EE 146: Computer Vision

Buddy Ugwumba SID: 862063029

Lab 7: Image Matching - Template and Chamfer Matching

Date: 02/21/2022

```
clc
clear all
close all
```

Problem 1 - templete matching

```
I = imread('cameraman.tif');
imshow(I)
```



```
t = I(60:85,130:170 ); % this is your template image
imshow(t)
```



```
% write your code here
% functions: imadjust(), imrotate(), xcorr2(), normxcorr2()

% step 1 - get cross correlation / normalized cross correlation
cross_correlation = xcorr2(t, I);
norm_correlation = normxcorr2(t, I);
% step 2 - find the peak value location in the correlation matrix
[x_peak, y_peak] = find(norm_correlation == max(norm_correlation(:)))
```

(a) Report results by showing the results of cross-correlation and normalized cross-correlation. Find the instances of template by thresholding the cross-correlation results



```
% for each experiment, display the related search image, template image,
% and matched box
```

(b) Change the template's intensity but leave the images intensity as in (a) then compare the results obtained in (a)

```
new_temp = imadjust(t, [0.4; 0.5]);
norm_correlation2 = normxcorr2(new_temp, I);
[x_peak_b, y_peak_b] = find(norm_correlation2 == max(norm_correlation2(:)))

x_peak_b = 85
y_peak_b = 170

new_template_size = size(new_temp)

new_template_size = 1x2
26    41

matched_box_b = insertShape(I, 'Rectangle', [y_peak_b - new_template_size(1,2), x_peak_b - new_template_size(1,1), size(new_temp,2), size(new_temp,1)]);
imshow(matched_box_b)
```



After chanigng the intensity value of the template image, we see no change in the template matching of a gray scale image

(c) Keep the templates intensity the same as in (a) but the image intensity has changed. Compare the results with those obtained in (a) and (b)



After chanigng the intensity value of the image, we see no change in the template matching of a gray scale image

(d) After the intensity of both the image and template have been changed, Compare the results with what was obtained in (a), (b), and (c)



After chanigng the intensity value of the template and the image, we see no change in the template matching of a gray scale image

(e) Evaluate the effect of rotation on the performance of detection by template matching after the template has been rotated by 90 degrees

```
rotated_t = imrotate(t, 90);
norm_correlation_rotated = normxcorr2(rotated_t, I);
[x_peak_e, y_peak_e] = find(norm_correlation_rotated == max(norm_correlation_rotated(:
    x_peak_e = 92
    y_peak_e = 91

rotated_template_size = size(rotated_t)

rotated_template_size = 1x2
    41    26

matched_box_e = insertShape(I, 'Rectangle', [y_peak_e - rotated_template_size(1,2), x_]
    - rotated_template_size(1,1), size(rotated_t,2), size(rotated_t,1)]);
imshow(matched_box_e)
```



After rotating the template by 90 degrees we see that the template matching algorithm is not as successful in locating the camera in the image

Problem 2 - binary image matching

```
BW = zeros(100);
b = strel( 'diamond',3);
b = b.Neighborhood;
R = b;
x = [3, 3, 50, 78, 90];
y = [5, 60, 20, 80, 1];
for i = 1 : length(x)
    BW(y(i):y(i)+6,x(i):x(i)+6) = b;
end
b = strel( 'square',5);
b = b.Neighborhood;
x = [31, 35, 80, 7, 60, 15, 20, 70];
y = [5, 60, 60, 80, 30, 20, 50, 66];
for i = 1 : length(x)
    BW(y(i):y(i)+4,x(i):x(i)+4) = b;
end
% now, BW is your search image, R is your reference image
% write your code here
% use cross correlation from problem 1 to find matching, record time
before = cputime
before = 1.7442e+03
matching = xcorr2(R, BW);
after = cputime
after = 1.7443e+03
time = after - before
time = 0.0300
% use chamferMatch() to get the distance transform image Q
Q = chamferMatch(BW,R);
before = cputime;
[x min, y min] = find(Q == min(Q(:)))
x \min = 5x1
    60
    20
    80
    1
y_min = 5x1
    3
```

```
3
50
78
90
```

```
after = cputime;
% then find the minimum distance in Q, record time
time = after - before
```

time = 0.0300

```
% display all the matching using insertShape() refSize = size(R)
```

```
refSize = 1 \times 2
```

```
before1 = cputime;
matching_1 = insertShape(BW, 'Rectangle', [y_min(1,1), x_min(1,1)...
    refSize(1,2), refSize(1,1)]);
imshow(matching_1)
after1 = cputime;
time1 = after1 - before1
```

time1 = 0.1200

```
matching_2 = insertShape(matching_1, 'Rectangle', [y_min(2,1), x_min(2,1)...
    refSize(1,2), refSize(1,1)]);
imshow(matching_2)
matching_3 = insertShape(matching_2, 'Rectangle', [y_min(3,1), x_min(3,1)...
    refSize(1,2), refSize(1,1)]);
imshow(matching_3)
matching_4 = insertShape(matching_3, 'Rectangle', [y_min(4,1), x_min(4,1)...
    refSize(1,2), refSize(1,1)]);
imshow(matching_4)
matching_5 = insertShape(matching_4, 'Rectangle', [y_min(5,1), x_min(5,1)...
    refSize(1,2), refSize(1,1)]);
imshow(matching_5)
```



```
after = cputime;
time = after-before1
```

time = 0.4500

| The cross correlation and the distance formula took the same amount of CPU time, however, the chamfer matching for each took longer. I learned that the chamfer matching is not as quick as the cross correlation. |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |