Computer Vision and Probabilistic Inference

Brian Potetz



Inference of Depth:

Ambiguous, Underconstrained, Difficult



Surface Material Properties

Ambiguous, Underconstrained, Difficult

Illumination

Model of Image Formation

2D Image

3D Shape

INFORMATIO & TELECOMMUNICATION THE OF IN (O) LO GY OF NITE The University of Kansas **Brian Potetz**

Inference of Depth:

Ambiguous, Underconstrained, Difficult



Standard Past Approach:

- 1) Form a deterministic model of image formation
- 2) Invert it

INFORMATIO & TELECOM MUNICATION HE OF IN O LO GY OF NITE The University of Kansas **Brian Potetz**

Inference of Depth:

Ambiguous, Underconstrained, Difficult



Standard Past Approach:

- 1) Form a deterministic model of image formation
- 2) Invert it

A Better Approach:

- 1) Model the uncertainties directly
- 2) Solve the problem probabilistically

Background: Statistical Inference

A Better Approach to infer shape:

- 1) Model the uncertainties directly
- 2) Solve the problem probabilistically

Requires finding the most likely point of a complex, high-dimensional probability distribution: P(Shape|Image)



The University of Kansas



Background: Statistical Inference

A Better Approach to infer shape:

- 1) Model the uncertainties directly
- 2) Solve the problem probabilistically

Requires finding the most likely point of a complex, high-dimensional probability distribution: P(Shape|Image)

- In general, statistical inference is NP-Hard
- Gradient ascent often struggles with local maxima



Brian Potetz

The University of Kansas Brian Potetz

Background: Statistical Inference

A Better Approach to infer shape:

- 1) Model the uncertainties directly
- 2) Solve the problem probabilistically

Requires finding the most likely point of a complex, high-dimensional probability distribution: P(Shape|Image)

- In general, statistical inference is NP-Hard
- Gradient ascent often struggles with local maxima
- Key insight: exploit local *structure* of the problem. Many probability distributions can be factorized:

$$p(\vec{X}) = \prod f_i(\vec{x_i}) \qquad \vec{x_i} \subset \vec{X}$$



Background: Statistical Inference

• Key insight: exploit local *structure* of the problem. Many probability distributions can be factorized:

$$p(\vec{X}) = \prod f_i(\vec{x_i}) \qquad \vec{x_i} \subset \vec{X}$$

Example:

 $P(a, b, c, d, e) \propto f_1(a, b, c) f_2(b, d) f_3(c, e) f_4(d, e)$

Drawn as a Factor Graph:

solve using graph based algorithms

Applications:

- speech recognition
- disease diagnosis
- fraud detection
- genetic linkage analysis



- error-correcting codes
- data compression
- computer vision

Belief Propagation

Ex: $P(a, b, c, d, e) \propto f_1(a, b, c) f_2(b, d) f_3(c, e) f_4(d, e)$

Great empirical successes:

- Error-correcting codes,
- Image super-resolution,
- Shape from stereo,
- Photometric stereo, etc.



Slow for highly connected graphs

- Takes *exponential* time to compute
- Especially slow for continuous variables
- Loopy Belief Propagation for continuous variables is historically limited to pairwise-connected graphs



Brian Potetz

Belief Propagation

Ex: $P(a, b, c, d, e) \propto f_1(a, b, c) f_2(b, d) f_3(c, e) f_4(d, e)$

Great empirical successes:

- Error-correcting codes,
- Image super-resolution,
- Shape from stereo,
- Photometric stereo, etc.



Slow for highly connected graphs

- Takes *exponential* time to compute
- Especially slow for continuous variables
- Loopy Belief Propagation for continuous variables is historically limited to pairwise-connected graphs

I have developed a method to reduce complexity (run-time) from exponential to linear.



Shape-From-Shading

Goal: Recover 3D surface shape from a single image





The University of Kansas

Shape-From-Shading

Goal: Recover 3D surface shape from a single image







The University of Kansas

Shape-From-Shading Results



2D images generated by illuminating the reconstructed 3D shapes.







2D Input image