## Reconnaissance d'objets et vision artificielle http://www.di.ens.fr/willow/teaching/recvis09

## Lecture 3

A refresher on camera geometry Image alignment and 3D alignment

## Check it out!

## Cours de "Computational photography" de Frédo Durand Le jeudi de 9h30 a 12h30 Salle Info 2

http://people.csail.mit.edu/fredo/Classes/Comp\_Photo\_ENS/

# N'oubliez pas!

# Premier exercice de programmation du le 27 octobre

http://www.di.ens.fr/willow/teaching/recvis09/assignment1/

## Pinhole perspective equation





#### NOTE: z is always negative...

## Affine models: Weak perspective projection



When the scene relief is small compared its distance from the Camera, *m* can be taken constant: weak perspective projection.

#### Affine models: Orthographic projection



$$\begin{cases} x' = x \\ y' = y \end{cases}$$

When the camera is at a (roughly constant) distance from the scene, take *m*=1.

## Analytical camera geometry



#### Coordinate Changes: Pure Translations



 $\overrightarrow{O_BP} = \overrightarrow{O_BO_A} + \overrightarrow{O_AP} \iff ^{B}P = ^{A}P + ^{B}O_A$ 

### Coordinate Changes: Pure Rotations



## Coordinate Changes: Rotations about the z Axis



$${}^{B}_{A}R = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta & 0 \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$



A rotation matrix is characterized by the following properties:

• Its inverse is equal to its transpose, and

• its determinant is equal to 1.

Or equivalently:

• Its rows (or columns) form a right-handed orthonormal coordinate system.





$$\overrightarrow{OP} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{i}_A & \mathbf{j}_A & \mathbf{k}_A \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A \\ A \\ A \\ A \\ Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{i}_B & \mathbf{j}_B & \mathbf{k}_B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B \\ Z \\ B \\ B \\ Z \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow {}^{B}P = {}^{B}_{A}R^{A}P$$

## Coordinate Changes: Rigid Transformations



 $^{A}P$  ${}^{B}P$  ${}^{B}_{A}\boldsymbol{B}$ 

## Pinhole perspective equation





#### NOTE: z is always negative...

#### The intrinsic parameters of a camera





$$\begin{cases} \hat{u} = \frac{x}{z} \\ \hat{v} = \frac{y}{z} \end{cases} \iff \hat{p} = \frac{1}{z} (\text{Id} \quad \mathbf{0}) \begin{pmatrix} P \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

#### Physical image coordinates

Normalized image coordinates

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u = kf\frac{x}{z} \\ v = lf\frac{y}{z} \end{array} \right.$$

#### The intrinsic parameters of a camera



#### Calibration matrix

$$\boldsymbol{p} = \mathcal{K}\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \quad ext{where} \quad \boldsymbol{p} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad ext{and} \quad \mathcal{K} \stackrel{ ext{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} lpha & -lpha \cot heta & u_0 \\ 0 & rac{eta}{\sin heta} & v_0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

The perspective projection equation

$$\boldsymbol{p} = \frac{1}{z} \mathcal{M} \boldsymbol{P}, \text{ where } \mathcal{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{K} \ \mathbf{0})$$

## The extrinsic parameters of a camera

• When the camera frame (C) is different from the world frame (W),  $\binom{^{C}P}{_{1}} = \binom{^{C}C}{_{W}\mathcal{R}} \quad \stackrel{^{C}O_{W}}{_{0}^{T}} \quad \binom{^{W}P}{_{1}}.$ 

• Thus,

$$oldsymbol{p} = rac{1}{z} \mathcal{M} oldsymbol{P}, \hspace{1cm} ext{where} \hspace{1cm} \left\{ egin{array}{ll} \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{K} \left( \mathcal{R} & oldsymbol{t} 
ight), \ \mathcal{R} = {}_W^C \mathcal{R}, \ \mathcal{I} = {}^C O_W, \ \mathcal{I} = {}^C O_W, \ \mathcal{I} = {}^C O_W 
ight). \end{array} 
ight.$$

• Note: z is *not* independent of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathbf{P}$ :

$$\mathcal{M} = egin{pmatrix} oldsymbol{m}_1^T \ oldsymbol{m}_2^T \ oldsymbol{m}_3^T \end{pmatrix} \Longrightarrow z = oldsymbol{m}_3 \cdot oldsymbol{P}, \quad ext{or} \quad \left\{ egin{array}{c} u = rac{oldsymbol{m}_1 \cdot oldsymbol{P}}{oldsymbol{m}_3 \cdot oldsymbol{P}}, \ v = rac{oldsymbol{m}_2 \cdot oldsymbol{P}}{oldsymbol{m}_3 \cdot oldsymbol{P}}. \end{array} 
ight.$$

1

# Perspective projections induce projective transformations between planes



## Affine cameras

#### Weak-perspective projection



#### Paraperspective projection



## More affine cameras

Orthographic projection



#### Parallel projection



### Weak-perspective projection model

$$oldsymbol{p} = rac{1}{z_{
m r}} \mathcal{M} oldsymbol{P}$$

p = M P

(p and P are in homogeneous coordinates)

(*P* is in homogeneous coordinates)

p = A P + b (neither p nor P is in hom. coordinates)

Affine projections induce affine transformations from planes onto their images.



### Image alignment task





- It helps to be able to compare *descriptors* of local patches surrounding interest points (cf last lecture).
- This is not strictly necessary. We will concentrate here on the geometry of the problem.

## Dealing with outliers

The set of putative matches still contains a very high percentage of outliers

How do we fit a geometric transformation to a small subset of all possible matches?

Possible strategies:

- RANSAC
- Incremental alignment
- Hough transform
- Hashing

## Strategy 1: RANSAC

RANSAC loop (Fischler & Bolles, 1981):

- Randomly select a *seed group* of matches
- Compute transformation from seed group
- Find *inliers* to this transformation
- If the number of inliers is sufficiently large, re-compute least-squares estimate of transformation on all of the inliers
- Keep the transformation with the largest number of inliers









## Strategy 2: Incremental alignment

Take advantage of strong locality constraints: only pick close-by matches to start with, and gradually add more matches in the same neighborhood

Approach introduced in [Ayache & Faugeras, 1982; Hebert & Faugeras, 1983; Gaston & Lozano-Perez, 1984]

Illustrated here with the method from S. Lazebnik, C. Schmid and J. Ponce, "Semi-local affine parts for object recognition", BMVC 2004



#### Generating seed groups:

- Identify triples of neighboring features (*i*, *j*, *k*) in first image
- Find all triples (*i*', *j*', *k*') in the second image such that *i*' (resp. *j*', *k*') is a putative match of *i* (resp. *j*, *k*), and *j*', *k*' are neighbors of *i*'



#### Beginning with each seed triple, repeat:

- Estimate the aligning transformation between corresponding features in current group of matches
- Grow the group by adding other consistent matches in the neighborhood

Until the transformation is no longer consistent or no more matches can be found



Beginning with each seed triple, repeat:

- Estimate the aligning transformation between corresponding features in current group of matches
- Grow the group by adding other consistent matches in the neighborhood

Until the transformation is no longer consistent or no more matches can be found



Beginning with each seed triple, repeat:

- Estimate the aligning transformation between corresponding features in current group of matches
- Grow the group by adding other consistent matches in the neighborhood

Until the transformation is no longer consistent or no more matches can be found



Beginning with each seed triple, repeat:

- Estimate the aligning transformation between corresponding features in current group of matches
- Grow the group by adding other consistent matches in the neighborhood

Until the transformation is no longer consistent or no more matches can be found

## Strategy 3: Hough transform

Suppose our features are scale- and rotation-covariant

• Then a single feature match provides an alignment hypothesis (translation, scale, orientation)



David G. Lowe. "Distinctive image features from scale-invariant keypoints", *IJCV* 60 (2), pp. 91-110, 2004.
### Strategy 3: Hough transform

Suppose our features are scale- and rotation-covariant

- Then a single feature match provides an alignment hypothesis (translation, scale, orientation)
- Of course, a hypothesis obtained from a single match is unreliable
- Solution: let each match vote for its hypothesis in a Hough space with very coarse bins





David G. Lowe. "Distinctive image features from scale-invariant keypoints", *IJCV* 60 (2), pp. 91-110, 2004.

## Hough transform

- An early type of voting scheme
- General outline:
  - Discretize parameter space into bins
  - For each feature point in the image, put a vote in every bin in the parameter space that could have generated this point
  - Find bins that have the most votes



P.V.C. Hough, *Machine Analysis of Bubble Chamber Pictures,* Proc. Int. Conf. High Energy Accelerators and Instrumentation, 1959

#### Parameter space representation

• A line in the image corresponds to a point in Hough space



#### Parameter space representation

- What does a point (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) in the image space map to in the Hough space?
  - Answer: the solutions of  $b = -x_0m + y_0$
  - This is a line in Hough space



#### Parameter space representation

- Where is the line that contains both (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) and (x<sub>1</sub>,y<sub>1</sub>)?
  - It is the intersection of the lines  $b = -x_0m + y_0$  and  $b = -x_1m + y_1$



#### Hough transform details (D. Lowe's system)

- **Training phase:** For each model feature, record 2D location, scale, and orientation of model (relative to normalized feature frame)
- **Test phase:** Let each match between a test and a model feature vote in a 4D Hough space
  - Use broad bin sizes of 30 degrees for orientation, a factor of 2 for scale, and 0.25 times image size for location
  - Vote for two closest bins in each dimension
- Find all bins with at least three votes and perform geometric verification
  - Estimate least squares affine transformation
  - Use stricter thresholds on transformation residual
  - Search for additional features that agree with the alignment

Affine projections induce affine transformations from planes onto their images.



### Affine transformations

An affine transformation maps a parallelogram onto another parallelogram



### Fitting an affine transformation

Equation for affine transformation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} u' \\ v' \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & b_1 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & b_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

9 entries, 6 degrees of freedom

2 equations in 6 unknowns

U **a** = **u**'

In general uniquely determined by 3 correspondences

Linear least squares for more correspondences

$$\begin{bmatrix} u & v & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & u & v & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} \\ a_{12} \\ b_1 \\ a_{21} \\ a_{22} \\ b_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} u' \\ v' \end{bmatrix}$$

#### Strategy 4: Hashing

Make each invariant image feature into a low-dimensional "key" that indexes into a table of hypotheses



### Strategy 4: Hashing

Make each invariant image feature into a low-dimensional "key" that indexes into a table of hypotheses

Given a new test image, compute the hash keys for all features found in that image, access the table, and look for consistent hypotheses



#### Strategy 4: Hashing

- Make each invariant image feature into a low-dimensional "key" that indexes into a table of hypotheses
- Given a new test image, compute the hash keys for all features found in that image, access the table, and look for consistent hypotheses
- This can even work when we don't have any feature descriptors: we can take n-tuples of neighboring features and compute invariant hash codes from their geometric configurations



### Beyond affine transformations

What is the transformation between two views of a planar surface?



What is the transformation between images from two cameras that share the same center?





# Perspective projections induce projective transformations between planes



## Beyond affine transformations

**Homography:** plane projective transformation (transformation taking a quad to another arbitrary quad)



## Fitting a homography

Recall: homogenenous coordinates

$$(x,y) \Rightarrow \left[ egin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ 1 \end{array} 
ight]$$

Converting *to* homogenenous image coordinates

$$\begin{vmatrix} x \\ y \\ w \end{vmatrix} \Rightarrow (x/w, y/w)$$

Converting *from* homogenenous image coordinates

## Fitting a homography

Recall: homogenenous coordinates

$$(x,y) \Rightarrow \left[ egin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ 1 \end{array} 
ight]$$

Converting *to* homogenenous image coordinates

 $\Rightarrow (x/w, y/w)$ 

 $\boldsymbol{x}$ 

y

w

Equation for homography:

## Fitting a homography

Equation for homography:

$$\lambda \begin{bmatrix} x'_{i} \\ y'_{i} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} & h_{12} & h_{13} \\ h_{21} & h_{22} & h_{23} \\ h_{31} & h_{32} & h_{33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{i} \\ y_{i} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \lambda \mathbf{x}'_{i} = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x}$$

9 entries, 8 degrees of freedom (scale is arbitrary)

$$\mathbf{x}_i' \times \mathbf{H} \, \mathbf{x}_i = 0$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i}' \times \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} y_{i}' \mathbf{h}_{3}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{h}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} \\ \mathbf{h}_{1}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} - x_{i}' \mathbf{h}_{3}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{i}' \mathbf{h}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} - y_{i}' \mathbf{h}_{1}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}^T & -\mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{y}_i' \, \mathbf{x}_i^T \\ \mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0}^T & -\mathbf{x}_i' \, \mathbf{x}_i^T \\ -\mathbf{y}_i' \, \mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{x}_i' \, \mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0}^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1 \\ \mathbf{h}_2 \\ \mathbf{h}_3 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$$

3 equations, only 2 linearly independent

 $\mathbf{h}_{1}^{T}$ 

 $\mathbf{h}_3^T$ 

 $\mathbf{X}_{i}$ 

#### Direct linear transform

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}^{T} & \mathbf{x}_{1}^{T} & -y_{1}' \mathbf{x}_{1}^{T} \\ \mathbf{x}_{1}^{T} & \mathbf{0}^{T} & -x_{1}' \mathbf{x}_{1}^{T} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \mathbf{0}^{T} & \mathbf{x}_{n}^{T} & -y_{n}' \mathbf{x}_{n}^{T} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{h}_{1} \\ \mathbf{h}_{2} \\ \mathbf{h}_{3} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{h}$$

H has 8 degrees of freedom (9 parameters, but scale is arbitrary)

One match gives us two linearly independent equations Four matches needed for a minimal solution (null space of 8x9 matrix)

More than four: homogeneous least squares

#### Application: Panorama stitching







Images courtesy of A. Zisserman.

#### Recognizing panoramas

Given contents of a camera memory card, automatically figure out which pictures go together and stitch them together into panoramas



M. Brown and D. Lowe, "Recognizing panoramas", ICCV 2003.

## 1. Estimate homography (RANSAC)



# 1. Estimate homography (RANSAC)



## 1. Estimate homography (RANSAC)



## 2. Find connected sets of images



## 2. Find connected sets of images











## 2. Find connected sets of images















## 3. Stitch and blend the panoramas











#### Issues in alignment-based applications

#### Choosing the geometric alignment model

• Tradeoff between "correctness" and robustness (also, efficiency)

#### Choosing the descriptor

- "Rich" imagery (natural images): high-dimensional patch-based descriptors (e.g., SIFT)
- "Impoverished" imagery (e.g., star fields): need to create invariant geometric descriptors from k-tuples of point-based features

#### Strategy for finding putative matches

- Small number of images, one-time computation (e.g., panorama stitching): brute force search
- Large database of model images, frequent queries: indexing or hashing
- Heuristics for feature-space pruning of putative matches

#### Issues in alignment-based applications

Choosing the geometric alignment model Choosing the descriptor Strategy for finding putative matches Hypothesis generation strategy

- Relatively large inlier ratio: RANSAC
- Small inlier ratio: locality constraints, Hough transform

Hypothesis verification strategy

- Size of consensus set, residual tolerance depend on inlier ratio and expected accuracy of the model
- Possible refinement of geometric model
- Dense verification

# Affine Patches for 3D Alignment



# Repeatibility, covariance, invariance

Tell & Carlsson (2000); Kadir & Brady (2001); Matas et al. (2001); Tuytelaars & Van Gool (2002)



# Modeling and recognizing 3D rigid solids





Johnson & Hebert (1998); Lowe (1999)



Duda & Hart (1972); Weiss (1987); Burns et al. (1992); Mundy et al. (1992, 1994); Rothwell et al. (1992) Ayache & Faugeras (1982); Hebert & Faugeras (1983); Gaston et al. (1984); Huttenlocher & Ullman (1987)























Dataset: 149 training images of 8 objects



| Number of images per object |      |        |      |      |        |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|------|------|--------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Apple                       | Bear | Rubble | Salt | Shoe | Spidey | Truck | Vase |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29                          | 20   | 16     | 16   | 16   | 16     | 16    | 20   |  |  |  |  |  |







8 learned 3D object models (Rothganger et al.'04)

| Number of patches per model |      |        |      |      |        |       |      |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|------|------|--------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Apple                       | Bear | Rubble | Salt | Shoe | Spidey | Truck | Vase |  |  |  |  |
| 759                         | 4014 | 727    | 866  | 488  | 526    | 518   | 1085 |  |  |  |  |



8 objects present in each image.




## The four failures



## Some successes

