



**Federal University of Bahia
State University of Feira de Santana**

MASTER THESIS

A multi-view environment for markerless augmented reality

Caio Sacramento de Britto Almeida

Master in Computer Science – MMCC

Salvador
December 15th, 2014

MMCC-Msc-0007

CAIO SACRAMENTO DE BRITTO ALMEIDA

**A MULTI-VIEW ENVIRONMENT FOR MARKERLESS
AUGMENTED REALITY**

Thesis submitted to the Master Program in Computer Science from Federal University of Bahia and State University of Feira de Santana, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Computer Science.

Advisor: Antônio Lopes Apolinário Júnior

Salvador
December 15th, 2014

Index card.

Sacramento de Britto Almeida, Caio

A multi-view environment for markerless augmented reality/ Caio Sacramento de Britto Almeida– Salvador, December 15th, 2014.

12p.: il.

Advisor: Antônio Lopes Apolinário Júnior.

Thesis (master)– Federal University of Bahia, Institute of Mathematics, December 15th, 2014.

1. Multi-view environment. 2. Augmented reality. 3. Computer graphics.

I. Apolinário Jr., Antônio Lopes. II. Federal University of Bahia. Institute of Mathematics. III A multi-view environment for markerless augmented reality.

CDD 20.ed. 123.45

APPROVAL SHEET**CAIO SACRAMENTO DE BRITTO ALMEIDA****A MULTI-VIEW ENVIRONMENT FOR
MARKERLESS AUGMENTED REALITY**

This thesis was considered worthy of acceptance of the master's degree in Computer Science and approved on its final form by the UFBA-UEFS Master Program in Computer Science.

Salvador, December 15th, 2014

Prof. Dr. Antônio Lopes Apolinário Júnior 1
Federal University of Bahia - Brazil

Prof. Dr. Michelle Ângelo 2
State University of Feira de Santana - Brazil

Prof. Dr. Rodrigo Silva 3
Federal University of Juiz de Fora - Brazil

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family for all the support during all those years, not only the time spent on the master program, but also during all my graduation. Namely, first I would like to thank my brother, Rodrigo, for being my inspiration on following this career; my twin sister, Thalita, for being my support of all times; my parents, for the great education that was given to me; my grandmother Lourdes; my girlfriend Jéssica; my friends; and specially my advisor Antônio Apolinário for relying on me to make this work happen.

ABSTRACT

Augmented reality is a technology which allows 2D and 3D computer graphics to be aligned or registered with scenes of the real-world in real-time. This projection of virtual images requires a reference in the captured real image, which is often achieved by using one or more markers. But, there are situations where using markers can be unsuitable, like medical applications, for example. In this work, we present a multi-view environment, composed by augmented reality glasses and two Kinect devices, which doesn't use fiducial markers in order to run augmented reality applications. All devices are calibrated according to a common reference system, and then the virtual models are transformed accordingly too. In order to achieve that, two approaches were specified and implemented: one based on one Kinect plus optical flow and accelerometer data from augmented reality glasses, and another one based purely on two Kinect devices. The results regarding quality and performance achieved by these two approaches are presented and discussed, as well as a comparison between them.

Keywords: augmented reality, augmented reality glasses, kinect, transformation, optical flow, markerless

CONTENTS

Chapter 1—Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Objectives	1
1.3 Thesis overview	1
Chapter 2—Conceptual primer	3
2.1 Augmented reality	3
2.1.1 Fiducial markers	3
2.1.2 Markerless	3
2.1.3 Direct or indirect vision	3
2.2 Cameras	3
2.2.1 Calibration	3
2.2.2 Parameters	3
2.2.3 Multi-view	3
2.3 Sensor-based registration approach	3
2.3.1 Kinect	3
2.3.2 Registration	3
2.3.3 Transformation	3
2.4 Vision-based registration approach	3
2.4.1 Optical flow	3
2.4.2 Lucas-Kanade algorithm	3
Chapter 3—Related work	5
Chapter 4—Procedure	7
4.1 Environment	7
4.2 Calibration	7
4.2.1 Augmented reality glasses calibration	7
4.2.2 Initial calibration between Kinects	7
4.2.3 Initial calibration between Kinect and glasses	7
4.3 Communication	7
4.4 Transformations	7
4.5 Method 1: Glasses accelerometer and one Kinect	7
4.6 Method 2: Two Kinects	7
4.7 Hybrid approach	7

Chapter 5—Result	9
5.1 Limitations	9
5.2 Analysis	9
5.3 Comparison	9
Chapter 6—Conclusions	11
6.1 Future work	11

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter

1

In this chapter I present the motivation, objectives and overview of this work.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 MOTIVATION

1.2 OBJECTIVES

Here we show the diagram with the overview, for example.

1.3 THESIS OVERVIEW

In this chapter I present the main concepts behind this work.

CONCEPTUAL PRIMER

2.1 AUGMENTED REALITY

2.1.1 Fiducial markers

2.1.2 Markerless

2.1.3 Direct or indirect vision

2.2 CAMERAS

2.2.1 Calibration

2.2.2 Parameters

2.2.3 Multi-view

2.3 SENSOR-BASED REGISTRATION APPROACH

2.3.1 Kinect

2.3.2 Registration

2.3.3 Transformation

2.4 VISION-BASED REGISTRATION APPROACH

2.4.1 Optical flow

2.4.2 Lucas-Kanade algorithm

Chapter

3

In this chapter I present some related works.

RELATED WORK

Cover all the related works, with multiple Kinects, optical flow, markerless augmented reality, medical applications, multi-view environment, reconstruction, etc.

Chapter

4

In this chapter I explain in details the steps performed in order to implement the objective of this work.

PROCEDURE

4.1 ENVIRONMENT

Technologies, machines, SOs, etc.

4.2 CALIBRATION

4.2.1 Augmented reality glasses calibration

4.2.2 Initial calibration between Kinects

4.2.3 Initial calibration between Kinect and glasses

4.3 COMMUNICATION

Network, sockets, etc.

4.4 TRANSFORMATIONS

4.5 METHOD 1: GLASSES ACCELEROMETER AND ONE KINECT

Cover Lucas-Kanade algorithm, etc.

4.6 METHOD 2: TWO KINECTS

Talk about performance of two Kinects fighting for a single GPU.

4.7 HYBRID APPROACH

When optical flow has just a few feature points, we switch to the second Kinect.

Chapter

5

In this chapter I present the results of the procedure explained in the previous chapter.

RESULT

5.1 LIMITATIONS

Talk about error propagation.

5.2 ANALYSIS

Talk about performance and alignment results.

5.3 COMPARISON

Compare methods 1 and 2 with regards to performance and quality.

Chapter

6

In this chapter I discuss the conclusions of this work and list some possibilities of future works.

CONCLUSIONS

6.1 FUTURE WORK

