Optimal Radiometric Calibration for Camera-Display Communication

Abstract

- A handheld camera pointed at the display can receive both the display image, but also an underlying message.
- Differencing the camera-captured frames results in errors due to photometric effects, and distorts message recovery.
- Online radiometric calibration significantly reduces message recovery errors, especially for low intensity messages and oblique camera angles.



Figure 1: Online Radiometric Calibration mitigates the distorting effects of the CDTF and enables more accurate message recovery. From the display to the camera, the light signal is affected by display photometry, camera pose and camera radiometry. In each pair of intensity histograms shown above, the left represents an image histogram before passing through the CDTF, and the right represents the histogram after the CDTF.

Eric Wengrowski, Wenjia Yuan, Kristin Dana, Ashwin Ashok, Marco Gruteser, Narayan Mandayam Rutgers University Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering



Figure 2: Message Embedding and Retrieval. Two sequential frames are sent, an original frame and a frame with an embedded message image. Simple differencing is not sufficient for message retrieval. Our method (OORC) is used to recover messages accurately.

Camera-Display Transfer Pipeline



Figure 3: Image Formation Pipeline: The image I_d is displayed by an electronic display with an emittance function e. The display is observed by a camera with sensitivity s and radiometric response function f.

Radiometric Calibration

The emittance function has three components, $\mathbf{e} =$ (e_r, e_q, e_b) . The emitted light I as a function of wavelength λ for a given pixel (x, y) on the electronic display is given by:

$$I(x, y, \lambda) = \rho \cdot \mathbf{e}(\lambda, \theta). \tag{1}$$

Accounting for nonlinearity of the camera and display, consider the radiometric response function f:

$$\mathbf{I_c} = f\left(\int_{\lambda} \left[\rho \cdot \mathbf{e}(\lambda, \theta)\right] \mathbf{s}(\lambda) d\lambda\right).$$
(2)

where $\mathbf{s} = (s_r, s_q, s_b)$. The camera-captured intensity is:

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{d}} = f^{-1}\left(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{d}}\right) = g\left(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{d}}\right). \tag{3}$$

Let g(i) be the inverse radiometric function f^{-1} , modeled with a fourth order polynomial:

$$g(i) = a_4 i^4 + a_3 i^3 + a_2 i^2 + a_1 i + a_0.$$
 (4)





Key Result

Online Radiometric Calibration significantly improves robust messaging, especially for lowintensity messages and oblique camera angles

Results

ccuracy (%)	Naive	Two-	OORC	Hidden
	Threshold	step		Ratex
Canon-iMac	72.94	75.67	99.17	89.63
Canon-LG	58.94	84.94	98.44	95.74
lanon-	48.44	64.89	99.39	89.91
amsung				
likon-iMac	60.17	75.50	95.17	90.00
likon-LG	49.72	73.39	99.33	94.81
likon-	47.22	72.89	95.00	89.54
amsung				
ony-iMac	64.44	76.00	99.06	71.11
ony-LG	56.11	75.61	98.56	90.93
ony-Samsung	47.50	79.11	98.89	87.80
verage	56.17	75.33	98.11	88.83
				·

Table 1: Accuracy of embedded message recovery and labeling with additive intensity $\kappa = +3$ on [0,255] and captured with 45° oblique view. Low κ values are desirable (because they are less visible) but lead to larger errors, especially at oblique views.



- We demonstrate experimental results for **nine** different camera-display combinations at frontal and oblique viewing angles.
- Prior methods of digital watermarking ignore the photometric effects of the camera-display transfer function and the dependence on camera pose.
- Naive thresholding is a poor choice because the variation of display intensity with camera pose is ignored.
- These methods lead to lower message recovery rates, especially for oblique views (45°) and small intensity messages.
- Our experimental results show that hidden, dynamic messages can be embedded and recovered robustly.

This work was supported primarily by the National Science Foundation under NSF grant CNS-1065463.



Intensity vs Radiometric Pose

Figure 4: Notice as observation angle changes, so does the distribution of captured intensities illustrating the angular variation of the display emittance function.

Conclusion

Acknowledgements

Contact Information

Email: eric.wengrowski@rutgers.edu

• Web: https://ericwengrowski.com



