

# A Spatial Post-Processing Algorithm for Images of Night Scenes

William B. Thompson and Peter Shirley  
University of Utah

James A. Ferwerda  
Cornell University

**Abstract.** The standard technique for making images viewed at daytime lighting levels look like images of night scenes is to use a low overall contrast, low overall brightnesses, desaturation, and to give the image a “blue shift.” This paper introduces two other important effects associated with viewing real night scenes: visible noise, and the loss of acuity with little corresponding perceived blur.

## 1. Introduction

While many researchers have studied how to display images of daylit (*photopic*) scenes (a good overview can be found in [Durand, Dorsey 00]), little work has dealt with the display of images of night (*scotopic*) scenes. The work that has been done uses some combination of a reduction in contrast/brightness, desaturation, a blue shift, and a low pass filter [Upstill 95], [Tumblin, Rushmeier 93], [Ward 94], [Ferwerda et al. 96]. These strategies have also been used for many years in film [Samuelson 84].

There are two subjective properties of night viewing that are missing from previous techniques. The first is that although there is a loss-of-detail at night, there is not a sense of blurriness. The second is the somewhat noisy appearance of night scenes. Both of these effects have been only partially explored scientifically [Makous 90], [Field, Brady 97].

In this paper we present techniques for augmenting images with the loss-of-detail and noise effects associated with night vision. Because the subjective properties of scotopic effects are themselves not fully understood, and because we have the added difficulty of trying to mimic these effects in photopically-viewed images, we do not use a specific quantitative model to drive our method. Rather, we developed an empirical image processing technique that is consistent with what is known, and highlight the features of the techniques by demonstrating them on a test pattern and real images.

## 2. Background

While scotopic vision has not been studied to the extent as photopic vision, there is still a wealth of knowledge about it (e.g., see [Hess et al. 90]). We review some of that work here, and conclude that while it does not provide us with an explicit model to control our image processing, it does give us useful subjective information.

### 2.1. *Visual Acuity and Perception of Blur*

Visual acuity is reduced in scotopic viewing due, in part, to the relative sparsity of rods versus cones in the central retina. Subjectively, however, night does not appear blurry [Hess 90]. This has been observed in people who have only rod vision (“complete achromats”) as well; Knut Nordby, a perceptual psychologist with that condition writes:

I experience a visual world where things appear to me to be well-focused, have sharp and clearly defined boundaries and are not fuzzy or cloudy. [Nordby 90]

Simulating such loss of acuity by low-pass filtering the original image (e.g., [Ferberda et al. 96]) fails to effectively capture the appearance of night scenes because when viewed in bright light, the images appear blurred rather than having the clearly defined boundaries Nordby describes.

Surprisingly little is known about the image cues that generate a sense of blur in the human vision system. While the power spectrum of natural images falls with frequency at about  $f^{-2}$  (e.g., [Ruderman 97]), there is substantial variability from image to image, even when the images appear sharp [Field, Brady 97]. As a result, a simple frequency distribution analysis will fail to predict the appearance of blur. Field and Brady argue that a person’s sensitivity to blur depends on both the high frequency content of an image and the density of fine scale edges. In particular, an image will tend not to look

blurred if fine detail edges are sufficiently crisp, independent of the number of fine scale edges in the image.

## 2.2. Noise

Noise in night scenes is also experienced subjectively. This is not surprising if one thinks of the scotopic vision system as a gain-control amplifier where low signals will have a noisy output [Lamb 90]. However, there are more potential sources of noise than this simple explanation suggests. These include the quantum number of photons, noise originating in the receptors themselves, and noise in the neural circuitry [Sharpe 90]. These various types of noise are themselves only partially quantified, and they are composed in complex ways which are not fully understood [Makous 90]. The noise is additive, but can behave as if multiplicative because neural noise might be added after logarithmic gain control [Makous 90].

## 3. Night Filtering

One way to simulate the loss of acuity in scotopic viewing would be to use some form of anisotropic diffusion (e.g., [Tumblin, Turk 99]), which has the effect of smoothing the geometry of edges without blurring across the edges. We have adopted a spatial filtering approach as an alternative because it does not require an iterative process and because the frequencies preserved can be more easily controlled. As noted above, an image will tend not to look blurred if fine detail edges are sufficiently crisp, independent of the number of fine scale edges in the image. For an original image  $I$  scaled to the range  $[0.0 - 1.0]$ , we start by low pass filtering the image, using convolution with a Gaussian kernel  $G_{\text{blur}}$ , where the standard deviation  $\sigma_{\text{blur}}$  is chosen to remove fine scale detail that would not be visible at night:

$$I_{\text{blur}} = G_{\text{blur}} * I. \quad (1)$$

It is not sufficient to simply apply a standard sharpening operator such as a narrow support unsharp mask to this blurred image, since there are no longer high frequencies to emphasize. A broader band sharpening filter, such as a larger extent unsharp mask, produces noticeable ringing. Instead, we apply a sharpening operator tuned to the finest detail edges remaining after the initial low pass filtering operation. This is done by first creating a bandpass-filtered image using the difference-of-Gaussian method, where the filter selects out the highest remaining spatial frequencies. The original image is convolved with a second Gaussian kernel  $G_{\text{blur}_2}$  with standard deviations  $\sigma_{\text{blur}_2} = 1.6 \sigma_{\text{blur}}$ , after which we take the difference of the two blurred images:

$$I_{\text{blur}_2} = G_{\text{blur}_2} * I, \quad (2)$$

$$I_{\text{diff}} = I_{\text{blur}} - I_{\text{blur}_2}. \quad (3)$$

$I_{\text{diff}}$  is a close approximation to the  $\nabla^2 G$  function used in some edge detectors and is a bandpassed version of  $I$  [Marr, Hildreth 80].  $I_{\text{blur}}$  can be decomposed into the bandpassed component plus an even lower pass component:

$$I_{\text{blur}} = I_{\text{blur}_2} + I_{\text{diff}}. \quad (4)$$

The appearance of blur can be substantially reduced while still attenuating fine detail by sharpening the edges in the bandpassed component. One way to do this would be to multiply  $I_{\text{diff}}$  by an appropriately chosen constant  $\alpha > 1.0$ . This is similar to a large-neighborhood unsharp mask and produces the same problems with ringing. Instead, we exploit the fact that edges are located at zero crossings of  $I_{\text{diff}}$  [Marr, Hildreth 80]. Edge sharpening can thus be accomplished by increasing the contrast of  $I_{\text{diff}}$  for values near 0:

$$I_{\text{night}} = I_{\text{blur}_2} + I_{\text{diff}}^{1.0/\gamma_{\text{edge}}} \text{ for } \gamma_{\text{edge}} > 1.0. \quad (5)$$

The value of  $\gamma_{\text{edge}}$  affects the apparent crispness of the final edges. A value of 1.25 works well for a wide range of naturally occurring images.

The literature on dark noise is not sufficiently definitive as to allow the development of a precise physiologically or psychophysically based approach to transforming images so that they look more night-like, even when viewed in bright light. The problem is further compounded by the fact that different types of display devices can have very different effects on the appearance of high frequency image noise. As a result, we have adopted an approach in which we add zero-mean, uncorrelated Gaussian noise to images after they have been spatially filtered, with the standard deviation  $\sigma_{\text{noise}}$  of the noise adjusted subjectively depending on the display device ( $\sigma_{\text{noise}} = .0125$  for the examples presented in this paper).

#### 4. Implementation Issues

We assume the input is a displayable RGB image. If our source image is a high-dynamic range image, it should first be tone-mapped using one of the standard techniques (e.g., [Reinhard 02]). This RGB image is then mapped to a scotopic luminance image, where each pixel is a single number indicating the “brightness” of the pixel as seen at night. This will tend to favor blues because the rods are more sensitive to blues than to greens and reds. This can either be done heuristically using a linear weighted sum of the the RGB channels or can be done by first converting to XYZ using one of the standard manipulations such as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \\ Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5149 & 0.3244 & 0.1607 \\ 0.2654 & 0.6704 & 0.0642 \\ 0.0248 & 0.1248 & 0.8504 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R \\ G \\ B \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

We can then use an empirical formula to approximate the scotopic luminance  $V$  [Larson et al. 97]:

$$V = Y \left[ 1.33 \left( 1 + \frac{Y + Z}{X} \right) - 1.68 \right]. \quad (7)$$

This results in a single-channel image that has values in approximately the  $[0,4]$  range. That image should then be scaled and multiplied by a bluish grey to give an unfiltered “night image.” Some authors suggest a blue with chromaticity approximately  $(0.03, 0.03)$  below the white point [Durand, Dorsey 00], although many films have a more saturated blue in their day-for-night scenes. Thus for each pixel we have

$$c_{\text{night}} = kVc_{\text{blue}}, \quad (8)$$

where  $k$  and  $c_{\text{blue}}$  are chosen empirically.

The resulting bluish image is then spatially processed using the methods discussed in Section 3. If some of the pixels are above the scotopic level, e.g., a car headlight or an area near a flame, then we can combine a day and a night image. If we consider the original RGB image to have a color  $c_{\text{day}}$  at each pixel, then we can use a scotopic fraction  $s$  at each pixel and blend the images pixel by pixel:

$$c = sc_{\text{night}} + (1 - s)c_{\text{day}}. \quad (9)$$

The fraction  $s$  can be chosen based on  $V$ , or can be chosen in a more principled manner (e.g., [Ferwerda et al. 96]).

## 5. Examples

We assume that the images we process have already undergone some day-for-night processing (reductions in brightness, contrast, and saturation, together with a blue shift). The images in this section were first transformed using a photo editing tool rather than a more formal tone-mapping algorithm. However, the techniques should be applicable to any initial day-for-night image.

Figure 1 illustrates the effect of applying the spatial filtering portion of the method to a test pattern consisting of gratings of different scales.  $\sigma_{\text{blur}}$  was chosen such that the individual bars in the center grouping would be resolvable, while the fine detail of the right-most bars would not. Figure 2 shows intensity plots of the test grating. The difference between night filtering



(a) Original image.



(b) Day-for-night tone mapping.



(c) Blurred to remove fine detail.




(d) Night-filtered to preserve same level of fine detail.

**Figure 1.** Test grating: The same level of detail is resolvable with Gaussian blurring and night filtering, but the night-filtered image looks sharper.

and simple blurring is most apparent when comparing the mid-sized bars in Figures 2(d) and 2(e). The night filtering does more than enhance the contrast: The definition of the bars relative to the overall contrast is significantly increased, which is why Figure 1(d) looks crisper than Figure 1(c).

Figures 3–8 illustrate the method on a natural image. Prior to spatial processing, the original image was corrected to account for photographic and digitization nonlinearities, with  $\gamma$  set based on a calibration target. Figure 4 was produced from Figure 3 by a manual day-for-night mapping involving a reduction in brightness, contrast, and saturation, as well as a blue shift. Figure 5 shows what would happen if the loss of acuity associated with viewing the scene at night was simulated by blurring. Figure 6 preserves the same level of detail as Figure 5, without appearing to be nearly as blurry. Figure 8 shows the effects of adding noise to Figure 6.



**Figure 2.** Plots of test grating images.

## 6. Discussion

There are three parameters of the operator:  $\sigma_{\text{blur}}$  which is physically based (smallest resolvable detail), and  $\gamma_{\text{edge}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{noise}}$  that are set subjectively. Experience suggests that a single setting is effective over a wide range of differing imagery. Because edges are stable over time in an image sequence, the edge operator we use will preserve locality and will also be stable [Marr, Hildreth 80]. Thus the operator is well-suited for animations. While the operator is designed for non-scientific applications, it might be calibrated to be useful in preference to a linear blur for low-vision simulations.



**Figure 3.** Original image.



**Figure 4.** Day-for-night tone mapping.



**Figure 5.** Blurred to remove fine detail.



**Figure 6.** Night-filtered, with the same level of fine detail as in Figure 5.



**Figure 7.** Blurred plus noise.



**Figure 8.** Night filtering plus noise.

## References

- [Durand, Dorsey 00] F. Durand and J. Dorsey. “Interactive Tone Mapping.” In *Eurographics Workshop on Rendering*, pp. 219–230. Wien: Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [Ferwerda et al. 96] J. A. Ferwerda, S. Pattanaik, P. S. Shirley, and D. P. Greenberg. “A Model of Visual Adaptation for Realistic Image Synthesis.” In *Proceedings of SIGGRAPH 96, Computer Graphics Proceedings, Annual Conference Series*, edited by Holly Rushmeier, pp. 249–258, Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1996.
- [Field, Brady 97] D. J. Field and N. Brady. “Visual Sensitivity, Blur and the Sources of Variability in the Amplitude Spectra of Natural Scenes.” *Vision Research* 37(23): 3367–3383 (1997).
- [Hess 90] R. F. Hess. “Rod-Mediated Vision: Role of Post-Receptorial Filters.” In *Night Vision*, edited by R. F. Hess, L. T. Sharpe, and K. Nordby, pp. 3–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [Hess et al. 90] R. F. Hess, L. T. Sharpe, and K. Nordby, eds. *Night Vision*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [Lamb 90] T. D. Lamb. “Dark Adaptation: A Re-Examination.” In *Night Vision*, edited by R. F. Hess, L. T. Sharpe, and K. Nordby, pp. 177–222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [Larson et al. 97] G. W. Larson, H. Rushmeier, and C. Piatko. “A Visibility Matching Tone Reproduction Operator for High Dynamic Range Scenes.” *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 3(4): 291–306 (October–December 1997).
- [Makous 90] W. Makous. “Absolute Sensitivity.” In *Night Vision*, edited by R. F. Hess, L. T. Sharpe, and K. Nordby, pp. 146–176. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [Marr, Hildreth 80] D. Marr and E. Hildreth. “Theory of Edge Detection.” *Proc. Royal Society London B* 207: 187–217 (1980).
- [Nordby 90] K. Nordby. “Vision in the Complete Achromat: A Personal Account.” In *Night Vision*, edited by R. F. Hess, L. T. Sharpe, and K. Nordby, pp. 3–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [Reinhard 02] E. Reinhard. “Parameter Estimation for Photographic Tone Reproduction.” *journal of graphics tools* 7(1): ??–?? (2002).
- [Ruderman 97] D. L. Ruderman. “The Statistics of Natural Images.” *Network: Computation in Neural Systems* 5(4): 517–548 (1997).

- [Samuelson 84] D. W. Samuelson. *Motion Picture Camera Techniques, second edition*. London: Focal Press, 1984.
- [Sharpe 90] L. T. Sharpe. “The Light Adaptation of the Human Rod Vision System.” In *Night Vision*, edited by R. F. Hess, L. T. Sharpe, and K. Nordby, pp. 49–124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [Tumblin, Rushmeier 93] J. Tumblin and H. Rushmeier. “Tone Reproduction for Computer Generated Images.” *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 13(6): 42–48 (November 93).
- [Tumblin, Turk 99] J. Tumblin and G. Turk. “LCIS: A boundary hierarchy for detail-preserving contrast reduction.” In *Proceedings of SIGGRAPH 99, Computer Graphics Proceeding, Annual Conference Series*, edited by Alyn Rockwood, pp. 83–90, Reading MA: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999.
- [Upstill 95] S Upstill. *The Realistic Presentation of Synthetic Images: Image Processing in Computer Graphics*. Ph. D. thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1995.
- [Ward 94] G. Ward. “A Contrast-Based Scalefactor for Luminance Display.” In *Graphics Gems IV*, edited by P. Heckbert, pp. 415–421. Boston: Academic Press, 1994.

**Acknowledgement.** Henrik Jensen, Daniel Kersten, Gordon Legge, Jack Loomis, and Simon Premoze provided helpful comments and discussion. This work was supported in part by National Science Foundation grants 89-20219, 95-23483, 98-18344 and 00-80999.

**Web Information:**

Images are available at

<http://www.acm.org/jgt/papers/ThompsonShirleyFerwerda02>

William B. Thompson, School of Computing, University of Utah, 50 S. Central Campus Drive, Rm. 3190, Salt Lake City, UT 84112 (thompson@cs.utah.edu)

Peter Shirley, School of Computing, University of Utah, 50 S. Central Campus Drive, Rm. 3190, Salt Lake City, UT 84112 (shirley@cs.utah.edu)

James A. Ferwerda, Computer Graphics Center, Cornell University, 580 Rhodes Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853 (jaf2@cornell.edu)

Received April 1, 2002; accepted in revised form May 30, 2002.