

Kanade–Lucas–Tomasi Tracking (KLT tracker)

Tomáš Svoboda, svoboda@cmp.felk.cvut.cz

Czech Technical University in Prague, Center for Machine Perception


<http://cmp.felk.cvut.cz>

Last update: January 5, 2010

Talk Outline

- ♦ importance for Computer Vision
- ♦ gradient based optimization
- ♦ good features to track
- ♦ experiments

Importance in Computer Vision







- ♦ Firstly published in 1981 as an image registration method [3].
- ♦ Improved many times, most importantly by Carlo Tomasi [5, 4]
- ♦ Free implementation(s) [available](#)¹.
- ♦ After more than two decades, a [project](#)² at CMU dedicated to this single algorithm and results published in a premium journal [1].
- ♦ Part of plethora computer vision algorithms.

¹<http://www.ces.clemson.edu/~stb/klt/>

²http://www.ri.cmu.edu/projects/project_515.html

Tracking of dense sequences — camera motion





Alignment of an image (patch)



Goal is to align a template image $T(\mathbf{x})$ to an input image $I(\mathbf{x})$. \mathbf{x} column vector containing image coordinates $[x, y]^T$. The $I(\mathbf{x})$ could be also a small subwindow withing an image.

On-line demo.

Original Lucas-Kanade algorithm I

Goal is to align a template image $T(\mathbf{x})$ to an input image $I(\mathbf{x})$. \mathbf{x} column vector containing image coordinates $[x, y]^T$. The $I(\mathbf{x})$ could be also a small subwindow withing an image.

Set of allowable **warps** $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})$, where \mathbf{p} is a vector of parameters. For translations

$$\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} x + p_1 \\ y + p_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})$ can be arbitrarily complex

The best **alignment**, \mathbf{p}^* , minimizes image dissimilarity

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} [I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

Original Lucas-Kanade algorithm II



$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} [I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

is a **nonlinear** optimization! The warp $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})$ may be linear but the pixels value are, in general, non-linear. In fact, they are essentially unrelated to \mathbf{x} .

It is assumed that some \mathbf{p} is known and best increment $\Delta \mathbf{p}$ is sought. The the modified problem

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} [I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p} + \Delta \mathbf{p})) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

is solved with respect to $\Delta \mathbf{p}$. When found then \mathbf{p} gets updated

$$\mathbf{p} \leftarrow \mathbf{p} + \Delta \mathbf{p}$$

Original Lucas-Kanade algorithm III



$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} [I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p} + \Delta \mathbf{p})) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

linearized by performing first order Taylor expansion³

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} [I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})) + \nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \Delta \mathbf{p} - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

$\nabla I = [\frac{\partial I}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial I}{\partial y}]$ is the **gradient** image⁴ computed at $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})$. The term $\frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}}$ is the **Jacobian** of the warp.

³Detailed explanation on the blackboard.

⁴As a vector it should have been a column wise oriented. However, for sake of clarity of equations row vector is exceptionally considered here.

Original Lucas-Kanade algorithm IV



Derive

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} [I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})) + \nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \Delta \mathbf{p} - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

with respect to $\Delta \mathbf{p}$

$$2 \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^{\top} \left[I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})) + \nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \Delta \mathbf{p} - T(\mathbf{x}) \right]$$


setting equality to zero yields

$$\Delta \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{H}^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^{\top} [T(\mathbf{x}) - I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p}))]$$

where \mathbf{H} is product of first derivatives

$$\mathbf{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^{\top} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]$$

The Lucas-Kanade algorithm—Summary





Iterate:



1. Warp I with $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})$
2. Warp the gradient ∇I with $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})$
3. Evaluate the Jacobian $\frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}}$ at $(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p})$ and compute the steepest descent image $\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}}$
4. Compute the $\mathbf{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^T \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]$
5. Compute $\Delta \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{H}^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^T [T(\mathbf{x}) - I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p}))]$
6. Update the parameters $\mathbf{p} \leftarrow \mathbf{p} + \Delta \mathbf{p}$


until $\|\Delta \mathbf{p}\| \leq \epsilon$

Example of convergence



Example of convergence





What are good features (windows) to track?

How to select good templates $T(\mathbf{x})$ for image registration, object tracking.

$$\Delta \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{H}^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^T [T(\mathbf{x}) - I(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p}))]$$

where \mathbf{H} is the matrix

$$\mathbf{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^T \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]$$

The stability of the iteration is mainly influenced by the inverse of Hessian. We can study its eigenvalues. Consequently, the criterion of a good feature window is $\min(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) > \lambda_{min}$ (texturedness).

What are good features (windows) to track?

Consider translation $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} x + p_1 \\ y + p_2 \end{bmatrix}$. The Jacobian is then

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right]^T \left[\nabla I \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial I}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial I}{\partial y} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial I}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial I}{\partial y} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \begin{bmatrix} \left(\frac{\partial I}{\partial x} \right)^2 & \frac{\partial I}{\partial x} \frac{\partial I}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial I}{\partial x} \frac{\partial I}{\partial y} & \left(\frac{\partial I}{\partial y} \right)^2 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The image windows with varying derivatives in both directions. Homogeneous areas are clearly not suitable. Texture oriented mostly in one direction only would cause instability for this translation.

What are the good points for translations?


The matrix

$$H = \sum_x \begin{bmatrix} \left(\frac{\partial I}{\partial x}\right)^2 & \frac{\partial I}{\partial x} \frac{\partial I}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial I}{\partial x} \frac{\partial I}{\partial y} & \left(\frac{\partial I}{\partial y}\right)^2 \end{bmatrix}$$


Should have large eigenvalues. We have seen the matrix already, where?


Harris corner detector [2]! The matrix is sometimes called Harris matrix.

Experiments - no occlusions



Experiments - occlusions





Experiments - object motion



References

- [1] Simon Baker and Iain Matthews. Lucas-Kanade 20 years on: A unifying framework. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 56(3):221–255, 2004.
- [2] C. Harris and M. Stephen. A combined corner and edge detection. In M. M. Matthews, editor, *Proceedings of the 4th ALVEY vision conference*, pages 147–151, University of Manchester, England, September 1988. on-line copies available on the web.
- [3] Bruce D. Lucas and Takeo Kanade. An iterative image registration technique with an application to stereo vision. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 674–679, August 1981.
- [4] Jianbo Shi and Carlo Tomasi. Good features to track. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 593–600, 1994.
- [5] Carlo Tomasi and Takeo Kanade. Detection and tracking of point features. Technical Report CMU-CS-91-132, Carnegie Mellon University, April 1991.

End

