Learning Representations for Automatic Colorization

Experiment Presentation - 09/21/16 Tushar Nagarajan

Introduction

Colorization



Larsson et al. (2016)

Previous attempts: Transfer, Scribble



Levin et al. (2004)



Wesch et al. (2002)





Why HSL?

Thinkstock

Predict the color histogram for each pixel

Representing a pixel - Image hypercolumn interpolate conv2 conv1





Larsson et al. (2016)

Image hypercolumn features : pre-trained VGG



Image hypercolumn features : pre-trained VGG



Larsson et al. (2016)

Why just two predictions?



Lightness information already present

$$L = \frac{R + B + G}{3}$$

$$\widetilde{H} = \frac{B - \frac{1}{2}(R + G)}{L + \epsilon}$$

$$\widetilde{S} = \frac{R - G}{L + \epsilon}$$

Results







Larsson et al. (2016) Demo: http://colorize.ttic.edu/

Results



Why is this important?

Larsson et al. (2016)

Experiment

Experiment - Foreground Consistency



Photo credit: Peter Zelewski

Not the best colorization we've seen...





Source of inconsistency?



Input: Grayscale Image



























- Averaged over 15 models
- Errors for 64 backgrounds





Background class 1





Qualitative Analysis



Qualitative Analysis



Qualitative Analysis



Do colorization errors in the background trickle down to the foreground?

Ans: Not too much, sorry.

R = 0.414



Summary

- Background coloring influences foreground coloring to some extent

- Hypercolumn features = extra background information

- Low L scenes contribute less to the top of the hypercolumn than the foreground?

Demo

http://colorize.ttic.edu/

Thank you