In this study, a novel illuminant color estimation framework is proposed for color constancy, which incorporates the high representational capacity of deep-learning-based models and the great interpretability of assumption-based models. The well-designed building block, feature map reweight unit (ReWU), helps to achieve comparative accuracy on benchmark datasets with respect to prior state-of-the-art models while requiring only 1%–5% model size and 8%–20% computational cost. In addition to local color estimation, a confidence estimation branch is also included such that the model is able to produce point estimate and its uncertainty estimate simultaneously, which provides useful clues for local estimates aggregation and multiple illumination estimation. The source code and the dataset are available at https://github.com/QiuJueqin/Reweight-CC.

**Keywords** Color constancy, illuminant estimation, convolutional neural network, computer vision

1 Introduction

Color constancy of the human visual system is an essential prerequisite for many vision tasks, which compensates for the effect of the illumination on objects’ color perception. Many computer vision applications are designed to extract comprehensive information from the intrinsic colors of the objects, thereby requiring the input images to be color-unbiased. Unfortunately, the photosensors in modern digital cameras do not possess the ability of automatically compensating for the illuminant colors. To address this issue, a variety of computational color constancy algorithms have been proposed to mimic the dynamical adjustments of the cones in the human visual system [1, 2, 3].

Computational color constancy generally works by first estimating the illuminant color, and then compensating it by multiplying the reciprocal of the illuminant color to the color-biased image. Existing computational color constancy algorithms can be classified into a priori assumption-based ones and learning-based ones, according to whether a training process is needed. Typical assumption-based algorithms include Gray-World [4], White-Patch [1], variants of Gray-Edge [5, 6], and some that utilize statistical information of the images [7]. Although assumption-based methods are lightweight and comprehensible, their performances are likely to decrease dramatically if these restrictive assumptions are not satisfied. Learning-based algorithms can be further grouped into low-level ones and high-level ones. Typical low-level methods include Color-by-Correlation [8], Gamut Mapping [9], Bayesian color constancy [10], etc. Since the spatial and textural information has been lost when generating low-level color descriptors, these methods are prone to produce ambiguous estimates if they have not “seen” the colorimetric patterns of the test images in the training phase. In recent years, following the massive success of deep learning in computer vision community, high-level color constancy algorithms based on the convolutional neural network (CNN) have achieved state-of-the-art performances on the benchmark datasets [11, 12, 13]. However, we notice that many existing CNN-based models adopt the architectures from image classification domain, e.g., AlexNet [14] in [13], SqueezeNet [16] in [13], which are overcomplicated and inefficient when dealing with color-relevant applications.
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Compared to visual recognition or understanding tasks, color constancy has its own unique properties:

**High priority** - It is generally suggested that the ganglion cells within the retina are the basis of color processing mechanisms of human color constancy, which respond to the activations of cone photoreceptors at the very first stage of the human visual system \[1,17\]. Therefore, it makes more sense to perform the computational color constancy before the explorations of further semantic information.

**Condensation and superficiality** - The useful cues for color constancy are highly condensed: if there exists neutral or specular regions in the image, computational color constancy can be done by pooling these regions in the spatial domain \[18,19,20\]; if there exists shading regions, it can be done by extracting these regions in the gradient domain \[21\]. Instead of learning very deep features as many visual recognition tasks try to do, color constancy is such a task that can be solved in a more superficial level.

Based on these observations, in this study an efficacious building block, dubbed **feature map reweight unit (ReWU)**, is proposed to extract informative cues from image feature maps. With ReWUs, the illuminant colors can be accurately estimated with only 1–3 convolutional layers, which makes our model more compact and efficient compared to prior CNN-based models.

## 2 Preliminaries

Assuming Lambertian reflection and uniform illumination, the raw intensity vector \(p(x) \in \mathbb{R}^3\) at pixel \(x\) recorded by a typical tri-chromatic photosensor is given by \[22\]

\[
p(x) = \kappa(X) \int_{\Omega} \rho(\lambda,X) \ell(\lambda) s(\lambda) \, d\lambda, \tag{1}\]

where \(X\) is the point in the space corresponding to \(x\), \(\rho(\lambda,X)\) is the spectral reflectance at \(X\), \(\ell(\lambda)\) is the spectral irradiance by an arbitrary incident illumination, \(s(\lambda)\) denotes the spectral sensitivities of the photosensors, and \(\kappa(X)\) is a geometry-dependent factor.

Recovering \(\ell\) from the integration is an ill-posed problem. A common approximation is to reformulate \(\text{(1)}\) with a Hadamard product as per von Kries model \[1\]:

\[
p(x) \approx p^*(x) \circ \mathbf{L}, \tag{2}\]

where \(p^*(x)\) is the vector of the “intrinsic” color of the object when it is observed under a canonical illuminant, and \(\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^3\) is the color vector of the arbitrary light source:

\[
\mathbf{L} = \int_{\Omega} \ell(\lambda) s(\lambda) \, d\lambda. \tag{3}\]

In this way, computational color constancy is equivalent to illuminant color estimation problem and consequently can be achieved by compensating for the color of the arbitrary light source:

\[
p^*(x) \approx p(x) \circ \mathbf{L}^{-1}, \tag{4}\]

where \((\cdot)^{-1}\) is the element-wise reciprocal calculation.

## 3 Model

In this section we first introduce the **feature map reweight unit (ReWU)**, a lightweight build block specifically designed for color-relevant applications. ReWUs work cooperatively with the hierarchical feature maps extracted by the convolution blocks. Taking one feature map as input, a ReWU extracts informative cues for illuminant color estimation by assigning varying weights to the pixels in the feature map. Pixels with higher weights will dominate the decision of color estimation in the downstream of the network, and pixels with lower weights will have less of a say or even be ignored. Since generating feature maps can be regarded as weighting the input image with different kernels, we denominate the proposed technique **reweighting**.

In subsection B, the network architecture for illuminant color estimation is proposed. The architecture can be interpreted as connecting up a set of ReWUs to each convolution blocks in a sequential convolutional neural network. To produce final illuminant color estimate, the global average poolings \[23\] are applied to each reweighted feature map such that only the pixels with highest activations are kept and fed into the branch of fully-connected layers. The proposed model takes color-biased **image patches** as inputs, thus it works for both local and global estimation cases.
Figure 1: Visualization of near-achromatic pixels distillation by the function $\mathcal{W}$ in Eq. (6). Pixels with chromaticity coordinates $(u, v)$ located within a small region (controlled by the threshold $T$) centering at the neutral point $(u_0, v_0)$ will be considered near-achromatic. Without loss of generality, in this example we choose $(u_0, v_0) = (0.33, 0.33)$ and $T = 0.03$.

In addition to the accuracy metric, it is also suggested that the uncertainty information of illuminant color is of great importance for practical uses. To circumvent the absence of uncertainties prediction in the naive model, in subsection C, we add a confidence estimation branch to the network such that the point estimates (illuminant colors) as well as the uncertainty estimates can be produced simultaneously.

### 3.1 Feature map reweight unit (ReWU)

Based on the observation that some pixels matter more than others in inferring illuminant color, many algorithms were designed to detect and analyze the pixels that satisfy some constraints. In the very simplest case, in order to distill all near-achromatic pixels that might belong to the neutral objects, the selective Gray Point algorithm loops through all pixels $x$’s in an image and finds those located within a specified region centering at the neutral point:

$$
x := \begin{cases} 
\text{achromatic} & \text{if } |(u_x - u_0) - (v_x - v_0)| \leq T \text{ and } |(u_x - u_0) + (v_x - v_0)| \leq T, \\
\text{chromatic} & \text{otherwise,} 
\end{cases}
$$

where $[u_x, v_x] = [r_x/(r_x + g_x + b_x), g_x/(r_x + g_x + b_x)]$ is the dimension-reduced chromaticity coordinate of pixel $x$, $[u_0, v_0]$ is the coordinate of the neutral point, which can be predefined given a particular photosensors, and $T$ is an adjustable threshold.

Equation (5) can be rewritten in a more computational friendly form such that it can be easily handled by the tensor manipulations in the deep-learning frameworks:

$$
x := \begin{cases} 
\text{achromatic} & \text{if } \mathcal{W}(u_x, v_x) > 0, \\
\text{chromatic} & \text{otherwise,} 
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\mathcal{W}(u_x, v_x) = \text{ReLU} \left( \min \left( A[u_x, v_x]^T + b \right) \right),
$$

$$
A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} T - u_0 + v_0 \\ T + u_0 - v_0 \\ T - u_0 - v_0 \end{bmatrix},
$$

where $\min(\cdot)$ returns the minimum element in the input vector, and $\text{ReLU}(\cdot)$ is the rectified linear units that clamps all the negative values at zero. Figure 1 demonstrates how the function $\mathcal{W}$ works in this example to distill near-achromatic pixels from a quad.

Inspired by this selective attention mechanism, we propose the feature map reweight unit (ReWU) that is able to highlights informative pixels and suppresses less useful ones by learning how to impose the “constraints” and “thresholds” on the feature maps. Instead of using the simple yes-or-no scheme in Eq. (5) to select pixels, ReWUs assign varying weights to pixels in the feature maps.
Formally, the reweight unit \( W : M \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C} \rightarrow M' \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C} \) produces the reweighted output feature map \( M' \) by pixelwise multiplying the input feature map \( M \) with a reweighting map \( W \):

\[
M' = W \circ M, \quad (7)
\]

where \( W \) is calculated by first convolving the input feature map with \( 1 \times 1 \) kernels and activating those pixels that satisfy the constraints implicitly embedded in the kernels and thresholds:

\[
W = k \cdot ReLU(\text{min}(g * M + T)). \quad (8)
\]

Here \( g \) is a \( 1 \times 1 \times C \times K \) tensor, where \( C \) is the number of channels in the input feature map, \( K \) is the number of kernels, which can also be interpreted as the number of constraints imposed on the feature map. \( T \) is a \( K \times 1 \) thresholds vector determining the tolerance for the pixels being away from the “hotspot” in the \( C \)-dimensional space. Symbol \( * \) denotes the spatial convolution, \( \text{min}(\cdot) \) herein is the minimization operation along the channel axis, and \( k \) is a trainable scaling parameter that allows to adjust the activation of the reweighting map if needed. The structure of the ReWU is illustrated in Fig. 2.

Apparently, the example of near-achromatic pixels distillation in Fig. 1 is a particular instance of ReWU where 4 constraints are imposed upon the 2-dimensional chromaticity plane, and a binarized reweighting map is produced.

The ReWUs are highly parameter-economic. By setting the number of kernels to be equal to the number of channels in the input feature maps in our experiments, a ReWU has only \( O(C^2) \) space complexity, which reduces the numbers of parameters by 1–2 order of magnitude compared to a conventional convolution blocks.

It should be noted that although the \( 1 \times 1 \) convolution has been used in other network structures like Inception [29], ShuffleNet [30] and LiteFlowNet [31], the idea behind the ReWU is quite different. Furthermore, it is also possible to modify the \( 1 \times 1 \) convolutions in ReWUs to others with larger receptive fields, if the structural information among the neighboring pixels are expected to be utilized.

### 3.2 Network architecture

The proposed illuminant color estimation network is a CNN-based regression model that takes the color-biased image patches as inputs. The network is organized by connecting up a set of ReWUs to the feature maps (including the color-biased input image itself) in a sequential convolutional neural network. For each ReWU, the global average pooling [23] is applied to its output feature map \( M' \) such that only pixels with highest activations in respective channels are kept and collected into an activation vector. Vectors from different ReWUs will be concatenated into a long vector, which will be fed into the fully-connected illuminant color estimation branch to produce final regressors. The network can be trained end-to-end by using the mean squared errors between the estimated and the ground truth illuminant colors (both \( \ell_1 \)-normalized) as the loss function. To produce the \( \ell_1 \)-normalized estimates, we add an extra softmax layer after the final fully-connected layer. Figure 3 illustrates the abstract architecture of the proposed regression network.

The number of hierarchical levels of the network can be flexibly chosen. We found that stacking only 1–3 convolution blocks is adequate to achieve the practical accuracy for illuminant color estimation. More ablation experiments about the depths of the models will be given in section 4.

Cooperating the global average poolings with ReWUs makes our model interpretable. Applying global average poolings to the output feature maps of the ReWUs is equivalent to applying weighted poolings to the convolutional feature maps.

\[\text{We tried to optimize the network towards minimizing both MSE and cosine error but found no noticeable difference in performance. However, minimizing MSE accelerated the convergence approximately 20% over the cosine error.}\]
or the input image. For example, assuming that a ReWU highlights the human face regions in the input image, the global average pooling acts like the method in [32] as it assigns high weights to the pixels with skin colors. Looked at from another point, the ReWUs and global average poolings act somewhat like the Squeeze-and-Excitation blocks [13] or attention modules [33], but in a more extreme way that only the most important cues could participate in the decision-making of the illuminant color estimation.

It is also worth noting that the global average pooling makes our network available to be adapted to arbitrary input sizes, since the length of the concatenated vector is only dependent on the sum of channels in all reweighted feature maps, which can be determined in advance. Furthermore, both ReWU and global average pooling are shift invariant, which is reasonably required by the illuminant color estimation models.

3.3 Confidence estimation branch

In making decisions, it is often necessary to be able to tell whether a model is certain about its outputs. To this end, we add an extra confidence estimation branch to the naive network discussed above, such that the predictive uncertainties can be produced simultaneously along with the point estimates [34].

The proposed confidence estimation branch is motivated by the out-of-distribution detecting algorithm in [35]. We adapt it to make it fit for regression tasks. The branch will mainly focus on the aleatoric uncertainties that come from the out-of-distribution data or foreign situations but neglect the epistemic uncertainty that comes from the intrinsic nature of the model.

The confidence estimation branch is added to the naive network in parallel with the fully-connected illuminant color estimation branch, as depicted in Fig. 3 such that both branches receive the same input (the concatenated vector). The confidence estimation branch outputs a single scalar $c \in [0, 1]$ parametrized by the sigmoid function, which represents the network’s confidence that the illuminant color can be correctly estimated given a color-biased input image. Ideally, if the network is confident about its illuminant color estimate, $c$ should be close to 1. Conversely, if the network is not confident that it can produce an accurate estimate, $c$ should be close to 0.

We use the adjusted mean squared error as the task loss in this new network:

$$L_t = \|L^* - \hat{L}'\|_2^2,$$

where $L^*$ is the ground truth color vector of the light source (also $\ell_1$ normalized), and $\hat{L}'$ is the adjusted estimated color vector produced by interpolating between the original estimate $\hat{L}$ and the ground truth, where the degree of interpolation is indicated by the confidence:

$$\hat{L}' = c \cdot \hat{L} + (1 - c) \cdot L^*.$$  

Given an input image for which the illuminant color estimation branch might produce large estimation error, assigning it with a lower confidence will give the network more “hints” to reduce the task loss. To prevent the network from
Table 1: Architecture details of incarnate networks with 1, 2, and 3 hierarchical levels. The confidence estimation branches are not included but they share the same architectures as the illuminant estimation branches, only with the final 3-neuron layer replaced by a 1-neuron one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>layer name (hrchy_0)</th>
<th>output size</th>
<th>Conv / FC</th>
<th>ReWU</th>
<th>output size</th>
<th>Conv / FC</th>
<th>ReWU</th>
<th>output size</th>
<th>Conv / FC</th>
<th>ReWU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>input</td>
<td>224 × 224</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 × 1, 16</td>
<td>224 × 224</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 × 1, 16</td>
<td>224 × 224</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 × 1, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrchy_1</td>
<td>112 × 112</td>
<td>3 × 3, 32</td>
<td>stride 2</td>
<td>112 × 112</td>
<td>3 × 3, 32</td>
<td>stride 2</td>
<td>112 × 112</td>
<td>3 × 3, 32</td>
<td>stride 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrchy_2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrchy_3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concat</td>
<td>35 × 1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>67 × 1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>131 × 1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fc_1</td>
<td>64 × 1</td>
<td>1, 64</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>128 × 1</td>
<td>1, 128</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>256 × 1</td>
<td>1, 256</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fc_2</td>
<td>32 × 1</td>
<td>1, 32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>64 × 1</td>
<td>1, 64</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>128 × 1</td>
<td>1, 128</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fc_3</td>
<td>16 × 1</td>
<td>1, 16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>32 × 1</td>
<td>1, 32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>64 × 1</td>
<td>1, 64</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimate</td>
<td>3 × 1</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 × 1</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 × 1</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

minimizing the task loss by always choosing \( c = 0 \) and receiving the entire ground truth, we add the regularization loss as the penalty:

\[
L_r = -\log(c).
\]  

The final loss function is the weighted sum of the task loss and the regularization loss:

\[
L = L_t + \lambda L_r .
\]

where \( \lambda \) is a hyperparameter to balance the magnitudes of the two terms.

Giving a \( c \) smaller than 1 will push the original vector \( \hat{L} \) closer to the target one, resulting in a reduction in the task loss at the cost of an increase in the regularization loss. Optimizing the overall network is like running a competition game, wherein the network can reduce its final loss only if it can successfully predict which inputs it is likely to accurately estimate, and assigns high confidence scores to them.

Under the uniform illumination assumption, \( c \)'s from different input image patches can be treated as weights to aggregate local illuminant color estimates into a global estimate. When multiple illuminants exist in the image, the uncertainty estimates help to ameliorate the perturbation of color estimates across different local patches. In addition, quantifying predictive uncertainty in the networks also allows for better informed decisions. For example, if the confidences from all local estimates are low given a corner case, it is considerable to run some fallback algorithms in order to get more robust results.

4 Experiments

4.1 Incarnate networks and hyperparameters

Based on the basic architecture proposed in section 3.2, three incarnate networks were built up and tested, with 1, 2, and 3 hierarchical levels, respectively. Given a specified number of levels, two variants, one with and another without the confidence estimation branch, were also compared.

For the conventional convolution blocks in the networks, we adopted the designs in Inception v3 model [36] and set the numbers of kernels to 32, 32, and 64 respectively for the convolutional layers in first 3 hierarchical levels. For each ReWU, we fixed the number of \( 1 \times 1 \) kernels to be equal to the number of channels in its input feature maps, i.e., \( K = C \). One exception was the first ReWU directly connected to the color-biased input image, which had 16 kernels instead of 3. Table 1 lists the detailed architectures for three naive networks without the confidence estimation branches.

4.2 Initialization

For an incarnate network, the kernels in the conventional convolution blocks were initialized by the parameters from the corresponding layers in Inception v3 model [36]. For the fully-connected layers in both branches, the random normal initializers were used.
The initialization for the kernels in ReWUs is a bit more tricky. Without loss of generality, let us assume that the pixel values in the input feature map $M$ have uniform distribution between 0 and 1 and are independent and identically distributed. If the kernels in the tensor $g$ are randomly initialized from a standard gaussian and the thresholds vector $T$ is zero-initialized, we have

\[ E[Z] = E[G] E[M] = 0, \]
\[ \text{Var}[Z] = C \left( \text{Var}[G] \text{Var}[M] + \text{Var}[G] E^2[M] + \text{Var}[M] E^2[G] \right) = \frac{C}{3}, \tag{13} \]

where $G$, $M$, and $Z$ represent the random variables of values in $g$, $M$, and $(g * M)$ respectively, $C$ is the number of channels in $M$, and $E[\cdot]$ and $\text{Var}[\cdot]$ denote the expectation and variance calculations. Consequently, the random variable in $(g * M)$ is also normally distributed with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{C/3}$, which will lead to a zero-tensor output after ReLU because minimizing $(g * M)$ along the channel axis will always produce negative values.

We address this issue by appropriately initializing $T$ with a constant $\tau$ so as to ensure half of elements in the initial reweighting map $W$ are non-zero, given input feature maps with arbitrary dimensionalities and distributions.

First we apply a normalization function $CN(\cdot)$, dubbed channel normalization, to $(g * M)$ such that the random variable in $CN(g * M)$ has zero mean and unit standard deviation along the channel axis. Channel normalization performs computation to values in the intermediate map $(g * M)$:

\[ \hat{p}_{x,i} = \frac{p_{x,i} - \mu_x}{\sigma_x + \epsilon}, \tag{14} \]

where $x$ is the 2D spatial index, $i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ is the channel index, and $\epsilon$ is a small constant. $\mu_x$ and $\sigma_x$ are the mean and standard deviation individually calculated for each pixel over its all channels:

\[ \mu_x = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^{K} p_{x,i}, \quad \sigma_x = \sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^{K} (p_{x,i} - \mu_x)^2}. \tag{15} \]

Figure 4 compares the channel normalization with other existing feature normalization methods.

To ensure half of elements in $W$ are non-zero, the intermediate 1-channel map $\text{min}(CN(g * M) + T)$ should have an expectation of zero because its elements have approximately symmetrical distribution:

\[ E[\text{min}(CN(g * M) + T)] = E[\text{min}(CN(g * M))] + \tau = 0. \tag{16} \]

Therefore,

\[ \tau = E[\tau] = -E[\text{min}(CN(g * M))] \]
\[ = -K \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} z \varphi(z;0,1) (1 - \Phi(z;0,1))^{(K-1)} \, dz, \tag{17} \]

where $\varphi(\cdot;0,1)$ and $\Phi(\cdot;0,1)$ are the cumulative distribution and probability density functions of the standard normal distribution. The proof of (17) is presented in the Appendix.
4.3 Benchmark datasets and images pre-processing

We performed intra- and inter-camera experiments to evaluate the performances of the proposed models. For intra-camera evaluation, ColorChecker RECommended dataset [41] and NUS-8 Camera dataset [20] were used for benchmarking, in which 10 camera models in total were individually tested by three-fold cross validation. ColorChecker RECommended dataset is an updated version of the original Gehler-Shi dataset [42], in which a new “recommended” ground-truth set was re-generated. These updated ground-truths were used in our experiments as the labels to evaluate the illuminant estimation accuracy for Canon 1D and Canon 5D camera models. Following previous works [12,13,43], in intra-camera evaluations, we used the device-dependent raw images as the inputs for both training and validation, with the black levels subtracted.

For inter-camera accuracy evaluation, in addition to the 10 camera models from the aforementioned two standard datasets, we also included Cube dataset [44] for benchmarking, which contains 1365 exclusively outdoor images taken with a Canon 550D camera. We named this merged dataset as MultiCam dataset. The validation of the generalization abilities of our models was carried out using the leave-one-out cross validation on the MultiCam dataset. Specifically speaking, in each training-validation experiment, we used the images from 10 out of 11 camera models as the training data and computed statistics on the images from the left-out camera model. By repeating this procedure 11 times and calculating the arithmetic mean, final inter-camera illuminant estimation accuracy was obtained.

Since different photosensors record quite distinct responses given the same incident stimulus, it is necessary to pre-process the raw images from different camera models such that all the training images are in a common “calibrated” color space. We accomplished this by converting raw images (black levels subtracted) from camera color spaces into the standard linear sRGB color space using $3 \times 3$ color correction matrices provided by Dcraw [45]. Since the channel sensitivity scaling coefficients have already been involved in the color correction matrices, the ground truths of illuminant colors should be adjusted accordingly to fit the calibrated images.

To address the problem that the amount of training data were too small, especially for intra-camera experiments, to train overfitting-free models, we performed data augmentation by randomly cropping square sub-images from the original full-resolution images and rotating it with a random degree between $-10^\circ$ to $10^\circ$. Depending on the original image sizes, the crops had sizes from $256 \times 256$ to $768 \times 768$. Before being fed into a network, all sub-images would be resized to $224 \times 224$. Besides, to make our networks more robust to unseen scenes, given each sub-image, we intentionally added a small random bias with 50% probability to the illuminant color. The bias was restricted not to be greater than $5^\circ$ in angular error, and not to deviate from the ground-truth over 0.006 unit of $D_{uv}$.

4.4 Implementation details

The proposed networks were implemented in TensorFlow [48]. Nadam [49] was employed as the optimizer with a base learning rate of $5 \times 10^{-5}$. When plateaus detected, the learning rate would be decreased by 10%. We also included dropout [50] with probability of 0.2 for the fully-connected layers.

For a network with the confidence estimation branch, we trained the naive network first, then froze all its parameters and added the confidence branch to it. The hyperparameter $\lambda$ in (12) was initialized such that the task loss $L_t$ and the balanced regularization loss $\lambda L_r$ were of the same orders of magnitudes. In practice, we used $\lambda_0 = L_{t0}/L_{r0}$, where $L_{t0}$ and $L_{r0}$ were errors on the training set as per (9) and (11) by choosing $c = 0.5$. Following [35], we introduced a budget hyperparameter $\beta$ and allowed $\lambda$ to fluctuate within $(1 \pm 20\%) \lambda_0$ between iterations to prevent the unwished converges of $c$: if $L_r > \beta$ then increased $\lambda$ (i.e., make it more expensive to ask for “hints”), and if $L_r < \beta$ then decreased $\lambda$ (i.e., make it more tolerant to produce small confidences). The budget $\beta$ was empirically set to 0.6. We observed that the selections of $\lambda_0$ and $\beta$ had no significant impact on the performance of final model.

In the validation phase, we sampled 12 square sub-images from a $4 \times 3$ grid on the full-resolution image and resized each of them to $224 \times 224$ (some full-resolution images would have unused margins if their aspect ratios are not $4:3$). For a naive network with illuminant estimation branch only, we inferred the global estimate by simply calculating the median over all local estimates. For a network with the confidence estimation branch, we used the normalized confidence scores as weights to aggregate local estimates:

$$\hat{L}_{global} = \sum_{i} \frac{\hat{c}_i \cdot L_{local,i}}{\sum_i \hat{c}_i}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

$D_{uv}$ was calculated after converting device-dependent illuminant RGB into the CIE 1960 UCS [46]. We imposed this constraint to guarantee that the generated illuminant color would locate at a new point orthogonal to the iso-temperature line joining the ground truth, which was close to the practical illuminating situations. 0.006 is an empirical threshold that determines how far a “white light” is allowed to deviate from the Planckian locus as per [47].
Table 2: The number of model parameters and operations (multiply-adds) in one forward propagation, assuming the input image has fixed size of 224×224.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>#Param.</th>
<th>#Ops.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS-Net [51]</td>
<td>≈17.3M</td>
<td>≈6.0×10^{10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic CC [15]</td>
<td>≈13.9M</td>
<td>≈4.1×10^{9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC4 (AlexNet) [13]</td>
<td>≈3.8M</td>
<td>≈4.8×10^{9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Outdoor CC [52]</td>
<td>≈3.7M</td>
<td>≈2.3×10^{9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>7.6K</td>
<td>5.9×10^{7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>13.0K</td>
<td>5.9×10^{7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>32.7K</td>
<td>1.9×10^{8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>52.7K</td>
<td>1.9×10^{8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>112.6K</td>
<td>4.7×10^{8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>189.4K</td>
<td>4.7×10^{8}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DS-Net accepts 44×44 patches in the original paper. Enlarging the size of input will exponentially increase the amounts of operations for DS-Net. Nonetheless, to keep the comparison fair we fixed the sizes of inputs for all methods.

If an image produced confidence scores smaller than 0.5 for all the sub-images, naive aggregation method (calculating the median) would be used as the fallback.

Sub-images containing calibration targets (ColorChecker or SpyderCube) would be automatically excluded for both training and validation.

We also present the analysis with respect to the space and time complexities for the proposed networks and some CNN-based models, as listed in Table 2. The results suggest that the proposed models are lightweight with lower computational and storage budgets compared to prior CNN-based models. When running the 3-Hierarchy model on a PC with Nvidia 1080-Ti GPU, the average inference time is 48ms/image.

5 Results

5.1 Intra-camera accuracy

Intra-camera estimation accuracy was individually evaluated on 10 camera models from the ColorChecker RECOMMENDED and NUS-8 Camera datasets, and the results were reported by calculating the geometric means over all camera models from the same dataset. Tables 3 and 4 list the illuminant estimation accuracies of our models and prior mainstream algorithms. Following previous work, several standard metrics were reported in terms of angular error in degrees: mean, median, trimean, mean of the best quarter (best 25%), and mean of the worst quarter (worst 25%). It should be noted that according to [41], accuracies on the ColorChecker dataset presented in different papers are uncomparable because this dataset has at least 3 different sets of ground-truths. Therefore, we created Table 3 herein only for qualitative comparison purpose.

It is worth mentioning that with the confidence estimation branch, noticeable improvements are observed for the worst 25% metrics on both datasets, which indicates that the confidence estimation branch provides useful information for the local estimates aggregation and makes the model more robust to the estimation ambiguities in the hard cases.

5.2 Inter-camera accuracy

We evaluated inter-camera estimation accuracy on the MultiCam dataset using leave-one-out cross validation. Table 5 lists the comparison of the proposed models with other algorithms, in which all the metrics for the learning-based algorithms (with asterisk superscripts) were obtained by calculating arithmetic means over all rounds of the leave-one-out cross validations as discussed in subsection 4.3.

Significant performance degradation can be observed in Table 5 compared to the intra-camera results reported in the previous subsection, especially for the learning-based models. We reckon that the image character differences among camera models are the major cause of the degradation. Although color correction matrices had been applied to the
Table 3: Intra-camera illuminant color estimation accuracy (in degree) on the ColorChecker dataset [41, 42].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Med.</th>
<th>Tri.</th>
<th>Best 25%</th>
<th>Worst 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st-order Gray-Edge [6]</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shades-of-Gray [53]</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayesian [54]</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatio-spectral Statistics [55]</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixels-based Gamut [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianco CNN [12]</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng et al. 2015 [11]</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC [56]</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-Net [51]</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC4 (SqueezeNet) [13]</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFCC (model Q) [24]</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Intra-camera illuminant color estimation accuracy (in degree) on the NUS-8 Camera dataset [20].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Med.</th>
<th>Tri.</th>
<th>Best 25%</th>
<th>Worst 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pixel-based Gamut [9]</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayesian [54]</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shades-of-Gray [53]</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-order Gray-Edge [6]</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatio-spectral Statistics [55]</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng et al. 2014 [20]</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-Net [51]</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC [56]</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SqueezeNet-FC4 [13]</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng et al. 2015 [11]</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFCC (model Q) [24]</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, with conf. est.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raw images, other device-dependent characters, e.g., camera linearities, dynamic ranges, saturation preferences, still remained in the converted images, which introduced test noise and made the model challenging to converge.
Table 5: Inter-camera illuminant color estimation accuracy (in degree) on the MultiCam dataset. For the learning-based algorithms (with asterisks), the results were obtained by calculating arithmetic means over all rounds of the cross validation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Med.</th>
<th>Tri.</th>
<th>Best 25%</th>
<th>Worst 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatio-spectral Statistics* [55]</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Patch [1]</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shades-of-Gray [53]</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayesian* [54]</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-order Gray-Edge [6]</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianco CNN* [12]</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFCC (model Q)* [24]</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SqueezeNet-FC4* [13]</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.*</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 1-Hierarchy, with conf. est.*</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.*</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 2-Hierarchy, with conf. est.*</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, w/o conf. est.*</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours, 3-Hierarchy, with conf. est.*</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 presents some exemplars to visualize how the ReWUs work and what it has learned. As expected, the ReWU connected to the input images highlights achromatic pixels with moderate brightness (subfigures a and f), the surfaces with specularities (subfigures g and h), as well as some memory colors with high frequency of occurrences like skin tone (subfigures a–c) and green of the plants (subfigures d, e, and i). In the other hand, the ReWU also suppresses
those eccentric colors that may lead to the prejudicial decisions for the illuminant estimation, for example, the red paint on the wall (subfigure b), the orange on the peppers (subfigure i), the navy blue on the roadster (subfigure j), and the scarlet on the pillar box (subfigure k). The great interpretability of the ReWU makes it possible to serve as a guidance for designing statistics-based methods, especially for those low-end devices that do not have sufficient computational capacity to run CNN-based models.

To investigate how the confidence estimation branch helps to improve the reliability of local estimates aggregation, we draw a scatterplot of the angular errors of local estimates with respect to the confidence scores for all sub-images in the MultiCam dataset, as shown in Fig. 6. As expected, the confidence estimation branch has successfully learned to assign high confidence scores for images that can be accurately estimated, and low scores for those that are prone to be erroneously estimated. Furthermore, we sorted all the sub-images in the validation set by their confidence scores and surprisingly found that decision-making behavior of the confidence estimation branch was very similar to human’s color constancy mechanisms: when the scenes contained valuable clues for estimating illuminant color, e.g., objects with memory colors and/or recognizable patterns, the network became more confident about its estimates; nevertheless, when the objects and/or colors in the scenes were difficult to identify, the network appeared ambiguous about its decisions and thus produced low confidence scores. Figure 7 demonstrates some typical sub-images from the validation set with different levels of uncertainties, in which scenes containing frequently-occurring objects (lawns, neutral surfaces, brick roofs, etc.) are categorized as “strongly confident to estimate”, and scenes with vague patterns (pseudo-neutral objects, single-color surfaces, etc.) are categorized as “unconfident to estimate”.

6 Conclusion

A novel illuminant color estimation framework is proposed to exploit useful cues from feature maps in an efficient and interpretable way. To quantify the confidences of local illuminant estimates, an uncertainty prediction branch is included, upon which more flexible decisions can be made to determine the illuminant color. Experimental results indicate that the proposed framework achieves comparative performance with other high-level models for most of metrics, with a more compact model size and lower computational burden, making it suitable for applications deployed on mobile platforms. In addition to being employed for computational color constancy, the image feature reweight unit also has great potential for other color-relevant applications such as fine-grained classification and image semantic segmentation.

Appendix: Proof of Equation (17)

For the sake of briefness, let $X$ and $Y$ be the random variables of values in the channel axes of $CN(g \ast M)$ and $\min(CN(g \ast M))$, respectively.
By definition, the distribution function for $Y$ is calculated as
\begin{equation}
F(y) = P(Y \leq y) = 1 - P(Y > y) = 1 - P\left( \min(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_K) > y \right),
\end{equation}
where the subscripts are channel indices, $K$ is the number of channels in $CN(g \ast M)$. Since all values in $X$ are i.i.d., we have
\begin{equation}
F(y) = 1 - P(X_1 > y)P(X_2 > y) \ldots P(X_K > y) = 1 - P(X_1 > y)^K.
\end{equation}
According to the definition of the channel normalization in (14), $X$ approximately follows the standard normal distribution, which yields
\begin{equation}
P(X_1 > y) = 1 - P(X_1 \leq y) = 1 - \Phi(y; 0, 1),
\end{equation}
where $\Phi(y; 0, 1)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Therefore,
\begin{equation}
F(y) = 1 - P(X_1 > y)^K = 1 - (1 - \Phi(y; 0, 1))^K.
\end{equation}
The expectation of $\min(CN(g \ast M))$ can be calculated as
\begin{equation}
E[\min(CN(g \ast M))] = E[Y] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y f(y) \, dy = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y F'(y) \, dy = K \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y \varphi(y; 0, 1) (1 - \Phi(y; 0, 1))^{K-1} \, dy,
\end{equation}
where $\varphi(y; 0, 1)$ is the probability density function of the standard normal distribution.
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