Learned Multi-Patch Similarity

Supplementary material for "Learned Multi-Patch Similarity"

Wilfried Hartmann[1]   Silvano Galliani[1]   Michal Havlena[2]
Luc Van Gool[3,4]   Konrad Schindler[1]

[1]Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, ETH Zurich, Switzerland
[2]Vuforia, PTC, Vienna, Austria
[3]CVL, ETH Zurich, Switzerland   [4]PSI, KU Leuven, Belgium

Qualitative Results - DTU Evaluation   The qualitative results on the DTU dataset are presented in (Fig. 4) in the submitted paper. There the difference to ground truth depth maps are shown for three out of six methods. In (Fig. 1) the results for the remaining three methods are shown.

The methods SAD and SIFT perform different on the CAN dataset compared to the ZNCC and LIFT results. SAD has difficulties with the homogeneous can surface. For SIFT there are more correct depth estimates on the homogeneous can surface when comparing to LIFT. For the other three datasets there are no large differences seen when comparing the two proposed methods, ZNCC with SAD and LIFT with SIFT.


Figure 1. Plane sweeping using three different patch similarity measures. Proposed learned multi-view similarity with concatenation layer *vs*. pairwise SAD and pairwise SIFT. (a) - (d) difference from ground truth, proposed. (e) - (h) difference from ground truth, SAD. (i) - (l) difference from ground truth, SIFT.