
Dark room Bright room	x x	0.76 ± 0.20 0.80 ± 0.28	0.01 ± 0.01 0.05 ± 0.01	$0.48{\pm}0.15 \\ 0.71{\pm}0.11$	
C					

- Reliably remove effect of environmental illumination

- The given ICRF could contain errors, but our joint method is good

Effectiveness of using less polarizer angles



Benefits of the adapted checker pattern P3

		Known ICRI	7	Unknown ICRF				
	CRF err	. Ang. err.	#images	CRF err.	Ang. err.	#images		
P0	X	$0.80 {\pm} 0.16$	≥ 4	0.20 ± 0.06	82.2 ± 26.1	≥ 4		
P1	×	$0.78 {\pm} 0.15$	≥ 4	0.07 ± 0.02	$1.24 {\pm} 0.43$	>4		
P2	×	$0.79 {\pm} 0.14$	≥ 4	0.02 ± 0.02	$0.38 {\pm} 0.32$	$\geq 4 + 11$		
P3	×	$0.78 {\pm} 0.15$	≥ 4	$0.01 {\pm} 0.01$	0.48 ± 0.15	≥ 4		

- known ICRF: standard checker pattern can achieve the same accuracy
- **unknown ICRF**: P1 suffers from *spatial inconsistency*
- unknown ICRF: more accurate but require more images
- **unknown ICRF**: our results is close to GT with less images

Benefits of the adapted checker pattern P3

		Known ICRI	7	Unknown ICRF			
	CRF err.	Ang. err.	#images	CRF err.	Ang. err.	#images	
P0	×	$0.80 {\pm} 0.16$	≥ 4	0.20 ± 0.06	82.2 ± 26.1	≥ 4	
P1	×	$0.78 {\pm} 0.15$	≥ 4	0.07 ± 0.02	1.24 ± 0.43	≥ 4	
P2	×	$0.79 {\pm} 0.14$	≥ 4	0.02 ± 0.02	$0.38 \!\pm\! 0.32$	$\geq 4 + 11$	
P3	×	0.78 ± 0.15	≥ 4	$0.01{\pm}0.01$	0.48 ± 0.15	≥ 4	

- Accurate estimated ICRF could be distorted during BA

Joint calibration vs. separate calibration

		Known ICRF			Unknown ICRF				
		CRF err.	Ang. err.	ψ err.	#images	CRF err.	Ang. err.	ψ err.	#images
Ţ	Separate Joint	x 0.02	0.45 0.38	3.08 0.19	$\geq 4+2$ ≥ 4	0.02 0.01	0.83 0.48	3.10 0.20	$\geq 4 + 2 + 11$ ≥ 4
									E)



CRF	Method	CRF err.	Ang. err.	#polar. ang.	#images
nwo	[2]	×	8.85 ± 15.39	≥ 4	≥ 4
k K	Ours	×	$0.62 {\pm} 0.28$	≥ 2	≥ 4
wn	[2] + ICRF	×	15.84 ± 29.59	≥ 4	$\geq 4 + 11$
kno	[3]	$0.13{\pm}0.09$	12.56 ± 7.31	≥ 4	≥ 4
m	Ours	0.04 ± 0.02	$0.63 {\pm} 0.18$	\geq 2	≥ 4







CRF	Method	CRF err.	Ang. err.	#polar. ang.	#images
uwo	[2]	×	8.85 ± 15.39	≥ 4	≥ 4
kne	Ours	×	$0.62 {\pm} 0.28$	\geq 2	≥ 4
мп	[2] + ICRF	×	15.84 29.59	≦≥4	$\geq 4 + 11$
kno	[3]	0.13 ± 0.09	12.56 ± 7.31	$\sim \geq 4$	≥ 4
un	Ours	$0.04\!\pm\!0.02$	$0.63 {\pm} 0.18$	\geq 2	≥ 4



CRF	Method	CRF err.	Ang. err.	#polar. ang.	#images
UMO	[2]	×	8.85 ± 15.39	≥ 4	≥ 4
kne	Ours	×	0.62 ± 0.28	\geq 2	≥ 4
МN	[2] + ICRF	×	15.84 ± 29.59	≥ 4	$\geq 4 + 11$
kno	[3]	$0.13{\pm}0.09$	12.56 ± 7.31	≥ 4	≥ 4
un	Ours	$0.04\!\pm\!0.02$	$0.63 {\pm} 0.18$	\geq 2	≥ 4



CRF	Method	CRF err.	Ang. err.	#polar. ang.	#images
uwo	[2]	×	8.85 ± 15.39	≥ 4	≥ 4
kno	Ours	×	$0.62 {\pm} 0.28$	≥ 2	≥ 4
wn	[2] + ICRF	×	15.84 ± 29.59	≥ 4	$\geq 4 + 11$
kno	[3]	0.13 ± 0.09	12.56 ± 7.31	4	≥ 4
un	Ours	$0.04\!\pm\!0.02$	$0.63 {\pm} 0.18$	≥ 2	≥ 4

Applicability



Applicability





LCD screens with a touch panel



>>





Conclusion

We propose a *joint* calibration method using characteristics of an LCD monitor.

- Novel and new: The basic idea of joint calibration with an LCD monitor is novel, and our linear polarization calibration method due to the characteristics of LCD monitors is new.
- Efficient and effective: Using the estimated CRF as initialization, our bundle adjustment leads to accurate and reliable results. Which is demonstrated by conducting extensive experiments. Considering that LCD monitors are everywhere, we believe that our method is easy to use as self-calibration methods.

Thank you!