### Disparity Determination in Stereo Vision

### Lu Sang, Michael Haberl, Raphael Ullmann

### 22.07.2017



Algorithms

Results



### Algorithms

Results

Lu Sang, Michael Haberl, Raphael Ullmann





- What is the distance to an object?
- How to determine the distance by 2D images?

 $<sup>^{1} {\</sup>rm https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/4/49/Roboterhand.mit.Gluehbirne.png}$ 

- What is the distance to an object?
- How to determine the distance by 2D images?
- Applications
  - Autonomous driving
  - Robotics
  - Object recognition



1

 $^{1} \rm https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/4/49/Roboterhand.mit.Gluehbirne.png$ 

### Stereo Cameras





#### Figure: Left Picture [1]

#### Figure: Right Picture



#### Figure: Left Picture [1]

#### Figure: Right Picture



Figure: Left Picture [1] Figure: Right Picture

 Calculate for the pixels in the left image costs in the right image



Figure: Left Picture [1] Figure: Right Picture

- Calculate for the pixels in the left image costs in the right image
- 2 Pixel with minimal cost is the corresponding pixel

# Disparity



# Disparity



### Disparity

Pixel distance of related pixels.











### Distance

$$z = \frac{f \cdot b}{d}$$

- Distance z
- Focal length of the camera f
- Disparity d





### Algorithms

Results

### Overview





### Overview





#### Lu Sang, Michael Haberl, Raphael Ullmann

### Pre-processing: Undistortion







#### **Original Picture**

### Undistorted Picture

Lu Sang, Michael Haberl, Raphael Ullmann

# Pre-processing: Undistortion









**Original Picture** 



### Undistorted Picture

















#### Left Picture

**Right Picture** 

Lu Sang, Michael Haberl, Raphael Ullmann





Left Picture



**Right Picture** 

# Modelling: Energy Function



### **Energy Function**

### $\operatorname{argmin}_d C(p,d) + S(p,d)$

- Cost C(p, d) for every pixel p and disparities d = 1, ..., D
- Regularization S(p, d)
  - E.g. penalty for deviation of neighbouring pixels



# Cost Calculation: Comparing Windows





# Cost Calculation: Comparing Windows







Lu Sang, Michael Haberl, Raphael Ullmann

## Cost Calculation: Cross Correlation





# Cost Calculation: Cross Correlation



Cost Calculation: Cross Correlation









=


Total sum = 2  $\Rightarrow$  Costs = -2



Total sum = 2 
$$\Rightarrow$$
 Costs = -2







Total sum = 2  $\Rightarrow$  Costs = -2







=



Total sum = 2  $\Rightarrow$  Costs = -2



Total sum = 4  $\Rightarrow$  Costs = -4



Total sum = 2  $\Rightarrow$  Costs = -2



Total sum = 4  $\Rightarrow$  Costs = -4

Normalization and Zero Mean: Values in [-1, 1]

# Cost Calculation: Result





# Cost Calculation: Result





# Cost Calculation: Result





• Error Rate of NCC: 33.09%

## Test Data









### Figure: Right Image

## Test Data



- Middlebury Dataset
- Ground Truth
- Leaderboard



# Algorithm Defect







# Pyramid Scheme





# Pyramid Scheme















# Pyramid Scheme





## Pyramid Scheme: Results







Figure: Results of NCC

Figure: Results of Pyramid Scheme

- Error Rate of NCC: 33.09%
- Error Rate of Pyramid Scheme: 28.1%





- Interpret Cross Correlation as confidence indicator
- Use only pixels with high confidence
- Replace low confidence by values with high confidence in the window

# Force Local Consistency: Confidence Map







Figure: Results of NCC

Figure: Confidence Map

- Black point: trustworthy pixel with correct disparity (C(p) ≥ T).
- Red point: unreliable pixel with violated disparity (C(p) < T).





### 1 Mark all violated pixels.





- 1 Mark all violated pixels.
- 2 Find the pixel with max NCC coefficient.





- 1 Mark all violated pixels.
- 2 Find the pixel with max NCC coefficient.
- **3** Replace the disparity value by using the disparity of new pixel.

## Force Local Consistency: Results







### Figure: Results of NCC

### Figure: Results of FLC

- Error Rate of NCC: 33.09%
- Error Rate of FLC: 26.90%



# Local Penalty





### Local Penalty

- 1 Smoothness check
- 2 Search four directions
- 3 Punish on NCC coefficient

### 4 Iterate



Post Processing: Median Filter



## **Final Results**







### Figure: Results of FLC

Figure: After Post-processing

- Error Rate of FLC: 26.90%
- Error Rate of FLC + Median filter: 21.10%



**Problem Description** 

Algorithms

Results

### Results: Average Error Rates



## **Own Pictures**





Figure: Left Image

Figure: Pyramid Scheme + Median Filter

## **Own Pictures**



Figure: Left Image



Figure: Pyramid Scheme + Median Filter

# Summary



# Failed Approaches

- Disparity Calculation:
  - Cost Aggregation
  - Gradient Guided Weighted Match
  - Neural Network
- Disparity Refinement
  - Local Interpolation
  - Cubic Plane Interpolation
  - Segment Penalty
- Post-processing
  - Bilateral Filter
  - Gradient Guided Mask Filter

# Failed Approaches

- Disparity Calculation:
  - Cost Aggregation
  - Gradient Guided Weighted Match
  - Neural Network
- Disparity Refinement
  - Local Interpolation
  - Cubic Plane Interpolation
  - Segment Penalty
- Post-processing
  - Bilateral Filter
  - Gradient Guided Mask Filter



Figure: Disparity Image using Neural Networks

## Thanks!


## Sources

 D. Scharstein, H. Hirschmüller, Y. Kitajima, G. Krathwohl, N. Nesic, X. Wang, and P. Westling. High-resolution stereo datasets with subpixel-accurate ground truth. In German Conference on Pattern Recognition (GCPR 2014), Münster, Germany, September 2014