

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT KAISERSLAUTERN

MASTER THESIS

---

# Improved Normal Inference from Calibrated Illuminated RGBD Images

---

*Author:*

Jingyuan SHA

*Supervisor:*

Prof. Dr. Didier STRICKER  
M. Sc. Torben FETZER

Augmented Vision  
German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence



June 28, 2022



## Declaration of Authorship

I, Jingyuan SHA, declare that this thesis titled, “Improved Normal Inference from Calibrated Illuminated RGBD Images” and the work presented in it are my own. I confirm that:

- This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University.
- Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated.
- Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed.
- Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work.
- I have acknowledged all main sources of help.
- Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself.

Signed:

---

Date:

---



*“Thanks to my solid academic training, today I can write hundreds of words on virtually any topic without possessing a shred of information, which is how I got a good job in journalism.”*

Dave Barry



TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT KAIERSLAUTERN

*Abstract*

Faculty Name  
German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence

Master of Science

**Improved Normal Inference from Calibrated Illuminated RGBD Images**  
by Jingyuan SHA

The Thesis Abstract is written here (and usually kept to just this page). The page is kept centered vertically so can expand into the blank space above the title too...



## *Acknowledgements*

The acknowledgments and the people to thank go here, don't forget to include your project advisor...



# Contents

<b>Declaration of Authorship</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Related Work</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Approaches</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Neighbor based surface normal estimation . . . . .	5
3.2 Gated Convolution neural network for surface normal estimation . . . . .	7
3.2.1 Gated Convolution . . . . .	7
3.2.2 Architecture . . . . .	8
3.2.3 Loss Function . . . . .	8
Perceptual Loss . . . . .	8
L2 Loss . . . . .	8
3.3 Guided normal inference using GCNN . . . . .	10
3.3.1 Image Guided normal inference . . . . .	10
3.3.2 Add the light information . . . . .	10
<b>4 Dataset</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1 Synthetic Dataset . . . . .	13
4.1.1 Resource . . . . .	13
4.1.2 Synthesize Scenes using Unity . . . . .	13
4.1.3 Convert to Point Cloud . . . . .	15
4.1.4 Point Cloud Normalization . . . . .	16
4.1.5 Noise . . . . .	17
4.1.6 Fit to PyTorch . . . . .	17
4.2 Real Dataset . . . . .	18
<b>5 Experiments</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1 Surface Normal Inference based on Depth Map . . . . .	19
5.1.1 Compared Approaches . . . . .	19
5.1.2 Training Details . . . . .	19
5.1.3 Qualitative Evaluation . . . . .	19
5.1.4 Quantitative Evaluation . . . . .	19
5.1.5 Speed . . . . .	20
5.2 Guided Gated Convolution Neural Network for Normal Inference . . . . .	20
5.3 Guided Gated Convolution Neural Network for Normal Inference . . . . .	21
5.4 model comparison . . . . .	22
<b>6 Conclusion</b>	<b>23</b>

<b>A Dataset</b>	<b>25</b>
A.1 Dataset . . . . .	25
A.2 How do I change the colors of links? . . . . .	25
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>29</b>

# List of Figures

1.1 Left: A part of the point cloud of the dragon model. Right: The zoom in of the left point cloud.	1
3.1 Gated Convolution Layer, where $\oplus$ denotes element-wise multiplication.	8
3.2 Basic Normal Neural Network model based on Gated Convolution layer and UNet architecture.	9
3.3 Guided Gated Convolution Neural Network for normal estimation. The normal branch shows on the upper side taking point cloud as input. The image branch shows on the lower side taking image as input. There are total 4 times fusions between the two branches. The output is a corresponding normal map.	11
4.1 Point clouds scanned by high resolution scanners	14
4.2 The layout of synthetic scenes generation in Unity.	14
4.3 Convert depth to point in camera coordinate system	15
4.4 Left: Extreme value in 3 axis; Right: Vertex range in 3 axis	16
4.5 Noise-intensity on $\mu = 0, \mu = 10, \mu = 20, \mu = 30, \mu = 40, \mu = 50$ ,. Object Name: elephant-zun-lid.	17
5.1 GCNN Normal Inference on Synthetic Dataset (object: dragon)	20
5.2 Evaluation on Real Dataset	20
5.3 Evaluation of average angular loss on the whole test dataset with 90 scenes. The x-axis indicates the point number, the y-axis indicates the angles. The <b>Left</b> one using point cloud without noise, the <b>right</b> one has noise.	20
5.4 guided-GCNN Normal Inference on Synthetic Dataset (object: dragon). GCNN result is shown on (d) and (e) as comparison.	21
5.5 The normal difference of between GCNN and ground-truth in x, y, z-axis respectively. The y axis indicates the number of points, x axis indicates the value of normal in x/y/z axis. (The chart is based on the "dragon" scene showing above)	21
5.6 Normal Inference on different models with errors. (object: dragon)	22
A.1 Point clouds in training dataset A	26
A.2 Point clouds in training dataset B	27
A.3 Point clouds in training dataset C	28



# List of Tables

4.1	The information saved for each scene in “synthetic50-5” . . . . .	15
4.2	The fluctuation of extreme values and their ranges in 100 random training items. . . . .	17
4.3	The structure of a single tensor in the dataset. . . . .	17



# List of Abbreviations

**LAH** List Abbreviations Here  
**WSF** What (it) Stands For



# Physical Constants

Speed of Light  $c_0 = 2.997\,924\,58 \times 10^8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  (exact)



# List of Symbols

$a$	distance	m
$P$	power	W ( $\text{J s}^{-1}$ )
$\omega$	angular frequency	rad



*To ...*



## Chapter 1

# Introduction

Surface normal is an important property of a surface with many applications, like surface reconstruction, shadings generation and other visual effects. However, the calculation of surface normal in many tasks is not as straightforward as simply the cross-product of two plane vectors. Especially in the task of real-world object digitalization, the surface is usually hardly to be mathematically described in equations due to the elaborate details on the objects. Instead, it is common to use a group of points to describe the object surface, which is a memory economical solution to save the fine detail of the objects and also can be easier measured by 3D scanners. Therefore the task is converted to the normal inference based on the surface point, and the most of the case, the result surface normal is merely an approximation.




FIGURE 1.1: Left: A part of the point cloud of the dragon model.  
Right: The zoom in of the left point cloud.

Apart from this, due to the application scenarios, the working principle of scanners are various, which consequently produce point cloud structures in different forms. For the scanners without positions recording, the point cloud acquired after scanning is unstructured. In this case, every 3D point can be captured by different capture position, and neighbors are not defined by capture time. It increases the difficulty and computation for the neighbor based normal inference approaches. Furthermore, since the lack of inherent structure, the normal can hardly be inferred by the parallel approaches.

However, for the scanner with calibrated camera, a structured point cloud can be captured. One example is the depth camera. It captures the RGB-D images for the object, which includes the standard RGB image with depth information of each pixel. After camera calibration, a corresponding point cloud can be calculated based on the depth map and camera matrix. It gives the advantage that a structured point cloud is mapped directly based on the same capture position from a 2D depth map, the neighbor information of each point is identical to the corresponding pixel in the 2D depth map. It provides a better view for the normal inference task since the neighbor information can be considered as an important reference. Besides the point cloud, which is one piece of information can be used for normal reference, the

RGB image also leaves the trace of surface normal. If assume object surface is diffuse and the light coming from a knowing direction , the brightness of the object surface is proportional to the surface normal, which is known as Lambertian surface. It indicates the normal inference task can also utilize the relationship between surface normal and light reflection to further rectify the inferred normal map with knowing light source. Therefore, the illuminated calibrated RGB-D image provides as a good input for normal inference tasks. Unfortunately, in the actual situation, the depth maps captured by the sensors are only semi-dense, which is mainly caused by optical noises and the reflections in dark and shinny areas. Consequently, it disrupts the robustness of the normal inference methods. Median filters can be used for the sparse missing pixels, however, for the case of huge missing holes in the depth map, it produces just a paltry result. Thus a reasonable guess is required for missing areas.

Deep learning based methods provides multiple possible solutions for the challenges mentioned above. First, to deal with the noised input, deep learning based methods already have the solution for the similar tasks like image inpainting and depth density enhancement, which base on the noised image as input to predict the clean and fully dense output with or without original meanings. Therefore, it can be a help for noise in the depth map. Besides, the network of deep learning model can also handle the structured point cloud as a single input and infer the corresponding normal all together, which is very time economical comparing to the approaches like neighbor based methods. In addition, the multi-stages training architectures provide a way to consider both depth map and texture image as the input to predict the surface normals, which not only consider the point cloud but also the add the lambertian reflection as a further constraint.

In this work, we focus on the normal inference based on a semi-dense depth map with RGB image using deep learning based approaches. Specifically, the missing pixels in the depth map is filled up by the gated convolution and propagate in a customized UNet with skipping connections. The output of the training model is directly the surface normal corresponding the input depth map. The grayscale image is used to further improve the estimation accuracy. For the training work, a dataset named “synthetic50-5” is created including 55 high resolution point clouds from internet, as shown in Appendix A. The point clouds provide with the high accurate normals, which can be used as the ground truth of the training work. Most of the models have elaborate details with high curvatures but also contain smooth surfaces. The trained model is evaluated on both synthetic dataset as well as the real dataset captured from RGB-D cameras. A series of metrics have been used for qualitative evaluation. The model is shown to achieve a remarkably better prediction accuracy at a low computational cost compared to the standard approaches for semi-dense point clouds.

The structure of the thesis is as follows, Chapter 1 is the introduction of the whole work. Chapter 2 briefly discusses the related work about normal inference. Chapter 3 is the main approaches of this work. Chapter 4 introduces the created dataset for the training work. Chapter 5 is the description of the experiments and the evaluation of the models. Chapter 6 is the conclusion of the whole thesis.

## Chapter 2

# Related Work

Due to the different of data structures, the point clouds can be grouped into types, structured point cloud based and unstructured point cloud based. The first case contains the neighbor information of each point together with a depth map or RGB image, the second case does not contain any neighbor information which has to be further calculated.

**Structured Point Cloud Based** The relevant methods derive the surface normals based on spatial relationship, which utilizes the neighbor information for estimation. These methods performs well with a well-chosen window size. However, the drawbacks are that the algorithm is highly noise sensitive. It is weak in handling missing pixels, which is a common issue in the input data. The earlier methods usually use optimized methods. Holzer et al., 2012 proposed method to use local neighbors with an interest parameter  $p$  and compute the eigenvectors of the corresponding covariance matrix. They also smooth the depth data in order to handle the noise of depth image. The drawbacks are, as mentioned in the paper, the normals error go up when point depths change severely. Klasing et al., 2009 did a comparison among the optimization-based methods.

**Unstructured Point Cloud Based** For the unstructured point cloud, the neighbor information of each point is usually unknown. K-nearest neighbor (KNN) is a common algorithm for neighbor searching. With knowing this information, the neighbor based approaches can be used as a second step. However, KNN-method merely based on the Euclidean distance in the 3D space. Therefore, the points of the other surfaces but in a close distance will also be considered as neighbors. To ease this problem, Ben-Shabat, Lindenbaum, and Fischer, 2019 proposed a method based on unstructured point cloud with selecting the optimal scale around each point for normal estimation. To calculate the normals of multiple points in parallel Zhou et al., 2021 processes a series of overlapping patches for normal estimation.

Deep learning based methods take single RGB image or RGB-D image as the input for normal estimation. It has a strong relationship with the depth inference tasks, two benchmarks are highly used in these area. (Silberman et al., 2012 and Uhrig et al., 2017) Based on the input of training model, the methods can be roughly divided as follows:

**Depth Based** Depth map contains the spatial information of the object surface, which is very important for the normal inference task. However, the depth map captured by depth sensors are usually with missing pixels and holes on dark, shiny or transparent regions.(Silberman et al., 2012). To overcome the missing pixels, Yang, Kim, and Park, 2012 proposed a depth hole filling method using the depth distributions of neighboring regions. Knutsson and Westin, 1993 introduced normalized

convolution dealing with missing or uncertain data for convolution operation. It uses a binary mask to distinguish missing data and integrate it into the convolution operation. Eldesokey, Felsberg, and Khan, 2020a applied it and use normalized convolution layers in their networks, which aims to reconstruct the missing pixels from the sparse depth map sensed by cameras. Eldesokey et al., 2020 proposed an input confidence estimation network to estimate the confidence instead of using a binary mask. However, the relevant papers are only using 1 channel data as model input, which didn't discussed the case for the multiple-channel data as input, such as RGB image, or structured point cloud. Hua and Gong, 2018 further integrated RGB image as the guidance to deal with the missing pixels in the depth map.

**RGB based** RGB based methods predict the depth map directly from single RGB image. Eigen, Puhrsch, and Fergus, 2014 proposed a two staged network for depth map prediction based on RGB image, which consider the global features and the local features respectively. Laina et al., 2016 employed Residual Network for the feature extraction and further designed a upsampling part which replace the fully-connected layer with the unpoling layers. Fouhey, Gupta, and Hebert, 2013 proposed a method to learn discriminative and geometrically informative primitives from RGBD images, which is further used to recover the surface normals of a scene from a single image. Qi et al., 2018 uses ResNet (He et al., 2015) to infer a coarse surface normal based on RGB image, and further refine it with the help of depth map based on the methods based on Fouhey, Gupta, and Hebert, 2013. Li et al., 2022 proposed a method achieved state of art in NYUv2 Dataset (Silberman et al., 2012), which adaptively generate information to predict depth maps based on RGB image.

**RGB-D based** Zeng et al., 2019 based on UNet architecture for normal estimation using RGB-D image as input. The RGB image and depth map are in the separate branches and imply a fusion module in four sections of the network to concatenate two branches. It also considers the confidence of the values in depth map.

## Chapter 3

# Approaches

In three dimension geometry, a surface normal at the point  $P$  is a vector  $n$  perpendicular to the tangent plane of the surface at point  $P$ . The length of a normal is usually one, with a sign to represent the sides (interior or exterior).

Oord et al., 2016 proposed a gated activation unit to model more complex interactions comparing to standard CNN layers, which mainly inspired by the multiplicative units exist in Long Short-Term Memory proposed by Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997 and Rated Recurrent Unit (GRU) proposed by Cho et al., 2014. Yu et al., 2018 employed the same gated unit solving for the free-form image inpainting task. The proposed network use 3 channel RGB images as input and estimate the missing pixels.

Recently, deep learning based method achieved a great succeed for image processing. Redmon and Farhadi, 2018 proposed Tan, Pang, and Le, 2019 These network architectures use a batch of RGB/Grayscale images as input and are employed for classification problems. Usually, the images are convoluted with a convolution layer and downsampling with pooling layers. The outputs of the network consist of a single value to represent the index of the corresponding class Tan, Pang, and Le, 2019, or with a set of values to represent the position of bounding boxes. Redmon and Farhadi, 2018. However, in many other vision tasks, like normal map inference, the output is demanded as the same shape as the input. Instead of predicting one or several classes for the whole input matrix, the class for each pixel requires for prediction. In this case, the traditional network architecture is not suitable anymore.

It is worth to noticed that, the output of normal inference CNN model is not one or severl labels but an entire image or normal map with same size. Recently, Ronneberger et al proposed an architecture called UNet Ronneberger, Fischer, and Brox, 2015 for biomedical image segmentations. The architecture is shown in Figure ???. The first half network is a usual classification convolutional network, the second half replace the pooling layers and traditional fc layers in the traditional CNNs to upsampling layers, thus in the end of the second half, the output is able to back to the input size. The proposed network can successfully assigned each pixel a class for segmentation tasks. Under this symmetric network, an input image is downsampled 3 times and upsampled 3 times. Output image has exactly the same size as input image. The downsampling and upsampling both have large number of feature channels, which guarantee the network propagates the information to higher resolution layers.

### 3.1 Neighbor based surface normal estimation

For a point  $P$  in a surface, its normal  $n$  is a vector of the tangent plane  $\Pi$  of the surface at this point  $P$ . As long as find  $k$  vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$  on the tangent plane, the normal can be calculated immediately based on equation  $v \cdot n = 0$

Let  $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$  are  $k$  neighbors of point  $P$  in the point cloud. In order to find the normal  $n$ , we can assume the neighbor points and  $P$  are in the same tangent plane. Then

$$\mathbf{v}_i = P_i - P \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k \quad (3.1)$$

are  $k$  vectors on the tangent plane. Since they all perpendicular to the normal  $n$ , we have

$$\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k \quad (3.2)$$

The equation system can be further simplified as

$$M \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad (3.3)$$

where  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times 3}$  denotes the matrix constructed by  $\mathbf{v}_i$ . In order to avoid trivial solution, one more constraint should be added

$$\|\mathbf{n}_{3 \times 1}\|_2^2 = 1$$

, which also let the normal to be a unit vector.

In order to calculate a valid normal, 3 points are required at least. For the sake of robust, more points can be used to reduce the measuring error. In this case, the equation system is over-determined, then the equation system mentioned above can be converted to follow optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \|M\mathbf{n}\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \|\mathbf{n}\|^2 = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

which can be solved by singular value decomposition(SVD). Let the decomposition of  $M = U\Sigma V^T$ , The solution i.e. normal is the last column of  $V$ .

At last, all the normals should point ot view point  $S$ , thus the direction of a normal should be inverted if

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot (P - S) > 0 \quad (3.5)$$

## 3.2 Gated Convolution neural network for surface normal estimation

The standard convolution layer goes like this

$$O = \Sigma \Sigma W \cdot I \quad (3.6)$$

each filter is applied as a sliding window to walk through the whole matrix and calculates the output matrix. Every entry in the matrix counts in the operation. This is reasonable for image processing task with full-dense input, since no missing pixels exist. However, the depth-map and point cloud is only semi-dense. The valid and invalid pixels will be treated equally if we still perform standard convolution layers. Since the aim of the network is not learning the pattern of noise, but the noise with eternally changing patterns will confuse the network, and it fails the normal inference, a mask is required to distinguish two kinds of pixels.

Eldesokey, Felsberg, and Khan, 2020b use binary mask to indicate valid pixels, and further use normalized convolution to predict the output. The normalized convolution is shown as follows

$$O(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_i^k \sum_j^k W(i, j) \cdot I(x - i, y - j) \cdot M(x - i, y - j)}{\sum_i^k \sum_j^k W(i, j) \cdot M(x - i, y - j)}, & \text{if } \sum_i^k \sum_j^k M(i, j) > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

where  $k$  is the kernel size,  $(x, y)$  is the position in input,  $(i, j)$  is the displacement in kernel,  $M$  is the corresponding mask. A binary mask uses 1 to indicate valid pixels and 0 otherwise.  $\odot$  denotes element-wise multiplication.

Normalized convolution layer added the weight to the mask. However, a initialization for the mask is still required, and the propagation of the mask remain a tricky task.

### 3.2.1 Gated Convolution

Yu et al., 2018 proposed gated convolution using for image inpainting task.

The structure is shown in Figure 3.1. Instead of using a mask as input to indicate valid pixels, it employs a standard convolution layers to learn this mask directly from data. The valid pixels are then activated by a Sigmoid function. Then it imply element-wise multiplication with the feature map. Formally, the gated convolution is described as follows, the layer with input size  $(N, C_{in}, H, W)$  and output size  $(N, C_{out}, H_{out}, W_{out})$ :

$$o(N_i, C_{o_j}) = \sigma\left(\sum_{k=0}^{C_{in}-1} w_g(C_{o_j}, k) \star i(N_i, k) + b_g(C_{o_j})\right) * \phi\left(\sum_{k=0}^{C_{in}-1} w_f(C_{o_j}, k) \star i(N_i, k) + b_f(C_{o_j})\right) \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\phi$  is LeakyReLU function,  $\sigma$  is sigmoid function, thus the output values are in range  $[0, 1]$ ,  $\star$  is the valid 2D cross-correlation operator,  $N$  is batch size,  $C$  denotes a number of channels,  $H$  is a height of input planes in pixels, and  $W$  is width in pixels,  $w(C_{o_j}, k)$  denotes the weight of  $j$ -th output channel corresponding  $k$ -th input channel,  $i(N_i, k)$  denotes the input of  $i$ -th batch corresponding  $k$ -th input channel,  $b(C_{o_j})$  denotes the bias of  $j$ -th output channel.




FIGURE 3.1: Gated Convolution Layer, where  $\oplus$  denotes element-wise multiplication.

### 3.2.2 Architecture

Based on the implementation mentioned above, the architecture roughly follows on UNet proposed by Ronneberger, Fischer, and Brox, 2015, as shown in Figure 3.2.

Instead of using pooling layers for down/up samplings, gated convolution layer with stride (2, 2) is used. The gated convolution using Sigmoid function for gating layer and LeakyReLU function for feature layer. All the layers are gated convolution layer with the exception of last two layer, which instead uses standard convolution layer to scale the output in range  $[-1, 1]$ . Other than the last two layers which use  $1 \times 1$  kernels, all the gated convolution layer use  $3 \times 3$  kernels with  $1 \times 1$  padding.

The input is 3D vertex with size  $512 \times 512 \times 3$ , and output is  $512 \times 512 \times 3$  normal map, which has the same resolution. There are 3 times downsamplings, each scale with 3 gated convolution layers, the third layer has stride-2. The upsampling part interpolate the feature maps 3 times with 1 gated convolution layer in each scale.

It keeps the skip connection in UNet to remain the fine detail features.

### 3.2.3 Loss Function

#### Perceptual Loss

Johnson, Alahi, and Fei-Fei, 2016 proposed perceptual loss.

#### L2 Loss

The loss function is based on mean square error is described as follows:




FIGURE 3.2: Basic Normal Neural Network model based on Gated Convolution layer and UNet architecture.

$$\begin{aligned}
 l(x, y) = L &= \{l_1, \dots, l_N\}^T \\
 l_n &= \text{mean}(Mask_{ol}(x_n - y_n)^2 \cdot p + (x_n - y_n)^2 \cdot Mask_{nol})
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where  $x$  is input,  $y$  is target,  $N$  is the batch size.  $Mask_{ol}$  is the mask for the outlier,  $p$  is the penalty of the outlier, it is set as 1.4.

### 3.3 Guided normal inference using GCNN

#### 3.3.1 Image Guided normal inference

The normal inference can be guided by a RGB or gray-scale image, since the image is captured by passive method, it is fully-dense comparing to depth map, hence provides a complete view of the scene. The architecture is shown in Figure 3.3. The upper branch is the similar with GCNN model but with 4 additional concatenate layers, furthermore, 1 gated convolution layer is added before concatenate with image branch. The image branch takes a single grayscale image as input, then 3 times downsample with 3 standard layers in each scale. In the upsampling part, the feature map upsampled 3 times and concatenate with the last layer in the downsampling part before interpolation.

#### 3.3.2 Add the light information

stores for every pixel the direction of incoming light. find a mapping  $H$ , such that  $l_{in} = H(v, l_s)$  for pixel  $v$ ,  $l_s$  is the position of light source,  $l_{in}$  is direction of incoming light of pixel  $v$ . Iterate all the pixels, we get the light direction map  $L$ .

Let  $I$  denotes image,  $N$  denotes normal map,  $L$  denotes light direction map.

lambertian reflection

$$I = \rho N * L$$

where  $*$  denotes scalar product, the albedo rho can be computed by

$$\rho = \frac{I}{N * L}$$

in NN, it is

$$\rho = conv2d\left(\frac{I}{N * L}\right)$$

The corresponding loss term is

$$\|I - \rho(N * L)\|_{F_2}$$

in this case, the normal is supposed to be more crispy than the previous implement.

In a first step, we should compute initial albedos from the predicted normals and check if everything is correct. (Normals need to be in spatial space again, not in tangent space, and we need to use cameras extrinsics R and t from the data file to triangulate the vertex maps correctly)...

$$\rho = \frac{I}{N * L}$$




FIGURE 3.3: Guided Gated Convolution Neural Network for normal estimation. The normal branch shows on the upper side taking point cloud as input. The image branch shows on the lower side taking image as input. There are total 4 times fusions between the two branches. The output is a corresponding normal map.



## Chapter 4

# Dataset

### 4.1 Synthetic Dataset

To train a deep learning model with supervised learning scheme, a dataset should require two principles, truth-worthy ground-truth and comprehensive scenarios. The depth map captured by Kinect is not satisfied the first requirement since it is usually semi-dense with a number of missing pixels, as shown in Figure ???. Therefore, a more elaborate depth map is required for the training work. In this thesis, a dataset called “synthetic50-5” is created for the training works.

#### 4.1.1 Resource

*The Stanford 3D Scanning Repository* n.d., McGuire, 2017, McGuire, n.d. and *Smithsonian 3D Digitization* n.d. published a set of point cloud dataset on the internet for computer vision task research. These point clouds are scanned from real objects using high resolution scanners like Cyberware 3030 MS+ and calibrated with post processing. Each objects has been scanned for hundreds of times for an exhaustive completion for the origin objects, which is up to millions points. (*The Stanford 3D Scanning Repository* n.d.). The dense point clouds makes the normal inference task trivial since the neighbor based method performs good enough for these kind of task. Some of the point cloud even equipped with pre-computed normal map based on more advanced methods. They all provides the accurate ground-truth for the supervised learning method.

The “synthetic50-5”, is a datset with 50 point clouds as training set and 5 point clouds as test set. The dataset is created base on the work of this thesis and using for normal inference task. Figure ?? gives the illustrations of some objects. Appendix A gives a full version of dataset models.

#### 4.1.2 Synthesize Scenes using Unity

In order to fit the using scenario of Kinect as much as possible, the dataset consists of the generated synthetic 3D scenes via Unity, which is a game engine using for 3D games creation.

In the synthetic scenes from engine, the object is placed on a cylinder platform, which is lighted by a directional light nearby. A camera focus on the platform and captured the scene. The layout in the game engine is shown in Figure 4.2. In order to simulate more scenarios, the positions of the camera and directional light are randomly changed in each new scene. For 50 training objects, 1000 scenes are generated and each scene is saved in 3 kinds of resolutions  $512 \times 512 \times 3$ ,  $256 \times 256 \times 3$  and  $128 \times 128 \times 3$ .

The main advantage using generated scene is the availability of complete information. The depth map can be captured in a loss-free way. The corresponding normal




FIGURE 4.1: Point clouds scanned by high resolution scanners




FIGURE 4.2: The layout of synthetic scenes generation in Unity.

map can also be safely considered as ground truth. And the scale of the dataset is easy to control.

For each scene, following information is recorded

A depth map  $D$  is captured by a depth camera in Unity, which is a 1 channel image that contains the information relating to the distance of the surfaces of the scene objects from a viewpoint. It can be saved as a 16-bit grayscale image, i.e. each pixel in range  $0 - 65535$ . The grayscale image can be used as guided normal inference task and also as a readable scene for human. The gray-color is converted from RGB color based on following equation

$$gray : \frac{r + 2g + b}{4}$$

The normal map is the tangent surface normal, which is saved in 32-bit RGB color image. The surface normal ( $n_x, n_y, n_z$ ) and its corresponding RGB color ( $R, G, B$ )

TABLE 4.1: The information saved for each scene in “synthetic50-5”.

Data	Size
Depth map	$512 \times 512 \times 3$
Depth range	$2 \times 1$
Grayscale Image	$512 \times 512 \times 1$
Normal Map	$512 \times 512 \times 3$
Light Position	$3 \times 1$
Camera Intrinsic Matrix	$3 \times 3$
Camera Extrinsic Matrix	$3 \times 4$

can be converted based on following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} n_x &= \frac{R}{255} * 2 - 1 \\ n_y &= \frac{G}{255} * 2 - 1 \\ n_z &= 1 - \frac{B}{255} * 2 \end{aligned}$$

If consider the relation between Lambertian reflection and normal direction, the light source can be used to calculate the reflect direction of each point. The camera intrinsic and extrinsic matrix helps point cloud calculation.

It is necessary to point out again that “synthetic50-5” aiming to rebuild the using scenarios of Kinect, where all types of the generated data files shown in Table 4.1 are also the same format of the Kinect data.

#### 4.1.3 Convert to Point Cloud

The depth map can be converted to 3D vertex point cloud as the input of the normal inference model.




FIGURE 4.3: Convert depth to point in camera coordinate system

Consider a 3-dimensional Euclidean space. Use  $z$  axis denotes the depth. The  $x$  and  $y$  axes perpendicular with each other. For a pixel  $(u, v)$  on depth map, its depth

$D(u, v)$  is the  $Z$  component of the corresponding point  $P_C = (X, Y, Z)$  in camera coordinate system. The  $X$  and  $Y$  can be calculated based on the triangle similarity

$$X = \frac{uZ}{fk_u}$$

$$Y = \frac{vZ}{fk_v}$$

where  $fk_u, fk_v$  is the focal length in pixels align  $u$  and  $v$  axes. Converted a point from camera coordinate system to world coordinate system, using extrinsic matrix  $R$  and  $t$

$$P_W = P_C R + t$$

#### 4.1.4 Point Cloud Normalization

The sizes of each training object are various, whereas it should be as an invariant value for the training model. Thus the normalization is required before feed training objects into the models. The range of each axis is shown in Figure ???. Table 4.2 gives a quantitative measurement of corresponding average values.

The normalization has been performed as follows. First translate the points to the original point as close as possible, then choose the range value of one axis as a scale factor, normalize the points to unit vectors. The equation is shown as follows

$$X_n = \frac{X - \min(X)}{s}$$

$$Y_n = \frac{Y - \min(Y)}{s}$$

$$Z_n = \frac{Z - \min(Z)}{s}$$

where  $s$  is a scale factor,

$$s = \max(X) - \min(X)$$

It is calculated as the range in  $X$  axis, but theoretically can be used by  $Y$  or  $Z$  axes as well.




FIGURE 4.4: Left: Extreme value in 3 axis; Right: Vertex range in 3 axis

TABLE 4.2: The fluctuation of extreme values and their ranges in 100 random training items.

Axis	Scale	Min	Max
X	1.48	-0.75	0.73
Y	1.56	-0.76	0.80
Z	1.47	6.53	8.00

TABLE 4.3: The structure of a single tensor in the dataset.

Name	Content
	Vertex
input-tensor	Image
	Light Direction
	GT-Normal
output-tensor	Image
	GT-Light-Direction
Light position	light position
Camera Matrix	K,R,t
Depth Range	minDepth, maxDepth

#### 4.1.5 Noise

The raw depth maps captured by Kinect usually have missing pixels. Therefore, the “synthetic50-5” dataset adds a similar properties. As shown in Figure ???. the depth map has missing pixels distributed all around the scene. Correspondingly, an uniformly distributed pixel-delete noise is used for noise simulation. Furthermore, a parameter  $\mu$  is used to control the intensity of noise, it denotes the  $\mu$ -percent pixel dropoff. For example,  $\mu = 10$  means removes 10% pixels randomly. For each scene, the noising operation based on a random  $\mu$  in a range [0, 50], therefore some scenes have more missing pixels and some have less. The random noise intensity also enables the model to learn scenarios not only with noise, but also with minor noise or even without noise. Figure 4.5 shows the noise effect on different  $\mu$ .




FIGURE 4.5: Noise-intensity on  $\mu=0, \mu=10, \mu=20, \mu=30, \mu=40, \mu=50$ .  
Object Name: elephant-zun-lid.

#### 4.1.6 Fit to PyTorch

In order to saving the training time, the dataset is compressed in PyTorch format. The structure of a single item is shown in Table 4.3.

## 4.2 Real Dataset

The real dataset is the depth map and rgb image captured via Kinect...

## Chapter 5

# Experiments

The experiments are performed on two normal inference tasks: normal inference based on depth image and guided normal inference based on RGB-D image. Prior works for normal estimation using very deep networks. For a single object surface normal detection as stated in this thesis, the given methods has a similar performance but only with 1/10 size.

The model is trained with PyTorch 1.10.2, CUDA 10.2.89, GPU with single NVIDIA GEFORCE GTX 1080Ti.

### 5.1 Surface Normal Inference based on Depth Map

The goal of surface normal inference is to calculate the tangent surface normal map  $N$  from a single depth map  $D$ . A network named Gated Convolution Neural Network (GCNN) is trained and is compared with similar approaches.

#### 5.1.1 Compared Approaches

#### 5.1.2 Training Details

The network (see 3.2) is trained on stated dataset in Chapter 4. It has two versions, the L-size  $512 \times 512 \times 3$  and the S-size  $128 \times 128 \times 3$ . For the L-size model, it uses batch size 8 for 3500 iterations. For the S-size model, it uses batch size 32 for 6000 iterations. Both sizes use Adam optimizer Kingma and Ba, 2014 with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-3}$ , penalty-l2 loss(see ??). The output is directly the tangent normal in range  $[-1, 1]$ . The output and input has the same shape.

#### 5.1.3 Qualitative Evaluation

The evaluation visualization on dataset “synthetic50-5” (see 4) dataset is shown in Figure 5.1. It compares the results with method xxx, for both smooth and highly detailed cases. In all the cases, the angle errors are very close. The test-cases are based on test point cloud in “synthetic50-5”.

The model is supposed to used on any image size since it has no fully-connected layers (dense layers). Two size of models are based on exactly the same architecture.

It is

The evaluation visualization on real dataset is shown in Figure 5.2

#### 5.1.4 Quantitative Evaluation

The evaluation result on test scenes is shown in Figure 5.3. The GCNN based method has angle error between 5 to 15 degrees in both type of inputs. The error trends to higher with point number decrease. It is because the less points in the point cloud,




FIGURE 5.1: GCNN Normal Inference on Synthetic Dataset (object: dragon)




FIGURE 5.2: Evaluation on Real Dataset

the more detail is hided due to the insufficient of resolution. Therefore the recorded surface based on the point cloud is more coarse, which also increase the difficulty of the normal inference.




FIGURE 5.3: Evaluation of average angular loss on the whole test dataset with 90 scenes. The x-axis indicates the point number, the y-axis indicates the angles. The **Left** one using point cloud without noise, the **right** one has noise.

### 5.1.5 Speed

## 5.2 Guided Gated Convolution Neural Network for Normal Inference

The inference result of guided-GCNN model is shown in Figure 5.4. With adding the information of a gray-scale image, the model is able to sharpen the details over the whole scene.




FIGURE 5.4: guided-GCNN Normal Inference on Synthetic Dataset (object: dragon). GCNN result is shown on (d) and (e) as comparison.

### 5.3 Guided Gated Convolution Neural Network for Normal Inference

From the Figure 5.5 we can observe the normal difference between ground-truth and GCNN predicted normals in another dimension. It separates the interval  $[-1, 1]$ , which is exactly the range of normal vector, to 256 sections. Then it counts the number of points locates in each section for 3 axes. The 3 axes are fitted quit well in most of interval but other than  $[-0.25, 0.25]$  for x and y axes and interval close to  $-1$  for z axis. Therefore a further constraint can be considered to the loss function related to the normal difference shown in this figure.

It is faulty that almost no normal has -1 z-component in GCNN predicted normal map. The reason?




FIGURE 5.5: The normal difference of between GCNN and ground-truth in x, y, z-axis respectively. The y axis indicates the number of points, x axis indicates the value of normal in x/y/z axis. (The chart is based on the "dragon" scene showing above)

## 5.4 model comparison

This section evaluates the proposed models with the neighbor-based model and make comparison with each other.




FIGURE 5.6: Normal Inference on different models with errors. (object: dragon)

## Chapter 6

# Conclusion

Gated convolution neural network...



## Appendix A

# Dataset

### A.1 Dataset

### A.2 How do I change the colors of links?

The color of links can be changed to your liking using:

`\hypersetup{urlcolor=red}`, or  
`\hypersetup{citecolor=green}`, or  
`\hypersetup{allcolor=blue}`.

If you want to completely hide the links, you can use:

`\hypersetup{allcolors=}`, or even better:  
`\hypersetup{hidelinks}`.

If you want to have obvious links in the PDF but not the printed text, use:

`\hypersetup{colorlinks=false}`.




FIGURE A.1: Point clouds in training dataset A




FIGURE A.2: Point clouds in training dataset B




FIGURE A.3: Point clouds in training dataset C

# Bibliography

- Ben-Shabat, Yizhak, Michael Lindenbaum, and Anath Fischer (2019). “Nesti-Net: Normal Estimation for Unstructured 3D Point Clouds Using Convolutional Neural Networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- Cho, Kyunghyun et al. (2014). *On the Properties of Neural Machine Translation: Encoder-Decoder Approaches*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1409.1259. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.1259>.
- Eigen, David, Christian Puhrsch, and Rob Fergus (2014). *Depth Map Prediction from a Single Image using a Multi-Scale Deep Network*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1406.2283. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.2283>.
- Eldesokey, Abdelrahman, Michael Felsberg, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan (2020a). “Confidence Propagation through CNNs for Guided Sparse Depth Regression”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 42.10, pp. 2423–2436. DOI: 10.1109/tpami.2019.2929170. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/2Ftpami.2019.2929170>.
- (2020b). “Confidence Propagation through CNNs for Guided Sparse Depth Regression”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 42.10, pp. 2423–2436. DOI: 10.1109/tpami.2019.2929170. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109%2Ftpami.2019.2929170>.
- Eldesokey, Abdelrahman et al. (2020). *Uncertainty-Aware CNNs for Depth Completion: Uncertainty from Beginning to End*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2006.03349. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03349>.
- Fouhey, David F., Abhinav Gupta, and Martial Hebert (2013). “Data-Driven 3D Primitives for Single Image Understanding”. In: *2013 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 3392–3399. DOI: 10.1109/ICCV.2013.421.
- He, Kaiming et al. (2015). *Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1512.03385. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03385>.
- Hochreiter, Sepp and Jürgen Schmidhuber (Dec. 1997). “Long Short-term Memory”. In: *Neural computation* 9, pp. 1735–80. DOI: 10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735.
- Holzer, S. et al. (2012). “Adaptive neighborhood selection for real-time surface normal estimation from organized point cloud data using integral images”. In: *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 2684–2689. DOI: 10.1109/IROS.2012.6385999.
- Hua, Jiashen and Xiaojin Gong (2018). “A Normalized Convolutional Neural Network for Guided Sparse Depth Upsampling”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. IJCAI’18*. Stockholm, Sweden: AAAI Press, 2283–2290. ISBN: 9780999241127.
- Johnson, Justin, Alexandre Alahi, and Li Fei-Fei (2016). *Perceptual Losses for Real-Time Style Transfer and Super-Resolution*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1603.08155. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.08155>.
- Kingma, Diederik P. and Jimmy Ba (2014). *Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1412.6980. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.

- Klasing, Klaas et al. (2009). "Comparison of surface normal estimation methods for range sensing applications". In: *2009 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 3206–3211. DOI: [10.1109/ROBOT.2009.5152493](https://doi.org/10.1109/ROBOT.2009.5152493).
- Knutsson, H. and C.-F. Westin (1993). "Normalized and differential convolution". In: *Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 515–523. DOI: [10.1109/CVPR.1993.341081](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.1993.341081).
- Laina, Iro et al. (2016). *Deeper Depth Prediction with Fully Convolutional Residual Networks*. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1606.00373](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1606.00373). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.00373>.
- Li, Zhenyu et al. (2022). *BinsFormer: Revisiting Adaptive Bins for Monocular Depth Estimation*. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2204.00987](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.00987). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.00987>.
- McGuire, Morgan (n.d.). *Artec3D*. URL: <https://www.artec3d.com/3d-models/art-and-design>.
- (2017). *Computer Graphics Archive*. URL: <https://casual-effects.com/data>.
- Oord, Aaron van den et al. (2016). *Conditional Image Generation with PixelCNN Decoders*. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1606.05328](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1606.05328). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.05328>.
- Qi, Xiaojuan et al. (2018). "GeoNet: Geometric Neural Network for Joint Depth and Surface Normal Estimation". In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- Redmon, Joseph and Ali Farhadi (2018). *YOLOv3: An Incremental Improvement*. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1804.02767](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1804.02767). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.02767>.
- Ronneberger, Olaf, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox (2015). *U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation*. arXiv: 1505.04597 [cs.CV].
- Silberman, Nathan et al. (2012). "Indoor Segmentation and Support Inference from RGBD Images". In: *ECCV'12 Proceedings of the 12th European conference on Computer Vision - Volume Part V*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, pp. 746–760. ISBN: 978-3-642-33714-7. URL: <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/indoor-segmentation-support-inference-rgbd-images/>.
- Smithsonian 3D Digitization* (n.d.). URL: <https://www.3d.si.edu/explore>.
- Tan, Mingxing, Ruoming Pang, and Quoc V. Le (2019). "EfficientDet: Scalable and Efficient Object Detection". In: DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1911.09070](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1911.09070). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.09070>.
- The Stanford 3D Scanning Repository* (n.d.). URL: <http://www.graphics.stanford.edu/data/3Dscanrep/>.
- Uhrig, Jonas et al. (2017). "Sparsity Invariant CNNs". In: *International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*.
- Yang, Na-Eun, Yong-Gon Kim, and Rae-Hong Park (2012). "Depth hole filling using the depth distribution of neighboring regions of depth holes in the Kinect sensor". In: *2012 IEEE International Conference on Signal Processing, Communication and Computing (ICSPCC 2012)*, pp. 658–661. DOI: [10.1109/ICSPCC.2012.6335696](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSPCC.2012.6335696).
- Yu, Jiahui et al. (2018). *Free-Form Image Inpainting with Gated Convolution*. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1806.03589](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1806.03589). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.03589>.
- Zeng, Jin et al. (2019). "Deep Surface Normal Estimation With Hierarchical RGB-D Fusion". In: *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 6146–6155. DOI: [10.1109/CVPR.2019.00631](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2019.00631).
- Zhou, Jun et al. (2021). *Fast and Accurate Normal Estimation for Point Cloud via Patch Stitching*. arXiv: 2103.16066 [cs.CV].