

FishRecGAN: An End to End GAN Based Network for Fisheye Rectification and Calibration

Xin Shen, Kyungdon Joo, Jean Oh

Carnegie Mellon University

Pittsburgh, PA 15213

{xinshen, kjoo, jeanoh}@andrew.cmu.edu

Abstract—We propose an end-to-end deep learning approach to rectify fisheye images and simultaneously calibrate camera intrinsic and distortion parameters. Our method consists of two parts: a Quick Image Rectification Module developed with a Pix2Pix GAN and Wasserstein GAN (W-Pix2PixGAN), and a Calibration Module with a CNN architecture. Our Quick Rectification Network performs robust rectification with good resolution, making it suitable for constant calibration in camera-based surveillance equipment. To achieve high-quality calibration, we use the straightened output from the Quick Rectification Module as a guidance-like semantic feature map for the Calibration Module to learn the geometric relationship between the straightened feature and the distorted feature. We train and validate our method with a large synthesized dataset labeled with well-simulated parameters applied to a perspective image dataset. Our solution has achieved robust performance in high-resolution with a significant PSNR value of 22.343.¹

I. INTRODUCTION

Fisheye cameras have become popular in robotics-related industries due to their large field of view, but they introduce severe distortion and nonlinearity among pixels. To address this issue, the industry relies on traditional fisheye camera calibration [1], [2], which requires an individual to hold a checkerboard in front of the camera and take pictures with different poses. These pictures are then fed into a geometric algorithm to calibrate the camera intrinsic and distortion parameters. Many existed works can be operated through the OpenCV library [3] following the traditional method [4]. However, this process requires a significant amount of human labor.

A. Motivation

The traditional calibration method lacks consistency and requires a lot of human labor, leading to the possibility of human errors. It also cannot provide real-time rectification without pre-calibrating the camera. Moreover, it is not equipment-independent and requires the use of a corresponding camera to take pictures with a checkerboard for optimization. Therefore, we aim to provide an algorithm-dependent solution that is consistent and efficient without requiring human labor. Our proposed algorithm should be able to perform real-time rectification for camera surveillance work, which demands constant rectification during operation.

¹This work was done while authors attended Carnegie Mellon University at 2020. To communicate, please contact author Xin Shen via shenxin0126@gmail.com




Fig. 1. Traditional calibration and rectification require significant human labor as an individual must hold a checkerboard in front of the fisheye camera to obtain a better calibration. The top row of the image shows the original fisheye image, while the second row shows the rectification effect achieved via calibrated parameters using traditional geometric algorithms.

B. Our Contribution

In this paper, we proposed an enhanced approach to construct an end- to- end multi-contextual network architecture consisted of GANs and CNNs. The architecture can be found in the Fig. 2. Specifically, we make the following major contributions:

- We proposed an end- to- end GAN based multi- contextual network to better learn the geometric mapping relationship between the distorted nonlinear pixels (fisheye images) and the rectified linear pixels (fisheye- rectification) as an enhancement for one of the previous state- of- art work [5]. We developed a novel training algorithm for the Pix2Pix GAN model [6] by integrating Wasserstein GAN's (WGAN) [7] approach. This allowed the model to rectify a fisheye image to its corresponding straightened image pair with high resolution (avg. PSNR 22.343 IV-B) without the need for traditional geometric algorithm via the calibrated parameters, which is computationally expensive. The single GAN model provided the ability to rectify fisheye images for surveillance equipment that requires constant calibration.
- We synthesized a large- scale dataset consist of fisheye- image- straightened- image pairs with the corresponding parameters. This dataset contains both clear structural framework and weak structural image pairs with a well-simulated distortion parameters which provides consistency for a deep neural network to learn.




Fig. 2. The model consists of three major components: a *Quick Rectification Module*, a *Calibration Module*, and a *Rectification Layer*. The Quick Rectification Module is a Wasserstein GAN enhanced Pix2Pix GAN that generates a ground-truth-like semantic guidance and performs preliminary rectification in real-time. The Calibration Module is a ResNet-based CNN architecture that takes in the concatenated feature and extracts the pixel relationship between the curved and the straightened pixels to calibrate the parameters. Finally, the distortion parameters are used in the rectification layer to perform image rectification.

C. Overview of Our Approach

We use Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) [8] to solve the problem of fisheye image rectification, which involves finding the mapping function between nonlinearity and linearity among pixels. Compared to many traditional computer vision based algorithms to infer an object’s geometric conditions [1], [2], [9], GAN is advantageous because it can achieve real-time performance during inference with its lightweight architecture. Specifically, we use the Pix2Pix GAN to solve the direct mapping problem from fisheye image to perspective image. However, Pix2Pix GAN struggles with high differences between distributions, such as those found in fisheye images, making it difficult to learn in a high-level manifold. To address this, we incorporate the Wasserstein GAN (WGAN) learning algorithm, using the Earth Mover (EM) distance to provide a continuous learning curve. Our proposed W-Pix2PixGAN model achieves a high-resolution direct rectification from fisheye image to its corresponding perspective image, with an average PSNR score of 22.343.



Fig. 3. The quick rectification performed by our WGAN enhanced Pix2Pix GAN model. **1st row**: original synthesized fisheye images; **2nd Row**: rectified images

In many industrial applications, calibrated camera parameters are required for further use. While convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have been explored for predicting visual-based camera parameters [10], a simple feed-forward CNN

architecture is often more suitable for subtle visual classification and object detection [11], [12]. However, for regression tasks such as predicting camera parameters, a deep learning model requires more geometric information constraints than just a single raw fisheye image as the sole input feature. To address this issue, we focused on creating a strong inter-pixel relationship feature map for a convolution network to learn the mapping function between given features and the parameters for regression. In line with Xue, Zhucun and colleagues, we used the lines detected on the raw fisheye image from the line detection network as a "semantic guidance" concatenated with the raw fisheye image to create a new feature map for a ResNet based model to learn [5], [13]. We proposed an assumption that this would help to enhance the performance more than the previous work. Thus, unlike this previous work, we concatenate the output from the W-Pix2PixGAN, which is already a ground- truth- alike feature, to the raw fisheye image. By doing so, we are able to create an inter- relationship between any curved structures in the fisheye image and the corresponding straightened ones which are how the curved supposed to be rectified. Then this new feature map is fed into the an similar Parameter- Calibration Module architecture as the previous work to perform the regression/ calibration, which is to predict 9 distortion parameters.

II. RELATED WORK

In 2019, Wuhan University proposed the "Multi-contextual Network" approach, which introduces a "Guidance-alike" semantic feature map generated from a CNN and concatenated with the original fisheye image for enhanced learning [14]. Previous work in 2019 by Xue et al. [5] used a line detection network to highlight distorted lines in fisheye images and concatenated them with the original image to create a feature map containing more geometric information for a ResNet-based regression network to learn. The architecture consists of

a line detection network, a calibration module with ResNet, and a traditional geometric rectification method to take in the calibrated parameters for rectification. A brief illustration of the network architecture is shown in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4. Architecture of the related work contributed by Zhucun Xue and et al.

While the use of distorted lines as guidance for introducing more geometric information on the pixel level is an innovative idea, it falls short in providing a real-time solution for fisheye image rectification. The pipeline still requires simulating the calibration process to obtain distortion parameters, and during inference, the multi-contextual network requires too much computation to run in real-time. Additionally, using distorted lines as guidance may have limitations in detecting well-structured lines in non-line sensitive input images, which can reduce the quality of the semantic feature.

We aimed to enhance the previous work by focusing on the semantic generation part of the pipeline. Our assumption was that better quality semantic features would result in better calibration. We proposed concatenating a ground-truth-like feature, namely the corresponding perspective image, which not only straightens all the lines but also has linear pixel patterns, to improve the guidance work in the calibration part. To achieve this, we utilized generative adversarial networks (GANs) and trained them with a pair of distorted and perspective images. The GAN model provided a ground-truth-like feature and enabled quick rectification using only the generator. We integrated the training algorithm of WGAN and modified the original loss function of Pix2Pix GAN with EM distance to enhance the GAN model’s performance and produce high-resolution outputs.

III. TECHNICAL APPROACH

To validate our approach and assumption, we aimed to replicate the previous work as closely as possible, with the exception of replacing the original line detection network with the W-Pix2PixGAN for semantic generation. However, the previous work’s authors did not publicly share their implementation, so we developed a similar dataset by implementing a fisheye-image-synthesis algorithm with the same camera model mentioned in the paper. Through simulating fisheye-effect-synthesis, we identified the parameters needed to generate a fisheye image similar to the previous work. During training and inference, we followed the same pipeline as the previous work, randomly selecting four distortion parameter sets out of the total twelve to synthesize the fisheye image. We replicated

a similar Calibration Module architecture using ResNet34 as the backbone. By changing only the first part of the network, we conducted a fair comparison to determine which semantic generation model provided better guidance semantics.

A. Data Synthesis and General Fisheye Camera Model

To train the model, we synthesized our datasets by distorting a perspective image using a general polynomial projection model [15]. With a given normal perspective pinhole camera, a point $\mathbb{P} := \{X, Y, Z\} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ in the world frame can be projected onto the image frame $\mathbb{P}_i := \{u, v\} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ in the following transformation using the camera intrinsic matrix. See Appendix A for detailed mathematical models and derivations.




Fig. 5. Shows the distortion parameters’ simulation to figure out the proper ones for fisheye image generation

B. Parameter Selection and Simulation

Since the authors of the previous work, Zhucun Xue and et al [5], did not provide the distortion parameters they used, we picked up our own parameters which yield the similar fisheye distortion effect shown in their work, shown in Fig. 6.

To be consistent with the previous work, we generated our synthesized dataset by artificially adding distortion upon the WireFrame Dataset [16] with randomly selecting 4 distortion parameters out of 12. In Fig. 7, we list several samples of the distortion effect, such as full- frame fisheye image, minor-distortion image, drum- fisheye image, and full- circle image.

Machine learning algorithms often face the difficulty of learning a non-deterministic and inconsistent mapping function.




Fig. 6. The synthesized fisheye effects: small distortion, sphere distortion and the moderate distortion respectively from the previous work.

The problem of generating a fisheye effect from a given perspective image is particularly challenging, given the many random combinations of the nine distortion parameters involved. Blindly and randomly selecting parameter combinations can make it difficult for the network to learn the transformation pattern. To overcome this issue, we conducted a simulation process that changed one parameter at a time while ruling out the others and observed the physical effect of each parameter. We varied each parameter from -0.9 to 1 and visualized the effects of changing each k_i at the same level in Fig. 5. Upon observation, we discovered that:

- k_1 is doing the major contribution which has a sensitive and significant effect on both the center and the edge of a given perspective image.
- k_2 and k_3 have a less sensitive effect on distorting an image and both have a slight impact on the center of the image.
- k_4 and k_5 almost have no effect in distorting the center pixels while both have a slight and non-sensitive effect on the edge.

From the 1st row of Fig. 5, we have found that by only changing k_1 could we obtain a similar visual distortion effect as the previous works. However, in order to increase the model’s generalization ability and meanwhile to keep the parameters consistency, we chose k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5 to be as simple as possible but not to be 0. In Fig. 7 shows a set of samples of our synthesized dataset with 12 different fisheye distortion effect.

C. Deep Rectification and Calibration Network

In this section, we mainly exploit the details of the two major modules of our model, namely the W-Pix2PixGAN model and the Calibration Module with Resnet34 as the backbone. Meanwhile, we will introduce the training scheme and the loss function designed.

As shown in Fig. 2, our full model is mainly consisted of two major deep neural networks. The first one is the Rectification Module consisted of W-Pix2PixGAN model to perform a preliminary and quick rectification with a given fisheye image. The second is the Calibration Module with ResNet34 as the backbone; we built this module in the similar architecture, such




Fig. 7. A sample showing the synthesized fisheye- perspective image pair

as filter sizes and convolutional layers designs, as much similar as possible to the previous work [5]. This module is designed to perform the estimation of the 9 important parameters including the distortion parameters K_d as universal regressor.

Given a RGB fisheye image I with size of $H \times W$, a rectified semantic map $\mathbb{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{W}}$ is generated from the Rectification Module, and then this semantic feature is used as a guidance to be concatenated with the original fisheye image to create a new feature F . This new feature is then fed into the Calibration Module to learn the inner- pixel relationship between the curved lines and the corresponding rectified line in a high manifold, and finally to learn the 9 parameters through a multi- layer perception network. Thus, for our model, every training data sample contains: (1) a fisheye image I , (2) the ground truth of the corresponding rectified image map H , (3) the ground truth of the distortion parameters K_d .

We used the architecture of the Pix2PixGAN for the W-Pix2PixGAN model, which includes the U-Net structure for the generator and the patch-discriminator structure. However, since we needed the model to learn a mapping between two distributions, the fisheye distribution and the rectified distribution, we used Instance-Normalization instead of Batch-Normalization. Initially, training the Pix2PixGAN model was challenging due to the inherent limitation of the GAN’s objective function, which minimized the difference between the Jensen–Shannon divergence between the real and fake distributions and a constant value. However, this led to zero-overlapping in the high manifold and a lack of learning. To resolve this, we used a 16×16 patch design and modified the discriminator’s architecture to use a linear layer instead of a sigmoid layer, so that the output is a regression used as the GAN loss. Overall, we used the original structural design of the generator and the 16×16 patch-discriminator design with four convolutional layers.

Layer Number	Kernel Information	Receptive Field
conv_layer1	[4 x 4, 64], s = 2, p = 1	4
conv_layer2	[4 x 4, 128], s = 2, p = 1	10
conv_layer3	[4 x 4, 256], s = 2, p = 1	22
conv_layer4	[4 x 4, 512], s = 2, p = 1	46
conv_layer5	[4 x 4, 1], s = 2, p = 1	70

TABLE I

THE SUMMARY OF THE RECEPTIVE FIELD IN EACH CONVOLUTIONAL LAYER. AS SHOWN IN THE TABLE, WITH THIS DESIGN WE COULD ACHIEVE A HIGH RECEPTIVE FIELD UP TO 70 AT THE LAST CONVOLUTIONAL LAYER

Calibration Module. In order to validate our assumption that by using GAN as the semantic generation part, we needed to control variables. Thus, we tried to follow the original architecture of the previous work’s design as much as possible; however, most architecture details were not clearly indicated. This module is trimmed to estimate the distortion parameters from the concatenated features. As mentioned above, the input feature for this module is the concatenation of the rectification map H and the raw fisheye image I with the size of $H \times W \times 6$. As shown in the Fig. 2 we applied a

4-level ResNet-34 [13] as the backbone for this module. A high-level dense feature map out from the L1- L4 ResNet is then fed to 2 other convolutional layers to be introduced with more nonlinearity with LeakyReLU activation. A 3-layer fully connected (FC) layers are then connected after the last convolutional layer. In order to restrict the model’s learning behavior, we did not introduce any dropouts within the FC layers, and as this is a regression problem, we used all linear activation within the FC layers. The last FC layer is used to predict a 9-D vector representing the distortion parameters denoted by K_d .

Rectification Layer. In this module, we followed geometric model in Eq. (10) to iteratively remove the distortion parameters predicted using bi-linear interpolation.

$$P_d = \tau(p, K_d) = \begin{bmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{r(\theta)p}{\|p\|_2} \quad (1)$$

, where the pixel coordinate in the rectified image is $\mathcal{P} = (x, y)$, and the pixel coordinate in the fisheye image is $\mathcal{P}_D = (x_d, y_d)$.

D. Loss Function and Training Scheme

In our network, which performs both quick rectification by W-Pix2PixGAN and distortion parameter calibration by a ResNet-based CNN, we performed supervised training for both modules. To pre-train the GAN, we provided a pair of images: a fisheye image denoted as $Real_A$ and a ground truth picture of the rectified perspective image denoted as $Real_B$. The learning objective of the GAN was to learn a direct mapping between the fisheye image and the generated rectified image, denoted as $Fake_B$. Following the scheme in Fig. 2, we next used the generated rectified image as guidance and concatenated it with the raw fisheye image to create a new feature map, which was then fed into the Calibration Module. This learning was supervised by the ground truth of the 9 distortion parameters K_d , and in turn, this network was trained to perform a universal regression to predict the corresponding parameters using the concatenated feature map.

We integrated the original Pix2PixGAN model [6] with the Wasserstein GAN’s idea of EM distance [7] to achieve a continuous GAN loss for training. This enabled our model to successfully learn the mapping function between two significantly different pixel distributions. We modified the original MSE loss between the probability output distribution from the discriminator and the truth distribution (either all ones or all zeros, representing being real and being fake, respectively) to the EM distance by removing the last sigmoid layer of the discriminator, f_w . The input fed into the discriminator was identical to the original Pix2PixGAN’s design, where we concatenated $Real_A$ to $Real_B$ as a new distribution, P_r , to train the discriminator to recognize the real distribution. Similarly, we concatenated $Real_A$ to $Fake_B$ as a new distribution in P_g to train the discriminator to recognize the fake distribution. The expectation of the output distribution from the discriminator

was directly treated as the GAN loss. The discriminator loss and the generator loss are shown in Eq. 2 and Eq. 3, respectively.

$$\mathcal{L}_D = \mathbb{E}_{x \in P_r}[f_w(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{x \in P_g}[f_w(x)] \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_G = -\mathbb{E}_{x \in P_g}[f_w(x)] \quad (3)$$

The previous loss function designed enlightened by Wasserstein GAN helps a continuous learning curve when the Pix2PixGAN is faced with 2 significantly different distribution; however, meanwhile, the generator’s role is not only to fool the discriminator but also to generate an output as closer to the ground truth as possible. Thus, we also utilized the original pixel loss by using the L_1 loss between the generator’s output and the ground truth, shown in Eq. 4.

$$\mathcal{L}_{L1(G)} = \mathbb{E}\|y - G(x)\|_1 \quad (4)$$

Overall, our final objective is shown in Eq.5.

$$G^* = \underset{D}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathcal{L}_D + \underset{G}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}_G + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{L1(G)} \quad (5)$$

Lastly, the pseudo code of our training algorithm can be found below:

Algorithm 1: Training Algorithm for W-Pix2PixGAN

Require: α , the learning rate. c , the weight clipping parameter. m , the batch size. n , how many more iterations to train discriminator more

while *Within training epochs do*

for $t = 0, \dots, n$ **do**

 Sample $\{x_A^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^m$ from fisheye data;

 Sample $\{x_B^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^m$ from perspective data;

$g_B = f_\theta(x_A)$;

$d_A^{(i)} = \operatorname{cat}(x_A^{(i)}, x_B^{(i)})$;

$d_B^{(i)} = \operatorname{cat}(x_A^{(i)}, g_B^{(i)})$;

$G_w \leftarrow \nabla_w [\frac{1}{m} \sum_1^m f_w(d_A^{(i)}) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_1^m f_w(d_B^{(i)})]$

 ;

$w \leftarrow w + \alpha \cdot \operatorname{RMSPProp}(w, G_d)$;

$w \leftarrow \operatorname{clip}(w, -c, c)$;

end

 Sample $\{z_A^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^m$ from fisheye data;

$g_B^{(i)} = G_\theta(z_A^{(i)})$;

$d_B^{(i)} = \operatorname{cat}(z_A^{(i)}, g_B^{(i)})$;

$G_\theta \leftarrow \nabla_\theta [-\frac{1}{m} \sum_1^m f_w(d_B^{(i)}) + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_{L1(G)}]$;

$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \cdot \operatorname{RMSPProp}(\theta, G_\theta)$;

end

The training was done on Nivida 1080Ti GPU device with 500 epochs and the learning rate was set to decay dynamically with respect to the validation performance using PyTorch.

The Training of Calibration Module. In this module, the learning goal is to build a universal regressor to predict the 9 distortion parameters K_d . Thus, ideally, we perform a L2 loss upon the prediction against the ground truth K_{gt} . However, as

shown in Fig. 5, we have found out that among all 9 parameters, K_1 is making the significant impact on the distortion effect both on the center and on the edge of the image. Thus, we performed a weighted L2 loss which emphasizes on K_1 more with a parameter β .

$$\mathcal{L}_{L2} = \frac{1}{9}[\beta \cdot (K_g(1) - K_{gt}(1))^2 + \sum_{i=2}^9 (K_g(i) - K_{gt}(i))^2] \quad (6)$$

Similarly, this training was implemented with PyTorch using Nvidia TITAN GPU device for 500 epochs, and the learning rate was set to decay dynamically with respect to the validation performance.

IV. EXPERIMENT AND EVALUATION

A. Implementation Details

We randomly selected 4 out of the total 12 distortion parameters and applied them to the WireFrame dataset, creating 20,000 training samples and 1,848 test samples. We trained the Rectification Module (W-Pix2PixGAN) for 500 epochs using the training scheme outlined in Section III-D. We used an initial discriminator learning rate of $Lr_D := 0.0009$, an initial generator learning rate of $Lr_G := 0.0001$, and a batch size of 32. We also allowed for dynamic learning rate decay with respect to the validation performance to refine the GAN model output resolution during training.

We concatenated the output from the W-Pix2PixGAN with the raw fisheye image to create a new feature map to train the calibration network for 500 epochs with an initial learning rate of 0.001 and a batch size of 16. We also allowed for dynamic learning rate decay with respect to the validation loss. We used β , the weighted penalty upon distortion K_1 , as 32. Finally, during inference, we loaded the best performing weights for both models and performed quick rectification, followed by concatenation and calibration, and then calibration and fine rectification sequentially.

B. Evaluation Details

As the authors of the previous model have not yet published their code, we were unable to access their line detection module. To assess the impact of our approach, which replaces the line detection module with W-Pix2PixGAN, we assumed that our Calibration Module operates similarly to that of the previous work. As a measure of the quality of the guidance feature map, we concatenated the ground truth of distorted fisheye lines used in the previous work to the raw fisheye image. We then compared the rectified fisheye image using our approach to that of the previous work, using the predicted distortion parameters K_{Dpred} . To evaluate the quality of the rectified image, we used the peak signal to noise ratio (PSNR) and the structure similarity index (SSIM) [17], following the evaluation metrics used in the previous work [5]. To assess the fairness of this comparison, we also compared the PSNR and SSIM scores of the baseline output to the ground truth of the perspective image. We then used these metrics to evaluate the performance of our W-Pix2PixGAN model for quick rectification. Finally,

we used the distributions of the differences in PSNR and SSIM scores between the baseline output and our model's output to construct 95

V. EXPERIMENT RESULTS

A. The Performance by Quick Rectification Module

As one of our objectives is to provide a direct and quick rectification given any fisheye images without going through a calibration work either by human labor or through a computationally heavy calibration network with ResNet as the backbone, we put a lot of attention on refining our W-Pix2PixGAN model, and in turn we have provided the PSNR and SSIM calculation on the 1,848 test samples with 4 randomly selected distortion parameters applied. We then separately sampled out the quick rectification performed by GAN for distortions, such as, *minor distortion*, *drum- fisheye image*, *severe- drum- fisheye image*, *full- frame fisheye image*, and *severe-full- frame-fisheye iamge*. From the range of minor distortion to severe full- frame fisheye distortion, as shown in the Fig. 8, our W-Pix2PixGAN model could perform a quick and high- resolution rectification work directly from a given fisheye image by learning a universal pixel- to- pixel mapping relationship.




Fig. 8. Sample results showing the performance of our Quick Rectification Module. We can see that our W-Pix2PixGAN is able to rectify those curved structures back to straightened ones with a good resolution.

In the Tabel. II, we show the summaries of the quality of PSNR and SSIM. Compared to the previous work's overall average PSNR 27.61 and SSIM 0.8746 via the full- pipeline rectification using the calibrated parameters, we can see that given that it is solely a quick rectification by image transferring performed by W-Pix2PixGAN, the quantitative performance by our GAN model solely is acceptable.

	AVG. PSNR	AVG. SSIM
Minor Distortion	27.7673	0.8733
Full-frame Fisheye Distortion	23.4372	0.7431
Drum-fisheye Distortion	24.357	0.7823
Full Dataset with 4 Random Distortions	22.343	0.7185

TABLE II
THE SUMMARY OF THE W-PIX2PIXGAN'S PERFORMANCE ON EACH SEPARATED DISTORTION SET AND ON THE FULL- DATASET WITH RANDOMLY SELECTED 4 DISTORTIONS

B. Full- pipeline Comparison to Previous Work

By following the evaluation scheme mentioned in Section. IV-B, we then performed an end- to- end rectification from feeding the raw fisheye image in to rectifying the fisheye image using the predicted distortion parameters by fixing the calibration network but only changing the guidance semantic to be concatenated with the fisheye image with the ground truth of fisheye lines and our GAN's output respectively. However, none of these failed to duplicate the previous work's quantitative result in terms of PSNR and SSIM, shown in Table. III. We assume it is because the duplication of the calibration network was built out of scratch by following the previous work's publication; and yet, fully replicate a certain neural network requires more details.

	Average PSNR	Average SSIM
Our Approach	23.4717	0.7344
Baseline via Ground Truth	23.4263	0.7326

TABLE III
THE SUMMARIZED RESULTS COMPARING THE AVERAGED PSNR AND SSIM BY BOTH USING THE GROUND- TRUTH BASED BASELINE AND OUR APPROACH

However, both yielded a enhanced performance compared to solely using the Quick Rectification Module with a pair of very closed averaged result. By following the evaluation pipeline in Section. IV-B, we constructed a 95% confidence interval on the distribution of difference between the baseline model and our model for both PSNR and SSIM respectively shown in Fig. 10.




Fig. 9. Experiment results showing the rectification performance via the predicted distortion parameters by both our approach and the baseline approach




Fig. 10. Shows the distribution of the SSIM difference between the baseline performance and our model's performance

From the Table. IV, we can see we have obtained a tight interval for both PSNR and SSIM where 0 difference has fallen within. This shows that, compared to even using a ground truth for the distorted fisheye lines as the upper bound of the previous work, our approach by replacing the line detection model by W-Pix2PixGAN does not show a significant difference. Thus, we think our approach is comparable to the previous work. Below, we listed several rectification performance by using the predicted distortion parameters.

	PSNR Difference	SSIM Difference
Confidence Interval at 95%	[-0.0369, 0.0538]	[-0.0016, 0.0018]
Marginal Error	± 0.008479	± 0.00012

TABLE IV
CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AT 95% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL FOR PSNR AND SSIM

The results with structured dataset are promising. As mentioned in Section IV-B, this trial of experiment shows an unfairness for our approach because of the fact that we

are comparing our method with the ground truth of the distorted lines but our approach still shows a statistically proved comparable result with a slight improvement based on Table. III. Meanwhile, the baseline approach via using line detection model shows a clear advantage of the obvious presence the lines of within distorted images and in turn is expected to perform well on structured dataset, such as the WireFrame dataset used in this experiment. However, the previous work’s approach might show a limitation when faced with unstructured dataset where the edges of lines in one image is not clear to be detected, such as human faces. However, our GAN based approach is not limited by the nature of the dataset regardless of being structured or unstructured. Thus, this stimulates a further experiment on dataset such as CelebA [18] where the images might not include rich information in terms of lines for the baseline approach to exploit.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we proposed an enhanced approach to improve the fisheye image calibration and rectification with a multi- contextual neural network, which utilizes a GAN based semantic- guidance generator to provide a secondary ResNet based calibration network with a ground- truth- alike semantic feature and further to perform an automatic fisheye image rectification end to end by feeding a single fisheye image. Due to the lack of the detailed implementation of the secondary calibration network from the previous work, we could not replicate the exact experimental results, but we hope to perform our evaluation again once the authors of the previous work have released their implementation. On the other hand, statistically, we have proved that our approach shows no significant difference than using the ground truth of the distorted fisheye lines as the upper bound of the previous work’s line detection’s output. Inherently, this shows that our assumption that the better the guidance is, the better the calibration is can be validated, as compared to detecting the distorted lines as the guidance, to directly use a ground- truth- alike feature shows its clear advantage. In turn, to refine the GAN model is necessary. Meanwhile, the baseline approach might show a disadvantage when faced with unstructured images such as human faces. Thus, in future, we should apply our approach’s pipeline upon unstructured dataset, such as Celeb-A [18]. Overall, the future work we will focus on includes: 1. to further enhance a more advanced GAN model architecture which could generate a higher- resolution perspective image, and 2. to re-evaluate the full- pipeline once the authors of the previous work have published their implementations.

Acknowledgment: This work’s Fig. 1 is supported by Justin Bi from Zenuity Ltd., who performed the traditional fisheye calibration and Zenuity Ltd. has generously shared us the sample images of its rectification results.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Scaramuzza, A. Martinelli, and R. Siegwart, “A flexible technique for accurate omnidirectional camera calibration and structure from motion,” in *ICVS*, 2006.

[2] —, “A toolbox for easy calibrating omnidirectional cameras,” in *IROS*, 2006.

[3] G. Bradski, “The opencv library,” *Dr. Dobbs’ Journal: Software Tools for the Professional Programmer*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 120–123, 2000.

[4] J. Kannala and S. S. Brandt, “A generic camera model and calibration method for conventional, wide-angle, and fish-eye lenses,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 1335–1340, 2006.

[5] Z. Xue, N. Xue, G.-S. Xia, and W. Shen, “Learning to calibrate straight lines for fisheye image rectification,” 2019, pp. 1643–1651.

[6] P. Isola, J.-Y. Zhu, T. Zhou, and A. A. Efros, “Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks,” in *CVPR*, 2017.

[7] M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou, “Wasserstein generative adversarial networks,” in *ICML*, 2017.

[8] e. a. Ian J. Goodfellow, “Advances in neural information processing systems,” in *NIPS*, 2014.

[9] Y. Mei, S. Wang, X. Shen, S. Rabke, and S. Goenezen, “Mechanics based tomography: a preliminary feasibility study,” *Sensors*, vol. 17, no. 5, p. 1075, 2017.

[10] J. Shi, Z. Zhu, J. Zhang, R. Liu, Z. Wang, S. Chen, and H. Liu, “Calibrenn: Calibrating camera and lidar by recurrent convolutional neural network and geometric constraints,” in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 10 197–10 202.

[11] X. Shen, P. Agrawal, and Z. Cheng, “Data efficient training with imbalanced label sample distribution for fashion detection,” 2023.

[12] R. Xin, J. Zhang, and Y. Shao, “Complex network classification with convolutional neural network,” *Tsinghua Science and technology*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 447–457, 2020.

[13] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *CVPR*, 2015.

[14] X. Yin, X. Wang, J. Yu, M. Zhang, P. Fua, and D. Tao, “Fisheyecnet: A multi-context collaborative deep network for fisheye image rectification,” in *ECCV*, 2018.

[15] J. Kannala and S. S. Brandt, “A generic camera model and calibration method for conventional, wide-angle, and fisheye lenses,” in *PAMI*, 2006.

[16] K. Huang, Y. Wang, Z. Zhou, T. Ding, S. Gao, , and Y. Ma, “Learning to parse wireframes in images of man-made environments,” in *CVPR*, 2018.

[17] A. Hore and D. Ziou, “Image quality metrics: Psnr vs. ssim,” in *2010 20th international conference on pattern recognition*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 2366–2369.

[18] Z. Liu, P. Luo, X. Wang, and X. Tang, “Deep learning face attributes in the wild,” in *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.

APPENDIX

We list the detailed mathematical modeling to generate synthetic data in this section.

Below shows a general camera model.

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f_x & 0 & c_x \\ 0 & f_y & c_y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_c \\ Y_c \\ Z_c \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

, where the $\mathbb{P}_c = \{X_c, Y_c, Z_c\} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the coordinates transformed from the world coordinate onto the camera frame using the following transformation.

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_c \\ Y_c \\ Z_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & r_{13} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} & r_{23} \\ r_{31} & r_{32} & r_{33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \\ Z \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \\ t_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

Meanwhile, with a focal length f , a perspective projection model can be presented as

$$r = f \tan \theta \quad (9)$$

, where θ is the angle between the incident ray and the optical axis, and r is denoted as the distance from the principal

point on the image frame to the projection point. Additionally, the fisheye distortion model can be approximated as:

$$r(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \theta^{2i-1}, n = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots \quad (10)$$

and

$$r = \sqrt{\left(\frac{X_c}{Z_c}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{Y_c}{Z_c}\right)^2} = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \quad (11)$$

To be consistent with the previous work, the n was chosen to be 5 [5]. The distorted $\mathbb{P}_d := \{x_d, y_d\} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a nonlinear refraction by the fisheye lens onto $\mathbb{P} := \{x, y\} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, which is the normalized camera coordinate described in the equation (5).

Given a normal perspective image, we could obtain the pixel coordinates (u, v) easily. In order to operate adding distortion onto this normal perspective image, we need to obtain θ in equation (3). We did a similarity transformation upon equation (5) using the pixel coordinates information.

$$r = \frac{\sqrt{(u-c_x)^2 + (v-c_y)^2}}{f} \quad (12)$$

, and by using the relationship in equation (3), we can have

$$\theta = \arctan\left(\frac{\sqrt{(u-c_x)^2 + (v-c_y)^2}}{f^2}\right) \quad (13)$$

From here, the distorted $r_d(\theta)$ can be obtained by adding reasonable distortion parameters k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5 using equation (4) and the correspondence between \mathbb{P}_d and \mathbb{P} can be expressed as

$$P_d = r_d(\cos\phi, \sin\phi)^T, \phi = \arctan\left(\frac{u-c_x}{v-c_y}\right) \quad (14)$$

The ϕ indicates the angle between the ray connects the projected points and the center of image plane and the x -axis of the image coordinate system. By following the previous works' assumption that the pixel coordinate system is orthogonal, we can get a new distorted pixel coordinates (u_d, v_d) converted by the distorted P_d as

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_d \\ v_d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f_x & 0 \\ 0 & f_y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_d \\ y_d \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

In summary, by going through the processes described above, we are going to accurately estimate the needed 9 parameters $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5, f_x, f_y, c_x, c_y$ to synthesize sets of distorted fisheye images pair via the perspective/ normal wireframe dataset [16]. The fisheye- perspective images pair are used to train our W-Pix2PixGAN model, whereas the parameters used are used to sequentially train the parameter- calibration module as the label.