


Read Szeliski 7.1.2 and 7.1.3

Local Image Features

Computer Vision


James Hays





“Flashed Face Distortion”
2nd Place in the 8th Annual
[Best Illusion of the Year](#)
[Contest](#) , VSS 2012



Keep your eyes
on the cross



Project 2




The top 100 most confident local feature matches from a baseline implementation of project 2. In this case, 93 were correct (highlighted in green) and 7 were incorrect (highlighted in red).


Project 2: Local Feature Matching

This section: correspondence and alignment

- Correspondence: matching points, patches, edges, or regions across images



Overview of Keypoint Matching



1. Find a set of distinctive keypoints




2. Compute a local descriptor from the region around each keypoint

3. Match local descriptors

Review: Harris corner detector

- Define distinctiveness by local auto-correlation.
- Approximate local auto-correlation by second moment matrix
- Quantify distinctiveness (or cornerness) as function of the eigenvalues of the second moment matrix.
- But we don't actually need to compute the eigenvalues. Instead, we use the determinant and trace of the second moment matrix.

$E(u, v)$



If you're not comfortable with Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors, Gilbert Strang's linear algebra lectures are linked from the course homepage

Lecture 21: Eigenvalues and eigenvectors

COURSE HOME

SYLLABUS

CALENDAR

INSTRUCTOR
INSIGHTS

VIDEO LECTURES <

READINGS

ASSIGNMENTS



Linear Algebra Lecture 21
Eigenvalues - Eigenvectors
 $\det[A - \lambda I] = 0$
TRACE = $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_n$

00:15 51:23 HD CC

Interactive Transcript

Harris Detector [Harris88]

- Second moment matrix

$$\mu(\sigma_I, \sigma_D) = g(\sigma_I) * \begin{bmatrix} I_x^2(\sigma_D) & I_x I_y(\sigma_D) \\ I_x I_y(\sigma_D) & I_y^2(\sigma_D) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\det M = \lambda_1 \lambda_2$$

$$\text{trace } M = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$$

2. Square of derivatives


3. Gaussian filter $g(\sigma_I)$

4. Cornerness function – both eigenvalues are strong




$$har = \det[\mu(\sigma_I, \sigma_D)] - \alpha[\text{trace}(\mu(\sigma_I, \sigma_D))]^2 =$$

$$g(I_x^2)g(I_y^2) - [g(I_x I_y)]^2 - \alpha[g(I_x^2) + g(I_y^2)]^2$$

5. Non-maxima suppression



1. Image derivatives (optionally, blur first)




Harris Detector: Steps



Harris Detector: Steps

Compute corner response R




Harris Detector: Steps

Find points with large corner response: $R > \text{threshold}$



Harris Detector: Steps

Take only the points of local maxima of R



Harris Detector: Steps



Invariance and covariance

- We want corner locations to be *invariant* to photometric transformations and *covariant* to geometric transformations
 - **Invariance:** image is transformed and corner locations do not change
 - **Covariance:** if we have two transformed versions of the same image, features should be detected in corresponding locations





Affine intensity change




$$I \rightarrow aI + b$$

- Only derivatives are used => invariance to intensity shift $I \rightarrow I + b$
- Intensity scaling: $I \rightarrow aI$



Partially invariant to affine intensity change


Image translation



- Derivatives and window function are shift-invariant

Corner location is covariant w.r.t. translation


Scaling



All points will
be classified
as **edges**

Corner location is not covariant to scaling!

Image rotation



Second moment ellipse rotates but its shape (i.e. eigenvalues) remains the same

Corner location is covariant w.r.t. rotation

So far: can localize in x-y, but not scale



Automatic Scale Selection




$$f(I_{i_1 \dots i_m}(x, \sigma)) = f(I_{i_1 \dots i_m}(x', \sigma'))$$


How to find corresponding patch sizes?

Automatic Scale Selection

- Function responses for increasing scale (scale signature)




$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x, \sigma))$$




$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x', \sigma))$$

Automatic Scale Selection

- Function responses for increasing scale (scale signature)





$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x, \sigma))$$




$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x', \sigma))$$

Automatic Scale Selection

- Function responses for increasing scale (scale signature)





$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x, \sigma))$$




$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x', \sigma))$$

Automatic Scale Selection

- Function responses for increasing scale (scale signature)





$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x, \sigma))$$




$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x', \sigma))$$

Automatic Scale Selection

- Function responses for increasing scale (scale signature)





$$f(I_{i_1 \dots i_m}(x, \sigma))$$




$$f(I_{i_1 \dots i_m}(x', \sigma))$$

Automatic Scale Selection

- Function responses for increasing scale (scale signature)



$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x, \sigma))$$





$$f(I_{i_1..i_m}(x', \sigma'))$$

Orientation Normalization

- Compute orientation histogram
- Select dominant orientation
- Normalize: rotate to fixed orientation

[Lowe, SIFT, 1999]





Maximally Stable Extremal Regions [Matas '02]


- Based on Watershed segmentation algorithm
- Select regions that stay stable over a large parameter range



Example Results: MSER




Comparison




Harris



Hessian




LoG



MSER


Local features: main components

1) Detection: Identify the interest points



2) Description: Extract vector feature descriptor surrounding each interest point.

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = [x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_d^{(1)}]$$



3) Matching: Determine correspondence between descriptors in two views

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = [x_1^{(2)}, \dots, x_d^{(2)}]$$





Image representations

- Templates
 - Intensity, color, gradients, etc.
 - Keeps spatial layout



23	31	25	17	22	80	170	38
81	77	42	21	17	75	85	67
88	83	24	30	29	34	51	21
79	85	92	61	112	103	181	20
75	77	113	103	75	83	97	19
57	68	106	98	86	97	51	41
61	52	89	97	115	97	103	101
155	196	180	183	183	197	201	212

- Histograms
 - Distribution of intensity, color, texture, SIFT descriptors, etc.
 - Discards spatial layout








Image Representations: Histograms

Histogram: Probability or count of data in each bin




- Joint histogram
 - Requires lots of data
 - Loss of resolution to avoid empty bins

Marginal histogram

- Requires independent features
- More data/bin than joint histogram

Image Representations: Histograms

Clustering



Use the same cluster centers for all images

Computing histogram distance

$$\text{histint}(h_i, h_j) = 1 - \sum_{m=1}^K \min(h_i(m), h_j(m))$$

Histogram intersection (assuming normalized histograms)

$$\chi^2(h_i, h_j) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^K \frac{[h_i(m) - h_j(m)]^2}{h_i(m) + h_j(m)}$$

Chi-squared Histogram matching distance



Cars found by color histogram matching using chi-squared

Histograms: Implementation issues

- Quantization
 - Grids: fast but applicable only with few dimensions
 - Clustering: slower but can quantize data in higher dimensions



Few Bins

Need less data

Coarser representation

Many Bins


Need more data

Finer representation


- Matching
 - Histogram intersection or Euclidean may be faster
 - Chi-squared often works better
 - Earth mover's distance is good for when nearby bins represent similar values

What kind of things do we compute histograms of?

- Color



L*a*b* color space



HSV color space

- Texture (filter banks or HOG over regions)

What kind of things do we compute histograms of?

- Histograms of oriented gradients






Image gradients




Keypoint descriptor

SIFT – Lowe IJCV 2004

SIFT vector formation


- 4x4 array of gradient orientation histogram weighted by magnitude
- 8 orientations x 4x4 array = 128 dimensions
- Motivation: some sensitivity to spatial layout, but not too much.



showing only 2x2 here, but typical feature would be 4x4


Ensure smoothness

- Gaussian weight
- Interpolation
 - a given gradient contributes to 8 bins:
4 in space times 2 in orientation




Reduce effect of illumination

- 128-dim vector normalized to 1
- Optionally, threshold gradient magnitudes to avoid excessive influence of high gradients
 - after normalization, clamp gradients >0.2
 - renormalize



Local Descriptors: Shape Context



Count the number of points inside each bin, e.g.:


Count = 4

⋮

Count = 10

Log-polar binning: more precision for nearby points, more flexibility for farther points.

Shape Context Descriptor




Self-similarity Descriptor



Figure 1. *These images of the same object (a heart) do NOT share common image properties (colors, textures, edges), but DO share a similar geometric layout of local internal self-similarities.*


Matching Local Self-Similarities across Images
and Videos, Shechtman and Irani, 2007

Self-similarity Descriptor





Matching Local Self-Similarities across Images and Videos, Shechtman and Irani, 2007

Self-similarity Descriptor




Matching Local Self-Similarities across Images
and Videos, Shechtman and Irani, 2007


Learning Local Image Descriptors, Winder and Brown, CVPR 2007




S1: SIFT grid with bilinear weights



S2: GLOH polar grid with bilinear radial and angular weights



S3: 3x3 grid with Gaussian weights



S4: 17 polar samples with Gaussian weights

Learning Local Image Descriptors, Winder and Brown, CVPR 2007




Figure 5. Selected ROC curves for the trained descriptors with four dimensional T-blocks ($k = 4$). Those that perform better than SIFT all make use of the S2 log-polar summation stage. See Table 4 for details.


We obtained a mixed training set consisting of tourist photographs of the Trevi Fountain and of Yosemite Valley (920 images), and a test set consisting of images of Notre Dame (500 images). We extracted interest points and matched them between all of the images within a set using the SIFT detector and descriptor [9]. We culled candidate matches using a symmetry criterion and used RANSAC [5] to estimate initial fundamental matrices between image pairs. This stage was followed by bundle adjustment to reconstruct 3D points and to obtain accurate camera matrices for each source image. A similar technique has been described by [17].

Local Descriptors

- Most features can be thought of as templates, histograms (counts), or combinations
- The ideal descriptor should be
 - Robust
 - Distinctive
 - Compact
 - Efficient
- Most available descriptors focus on edge/gradient information
 - Capture texture information
 - Color rarely used


Local features: main components

1) Detection: Identify the interest points




2) Description: Extract vector feature descriptor surrounding each interest point.

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = [x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_d^{(1)}]$$




3) Matching: Determine correspondence between descriptors in two views

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = [x_1^{(2)}, \dots, x_d^{(2)}]$$




Matching

- Simplest approach: Pick the nearest neighbor. Threshold on absolute distance
- Problem: Lots of self similarity in many photos



Distance: 0.34, 0.30, 0.40




Distance: 0.61
Distance: 1.22

Nearest Neighbor Distance Ratio


- $\frac{NN1}{NN2}$ where NN1 is the distance to the first nearest neighbor and NN2 is the distance to the second nearest neighbor.
- Sorting by this ratio (into ascending order) puts matches in order of confidence (in descending order of confidence).

Matching Local Features

- Nearest neighbor (Euclidean distance)
- Threshold ratio of nearest to 2nd nearest descriptor




SIFT Repeatability




6.4 Matching to large databases

An important remaining issue for measuring the distinctiveness of features is how the reliability of matching varies as a function of the number of features in the database being matched. Most of the examples in this paper are generated using a database of 32 images with about 40,000 keypoints. Figure 10 shows how the matching reliability varies as a func-

SIFT Repeatability



SIFT Repeatability



Choosing a detector

- What do you want it for?
 - Precise localization in x-y: Harris
 - Good localization in scale: Difference of Gaussian
 - Flexible region shape: MSER
- Best choice often application dependent
 - Harris-/Hessian-Laplace/DoG work well for many natural categories
 - MSER works well for buildings and printed things
- Why choose?
 - Get more points with more detectors
- There have been extensive evaluations/comparisons
 - [Mikolajczyk et al., IJCV'05, PAMI'05]
 - All detectors/descriptors shown here work well

Comparison of Keypoint Detectors

Table 7.1 Overview of feature detectors.

Feature Detector	Corner	Blob	Region	Rotation invariant	Scale invariant	Affine invariant	Localization			
							Repeatability	accuracy	Robustness	Efficiency
Harris	✓			✓			+++	+++	+++	++
Hessian		✓		✓			++	++	++	+
SUSAN	✓			✓			++	++	++	+++
Harris-Laplace	✓	(✓)		✓	✓		+++	+++	++	+
Hessian-Laplace	(✓)	✓		✓	✓		+++	+++	+++	+
DoG	(✓)	✓		✓	✓		++	++	++	++
SURF	(✓)	✓		✓	✓		++	++	++	+++
Harris-Affine	✓	(✓)		✓	✓	✓	+++	+++	++	++
Hessian-Affine	(✓)	✓		✓	✓	✓	+++	+++	+++	++
Salient Regions	(✓)	✓		✓	✓	(✓)	+	+	++	+
Edge-based	✓			✓	✓	✓	+++	+++	+	+
MSER			✓	✓	✓	✓	+++	+++	++	+++
Intensity-based			✓	✓	✓	✓	++	++	++	++
Superpixels			✓	✓	(✓)	(✓)	+	+	+	+

Choosing a descriptor

- Again, need not stick to one
- For object instance recognition or stitching, SIFT or variant is a good choice
- Learning-based methods are taking over this space, although not as quickly as one might expect.

Things to remember

- Keypoint detection: repeatable and distinctive
 - Corners, blobs, stable regions
 - Harris, DoG
- Descriptors: robust and selective
 - spatial histograms of orientation
 - SIFT

