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Abstract

Binary descriptors have been instrumental in the recent evolution of computationally efficient sparse image alignment algorithms. Increasingly, however, the vision community is interested in dense image alignment methods, which are more suitable for estimating correspondences from high frame rate cameras as they do not rely on exhaustive search. However, classic dense alignment approaches are sensitive to illumination change. In this paper, we propose an easy to implement and low complexity dense binary descriptor, which we refer to as bit-planes, that can be seamlessly integrated within a multi-channel Lucas & Kanade framework. This novel approach combines the robustness of binary descriptors with the speed and accuracy of dense alignment methods. The approach is demonstrated on a template tracking problem achieving state-of-the-art robustness and faster than real-time performance on consumer laptops (400+ fps on a single core Intel i7) and hand-held mobile devices (100+ fps on an iPad Air 2).

1. Introduction

Binary descriptors such as BRIEF [10] & BRISK [24] are powerful tools for solving sparse image alignment problems due to their discriminative power, robustness to illumination change, and low complexity [21, 16, 20, 39]. Matching binary descriptors is typically performed by exhaustive search [7, 23] using the Hamming distance. Exhaustive search, however, is inefficient when dense correspondences are required in real-time [19, 30].

A classical way of speeding up the task of image alignment is to linearize pixel intensities of an image with respect to geometric displacement. The most notable example of this strategy can be found in the seminal work of Lucas & Kanade [27]. The Lucas & Kanade (LK) algorithm attempts to establish an approximate linear relationship between appearance and geometric displacement. Efficient linear solvers can then be employed for finding the best geometric alignment of the image with respect to a known template. The relationship between appearance and geometric displacement is seldom linear, so the linearization process is typically repeated until convergence. Due to its importance, numerous extensions and variations upon the LK algorithm have subsequently been explored in literature [2].

At the heart of the LK algorithm is the notion that an approximate linear relationship between pixel appearance and geometric displacement can be reliably established. Pixel intensities are not deterministically differentiable with respect to geometric displacement. Instead, the linear relationship is established stochastically through spatial finite differences whose outputs we refer to as image gradients. The notion of estimating stochastic gradients on image intensities has a long and rich history dating back to some of the most seminal works of computer vision [29]. Further, it has been well documented that pixel intensities within natural images are strongly correlated over small spatial areas further validating the assumed approximate linear relationship between pixel intensities and geometric displacement [34]. Pixel intensities, however, have a problem when applied to most practical image alignment tasks. Specifically, they violate the brightness constancy assumption, which states that pixel intensities describing a scene shall remain constant under geometric distortion. Our proposed dense bit-planes descriptor offers a solution to this shortcoming using a computationally efficient strategy.

Contributions: In this work we explore the validity of a descriptor constancy assumption using photometrically invariant descriptors. In particular, we explore the effectiveness of one of the simplest and most efficient binary descriptors LBP [32] — or the Census Transform [42] — for robust and efficient dense correspondence estimation problems. The concept of linearizing feature descriptors with respect to geometric displacement within the LK framework is a relatively new and emerging topic [8, 1]. Hitherto, most of the previously employed descriptors have a considerable computational footprint such as HOG [12], dense SIFT [6, 26], and even SURF [5] making them unsuitable for practical use in many vision applications requiring dense correspondences in real-time from high frame rate data. In
this paper we make the following contributions:

- We propose the bit-planes descriptor, an adaptation of the LBP descriptor, that can be used within the LK framework. Specifically, we propose a multi-channel LK adaptation that allows us to minimize the Hamming distance using standard least squares optimization.
- The suitability of our bit-planes descriptor for linearization is explored as a function of geometric displacement. We demonstrate that even though the dense bit-planes descriptor is inherently discontinuous it shares the same critical properties enjoyed by pixel intensities, which make them suitable for gradient-based optimization.
- Unlike classical dense descriptors such as HOG and dense SIFT, we demonstrate the efficiency of our bit-planes descriptor on planar target tracking achieving speeds in excess of 400 fps on a laptop, and in excess of 120 fps on mobile devices. Furthermore, we demonstrate faster and more robust template tracking in comparison to RANSAC-based algorithms on sparse features, especially with low- and ambiguously textured objects.

2. The Lucas & Kanade Algorithm

In this section we briefly review the LK algorithm in order to introduce notation. Let $I_0 : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be the template/reference image. After camera motion with parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we obtain an input/moving image $I_1$. We desire to estimate the parameters of motion such that the following quantity is minimized:

$$\mathcal{E}(x; \theta) = \sum_{x \in \Omega_0} \| I_0(x) - I_1(x'(\theta)) \|^2,$$

(1)

where $\Omega_0$ is a subset of pixels in the template image, $\theta$ is an initial estimate of parameters and $x'(\theta)$ describes the transformed pixel coordinates given the motion parameters, commonly known as the warping function. By performing a first-order Taylor expansion of Eq. (1) in the vicinity of $\theta$, taking the derivative with respect to the parameter update, and equating it to zero, we arrive at the normal equations:

$$J(x; \theta)' J(x; \theta) \Delta \theta = J(x; \theta)' e(x; \theta),$$

(2)

where $J(x; \theta)$ is the matrix of partial derivatives of the warped image intensities with respect to the motion parameters evaluated at the current estimate of parameters $\theta$, and $e(x; \theta) = I_0(x) - I_1(x'(\theta))$. Using the chain rule we obtain

$$J(x; \theta) = \frac{\partial I_1(x)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial I_1}{\partial x'} \frac{\partial x'}{\partial \theta},$$

(3)

where $\partial I_1/\partial x'$ is estimated stochastically through $x$- and $y$-finite difference filters, while $\partial x'/\partial \theta$ is obtained deterministically using the closed-form of the warping function. The original formulation of LK is applicable to a wide variety of problems. For special warps that satisfy a group requirement, however, a more efficient variation is Baker & Matthews’ Inverse Compositional algorithm (IC) [2] which we will use in the experimental portion of this paper.

Photometric variation: The classical formulation of LK relies on the brightness constancy assumption [27], which is seldom satisfied in real life applications. Techniques to address illumination change include: (i) estimating illumination parameters alongside the motion parameters (either jointly [4] or in an alternating fashion [38]), (ii) using intrinsically robust similarity measures, such as Mutual Information [14, 13], or the normalized correlation [22], and (iii) preprocessing the images to obtain a representation that is more robust to intensity variations [28, 1, 40].

On the one hand, estimating illumination is sensitive to the modeling assumptions and increases the dimensionality of the state and vector, thereby increasing the complexity of the optimization. On the other hand, optimizing robust similarity metrics requires general purpose optimizers that cannot exploit the special structure of least squares problems.

Preprocessing the image does not typically require restrictive assumptions, and does not affect the dimensionality of the state vector. Traditionally, preprocessing an image is done by convolving with filters, or other simple operations such as whitening the signal [17, 36]. Densely sampled feature descriptors are another form of preprocessing, which we adopt in this work. In particular, we propose the use of a dense bit-planes descriptor. During evaluation, we show that our approach exceeds the robustness of algorithms that explicitly model illumination as well as methods that rely on robust cost metrics. Furthermore, our method is more efficient, and simpler to implement. Central to our work is the multi-channel formulation of LK, which we review next.

Multi-channel LK: In this section we present a generalization of the LK algorithm to accommodate the application of multi-channel descriptors. Herein, we shall refer to this generalization as the multi-channel LK algorithm. Let $\phi_0 : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be the $d$-channel representation of the template/reference image. Employing a similar notation to the classical LK algorithm, after camera motion with parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we obtain an input/moving $d$-channel representation $\phi_1$. To align descriptors using LK we seek to minimize

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi(x; \theta) = \sum_{x \in \Omega_0} \| \phi_0(x) - \phi_1(x'(\theta)) \|^2.$$
cission $J_\phi(x; \theta) = \partial \phi / \partial \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$. Let the value of the $j$-th channel, as illustrated in Fig. 1, of the multi-channel representation be described as $\phi^j(x)$, where $\phi(x) = [\phi^1(x), \ldots, \phi^d(x)]^\top$. The sought Jacobian for each channel in Eq. (4) can be obtained using the chain rule

$$
\frac{\partial \phi^j(x)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial x'} \frac{\partial x'}{\partial \theta}
$$

(5)

for $j = 1, \ldots, d$ where $\frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial x'}$ is estimated stochastically through x- and y- finite difference filters on $\phi^j$, and $\frac{\partial x'}{\partial \theta}$ is obtained deterministically from the warp function. The multi-channel $d \times p$ Jacobian matrix can then be formed as

$$
J_\phi(x; \theta) = \frac{\partial \phi_1(x)}{\partial \theta} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial \phi^1_1(x)}{\partial \theta} \\
\vdots \\
\frac{\partial \phi^1_p(x)}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(6)

Using this multi-channel linearization all extensions and variations of the LK algorithm can be extended to different types of multi-channel descriptors. Recent work has demonstrated the utility of multi-channel LK [1, 8] using classical dense descriptors such as dense SIFT and HOG. A novel component of this paper is the derivation of a low-complexity dense binary descriptor that can be seamlessly applied within the multi-channel LK framework.

3. Dense Binary Descriptors

Local Binary Patterns (LBP) [32] were among the first binary descriptors proposed in vision. An almost identical binary representation was independently developed by Zabih & Woodfill under the name: Census Transform (CT) [42], which is still commonly applied in stereo and optical flow research [39, 20, 31, 35]. LBP is based on optical flow research [39, 20, 31, 35]. LBP is based on classical dense descriptors such as dense SIFT and HOG.

Using a multi-channel linearization all extensions and variations of the LK algorithm can be extended to different types of multi-channel descriptors. Recent work has demonstrated the utility of multi-channel LK [1, 8] using classical dense descriptors such as dense SIFT and HOG. A novel component of this paper is the derivation of a low-complexity dense binary descriptor that can be seamlessly applied within the multi-channel LK framework.

**3. Dense Binary Descriptors**

Local Binary Patterns (LBP) [32] were among the first binary descriptors proposed in vision. An almost identical binary representation was independently developed by Zabih & Woodfill under the name: Census Transform (CT) [42], which is still commonly applied in stereo and optical flow research [39, 20, 31, 35]. LBP is based on the predicate of pixel comparisons in a small neighborhood as illustrated in Fig. 2. By definition, the LBP descriptor is invariant to monotonic illumination change, which is desirable in practical image alignment applications. Recently, binary descriptor research has progressed significantly with the development of several high performance descriptors such as ORB [10] and BRISK [24] among others [10, 37, 3, 25].

**LBP descriptor:** When extracting a LBP descriptor about a pixel position $x$ one obtains,

$$
\phi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{8} 2^{i-1} [I(x) \bowtie I(x + \Delta x_i)],
$$

(7)

where $\{\Delta x_i\}_{i=1}^{8}$ is the set of the eight relative coordinate displacements possible within a $3 \times 3$ neighborhood around the center pixel location $x$. Other neighborhood sizes and sampling locations can be used, but we found a $3 \times 3$ region to perform best. The operator $\bowtie \in \{>, \ge, <, \le\}$ is a pixel comparison/binary test, and the bracket notation represents the indicator function. We refer to the LBP descriptor described in Equation Eq. (7) as single-channel since its output is a scalar at every pixel position $x$ within the image. A visual depiction of the single-channel LBP descriptor estimation process can be found in Fig. 2.

**Bit-planes descriptor:** When matching LBP descriptors it is common practice to employ the Hamming distance. Hamming distance is useful, because it matches LBP descriptors in a fashion that is invariant to the ordering of pixel comparisons within the $3 \times 3$ neighborhood. Other distance metrics such as sum or squared distances (SSD) lack this desirable property and are dependent on the ordering specified by $\{\Delta x_i\}_{i=1}^{8}$. This becomes problematic when employing dense binary descriptors within the multi-channel LK framework due to its inherent dependence on the SSD.

To make dense binary descriptors compatible with LK, we propose the *bit-planes* descriptor given by

$$
\phi(x) = \begin{bmatrix}
I(x) \bowtie I(x + \Delta x_1) \\
\vdots \\
I(x) \bowtie I(x + \Delta x_8)
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(8)

For each pixel coordinate $x$ in the image, this descriptor produces an 8-channel vector of binary values $\{0, 1\}$. Notably, using the SSD with the multi-channel representation in Eq. (8) between two bit-planes descriptor is equivalent.
to the Hamming distance between single-channel LBP descriptors. Specifically, the ordering of the pixel comparisons within the $3 \times 3$ neighborhood of the bit-planes descriptor has no effect on the SSD. An analysis on the choice of operator $\in \{ >,\geq,=,\leq,\} \in \{ >,\geq,=,\leq,\}$ is explored in the experiments section of this paper.

4. Linearizing Bit-Planes

In order for our proposed bit-planes descriptor to be effective within a multi-channel LK framework we first need to establish that there exists an approximate linear relationship between the multi-channel bit-planes descriptor and geometric displacements. Inspecting a visualization of the bit-planes descriptor in Fig. 1, one could be doubtful about the existence of such relationship. Specifically, each channel of the bit-planes descriptor is highly discontinuous (due to its binary nature). In addition, estimating stochastic gradients per channel of the bit-planes descriptor seems strange as they can take on only three possibilities: $\{-1,0,+1\}$.

**SSD cost surface:** However, the news is not all gloomy. In Fig. 3 we see the SSD cost surface between a patch within a natural image and shifted versions of itself in the $x$- and $y$- directions. This was repeated over a subset of natural images with the aggregate result being depicted in Fig. 3. Sub-pixel shifts are entertained here using bi-linear interpolation. In Fig. 3b one sees the cost surface for raw pixel intensities, and as expected, we see a quasi-convex cost surface surrounding the origin. This quasi-convex surface is important with respect to the effectiveness of the LK algorithm — as the LK objective relies on a graceful reduction of the SSD cost as a function of geometric displacement from ground-truth. In fact the LK algorithm can be interpreted as attempting to hallucinate a convex quadratic representation of this SSD cost surface. Interestingly, when inspecting Fig. 3a we see a similar quasi-convex cost surface, which indicates that bit-planes have similar properties to raw pixel intensities when it comes to the use of SSD as a measure of dissimilarity.

**Linear predictions of bit-planes:** Consider a translational displacement warp $\Delta \theta \in \mathbb{R}^2$ where we attempt to linearly predict an image representation $R$ (raw pixels, or bit-planes) in the $x$- and $y$- directions,

$$R(x(0)) + \frac{\partial R(0)}{\partial \theta} \Delta \theta \approx R(x(\Delta \theta)) . \quad (9)$$

We employ the neutral notation $R$ to represent either raw pixels $I$ or bit-planes $\phi$. We can define the error of this linear approximation to be:

$$\epsilon(\Delta \theta) = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \| R(x(0)) + \frac{\partial R(0)}{\partial \theta} \Delta \theta - R(x(\Delta \theta)) \|^2_2 \quad (10)$$

The signal-to-noise-ratio (SNR) of the approximation can then be defined as

$$\text{SNR}(\Delta \theta) = 10 \cdot \log \left( \sum_{x \in \Omega} \| R(x(0)) \|^2_2 - \log \epsilon(\Delta \theta) \right) \quad (11)$$

In Fig. 4 we depict the SNR of the linearized objective as a function of increasing translational shifts from the true minima for both raw intensities, and the binary channels in bit-planes. The experiments were carried out in a similar manner through the use of a subset of natural images and aggregated to form the results in Fig. 4. As expected, the SNR when using binary features is lower than using raw intensities. However, it seems that at least qualitatively bit-planes gradient estimates provide a good local linear approximation of the objective. Hence, further justifying the use of the bit-planes descriptor within the LK framework.

5. Experiments

In this section we shall attempt to answer a number of important questions regarding the validity of our dense bit-planes descriptor for robust and efficient image alignment.
**Pre-computing descriptors:** An obvious question to ask when considering the application of multi-channel descriptors, such as bit-planes, within the LK framework is: whether we can pre-compute the descriptors before warping? Specifically, due to the iterative nature of the LK algorithm it becomes computationally expensive to re-compute dense descriptors after each image warp. If one can pre-compute the descriptor before warping substantial efficiencies can be integrated into any LK-based image alignment.

We attempted to answer this question in Fig. 5 where we evaluated a number of well-known LK variants [2]: forward additive (FA), forward compositional (FC), and inverse compositional (IC) for the task of image alignment on natural images. Random warp initializations and appearance variation of the form

$$I_1(x) = 255 \left( \frac{\alpha I_0(\theta_a(x)) + \beta}{255} \right)^{1+\gamma}$$

(12)

were included, where $\theta_a(\cdot)$ are the 6DOF parameters of an affine warp, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are multiplicative and additive lighting change terms, and $|\gamma| < 1$ is used for gamma correction. We can see that warping feature channels is less accurate than re-computing the descriptor on the warped image as shown in Fig. 5.

The degree to which warping the feature channels vs. recomputing them affects accuracy depends on the application and the type of warp. For simple warps such as 2D translation, the relationship between intensity deformation as a function of warp parameters is linear. Hence, approximating multi-channel LK by warping the feature channels is equivalent to re-computing the features on warped images as shown in Fig. 6. However, for more complicated warps where deformation of image intensities is nonlinearly dependent on the warp parameters we expect a pronounced difference in alignment accuracy. This is because the value of each descriptor channel might significantly differ after a nonlinear warp. Overall, it is possible to approximate the multi-channel objective in Eq. (4) with warping feature channels depending on the type and accuracy requirements of the application at hand. In our experiments, we chose to recompute descriptors after every iteration of image warping.

**LBP within LK:** Employing bit-planes requires the alignment of eight separate channels as opposed to a single channel when working with raw intensities. In Fig. 8 we discussed the problems of using a LBP descriptor within the LK framework. In particular, the representation is inherently sensitive to the ordering of pixel comparisons when using a SSD measure of dissimilarity. Using LBP descriptors within a LK framework as been reported to perform well [39, 20] given small displacements. However, under moderate displacements the use of the LBP descriptor in LK introduces biases due to choices of the binary test and neighborhood ordering. In Fig. 8 we show the effect of differing binary comparison operators $\in \{<, >, \geq, \leq\}$ compared to our proposed bit-plane descriptor. Our bit-planes descriptor is unaffected by the ordering. In our experiments we noticed indistinguishable differences in performance between binary comparison operators when employing the bit-planes descriptor. As a result, we chose to use the $>$ operator for the rest of our experiments.

**Real-time template tracking:** We evaluate the performance of bit-planes for a template tracking problems using the benchmark dataset collected by Gauglitz et al. [18]. An example of the dataset is shown in Fig. 9. Our plane tracker estimates an 8DOF homography using the IC algo-
The efficiency is achieved by utilizing SIMD instructions on the CPU that allows us to process 16 pixels at once (or 32 pixels with modern AVX instructions). Additionally, the operations required to compute the LBP descriptor are limited to bit shifts, ORs and ANDs, all of which can be performed with low latency.

We compare the performance of our algorithm against a variety of template tracking methods summarized in Table 1. The algorithms are: the enhance correlation coefficient (ECC) [15], which serves as an example of an intrinsically robust cost function that is invariant up to an affine illumination change. The Dual Inverse Compositional (DIC) algorithm [4], which serves as an example of algorithms that attempt to estimate illumination parameters. We use two variations of the DIC: (i) the gain+bias model on grayscale images denoted by DIC-1, and (ii) using a full affine lighting model the makes use of RGB image data denoted by DIC-2. We also compare the performance against a recently published descriptor-based method [11] called Descriptor Fields (DF). Finally, we include baseline results from raw intensity (BF), improved LK with the Gradient Constraint (GC) [9], and alignment with the Gradient Magnitude (GM).

We report two quantities in the evaluation. First, is the percentage of successfully tracked frames. A frame is successfully tracked if the overlap between the estimate and the ground truth is greater than 90%. The overlap is computed as: $o = (A \cap B)/(A \cup B)$, where $A$ is the warped image given each algorithm’s estimate, and $B$ is the warped image given the ground truth. Second, since we are also interested in subpixel accuracy we show the mean percentage of overlap across all frames given by $m = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} o_i$, where $n$ is the number of frames in each sequence.

**Real-time results:** Results are compared for three types of geometric and photometric variations. First is an **out of plane rotation**, which induces perspective change as shown in Fig. 9b. Second, is **dynamic lighting change** where the image is stationary but illuminated with nonlinearly varying light source. Finally a **static lighting change**, where the transition phase of change in lighting is omitted.

Our evaluation results are shown in Table 3 and in Fig. 10. Based on our experimentation, the top performing methods are the ones that employ a descriptor constancy assumption, namely: bit-planes and DF. However, bit-planes is more efficient and it performed significantly better for the ‘out of plane rotation’, which induces perspective change in the image. In fact, all tested algorithms, with the exception of bit-planes, performed poorly with this data. Algorithms that use a robust function (ECC) and the ones that attempt to estimate illumination (DIC) performed well, but fell behind in comparison to descriptor constancy and gradient constraint.

**Results on mobile devices:** We further evaluate the work...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>br</th>
<th>bu</th>
<th>mi</th>
<th>pa</th>
<th>su</th>
<th>wd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of Plane Rotation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>100.0 (99.38)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.51)</td>
<td><strong>87.50</strong> (99.38)</td>
<td><strong>97.92</strong> (99.26)</td>
<td><strong>79.17</strong> (99.57)</td>
<td><strong>93.75</strong> (99.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>25.00 (96.16)</td>
<td>33.33 (95.85)</td>
<td>25.00 (95.99)</td>
<td>33.33 (96.65)</td>
<td>20.83 (95.52)</td>
<td>18.75 (95.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-1</td>
<td>25.00 (96.20)</td>
<td>33.33 (95.83)</td>
<td>25.00 (95.98)</td>
<td>33.33 (96.73)</td>
<td>20.83 (95.95)</td>
<td>18.75 (95.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-2</td>
<td>25.00 (96.22)</td>
<td>35.42 (95.56)</td>
<td>25.00 (95.51)</td>
<td>35.42 (96.42)</td>
<td>25.00 (96.22)</td>
<td>18.75 (95.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>91.67 (99.51)</td>
<td>93.75 (99.44)</td>
<td>79.17 (99.70)</td>
<td>85.42 (99.75)</td>
<td>70.83 (99.60)</td>
<td>83.33 (99.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.24)</td>
<td>95.83 (99.66)</td>
<td><strong>87.50</strong> (99.52)</td>
<td><strong>93.75</strong> (99.51)</td>
<td>62.50 (98.88)</td>
<td>91.67 (99.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>62.50 (99.86)</td>
<td>83.33 (99.62)</td>
<td>77.08 (99.72)</td>
<td>77.08 (99.81)</td>
<td>58.33 (99.71)</td>
<td>62.50 (99.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>93.75 (99.68)</td>
<td>91.67 (99.70)</td>
<td>83.33 (99.32)</td>
<td>91.67 (99.63)</td>
<td>37.50 (97.64)</td>
<td>66.67 (99.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic Lighting Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>100.0 (98.97)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.08)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.13)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.91)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.98)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>16.33 (98.03)</td>
<td>19.39 (99.00)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.64)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.69)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.30)</td>
<td>67.35 (98.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-1</td>
<td>100.0 (98.40)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.04)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.77)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.60)</td>
<td>86.87 (96.02)</td>
<td>20.41 (95.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-2</td>
<td>100.0 (98.39)</td>
<td>100.0 (98.85)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.61)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.58)</td>
<td>85.86 (96.42)</td>
<td>26.53 (97.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.30)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.08)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.35)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (98.87)</td>
<td>20.41 (99.36)</td>
<td>68.37 (99.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>17.35 (99.87)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.50)</td>
<td>22.45 (99.84)</td>
<td>18.37 (99.88)</td>
<td>12.24 (99.72)</td>
<td>17.35 (99.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>17.35 (98.99)</td>
<td>19.39 (99.23)</td>
<td>23.47 (99.10)</td>
<td>19.39 (99.08)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>13.27 (99.34)</td>
<td>31.69 (98.26)</td>
<td>18.37 (98.82)</td>
<td>18.37 (99.32)</td>
<td>12.24 (99.16)</td>
<td>16.33 (98.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Static lighting change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.76)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.85)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.61)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.85)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.63)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.33)</td>
<td>100.0 (97.67)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.75)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.41)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (96.79)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-1</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.70)</td>
<td>100.0 (97.77)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.80)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.20)</td>
<td>98.72 (96.58)</td>
<td>89.74 (96.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC-2</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.58)</td>
<td>79.49 (97.59)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.07)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (97.13)</td>
<td>89.74 (95.75)</td>
<td>79.49 (96.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.68)</td>
<td>100.0 (99.51)</td>
<td>76.92 (99.71)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.77)</td>
<td>74.36 (99.70)</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong> (99.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>74.36 (99.73)</td>
<td>74.36 (99.84)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.97)</td>
<td>74.36 (99.76)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.74)</td>
<td>51.28 (99.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>48.72 (99.88)</td>
<td>74.36 (99.75)</td>
<td>74.36 (99.66)</td>
<td>74.36 (99.81)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.76)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>48.72 (99.80)</td>
<td>74.36 (99.67)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.95)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.93)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.40)</td>
<td>48.72 (99.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Template tracking evaluation [18]. We show the percentage of successfully tracked frames. In parenthesis we show the average percentage of overlap for all successfully tracked frames. The available textures are: **br** (bricks), **bu** (building), **mi** (mission), **pa** (paris), **su** (sunset), and **wd** (wood).

![Sudden lighting change and ambiguous texture.](image1)

(a) Sudden lighting change and ambiguous texture.

![Sudden lighting change and perspective distortion with medium texture.](image2)

(b) Sudden lighting change and perspective distortion with medium texture.

![Sudden lighting change and motion blur with high texture.](image3)

(c) Sudden lighting change and motion blur with high texture.

Figure 11. High frame rate data at 120 Hz captured using an iPhone 5s. Dataset contains different textures under sudden lighting change, low lighting, and motion blur. All data and code will be publicly available for the research community.
on high frame rate data (Slo-mo) using two smart mobile devices: the iPad Air 2 and the iPhone 5s. In addition to compression artifacts, we made the data more challenging by turning off the lights multiple times to cause sudden lighting change and low illumination. The videos are recorded with unsteady hands causing further motion blur. An example of the videos is shown in Fig. 11 featuring an ambiguously textured object in Fig. 11a, normal levels of texture in Fig. 11b as well as higher amount of texture in Fig. 11c. The first image in Fig. 11 shows the selected template, which we hold fixed throughout tracking. The total number of frames from the videos combined is 6447.

We compare the performance of dense tracking using bit-planes with the RANSAC-based tracking by detection using two types of binary descriptors, ORB [33] and BRISK [24]. In terms of efficiency, even though our mobile device implementation does not make use of NEON instructions or the GPU, we outperform opencv3’s optimized implementations of ORB and BRISK by a substantial margin.

More importantly, our approach is more robust. Feature-based tracking failed approximately on 15% of the frames due to either: (i) inability to detect features under low light, and (ii) RANSAC failure due to imprecise correspondences under motion blur.

Perhaps more interestingly, bit-planes is able to perform well and improve efficiency by reducing image resolution. In fact, tracking speed more than doubles when reducing the template size by half. However, this is not the case with sparse features as memory overhead depends on the number of extracted keypoints, which we kept fixed at 512. It is possible to improve the tracking speed of ORB and BRISK by reducing the number of extracted keypoints. However, lowering the number of keypoints must be done carefully as not to compromise the robustness of the system. We note that the ability to work with lower resolution is important on mobile devices, not only for efficiency considerations, but also for power consumption.

Finally, we note that while dense bit-planes tracking produces faster and more accurate results, its main limitation is the inability to recover if the template is lost due to occlusions or significant drift. In such cases, track by detection can be of immense value to re-initialize LK-based methods if needed.

6. Conclusions

In this work, we proposed a multi-channel representation that enables nonlinear gradient-based optimization algorithms to work with binary features. We arrive at the surprising result that binary data is suitable for gradient-based optimization, as the local approximation of gradients per channel is well-approximated with a quadratic form.

We used the multi-channel representation in a Lucas & Kanade (LK) image alignment framework with our proposed bit-planes descriptors, which greatly improves the robustness to arbitrary illumination variations without significantly increasing computational demands. In addition, we obtained a precise subpixel localization of binary descriptors at speeds faster than real time.

In the context of binary features, least squares minimization over the multi-channel representation is equivalent to minimizing the Hamming distance. Hence, we are able to
minimize the Hamming distance in a standard least squares optimization framework.
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