



Evaluating the Effect of Enhancing the Contrast of UAV Images on Photogrammetry Products

Soroush Motayeb¹ Soroush.motayyeb@ut.ac.ir



Seyed Arya Fakhri² aryafakhri@trn.ui.ac.ir



Masood Varshosaz ³ varshosazm@kntu.ac.ir





UAVs and applications





3D reconstruction



1/19



Challenges of Commercial and Cheap Cameras UAVs

- Image motion
- Bad lighting effects
- Poor texture
- Dead area

• Constraints on feature extraction

- Decrease density point cloud
- o Quality of the derived tie points





- The article's objective
 - This paper proposes a contrast enhancement technique to improve the accuracy of a photogrammetric model created using UAV images.











Histogram of an enhanced image





Proposed method

6/19

• Evaluation of the propose algorithm for contrast enhancement

 $E(I) = -\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} p(k) \log_2(p(k))$ Shannon entropy (E) (Tsai et al., 2008)

 $SD(I) = \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} (k - A(I))^2 \times p(k)}$ Standard deviation (SD) (Román et al., 2017)

 $\gamma(I) = \frac{2}{M \times N} \sum_{\nu=1}^{M} \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} \min\{p_{u\nu}, (1 - p_{\nu\nu})\}$ The linear blur index (Kaufmann, 1975)

 $CM(I) = \sqrt{\left(\sigma_{\alpha}^{2} + \sigma_{\beta}^{2}\right)} + 0.3 * \sqrt{\left(\mu_{\alpha}^{2} + \mu_{\beta}^{2}\right)}$ Colorfulness (CM) (Susstrunk & Winkler, 2003) $PSNR(I, I_E) = 10 \times log_{10} \frac{(L-1)^2}{MSE(I, I_E)}$ Peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) (Hore & Ziou, 2010)

 $AMBE(I, I_E) = |A(I) - A(I_E)|$ Absolute Mean Brightness Error (AMBE) (Phanthuna, 2015)

 $CEF = \frac{colorfu \ ln \ ess(CM) \ of \ output \ image}{colorfu \ ln \ ess(CM) \ of \ input \ image}$ Color enhancement factor (CEF) (Susstrunk & Winkler, 2003)









• Performance of image contrast enhancement method

10/19

| Dataset | | E SD | | PNSR AMB | | γ | СМ | CEF | |
|---------------------|----------|--------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|--|
| Sakineh Paradise | Original | 5.6998 | 25.8475 | - | - | 0.7237 | 10.1122 | - | |
| | Reduced | 5.0099 | 13.8547 | 10.1139 | 53.1455 | 0.7185 | 6.0003 | 0.6221 | |
| | Enhanced | 7.9256 | 76.9027 | 20.4598 | 12.1186 | 0.3901 | 26.3608 | 3.7709 | |
| Qazvin | Original | 5.6245 | 22.314 | | | 0.7155 | 10.3145 | - | |
| | Reduced | 5.0147 | 14.1731 | 10.2792 | 49.3874 | 0.7273 | 7.0993 | 0.5857 | |
| | Enhanced | 7.9332 | 76.9040 | 20.4668 | 12.2148 | 0.3946 | 26.3710 | 3.7643 | |
| Helwan | Original | 5.5321 | 27.145 | - | - | 0.7321 | 11.3189 | - | |
| | Reduced | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Enhanced | 7.9358 | 76.9215 | 20.4514 | 12.1511 | 0.4001 | 26.1151 | 3.6778 | |

Table 1. Contrast enhancement of images in the data set in comparison to the original data and contrast reduction.



Performance of image contrast enhancement method

| Methods | E | SD | PNSR | AMBE | γ | СМ | CEF |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| HE | 5.7591 | 73.6543 | 12.0922 | 16.4611 | 0.4063 | - | - |
| CLAHE | 6.9114 | 29.3949 | 22.3057* | 13.0904 | 0.6631 | - | - |
| AMCE | 7.9599* | 75.2166* | 12.0413 | 12.0873* | 0.3921* | 11.4620 | 1.6411 |
| Proposed method | 7.9358 🖈 | 76.9011* | 20.4663* | 12.1138★ | 0.3911* | 26.3610 * | 3.7743* |

Table 2. Comparison of the proposed method's performance to that of other commonly used contrast enhancement methods.





Sparse point cloud







Sparse point cloud

Images with a low contrast

12/19

Images with enhanced contrast

Images with reduced contrast

Images with enhanced contrast



Comparison of Tie and Keypoints



reduced contrast



enhanced contrast

13/19



At different flying altitudes and in low contrast and enhanced modes, the number of tie points and reprojection error is shown in a diagram.



14/19



Diagram depicting the amount of error obtained on the check points at five different flight altitudes and two modes





DEM and orthophoto mosaic



Contrast enhancement images Low contrast images Contrast enhancement images Contrast reduction images Evaluating the Effect of Enhancing the Contrast of UAV Images on Photogrammetry Products



Orthophoto mosaic





17/19





Low contrast Enhanced contrast Evaluating the Effect of Enhancing the Contrast of UAV Images on Photogrammetry Products



| Dataset | Reprojection error | | Tie points | | Che | | s RMSE Z | 2(m) | DEM resolution (cm/px) | |
|---------|--------------------|------|------------|---------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|------|
| | Reduce | Enh. | Reduce | Enh. | Reduce | Enh. | Red. | Enh. | Reduce | Enh. |
| H 20 | 0.71 | 0.64 | 303,709 | 328,006 | 0.018 | 0.017 | 0.023 | 0.023 | 1.35 | 1.23 |
| H 40 | 0.92 | 0.85 | 291,301 | 308,780 | 0.021 | 0.021 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 6.95 | 6.47 |
| H 60 | 1.55 | 1.42 | 242,007 | 254,768 | 0.035 | 0.034 | 0.041 | 0.041 | 32.7 | 30.1 |
| H 80 | 2.49 | 2.31 | 188,242 | 202,021 | 0.072 | 0.072 | 0.071 | 0.070 | 39.5 | 38.2 |
| H 90 | 1.18 | 1.09 | 122,918 | 136,322 | 0.029 | 0.029 | 0.024 | 0.023 | 61.3 | 58.4 |

Table 3. Results from the production of photogrammetric products.

Evaluating the Effect of Enhancing the Contrast of UAV Images on Photogrammetry Products

18/19



- The results indicated that the number of tie points extracted after using the proposed contrast-enhancement technique to low-contrast images increased by approximately 10%, increasing the density of the point cloud
- Contrast enhancement of the images also results in a relative gain of approximately 2 cm/pix in the resolution of the Digital Elevation Model.

 Additionally, reprojection error was reduced by approximately 10%, although calibration parameters and check point error did not differ significantly between images with low contrast and images enhanced by the algorithm.

Evaluating the Effect of Enhancing the Contrast of UAV Images on Photogrammetry Products

19/19

Reference

[1] R. Maini, H. Aggarwal, A comprehensive review of image enhancement techniques, arXiv preprint arXiv:1003.4053.(2010)

[2] F. Bellavia, M. Fanfani ,C. Colombo, Fast Adaptive Frame Preprocessing for 3D Reconstruction, in: VISAPP (3), 2015, pp. 260-267.

 [3] G. Verhoeven, W. Karel, S. Štuhec, M. Doneus, I. Trinks, N. Pfeifer, Mind your grey tones: examining the influence of decolourization methods on interest point extraction and matching for architectural image-based modelling, in: 3D-Arch 2015: 3D Virtual Reconstruction and Visualization of Complex Architectures, Copernicus Gesellschaft, 2015, pp. 307-314.

[4] M. Gaiani, F. Remondino, F.I. Apollonio, A. Ballabeni, An advanced pre-processing pipeline to improve automated photogrammetric reconstructions of architectural scenes, Remote sensing, 8(3) (2016) 178.

[5] A. Ballabeni, F.I. Apollonio, M. Gaiani, F. Remondino, Advances in Image Pre-processing to Improve Automated 3D Reconstruction, International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing & Spatial Information Sciences. (2015)

[6] C. Wu, Towards linear-time incremental structure from motion, in: 3D Vision-3DV 201 2013, 3International Conference on, IEEE, 2013, pp. 127-134.

[7] W. Hartmann, M. Havlena, K. Schindler, Predicting matchability, in: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2014, pp. 9-16.

[8] M. Dymczyk, E. Stumm, J. Nieto, R. Siegwart, I. Gilitschenski, Will it last? learning stable features for long-term visual localization, in: 3D Vision (3DV), 2016 Fourth International Conference on, IEEE, 2016, pp. 572-581.



Thank you for your kind considerations