

# Photographic optics



# Course announcements

- Homework 1 is out.
  - Due September 18<sup>th</sup>.
  - Do not leave second part (pinhole camera) for the very last moment.
  - Any questions about homework 1.
- Camera tutorial is available on the course website.
- Please vote on Piazza about Discord or Slack or Pronto chat server.
- Should we reschedule this Wednesday's office hours to avoid overlap with RI town hall meeting?

# Overview of today's lecture

- Leftover from lecture 3.
- Paraxial optics.
- Ray transfer matrix analysis.
- Aberrations and compound lenses.
- Lens designations.
- Filters.
- Prisms.
- Exposure control.

# Slide credits



Many of these slides were adapted from:

- Kris Kitani (15-463, Fall 2016).
- Fredo Durand (MIT).
- Marc Levoy (Stanford).
- Gordon Wetzstein (Stanford).

# Paraxial optics

# Thin lens model

Simplification of geometric optics for well-designed lenses.



focal length  $f$

Two assumptions:


1. Rays passing through lens center are unaffected.
2. Parallel rays converge to a single point located on focal plane.

$$m = \frac{f}{D' - f}$$

$$\frac{1}{D'} + \frac{1}{D} = \frac{1}{f}$$

# Thin lens model

Simplification of geometric optics for well-designed lenses.



- Where do the thin lens properties come from?
- What determines the focal length of a thin lens?

Two assumptions:


1. Rays passing through lens center are unaffected.
2. Parallel rays converge to a single point located on focal plane.

$$m = \frac{f}{D' - f}$$
$$\frac{1}{D'} + \frac{1}{D} = \frac{1}{f}$$

# Real lenses

We will first consider the case of a system with an individual lens element



The lens' behavior is determined by three characteristics:






# Refraction

Refraction is the bending of rays of light when they cross optical interfaces (i.e., surfaces where the index of refraction changes).




# Refraction

Refraction is the bending of rays of light when they cross optical interfaces (i.e., surfaces where the index of refraction changes)




# Refraction

Refraction is the bending of rays of light when they cross optical interfaces (i.e., surfaces where the index of refraction changes)




# Refraction

Refraction is the bending of rays of light when they cross optical interfaces (i.e., surfaces where the index of refraction changes)



# Refraction

Refraction is the bending of rays of light when they cross optical interfaces (i.e., surfaces where the index of refraction changes)




Snell's law

$$n_1 \sin \theta_1 = n_2 \sin \theta_2$$


# Refraction at interfaces of complicated shapes

What shape should an interface have to make parallel rays converge to a point?




# Refraction at interfaces of complicated shapes

What shape should an interface have to make parallel rays converge to a point?



Single hyperbolic interface:  
point to parallel rays

Double hyperbolic interface:  
point to point rays





Therefore, lenses should also have hyperbolic shapes.



# Spherical lenses

In practice, lenses are often made to have spherical interfaces for ease of fabrication.

- Two roughly fitting curved surfaces ground together will eventually become spherical.



Spherical lenses don't bring parallel rays to a point.

- This is called *spherical aberration*.
- Approximately axial (i.e., paraxial) rays behave better.



# Paraxial approximation

Assume angles are small. Then:

$$\sin \theta \simeq \theta$$

$$\cos \theta \simeq 1$$

$$\tan \theta \simeq \theta$$

Where do these approximations come from?

# Paraxial approximation (a.k.a. first-order optics)

Assume angles are small. Then:

$$\sin \theta \simeq \theta$$

$$\cos \theta \simeq 1$$

$$\tan \theta \simeq \theta$$

Where do these approximations come from?


- First-order expansions of sin and cos functions.

$$\sin \theta = \theta - \frac{\theta^3}{3!} + \frac{\theta^5}{5!} - \frac{\theta^7}{7!} + \dots$$

$$\cos \theta = 1 - \frac{\theta^2}{2!} + \frac{\theta^4}{4!} - \frac{\theta^6}{6!} + \dots$$

# Refraction

Refraction is the bending of rays of light when they cross optical interfaces (i.e., surfaces where the index of refraction changes)




Snell's law

$$n_1 \sin \theta_1 = n_2 \sin \theta_2$$

How is Snell's law simplified under paraxial approximation?

# Refraction

Refraction is the bending of rays of light when they cross optical interfaces (i.e., surfaces where the index of refraction changes)




Snell's law

$$n_1 \sin \theta_1 = n_2 \sin \theta_2$$


How is Snell's law simplified under paraxial approximation?

$$n_1 \theta_1 = n_2 \theta_2$$

# Paraxial focusing



# Paraxial focusing




♦ assume  $e \approx 0$

♦ assume  $\sin u = h/l \approx u$  (for  $u$  in radians)

♦ assume  $\cos u \approx z/l \approx 1$


Where do these two equations come from?

# Paraxial focusing



How can we relate angles  $i$  and  $i'$  ?

# Paraxial focusing



Snell's law:


$$n \sin i = n' \sin i'$$

paraxial approximation:


$$n i \approx n' i'$$




# Paraxial focusing



# Paraxial focusing




# Paraxial focusing




$$n i \approx n' i'$$

What is angle  $i$  equal to?


# Paraxial focusing



# Paraxial focusing



# Paraxial focusing



$$i = u + a$$

$$u \approx h / z$$

$$u' \approx h / z'$$

$$a = u' + i'$$

$$a \approx h / r$$

$$n i \approx n' i'$$


$$n (u + a) \approx n' (a - u')$$

$$n (h / z + h / r) \approx n' (h / r - h / z')$$

What does this last equation imply?

$$n / z + n / r \approx n' / r - n' / z'$$

# Paraxial focusing



$$i = u + a$$

$$u \approx h / z$$

$$u' \approx h / z'$$

$$a = u' + i'$$

$$a \approx h / r$$

$$n i \approx n' i'$$


$$n (u + a) \approx n' (a - u')$$

$$n (h / z + h / r) \approx n' (h / r - h / z')$$

$$n / z + n / r \approx n' / r - n' / z'$$

$h$  has cancelled out, so any ray from  $P$  will focus at  $P'$ .

# Paraxial focusing



$$n i \approx n' i'$$

$$n(u + a) \approx n'(a - u')$$


$$n(h/z + h/r) \approx n'(h/r - h/z')$$

$$n/z + n/r \approx n'/r - n'/z'$$

What happens as  $z$  tends to infinity?



# Focal length



What happens if  $z$  is  $\infty$  ?

$$n/z + n/r \approx n'/r - n'/z'$$

$$n/r \approx n'/r - n'/z'$$

♦  $f \triangleq \text{focal length} = z'$


$$z' \approx (r n') / (n' - n)$$

# Thin lens

Using similar derivations, we can extend these results to two spherical interfaces.

- We obtain a spherical lens in air.
- Thin lens approximation:  $d$  close to zero.
- Under this approximation, we obtain the *lensmaker's equation*.

$$\frac{1}{s_o} + \frac{1}{s_i} = (n_l - 1) \left( \frac{1}{R_1} - \frac{1}{R_2} \right)$$



# Gaussian lens formula

- ◆ Starting from the lensmaker's formula

$$\frac{1}{s_o} + \frac{1}{s_i} = (n_l - 1) \left( \frac{1}{R_1} - \frac{1}{R_2} \right),$$

- ◆ and recalling that as object distance  $s_o$  is moved to infinity, image distance  $s_i$  becomes focal length  $f_i$ , we get

$$\frac{1}{f_i} = (n_l - 1) \left( \frac{1}{R_1} - \frac{1}{R_2} \right).$$



- ◆ Equating these two, we get the Gaussian lens formula

$$\frac{1}{s_o} + \frac{1}{s_i} = \frac{1}{f_i}.$$

Looks familiar?

# Thin lens model

Simplification of geometric optics for well-designed lenses.



focal length  $f$

Two assumptions:

1. Rays passing through lens center are unaffected.
2. Parallel rays converge to a single point located on focal plane.


Same result as what we obtained last time using ray tracing assumptions.

$$m = \frac{f}{D' - f}$$

$$\frac{1}{D'} + \frac{1}{D} = \frac{1}{f}$$

# Ray transfer matrix analysis


# Let's look at thin lenses (yet) again



Assumptions:

- Paraxial  $\rightarrow$  ?
- Thin lens  $\rightarrow$  ?


# Let's look at thin lenses (yet) again



Assumptions:

- Paraxial  $\rightarrow$  angles  $\theta$  are small, thus first-order approximations for  $\sin\theta$ ,  $\cos\theta$ , and  $\tan\theta$  apply.
- Thin lens  $\rightarrow$  width of lens is negligible ( $d \simeq 0$ ) relative to distances  $s$ .

# Let's look at thin lenses (yet) again




$$x_i = ?$$

$$x_o = ?$$

$$\frac{1}{s_o} + \frac{1}{s_i} = ?$$



# Let's look at thin lenses (yet) again




$$x_i = s_i \theta_i$$

$$x_o = s_o \theta_o$$

$$\frac{1}{s_o} + \frac{1}{s_i} = \frac{1}{f}$$

$$d \simeq 0 \Rightarrow x_i = x_o$$

# Let's look at thin lenses (yet) again



$$x_i = s_i \theta_i$$

$$x_o = s_o \theta_o$$


$$\frac{1}{s_o} + \frac{1}{s_i} = \frac{1}{f}$$

$$d \simeq 0 \Rightarrow x_i = x_o$$

Putting it all together,  
we can write:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{f} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \theta_i \end{bmatrix}$$

# Let's look at thin lenses (yet) again



$$x_i = s_i \theta_i$$

$$x_o = s_o \theta_o$$

$$\frac{1}{s_o} + \frac{1}{s_i} = \frac{1}{f}$$


$$d \simeq 0 \Rightarrow x_i = x_o$$

Putting it all together,  
we can write:

ray transfer matrix:  
relates each incoming  
ray to an outgoing ray

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{f} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \theta_i \end{bmatrix}$$

# Ray transfer matrix analysis




Every optical system implements a (generally non-linear) ray mapping of the form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x_i, \theta_i) \\ g(x_i, \theta_i) \end{bmatrix}$$

How do we go from here to a ray transfer matrix?

# Ray transfer matrix analysis




Every optical system implements a (generally non-linear) ray mapping of the form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x_i, \theta_i) \\ g(x_i, \theta_i) \end{bmatrix}$$

How do we go from here to a ray transfer matrix?

- Paraxial approximation: Use first-order approximation around axial ray.

# Ray transfer matrix analysis



Under paraxial approximation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x_i, \theta_i) \\ g(x_i, \theta_i) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \theta_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where}$$


$$A = ?$$

$$B = ?$$

$$C = ?$$

$$D = ?$$

# Ray transfer matrix analysis




Under paraxial approximation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x_i, \theta_i) \\ g(x_i, \theta_i) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \theta_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where}$$

$$A = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x_i=\theta_i=0} \quad B = ?$$

$$C = ? \quad D = ?$$

# Ray transfer matrix analysis



Under paraxial approximation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x_i, \theta_i) \\ g(x_i, \theta_i) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \theta_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where}$$

$$A = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x_i=\theta_i=0}$$


$$B = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_i} \right|_{x_i=\theta_i=0}$$

$$C = ?$$

$$D = ?$$



# Ray transfer matrix analysis



Under paraxial approximation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x_i, \theta_i) \\ g(x_i, \theta_i) \end{bmatrix} \approx \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{ray transfer matrix}} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \theta_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where}$$

definition of ray transfer matrix, a.k.a. ABCD matrix

why at  $x_i = \theta_i = 0$  ?

$$A = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x_i=\theta_i=0}$$


$$B = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_i} \right|_{x_i=\theta_i=0}$$

$$C = \left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x_i=\theta_i=0}$$

$$D = \left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_i} \right|_{x_i=\theta_i=0}$$

# What is the ABCD matrix of...

- free space propagation?




# What is the ABCD matrix of...

- free space propagation?

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & d \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$


- planar refractive interface?



# What is the ABCD matrix of...


- free space propagation?

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & d \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$




- planar refractive interface?

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{n_1}{n_2} \end{bmatrix}$$




- planar mirror?



# What is the ABCD matrix of...


- free space propagation?

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & d \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$




- planar refractive interface?

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{n_1}{n_2} \end{bmatrix}$$




- planar mirror?

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$




# Cascaded optical systems



Let's say we stack together three lenses.

- What is the total ray transfer matrix?

# Cascaded optical systems



Let's say we stack together three lenses.

- What is the total ray transfer matrix?
- Notice the matrix ordering.

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_o \\ \theta_o \end{bmatrix} = \overbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{f_3} & 1 \end{bmatrix}}^{\text{lens 3}} \overbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{f_2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}}^{\text{lens 2}} \overbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{f_1} & 1 \end{bmatrix}}^{\text{lens 1}} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \theta_i \end{bmatrix}$$

# Ray transfer matrix analysis

- Also known as ABCD matrix analysis (from the form of the ray transfer matrix).
- Any optical system, no matter how complicated, can be described by its ray transfer matrix.
- A cascaded optical system has a ray transfer matrix that is the product of the ray transfer matrices of its components.
- All of the above hold assuming paraxial rays, no aberrations, and no diffraction (geometric optics).



# Graphics perspective on ray transfer matrix analysis

- How can I use ray transfer matrix analysis to make ray tracing faster?
- How can I use ray transfer matrix analysis to make Monte Carlo rendering faster?



Computer Graphics, Volume 21, Number 4, July 1987

## Principles and Applications of Pencil Tracing

Mikio Shinya Tokiichiro Takahashi  
Seiichiro Naito

NTT Electrical Communications Laboratories  
3-9-11, Midori-cho, Musashino-shi  
Tokyo 180, Japan

### Abstract

Pencil tracing, a new approach to ray tracing, is introduced for faster image synthesis with more physical fidelity. The paraxial approximation theory for efficiently tracing a pencil of rays is described and analysis of its errors is conducted to insure the accuracy required for pencil tracing. The paraxial approximation is formulated from a  $4 \times 4$  matrix (a system matrix) that provides the basis for pencil tracing and a variety of ray tracing techniques, such as beam tracing, ray tracing with cones, ray-object intersection tolerance, and a lighting model for reflection and refraction. In the error analysis, functions that estimate approximation errors and determine a constraint on the spread angle of a pencil are given.

The theory results in the following fast ray tracing algorithms; ray tracing using a system matrix, ray interpolation, and extended 'beam tracing' using a 'generalized perspective transform'. Some experiments are described to show their advantages. A lighting model is also developed to calculate the illuminance for refracted and reflected light.

point, there have been problems such as high computational cost and aliasing. Many attempts have been made to tackle those problems, and some of them have produced good results by tracing a *pencil*<sup>1</sup> (or bundle) of rays, instead of an individual ray. However, as the methods lack sufficient mathematical bases, they are limited to specific applications.

Hockbert proposed a method called 'beam tracing'[2] which works well for reflecting polygonal objects. His method uses a pencil to be traced by introducing affine transformations in an object space. Unfortunately, the method finds only limited applications because of the way in which it approximates refractions. Moreover, since an error estimation method has not been proposed for guaranteeing the image accuracy, the accuracy cannot be controlled.

Amanatides proposed a 'ray tracing with cones' technique for anti-aliasing, fuzzy shadows, and dull reflections[3], where a conic pencil is traced. However, it failed to present a general equation for characterizing the spread-angle change of a conic pencil through an optical system. Such an equation is also required for the calculation of

## A Frequency Analysis of Light Transport

Frédéric Durand  
MIT-CSAIL

Nicolas Holzschuch Cyril Soler  
ARTIS\* GRAVIR/IMAG-INRIA

Eric Chan  
MIT-CSAIL

François X. Sillion  
ARTIS\* GRAVIR/IMAG-INRIA

### Abstract

We present a signal-processing framework for light transport. We study the frequency content of radiance and how it is altered by phenomena such as shading, occlusion, and transport. This extends previous work that considered either spatial or angular dimensions, and it offers a comprehensive treatment of both space and angle.

We show that occlusion, a multiplication in the primal, amounts in the Fourier domain to a convolution by the spectrum of the blocker. Propagation corresponds to a shear in the space-angle frequency domain, while reflection on curved objects performs a different shear along the angular frequency axis. As shown by previous work, reflection is a convolution in the primal and therefore a multiplication in the Fourier domain. Our work shows how the spatial components of lighting are affected by this angular convolution.

Our framework predicts the characteristics of interactions such as caustics and the disappearance of the shadows of small features. Predictions on the frequency content can then be used to control sampling rates for rendering. Other potential applications include precomputed radiance transfer and inverse rendering.

**Keywords:** Light transport, Fourier analysis, signal processing

### 1 Introduction

Light in a scene is transported, occluded, and filtered by its complex interaction with objects. By the time it reaches our eyes, radiance is an intricate function, and simulating or analyzing it is challenging.

Frequency analysis of the radiance function is particularly interesting for many applications, including forward and inverse rendering. The effect of local interactions on the frequency content of radiance has previously been described in a limited context. For instance, it is well-known that diffuse reflection creates smooth (low-frequency) light distributions, while occlusion and hard shadows





Figure 1: Space-angle frequency spectra of the radiance function measured in a 3D scene. We focus on the neighborhood of a ray path and measure the spectrum of a 4D light field at different steps, which we summarize as 2D plots that include only the radial components of the spatial and angular dimensions. Notice how the blockers result in higher spatial frequency and how transport in free space transfers these spatial frequencies to the angular domain. Aliasing is present in the visualized spectra due to the resolution challenge of manipulating 4D light fields.

This paper presents a theoretical framework for characterizing light transport in terms of frequency content. We seek a deep understanding of the frequency content of the radiance function in a scene and how it is affected by phenomena such as occlusion, reflection, and propagation in space (Fig. 1). We first present the two-dimensional case for simplicity of exposition. Then we show that it extends well to 3D because we only consider local neighborhoods


# Why would we ever stack together multiple lenses?



# Compound lenses and aberrations

# Thin lenses are a fiction

The thin lens model assumes that the lens has no thickness, but this is rarely true...




Note: Even though we have multiple lenses, the entire optical system can be (paraxially) described using a single focal length and aperture number.

To make real lenses behave like ideal thin lenses, we have to use combinations of multiple lens elements (compound lenses).

# Thin lenses are a fiction

The thin lens model assumes that the lens has no thickness, but this is rarely true...




To make real lenses behave like ideal thin lenses, we have to use combinations of multiple lens elements (compound lenses).

# Aberrations

Deviations from ideal thin lens behavior (e.g., imperfect focus).


- Example: chromatic aberration.

focal length shifts with wavelength



glass has dispersion (refractive index changes with wavelength)

one lens cancels out dispersion of other



glasses of different refractive index

Using a doublet (two-element compound lens), we can reduce chromatic aberration.





# Chromatic aberration examples



# Aberrations

Deviations from ideal thin lens behavior (i.e., imperfect focus).

- Example: spherical aberration.







# Oblique aberrations

These appear only as we move further from the center of the field of view.

- Contrast with chromatic and spherical aberrations, which appear everywhere.
- Many other examples (astigmatism, field curvature, etc.).



Coma



Pincushion

Barrel



# Distortion example



# Aberrations

Deviations from ideal thin lens behavior (i.e., imperfect focus).

- Example: chromatic aberration.
- Many other types (coma, spherical, astigmatism).





Why do we wear glasses?

# Aberrations


Deviations from ideal thin lens behavior (i.e., imperfect focus).

- Example: chromatic aberration.
- Many other types (coma, spherical, astigmatism).



Why do we wear glasses?

- We turn our eye into a compound lens to correct aberrations!





# A costly aberration

Hubble telescope originally suffered from severe spherical aberration.

- COSTAR mission inserted optics to correct the aberration.



# Lens designations

# Designation based on field of view

What focal lengths go to what category depends on sensor size.

- Here we assume full frame sensor (same as 35 mm film).
- Even then, there are no well-defined ranges for each category.

wide-angle  $f = 25 \text{ mm}$



mid-range  $f = 50 \text{ mm}$



telephoto  $f = 135 \text{ mm}$



# Wide-angle lenses

Lenses with focal length 35 mm or smaller.



They tend to have large and curvy frontal elements.



# Wide-angle lenses

Ultra-wide lenses can get impractically wide...



Fish-eye lens: can produce (near) hemispherical field of view.



# Telephoto lenses

Lenses with focal length 85 mm or larger.

Technically speaking, “telephoto” refers to a specific lens design, not a focal length range. But that design is mostly useful for long focal lengths, so it has also come to mean any lens with such a focal length.



Telephotos can get very big...



800mm f5.6 L IS



600mm f4 L IS II



200-400mm f4 L IS



500mm f4 L IS II



400mm f2.8 L IS II




300mm f2.8 L IS II



# Telephoto lenses

- What is this?
- What is its focal length?

Telephotos can get very big...




# Telephoto lenses

- What is this?
- What is its focal length?

About 57 meters.

Telephotos can get very big...



# Prime vs zoom lenses



Prime lens: fixed focal length

available focal  
length range



Zoom lens: variable focal length

Why use prime lenses and not always use the more versatile zoom lenses?

# Prime vs zoom lenses



Prime lens: fixed focal length

available focal  
length range



Zoom lens: variable focal length

Why use prime lenses and not always use the more versatile zoom lenses?

- Zoom lenses have larger aberrations due to the need to cover multiple focal lengths.

# Other kinds of lens designations


Macro lens: can achieve very large magnifications (typically at least 1:1).

- Macro photography: extremely close-up photography.




Achromatic or apochromatic lens: corrected for chromatic aberration.

- Achromatic: two wavelengths have same focus.
- Apochromatic (better): three wavelengths have same focus.
- Often done by inserting elements made from low-dispersion glass.
- Expensive.



Aspherical lens: manufactured to have special (non-spherical) shape that reduces aberrations.

- Expensive, often only 1-2 elements in a compound lens are aspherical.



# Filters



# Neutral density (ND) filters


Alternative way to control exposure:

- (Approximately) spectrally flat from 400-700 nm.
- Homogeneous glass that blocks by absorption or by reflection



Often characterized by *optical density* (OD):

- Transmittance =  $10^{(-\text{optical density})} \times 100$ .
- Optical density is additive as you stack together ND filters.




# Graduated neutral-density filters

Variable optical density, from too high to too low/zero.



soft edge



hard edge



What are these filters useful for?

# Graduated neutral-density filters

Useful in scenes with parts of very different brightness.

- Common scenario: Sky – horizon – ground.



# Polarizing filters (or polarizers)

Most commonly circular polarizers.

- Same principle as polarizing sunglasses.



What are these filters useful for?



# Polarizing filters (or polarizers)

Reduce sky light



Reduce haze






# Polarizing filters (or polarizers)

Reduce direct reflections




# Spectral (color) filters

Mostly used for scientific applications or under very special lighting settings.




# A note on filter sizes

Each individual filter is often offered in a variety of sizes, ranging from 30 mm to 100 mm



**Carl Zeiss T\* UV Filter**



**Carl Zeiss T\* POL Filter**



# A note on filter sizes

The filter size you need to use is determined by the lens you are using.

- You can find the filter size marking in the front of the lens.
- You can avoid having to buy dozens of filters by using step-up and step-down rings.



filter size  
marking





# Prisms


# Prisms

Many different types of prisms that produce different types of reflections.

right-angle prism



pentaprism





Do you know of any use of pentaprisms in photography?

# Single Lens Reflex (SLR) cameras

Mechanism to provide direct view through the lens (TTL).

- Any downsides?



- 1 - Front-mount Lens
- 2 - Reflex Mirror at 45 degree angle
- 3 - Focal Plane Shutter
- 4 - Film or Sensor

- 5 - Focusing Screen
- 6 - Condenser Lens
- 7 - Optical Glass Pentaprism (or Pentamirror)
- 8 - Eyepiece (a.k.a. viewfinder)



# Nikon D3s



# SLR versus mirrorless


Mirrorless cameras used to be mostly point-and-shoot, but are quickly becoming viable for high-end photography.

- What are some pros and cons of mirrorless compared to SLR?



- 1 - Front-mount Lens
- 2 - Reflex Mirror at 45 degrees
- 3 - Focal Plane Shutter
- 4 - Film or Sensor

## Mirrorless Camera



- 5 - Focusing Screen
- 6 - Condenser Lens
- 7 - Optical Glass Pentaprism
- 8 - Eyepiece (a.k.a. viewfinder)

# References

## Basic reading:

- Szeliski textbook, Section 2.2.3.
- Pedrotti et al., “Introduction to Optics,” Cambridge University Press 2017.  
This is a well-known general textbook on optics. Chapters 2 and 3 have the best (in my opinion) explanation of paraxial optics and ray transfer matrix analysis among common optics textbooks.

## Additional reading:

- Hecht, “Optics,” Pearson 2016.  
Probably the most commonly used optics textbook, also covers paraxial and ray transfer matrix analysis.
- London and Upton, “Photography,” Pearson 2013.  
A great book on photography, discussing in detail many of the issues addressed in this lecture.
- Ray, “Applied Photographic Optics,” Focal Press 2002.  
Another nice book covering everything about photographic optics.
- Shinya et al., “Principles and applications of pencil tracing,” SIGGRAPH 1987.
- Durand et al., “A frequency analysis of light transport,” SIGGRAPH 2005.  
Two graphics papers discussing ray transfer matrix analysis from the point of view of rendering.
- Tang and Kutulakos, “What Does an Aberrated Photo Tell Us about the Lens and the Scene?,” ICCP 2013.
- Hullin et al., “Polynomial Optics: A Construction Kit for Efficient Ray-Tracing of Lens Systems,” Computer Graphics Forum 2012.  
Two papers discussing the modeling of aberrations and limitations of paraxial optics.
- Sun et al., “Lens Factory: Automatic Lens Generation Using Off-the-shelf Components,” arXiv 2015.  
A discussion on lens design from a graphics-oriented point of view.
- Durand, “The DSLR will probably die. Are mirrorless the future of large standalone cameras?,”  
<http://www.thecomputationalphotographer.com/2018/10/the-dslr-will-probably-die-are-mirrorless-the-future-of-large-standalone-cameras/>  
A great blog post by Fredo Durand, discussing the relative merits of DSLR and mirrorless cameras.