

Coded photography



15-463, 15-663, 15-862
Computational Photography
Fall 2018, Lecture 14

Overview of today's lecture

- The coded photography paradigm.
- Dealing with depth blur: coded aperture.
- Dealing with depth blur: focal sweep.
- Dealing with depth blur: generalized optics.
- Dealing with motion blur: coded exposure.
- Dealing with motion blur: parabolic sweep.

Slide credits

Most of these slides were adapted from:

- Fredo Durand (MIT).
- Anat Levin (Technion).
- Gordon Wetzstein (Stanford).

The coded photography paradigm

Conventional photography




real world



optics



captured image




computation



enhanced image

- Optics capture something that is (close to) the final image.
- Computation mostly “enhances” captured image (e.g., deblur).

Coded photography




- Generalized optics encode world into intermediate representation.
- Generalized computation decodes representation into multiple images.

Can you think of any examples?


Early example: mosaicing




real world



generalized
optics



coded representation
of real world




generalized
computation



final image(s)

- Color filter array encodes color into a mosaic.
- Demosaicing decodes color into RGB image.

Recent example: plenoptic camera



- Plenoptic camera encodes world into lightfield.
- Lightfield rendering decodes lightfield into refocused or multi-viewpoint images.

Why are our images blurry?

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| • Lens imperfections. | ← | last lecture: deconvolution | } conventional photography |
| • Camera shake. | ← | last lecture: blind deconvolution | |
| • Scene motion. | ← | flutter shutter, motion-invariant photo | } coded photography |
| • Depth defocus. | ← | coded aperture, focal sweep, lattice lens | |


Why are our images blurry?

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| • Lens imperfections. | ← | last lecture: deconvolution | } conventional photography |
| • Camera shake. | ← | last lecture: blind deconvolution | |
| • Scene motion. | ← | flutter shutter, motion-invariant photo | } coded photography |
| • Depth defocus. | ← | coded aperture, focal sweep, lattice lens | |

Dealing with depth blur: coded aperture

Defocus blur


Point spread function (PSF): The blur kernel of a (perfect) lens at some out-of-focus depth.



What does the blur kernel depend on?



Defocus blur

Point spread function (PSF): The blur kernel of a (perfect) lens at some out-of-focus depth.





- Aperture determines *shape* of kernel.
- Depth determines *scale* of blur kernel.



Depth determines scale of blur kernel





Depth determines scale of blur kernel





Depth determines scale of blur kernel





Depth determines scale of blur kernel



Depth determines scale of blur kernel




Aperture determines shape of blur kernel




Aperture determines shape of blur kernel



photo of aperture



shape of aperture
(optical transfer function, OTF)




What causes these lines?

blur kernel
(point spread function, PSF)

How do the OTF and PSF relate to each other?

Removing depth defocus



measured PSFs at different depths



input defocused image

How would you create an all in-focus image given the above?


Removing depth defocus

Defocus is *local* convolution with a depth-dependent kernel


depth 3




=




*




depth 2




=




*




depth 1




=



*



input defocused image



measured PSFs at different depths

How would you create an all in-focus image given the above?


Removing depth defocus

Defocus is *local* convolution with a depth-dependent kernel

depth 3




=




*




depth 2




=




*




depth 1




=



*



input defocused image






measured PSFs at different depths

How would you create an all in-focus image given the above?

Removing depth defocus


- Deconvolve each image patch with all kernels
- Select the right scale by evaluating the deconvolution results






How do we
select the
correct scale?




Removing depth defocus


Problem: With standard aperture, results at different scales look very similar.






 \ast^{-1}  =  wrong scale 




 \ast^{-1}  =  correct scale ?




 \ast^{-1}  =  correct scale ?


Coded aperture


Solution: Change aperture so that it is easier to pick the correct scale


$$\text{ABC} *^{-1} \text{kernel} = \text{blurred ABC}$$

wrong scale 


$$\text{ABC} *^{-1} \text{kernel} = \text{sharp ABC}$$

correct scale 


$$\text{ABC} *^{-1} \text{kernel} = \text{blurred ABC}$$

wrong scale 



Build your own coded aperture




Voila!





Coded aperture changes shape of kernel



Coded aperture changes shape of kernel



Coded aperture changes shape of PSF



in-focus photo



out-of-focus, circular aperture





out-of-focus, coded aperture


Coded aperture changes shape of PSF

New PSF preserves high frequencies


- More content available to help us determine correct depth



↓ FFT



↓




Input



All-focused
(deconvolved)




Comparison between standard and coded aperture



Ringing due to wrong scale estimation




Comparison between standard and coded aperture



Refocusing



Refocusing



Refocusing



Depth estimation



Input



All-focused
(deconvolved)



Refocusing



Refocusing



Refocusing




Depth estimation






Any problems with using a coded aperture?

Any problems with using a coded aperture?

- We lose a lot of light due to blocking.




- The deconvolution becomes harder due to more diffraction/zeros in frequency domain.



- We still need to select correct scale.


Dealing with depth blur: focal sweep

The difficulty of dealing with depth defocus




At every focus setting, objects at different depths are blurred by different PSF

The difficulty of dealing with depth defocus




At every focus setting, objects at different depths are blurred by different PSF

The difficulty of dealing with depth defocus



At every focus setting, objects at different depths are blurred by different PSF


The difficulty of dealing with depth defocus



At every focus setting, objects at different depths are blurred by different PSF

As we sweep through focus settings, each point every object is blurred by all possible PSFs

Focal sweep




PSFs for object at depth 1



PSFs for object at depth 2


linear motion:




Go through all focus settings
during a single exposure

What is the effective
PSF in this case?

Focal sweep



linear motion:



Go through all focus settings
during a single exposure

$$\int \begin{matrix} \text{[blurry PSF]} & \text{[less blurry PSF]} & \text{[sharp PSF]} & \text{[less blurry PSF]} & \text{[blurry PSF]} \end{matrix} dt = \begin{matrix} \text{[blurred effective PSF]} \end{matrix} \quad \text{effective PSF for object at depth 1}$$

$$\int \begin{matrix} \text{[sharp PSF]} & \text{[less blurry PSF]} & \text{[blurry PSF]} & \text{[less blurry PSF]} & \text{[blurry PSF]} \end{matrix} dt = \begin{matrix} \text{[blurred effective PSF]} \end{matrix} \quad \text{effective PSF for object at depth 2}$$

Anything special about
these effective PSFs?


Focal sweep

The effective PSF is:

1. Depth-invariant – all points are blurred the same way regardless of depth.
2. Never sharp – all points will be blurry regardless of depth.

What are the implications of this?

1. The image we capture will be sharp nowhere; but
2. We can use simple (global) deconvolution to sharpen parts we want




1. Can we estimate depth from this?
2. Can we do refocusing from this?

Focal sweep

The effective PSF is:

1. Depth-invariant – all points are blurred the same way regardless of depth.
2. Never sharp – all points will be blurry regardless of depth.

What are the implications of this?




Focal sweep

The effective PSF is:

1. Depth-invariant – all points are blurred the same way regardless of depth.
2. Never sharp – all points will be blurry regardless of depth.

What are the implications of this?

1. The image we capture will not be sharp anywhere; but
2. We can use simple (global) deconvolution to sharpen parts we want



1. Can we estimate depth from this?
2. Can we do refocusing from this?


Focal sweep

The effective PSF is:

1. Depth-invariant – all points are blurred the same way regardless of depth.
2. Never sharp – all points will be blurry regardless of depth.

What are the implications of this?

1. The image we capture will not be sharp anywhere; but
2. We can use simple (global) deconvolution to sharpen parts we want




1. Can we estimate depth from this?
2. Can we do refocusing from this?



Depth-invariance of the PSF means that we have lost all depth information

How can you implement focal sweep?

How can you implement focal sweep?




Use translation stage to move sensor relative to fixed lens during exposure



Rotate focusing ring to move lens relative to fixed sensor during exposure

Comparison of different PSFs



Depth of field comparisons

conventional photo
(small DOF)



captured focal sweep
always blurry!



conventional photo
(large DOF, noisy)




EDOF image




Any problems with using focal sweep?

Any problems with using focal sweep?

- We have moving parts (vibrations, motion blur).




- Perfect depth invariance requires very constant speed.




- We lose depth information.

Dealing with depth blur: generalized optics

Change optics, not aperture




Wavefront coding




Replace lens with a cubic phase plate

Wavefront coding





In focus



Out of focus




standard lens



wavefront coding

- Rays no longer converge.
- Approximately depth-invariant PSF for certain range of depths.

Lattice lens




Add lenslet array with varying focal length in front of lens

Lattice lens



Does this remind you of something?



Lattice lens

- Effectively captures only the “useful” subset of the 4D lightfield.

Light field spectrum: 4D

Image spectrum: 2D

Depth: 1D




} 3D

→ **Dimensionality gap (Ng 05)**

Only the 3D manifold corresponding to physical focusing distance is useful

- PSF is not depth-invariant, so local deconvolution as in coded aperture.

PSFs at different depths



Results

Standard lens



Results

Lattice lens



Results

Standard lens



Results

Lattice lens



Results

Standard lens



Results

Lattice lens



Refocusing example



Refocusing example



Refocusing example



Comparison of different techniques

Depth of field
comparison:



standard
lens

<




coded
aperture

<<



focal
sweep

<



wavefront
coding

<




lattice
lens

Object at in-focus depth



Object at extreme depth



Diffusion coded photography

- can also do EDOF with diffuser as coded aperture, has better inversion characteristics than lattice focal lens



Conventional Camera



Diffusion Coded Camera

Can you think of any issues?


Dealing with motion blur

Why are our images blurry?

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| • Lens imperfections. | ← | last lecture: deconvolution | } conventional photography |
| • Camera shake. | ← | last lecture: blind deconvolution | |
| • Scene motion. | ← | flutter shutter, motion-invariant photo | } coded photography |
| • Depth defocus. | ← | coded aperture, focal sweep, lattice lens | |

Motion blur

Most scene is static



Can moving linearly from left to right

Motion blur



blurry image of
moving object



motion blur kernel



sharp image of
static object

What does the motion blur kernel depend on?

Motion blur



blurry image of
moving object



motion blur kernel



sharp image of
static object


What does the motion blur kernel depend on?

- Motion velocity determines direction of kernel.
- Shutter speed determines width of kernel.

Can we use deconvolution to remove motion blur?

Challenges of motion deblurring

- Blur kernel is not invertible.
- Blur kernel is unknown.
- Blur kernel is different for different objects.



Challenges of motion deblurring


- Blur kernel is not invertible.



How would you deal with this?

- Blur kernel is unknown.

- Blur kernel is different for different objects.



Dealing with motion blur: coded exposure

Coded exposure a.k.a. flutter shutter

Coded exposure (i.e., shutter speed) to make motion blur kernel better conditioned.

traditional
camera



blurry image of
moving object

$$= \text{[trapezoidal kernel]} *$$

motion blur kernel



sharp image of
static object

flutter-shutter
camera



blurry image of
moving object

$$= \text{[multi-peaked kernel]} *$$


motion blur kernel



sharp image of
static object

How would you implement coded exposure?

How would you implement coded exposure?




electronics for external
shutter control



very fast external
shutter

Coded exposure a.k.a. flutter shutter



motion blur kernel
in time domain




motion blur kernel
in Fourier domain



Why is flutter
shutter
better?



Coded exposure a.k.a. flutter shutter





Motion deblurring comparison



conventional photography


flutter-shutter photography

deconvolved
output



blurry
input





License Plate Retrieval




License Plate Retrieval

Challenges of motion deblurring


- Blur kernel is not invertible.

- Blur kernel is unknown.



How would you deal
with these two?

- Blur kernel is different for different objects.



Dealing with motion blur: parabolic sweep

Motion-invariant photography

Introduce extra motion so that:


- Everything is blurry; and
- The blur kernel is *motion invariant* (same for all objects).

How would you achieve this?

Parabolic sweep


Sensor position $x(t) = a t^2$

- start by moving very fast to the right
 - continuously slow down until stop
 - continuously accelerate to the left
- Intuition:
 - for any velocity, there is one instant where we track perfectly
 - all velocities captured same amount of time



Hardware implementation

Approximate small translation by small rotation



Some results



static camera input - unknown
and variable blur



parabolic input - blur is
invariant to velocity

Some results




static camera input - unknown
and variable blur



output after deconvolution

Is this blind or non-blind deconvolution?

Some results



static camera input



parabolic camera input



deconvolution output

Some results



static camera input



output after deconvolution
Why does it fail in this case?

References

Basic reading:

- Levin et al., “Image and depth from a conventional camera with a coded aperture,” SIGGRAPH 2007.
- Veeraraghavan et al., “Dappled photography: Mask enhanced cameras for heterodyned light fields and coded aperture refocusing,” SIGGRAPH 2007.
The two papers introducing coded aperture for depth and refocusing, the first covers deblurring in more detail, whereas the second deals with optimal mask selection and includes very interesting lightfield analysis.
- Nagahara et al., “Flexible depth of field photography,” ECCV 2008 and PAMI 2010.
The focal sweep paper.
- Dowski and Cathey, “Extended depth of field through wave-front coding,” Applied Optics 1995.
The wavefront coding paper.
- Levin et al., “4D Frequency Analysis of Computational Cameras for Depth of Field Extension,” SIGGRAPH 2009.
The lattice focal lens paper, which also includes a discussion of wavefront coding.
- Cossairt et al., “Diffusion Coded Photography for Extended Depth of Field,” SIGGRAPH 2010.
The diffusion coded photography paper.
- Raskar et al., “Coded Exposure Photography: Motion Deblurring using Fluttered Shutter,” SIGGRAPH 2006.
The flutter shutter paper.
- Levin et al., “Motion-Invariant Photography,” SIGGRAPH 2008.
The motion-invariant photography paper.

Additional reading:

- Zhang and Levoy, “Wigner distributions and how they relate to the light field,” ICCP 2009.
This paper has a nice discussion of wavefront coding, in addition to analysis of lightfields and their relationship to wave optics concepts.
- Gehm et al., “Single-shot compressive spectral imaging with a dual-disperser architecture,” Optics Express 2007.
This paper introduces the use of coded apertures for hyperspectral imaging, instead of depth and refocusing.