


Stable View Synthesis

Riegler, Gernot and Koltun, Vladlen, CVPR 2021



Seungwoo Yoo
Intern, Geometric AI Group

Problem: Novel View Synthesis



*Image Source: Neural scene representation and rendering, Eslami et al., Science 2018
(<https://deepmind.com/blog/article/neural-scene-representation-and-rendering>)*

“Given set of **image(s)** taken at **known viewpoint(s)**,
infer **another image** that would’ve seen from **unknown viewpoint**.”

Problem: Novel View Synthesis




Image Source: Official code repository of NeRF


Goal: Democratizing 3D Content Creation



Modeling
Texturing
Compositing
Rendering
And much more

... For the single (or few more) scene(s)

Goal: Democratizing 3D Content Creation




Modeling
Texturing
Compositing
Rendering
And much more



Single (or few more) image → 3D Scene
Everyone should be able to create their own 3D content

Neural Rendering




3D Abstract Scene Representation

Lift 2D image features to 3D

Blend it to abstract 3D volume

Image synthesis via feature retrieval from
volume



Neural Radiance Field
&
Volume Rendering


Approximate density / radiance field using MLP

Volume rendering for image synthesis


(Left) DeepVoxels: Learning Persistent 3D Feature Embeddings CVPR 2019 (Oral)

(Right) NeRF: Representing Scenes as Neural Radiance Fields for View Synthesis (ECCV 2020)


OK, NeRF is HOT these days...




*NeRF: Representing Scenes as Neural Radiance Fields for View Synthesis
(ECCV 2020)*



OK, NeRF is HOT these days...



*NeRF: Representing Scenes as Neural Radiance Fields for View Synthesis
(ECCV 2020)*




NeRF in the Wild - Neural Radiance Fields for Unconstrained Photo Collections (CVPR 2021)




NeuTex: Neural Texture Mapping for Volumetric Neural Rendering (CVPR 2021)

However, NeRF has drawbacks too...



*NeRF: Representing Scenes as Neural Radiance Fields for View Synthesis
(ECCV 2020)*

Shape-radiance ambiguity




Entangled geometry & color

Not explicitly models geometry

Leads to wrong reconstruction

Source: Towards Photorealism, Vladlen Koltun



Volume-based, NOT surface-based


Radiance can be assigned ANYWHERE

Artifacts due to radiance at media (free space)

Source: Further Towards Photorealism, Vladlen Koltun

Disclaimer: NeRF++ is one of follow-ups of NeRF from Koltun's lab

Trends of Neural Rendering




3D Abstract Scene Representation

Lift 2D image features to 3D

Blend it to abstract 3D volume

Image synthesis via feature retrieval from
volume



Neural Radiance Field
&
Volume Rendering

Approximate density / radiance field using MLP

Volume rendering for image synthesis


DeepVoxels: Learning Persistent 3D Feature Embeddings CVPR 2019 (Oral)

12

NeRF: Representing Scenes as Neural Radiance Fields for View Synthesis (ECCV 2020)

?

Trends of Neural Rendering




3D Abstract Scene Representation

Lift 2D image features to 3D

Blend it to abstract 3D volume


Image synthesis via feature retrieval from
volume



Neural Radiance Field
&
Volume Rendering

Approximate density / radiance field using MLP

Volume rendering for image synthesis



Rough Geometry Reconstruction
&
Feature Embedding onto Geometry


Stable View Synthesis (2021)

Free View Synthesis (2020)


SVS Overview




(a) Geometric scaffold



(b) Encoding source images




(c) On-surface aggregation



(d) Rendering in the target view

Reconstructing Geometric Scaffold




Structure from Motion (SfM)

Camera poses from images




Multi-View Stereo
Point cloud reconstruction




Mesh Reconstruction
Mesh from point cloud
→ **Geometric Scaffold**


Encoding Source Images




We've encoded images to feature tensors so far

What should we do to render an image?









*“How can we get
the feature tensor which is
to be decoded to image we want?”*

On-surface Aggregation



Given query viewpoint specified by:

\mathbf{K}_t : Camera parameters


\mathbf{R}_t : Camera Rotation Matrix

\mathbf{t}_t : Camera Translation Matrix

We want to synthesize an image \mathcal{O}

that would be seen from the viewpoint

On-surface Aggregation



Geometric Scaffold Γ

Project each pixel of O onto the scaffold

On-surface Aggregation

Determines the appearance of point \mathbf{X} seen from \mathbf{u}

Compute a target feature vector


$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$$

For each point $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$


This feature vector is a function of

- The viewing direction \mathbf{u}
- The surface point \mathbf{x}
- Set of associated image features

$$\{(\mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{f}_k(\mathbf{x}))\}_{k=1}^K$$



On-surface Aggregation



Specifically, the target feature vector is computed as:

$$g(x, \mathbf{u}) = \phi_{\text{aggr}}(\mathbf{u}, \{(\mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{f}_k(x))\}_{k=1}^K)$$

where a feature vector at \mathbf{x} derived from a source image is:

$$\mathbf{f}_k(x) = \mathcal{F}_k(\underbrace{\mathbf{K}_k(\mathbf{R}_k x + \mathbf{t}_k)}_{\text{Projection of } \mathbf{X} \text{ onto a source image}})$$

(Disclaimer: This step is NOT the part of the paper. I added it for better conceptual explanation)

Embedding Feature onto Scaffold



Source Image 1



Geometric Scaffold Γ



Source Image 2






Source Image K-1



Source Image K


(Disclaimer: This step is NOT the part of the paper. I added it for better conceptual explanation)

Embedding Feature onto Scaffold




Geometric Scaffold

Γ




(Disclaimer: This step is NOT the part of the paper. I added it for better conceptual explanation)

Embedding Feature onto Scaffold



Back to... On-surface Aggregation




Specifically, the target feature vector is computed as:

$$g(x, \mathbf{u}) = \phi_{\text{aggr}}(\mathbf{u}, \{(\mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{f}_k(x))\}_{k=1}^K)$$

where a feature vector at \mathbf{x} derived from a source image is:

$$\mathbf{f}_k(x) = \mathcal{F}_k(\underbrace{\mathbf{K}_k(\mathbf{R}_k x + \mathbf{t}_k)}_{\text{Projection of } \mathbf{X} \text{ onto a source image}})$$

Back to... On-surface Aggregation



Specifically, the target feature vector is computed as:

$$g(x, u) = \phi_{\text{aggr}}(u, \{(v_k, f_k(x))\}_{k=1}^K)$$

where a feature vector at x derived from a source image is:

$$f_k(x) = \mathcal{F}_k(\underbrace{K_k(R_k x + t_k)}_{\text{Projection of } X \text{ onto a source image}}))$$

What's the proper choice for THIS?

- Differentiable
- Process arbitrary number of inputs

On-surface Aggregation

Candidate 1. Weighted average

$$\phi_{\text{aggr}}^{\text{WA}} = \frac{1}{W} \sum_{k=1}^K \max(0, \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v}_k) \mathbf{f}_k(\mathbf{x})$$


Weight determined by alignment of
 \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v}_k

Sum of all weights

On-surface Aggregation

Candidate 2. PointNet Variant

$$\phi_{\text{aggr}}^{\text{MLP}} = \nu_{k=1}^K \text{MLP}(\mathbf{f}'_k)$$

$$\nu$$


(permutation-invariant operator)


$$\mathbf{f}'_k = [\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{f}_k(\mathbf{x})]$$


(concatenation)

On-surface Aggregation

Candidate 3. Graph Attention Network

$$\phi_{\text{aggr}}^{\text{GAT}} = \nu_{k=1}^K \text{GAT}(\{\mathbf{f}'_k\}_{k=1}^K)|_k$$



The readout of the feature vector on node k


On-surface Aggregation

Candidate 4. Graph Attention Network with readout

$$\phi_{\text{aggr}}^{\text{GAT-RO}} = \text{GAT}(\{[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{g}']\} \cup \{[\mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{f}_k(\mathbf{x})]\}_{k=1}^K)|_0$$

Initialized with weighted average method

The readout of the feature vector
associated with the target node



Rendering

$$\{\mathbf{x}_{h,w}\}_{h,w=1,1}^{H \times W}$$

Surface points from unprojection



Aggregated feature tensor

$$\mathcal{G} = [\mathbf{g}_{h,w}]_{h,w=1,1}^{H \times W}$$

Rendering

$$\mathcal{G} = [\mathbf{g}_{h,w}]_{h,w=1,1}^{H \times W}$$

Sequence of U-Nets

ϕ_{render}

*NOTE: The number of U-Net
affects the performance significantly.
This will be discussed in the experiment.*

$$\mathcal{O} = \phi_{\text{render}}(\mathcal{G})$$

$$\phi_{\text{render}}(\mathcal{G}) = \phi_{\text{render}}^L(\mathcal{G} + \phi_{\text{render}}^{L-1}(\mathcal{G} + \dots))$$

Training

Given a set of scenes

Sample: A scene & A source image \mathcal{I}_n

The rest of images from the scene are used for one training pass

Training

Minimize

$$\mathbb{L}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{I}_n) = \|\mathcal{O} - \mathcal{I}_n\|_1 + \sum_l \lambda_l \|\phi_l(\mathcal{O}) - \phi_l(\mathcal{I}_n)\|_1$$

Reconstruction loss

Perceptual loss

Convolutional layers of
Pretrained **VGG-19** are used

Fine-Tuning

1. Network fine-tuning

2. Scene fine-tuning

Fine-Tuning

1. Network fine-tuning



Model trained on
DTU dataset



Applying it to
Tank and Temple dataset...?

Fine-Tuning

1. Network fine-tuning

Optimize the parameters

$$[\theta_{\text{enc}}, \theta_{\text{aggr}}, \theta_{\text{render}}]$$

On the new scenes as well

**With the exactly same
training scheme**



Applying it to
Tank and Temple dataset...?

Fine-Tuning


2. Scene fine-tuning

HOW?

Recap - Encoding Source Images



Recap - Encoding Source Images



Recap - Encoding Source Images



Experimental Results



Experimental Results

1. Architectural Choices

	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%
Weighted Mean	21.42	0.870	12.84
MLP Mean	21.25	0.869	12.51
MLP Max	20.95	0.863	12.65
GAT Mean	21.01	0.864	12.84
GAT Max	21.05	0.864	13.09
GAT Readout	20.88	0.862	12.81

Among the 4 aggregation methods

MLP & Mean aggregation

Performs best especially in terms of LPIPS

Used throughout the rest of experiments!

Experimental Results

2. Number of refinement steps (= U-Nets)

	\uparrow PSNR	\uparrow SSIM	\downarrow LPIPS%
1	21.20	0.868	12.62
3	21.25	0.869	12.51
5	21.30	0.870	12.46
7	21.55	0.872	12.41
9	21.39	0.871	12.27

The deeper, the better

In terms of **LPIPS**

No significance in other metrics

Experimental Results

3. Effect of fine tuning

	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%
RGB Averaging	21.15	0.844	22.84
Network FT w/o PT	21.13	0.865	15.05
General	21.59	0.872	12.19
Network FT	22.16	0.874	11.26
Scene FT	22.02	0.873	9.99

Network is trained on the images of test scenes but not pretrained

Network is trained on the number of scenes, but not on the test scenes.

General + Network fine-tuning

General + Network FT + Scene FT

Note that LPIPS (perceptual similarity) improves by large margin

Experimental Results

3. Effect of fine tuning



General

Network FT

Scene FT

Experimental Results

4. Accuracy on different datasets

	Truck			M60			Playground			Train		
	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%
LLFF [24]	10.78	0.454	60.62	8.98	0.431	71.76	14.40	0.578	53.93	9.15	0.384	67.40
EVS [7]	14.22	0.527	43.52	7.41	0.354	75.71	14.72	0.568	46.85	10.54	0.378	67.62
NPBG [2]	21.88	0.877	15.04	12.35	0.716	35.57	23.03	0.876	16.65	18.08	0.801	25.48
NeRF [25]	20.85	0.738	50.74	16.86	0.701	60.89	21.55	0.759	52.19	16.64	0.627	64.64
NeRF++ [45]	22.77	0.814	30.04	18.49	0.747	43.06	22.93	0.806	38.70	17.77	0.681	47.75
FVS [30]	22.93	0.873	13.06	16.83	0.783	30.70	22.28	0.846	19.47	18.09	0.773	24.74
Ours w/o FT	23.09	0.893	12.41	19.41	0.827	23.70	23.61	0.876	17.38	18.42	0.809	19.42
Ours	23.86	0.895	9.34	19.97	0.833	20.45	23.72	0.884	14.22	18.69	0.820	15.73

Accuracy on Tanks and Temples dataset

Experimental Results

4. Accuracy on different datasets

	Bike		Flowers		Pirate		Digger		Sandbox		Soccertable	
	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%										
NPBG [2]	0.616	31.08	0.553	48.47	0.592	45.71	0.686	29.08	0.650	35.91	0.723	29.97
NeRF++ [45]	0.715	27.01	0.816	30.30	0.712	41.56	0.657	34.69	0.842	23.08	0.889	20.61
FVS [30]	0.592	27.83	0.778	26.07	0.685	35.89	0.668	23.27	0.770	30.20	0.819	19.41
Ours w/o FT	0.745	21.18	0.848	21.41	0.752	29.21	0.782	18.00	0.850	21.48	0.895	14.79
Ours	0.757	20.84	0.845	20.82	0.760	30.83	0.791	16.12	0.862	20.00	0.912	13.07

Accuracy on FVS dataset

Experimental Results

4. Accuracy on different datasets

	65			106			118		
	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%	↑PSNR	↑SSIM	↓LPIPS%
LLFF [24]	22.48/22.07	0.935/0.921	9.38/12.71	24.10/24.63	0.900/0.886	13.26/13.57	28.99/27.42	0.928/0.922	9.69/10.99
EVS [7]	23.26/14.43	0.942/0.848	7.94/22.11	20.21/11.15	0.902/0.743	14.91/29.57	23.35/12.06	0.928/0.793	10.84/25.01
NPBG [2]	16.74/15.44	0.889/0.873	14.30/19.45	19.62/20.26	0.847/0.842	18.90/21.13	23.81/24.14	0.867/0.879	15.22/16.88
NeRF [25]	32.00/28.12	0.984/0.963	3.04/8.54	34.45/30.66	0.975/0.957	7.02/10.14	37.36/31.66	0.985/0.967	4.18/6.92
FVS [30]	30.44/25.32	0.984/0.961	2.56/7.17	32.96/27.56	0.979/0.950	2.96/6.57	35.64/29.54	0.985/0.963	1.95/6.31
Ours w/o FT	30.08/23.98	0.983/0.960	2.36/7.16	32.06/29.01	0.978/0.959	3.54/5.36	35.65/30.42	0.986/0.966	2.15/5.15
Ours	32.13/26.82	0.986/0.964	1.70/5.61	34.30/30.64	0.983/0.965	1.93/3.69	37.27/31.44	0.988/0.967	1.30/4.26

Accuracy on DTU dataset

Left/Right: View interpolation / extrapolation

Conclusion

A view synthesis method based on **differentiable on-surface feature processing**

Adaptively aggregates deep features from set of known images,
on a reconstructed **geometric scaffold**

**This method will benefit from the improvements in
3D surface reconstruction** (e.g. SfM, MVS) methods

Trained end-to-end **eliminating the need of** determining
relevant images based on **heuristic** (drawback of FVS)

Sets the new **state-of-the-art photorealistic view synthesis** on large-scale real-world scenes

Discussion

1. Impossible to introduce appearance variation to the scene! (<-> NeRF-W, NeuTex)

2. Only handles static scenes!

Studies on applying neural rendering on dynamics scenes are still on-going

3. Can SVS handle volumetric phenomena such as fog?

It'd be interesting to merge volumetric radiance field approaches with this

Thank You