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A B S T R A C T

Intrinsic image decomposition is the decomposition of an image into its reflectance and shading components. The intrinsic image decomposition problem is inherently ill-posed, since there can be multiple solutions to compute the intrinsic components forming the same image. In this paper, we explore the use of physics-based priors. We also propose a new architecture that separates the learning components in a stacked manner. We explore various ways of integrating such priors into a deep learning system. Our method is trained and tested on a large synthetic garden dataset to assess its performance. It is evaluated and compared to state-of-the-art methods using two standard intrinsic datasets. Finally, the pre-trained network is tested on real world images to show the generalisation capabilities of the network.

1. Introduction

Intrinsic Image Decomposition (IID), under the Lambertian assumption, is the decomposition of an image (I) into its constituent Reflectance (R) and Shading (S) images (Barrow and Tenenbaum, 1978). Reflectance is independent of the lighting conditions and corresponds to the colour of the object. Shading is a function of the object’s geometry and lighting conditions. IID is beneficial for different computer vision applications, for example, shading cues helps to recover the shape of an object (Wada et al., 1995), while reflectance cues allow for object material editing (Ye et al., 2014; Meka et al., 2016; Beigpour and van de Weijer, 2011) and semantic segmentation (Baslamisli et al., 2018a).

For a given I, there can be different combinations of R and S. Therefore, IID is considered as an under-constrained problem. Early IID methods use various constraints like depth and geometry cues (Barron and Malik, 2015; Gehler et al., 2011; Shen et al., 2006). These constraints are usually derived from the image formation model. For example, the Retinex model (Land and McCann, 1971) defines IID components in terms of gradients. Reflectance is attributed to stronger gradient changes and shading to weaker gradient changes. Similarly, Barron and Malik (2015) defines reflectance as a piece-wise constant image containing a limited colour palette. Based on a general reflection model, these methods are quite robust at generalisation and are not dataset biased. However, these physics-based methods are less effective for scenes containing complex illumination conditions.

Recently, deep learning-based methods (Narihira et al., 2015; Li and Snavely, 2018; Fan et al., 2018; Bell et al., 2014) are proposed to compute IID in data-driven way. For example, Li and Snavely (2018) use multiple datasets to solve the IID problem in an end-to-end deep learning way. These methods show robust performance in decomposing scenes containing complex illumination cues. However, a drawback is that these methods are purely data-driven, and dataset biased. As a result, they do not generalise well to scenes that are different than the scenes used in the training set.

The two classes of approaches to compute the IID have different sources of weaknesses and may not necessarily offer a complete framework by themselves. However, their combination could provide a more robust and complete strategy. Therefore, we propose a new integrated approach to compute IID by leveraging the best of two worlds. We propose (generalised) physics-based cues to steer a (data-driven) CNN model by an integrated IID processing pipeline.

To steer our data-driven CNN pipeline, the physics-based cues are derived from illumination and geometry invariants namely (1) Colour Ratios (Finlayson, 1992) (CR), and (2) Cross Colour Ratios (Gevers and Smeulders, 1999) (CCR). The aim is to compute an invariant representation as an early stage of the pipeline using CCR and CR defining the surface albedo and shading cues respectively.

An overview of the proposed network is given in Fig. 1. The model uses an invariant representation to steer the (data-driven) CNN model by an integrated IID processing pipeline. The invariant representation...
The resulting features are concatenated and decoded into a reflectance image. The reflectance and \( C_R \) mony, are then used to optimise the reflectance. Sheng et al. (2020) proposes the Retinex algorithm where stronger gradients are used to model the reflectance–shading inter-dependency where the shading reflects the reflectance and vice versa. Therefore, a stacked approach is proposed to model the reflectance–shading inter-dependency where the shading stack exploits reflectance cues as priors.

An important characteristic of the IID problem is the inter-dependency between the reflectance and shading components. For deep learning-based models this by simultaneously learning the components (Narihira et al., 2015; Shi et al., 2017), thus relying on the simultaneous forward and backward propagation to learn the inter-dependency. However, this may lead to artefacts, like shading leakages in the reflectance and vice versa. Therefore, a stacked approach is proposed to model the reflectance–shading inter-dependency where the shading stack exploits reflectance cues as priors.

The proposed method is trained on the NED (Baslamisli et al., 2018a) synthetic dataset. The trained model is then tested on different IID datasets including the MIT (Grosse et al., 2009) and Sintel (Butler et al., 2012) datasets. In addition, we provide qualitative evaluations on real-world datasets such as NYU (Silberman et al., 2012) and Trimbot outdoor garden (Sattler et al., 2017) dataset. Our approach is compared to state-of-the-art methods in terms of usual IID metrics and generalisation capabilities.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose (generalised) physics-based cues to steer a (data-driven) CNN model by an integrated IID processing pipeline.
- A stacked approach is used to exploit reflectance cues for shading computation based on the imaging formation process, i.e. separating the intrinsic components for the learning phase is beneficial. The proposed method is able to cope with the dataset bias problem and has generalisation capacity to unseen domains.

2. Related work

**Physics based:** The image formation model is used to address the problem of IID. The landmark work by Land and McCann (1971) proposes the Retinex algorithm where stronger gradients are used to identify reflectance changes. Funt et al. (1992) extends this principle to colour images. Barron and Malik (2015) explores component specific properties by introducing physics-based constraints. A smoothness prior is added to the shading image to compute a rough depth map. Reflectance specific constraints like piece-wise constancy and parsimony, are then used to optimise the reflectance. Sheng et al. (2020) extends the shading constraints to compensate for shading changes. Chen and Koltun (2013) directly breaks down the shading component into the physical interaction of object geometry and light. Li et al. (2021a) uses RGB-D images coupled with a sparsity regularisation term to obtain IID components. However, the above methods are often designed for single objects or need specialised hardware for the additional input. Moreover, they may fail for scenes with complex imaging conditions (e.g. scenes containing unusual illumination and reflectance properties).

**Learning based:** With the introduction of large datasets for the IID problem (Chang et al., 2015; Li and Snavely, 2018; Butler et al., 2012; Li et al., 2021b), various learning based methods are proposed. Narihira et al. (2015) employs an end-to-end CNN to parameterise the IID problem. Shi et al. (2017) extends it by enforcing inter-dependence between the intrinsic components. Baslamisli et al. (2018b) uses a deep learning approximation of the Retinex algorithm, by learning in the gradients domain with a CNN model. The above-mentioned datasets are synthetic and do not always model the image formation complexities of real-world scenes. Bonneel et al. (2014) introduces a human-in-the-loop approach to address this. This is further explored to generate sparse crowd sourced reflectance and shading annotations (Bell et al., 2014; Kovacs et al., 2017; Narihira et al., 2015). Zhou et al. (2015) uses these sparse annotations to steer the proposed network. Li and Snavely (2018) makes use of both synthetic and real-world datasets and multiple losses to learn the IID problem. On the other hand, edge maps are used as guidance priors to enforce piece-wise smooth reflectance (Fan et al., 2018), while Zhu et al. (2021) uses images rendered by game engines for training on outdoor scenes. Cheng et al. (2018) explores different scale space properties. Shetlsamer et al. (2015) and Kim et al. (2016) include depth in their formulation in a joint learning manner. Luo et al. (2020) uses surface normal information to cope with illumination for indoor images. Baslamisli et al. (2018a) uses semantic segmentation to jointly learn intrinsic image decomposition. Sengupta et al. (2019) also introduces an inverse rendering network that decomposes an input into its albedo, normals and illumination. However, these fully data-driven methods are dataset biased and hence will come up short to generalise well to unseen data.

The two classes of IID approaches both have their weaknesses: (1) physics-based methods may fail short in performing well in realistic environments and (2) (data-driven) CNN models may suffer from the dataset bias problem. Therefore, we propose a combined approach to compute the IID. Our method uses the strength of one approach to cope with the weakness of the other approach. To this end, our method uses a (generalised) invariant representation derived from general physics modelling to steer the (data-driven) CNN model which can cope with erroneous invariant values caused by complex scenes.
3. Methodology

3.1. Image formation

Under the Lambertian assumption of diffuse image formation (Shafer, 1985), we have:

\[ I = m(\vec{n}, \vec{l}) \int \rho(\lambda) \epsilon(\lambda) f(\lambda) \, d\lambda, \quad (1) \]

where, \( I \) is the captured image, \( \lambda \) is the incoming light wavelength within the visible spectrum \( \omega \), \( m \) is a function of geometry of the object and lighting, \( \vec{n} \) denotes surface normal and \( \vec{l} \) denotes the light source direction, \( f \) indicates the spectral camera sensitivity and \( \epsilon \) describes the spectral power distribution of the light source. \( \rho \) denotes reflectance and is related to the colour of the object. Assuming a linear sensor response, a narrow band filter and a single (white) light source, Eq. (1) can be simplified to:

\[ I = S \times R, \quad (2) \]

where \( R \) is the reflectance image, the (albedo) colour of the object, and \( S \) is the illumination component associated with geometry and illumination. Obviously, Eq. (2) can have multiple solutions for the same \( I \) value.

3.2. Physics-based invariants

In this paper, (generalised) invariant representations are used to condition the ID process.

Colour Ratios: Finlayson (1992) introduces Colour Ratios (CR), which are illuminant invariant edge descriptors. Consider two neighbouring pixels, \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \), in a RGB image coming from a flat surface with a locally constant light source:

\[ e'(\vec{x}_1) = e'(\vec{x}_2) \quad (3) \]

where, \( e'(x) \) is the spectral power distribution function of the illumination for colour channel \( c \) and pixel \( x \). Assuming the same light source is justifiable for (adjacent) neighbouring pixels. Then, CR is defined by:

\[ MC_R = \frac{R_{x_1}}{R_{x_2}}, \quad MC_G = \frac{G_{x_1}}{G_{x_2}}, \quad MC_B = \frac{B_{x_1}}{B_{x_2}}. \quad (4) \]

where \( MC_R, MC_G, MC_B \) are Colour Ratios for \( R, \) \( G \) and \( B \) channels respectively. \( \{R_{x_1}, R_{x_2}\}, \{G_{x_1}, G_{x_2}\} \) and \( \{B_{x_1}, B_{x_2}\} \) are neighbouring pixels. Taking the logarithm of Eq. (4) results in:

\[ \log(MC_R) = \log(R_{x_1}) - \log(R_{x_2}), \quad \log(MC_G) = \log(G_{x_1}) - \log(G_{x_2}), \quad \log(MC_B) = \log(B_{x_1}) - \log(B_{x_2}). \quad (5) \]

Expanding \( R_{x_1} \), with Eq. (1), gives:

\[ R_{x_1} = m(\vec{n}, \vec{l}) e^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)} \rho^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)}. \quad (6) \]

Substituting Eq. (6) in Eq. (5), results in:

\[ \log(MC_R) = \log(R_{x_1}) - \log(R_{x_2}), \quad = \log(m(n_{x_1}^e \vec{l}_{x_1}) e^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)} + \log(\rho^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)})), \quad = \log(m(n_{x_1}^e \vec{l}_{x_1}) e^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)} - \log(\rho^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)})), \quad = \log(\rho^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)}) - \log(\rho^{R_{n_2}(\lambda)})), \quad (7) \]

where \( \vec{l}_{x_1}^e = \vec{l}_{x_2}^e \) and \( n_{x_1}^e = n_{x_2}^e \) assuming a white light source and a flat surface, respectively. Finally, \( e^{R_{n_1}} = e^{R_{n_2}} \) from Eq. (3). The same argument holds for the other channels.

Cross Colour Ratios: The assumption of flat surfaces limits the applicability of the descriptors. Gevers and Smeulder (1999) introduces Cross Colour Ratios (CCR) that are independent of both illumination and object geometry:

\[ M_1 = \frac{R_{x_1} G_{x_2}}{R_{x_1} G_{x_1}}, \quad M_2 = \frac{R_{x_2} B_{x_1}}{R_{x_2} B_{x_2}}, \quad M_3 = \frac{G_{x_1} B_{x_2}}{G_{x_2} B_{x_1}}. \quad (8) \]

where \( M_1, M_2, M_3 \) are CCR descriptors for \( (R, G), (R, B) \) and \( (G, B) \) channel pairs respectively. Taking the logarithm on both sides results in:

\[ \log(M_1) = \log(R_{x_1} G_{x_2}) - \log(R_{x_2} G_{x_1}), \quad (9) \]

Expanding Eq. (9) by Eq. (6) we get:

\[ \log(M_1) = \log(m(n_{x_1}^e \vec{l}_{x_1}) e^{R_{n_1}(\lambda)}), \quad (10) \]

Hence, for curved surfaces (i.e., \( n_{x_1}^e \neq n_{x_2}^e \)), the geometric and the illumination term are cancelled out. The resulting descriptor corresponds to a reflectance (albedo) indicator. The terms \( M_2 \) and \( M_3 \) can be similarly derived and are not shown for brevity.

For constant reflectance, the value of CCR is 1. The value changes for albedo changes i.e., reflectance transitions. Fig. 2 shows CR & CCR outputs. Both CR & CCR are calculated from the input RGB image. Note that the influence of geometry is discarded by the CCR computation and that edges resemble reflectance ground-truths. Conversely, the CR image preserves shading information. The mouth and nose are visible for the Sun (CR) image, while fold lines are visible for the paper (CR) image. (MC_R, MC_G, MC_B) and \( (M_1, M_2, M_3) \) are combined (3 channels) for CR and CCR visualisations, respectively. Images are gamma corrected.

3.3. Network architectures

The network takes a RGB image \( I \) as input. Using Eqs. (7) and (10), the CR invariants \( (CR) \) and CCR invariants \( (CCR) \) are obtained. \( I, CR \) and \( CCR \) are passed through separate encoders to obtain the encoded features for image \( (F_{img}) \), \( CCR \) \( (F_{crr}) \) and CR \( (F_{cr}) \) respectively. This allows the network to learn a rich feature representation for each of the individual descriptors. For example, \( F_{crr} \) corresponds to reflectance features, like illumination invariance and reflectance change.
obtain encoded reflectance features \( \mathbf{c}_r \). The predicted reflectance is passed through an encoder to reflectance features are exploited to over-constrain the shading decomposition, which penalises when reflectance and shading edges overlaps. The edge regularisation is defined by:

\[
E_R = \frac{1}{N} \sum ||r_c + s_c) - 1||
\]

where, \( r_c \) and \( s_c \) are the reflectance and shading edges, respectively and \( N \) is the number of edge pixels. \( E_R \) is the edge divergence regularisation, which penalises when reflectance and shading edges overlaps.

The network is optimised with Adam optimiser with a learning rate of \( 2e^{-4} \). The reflectance stack is trained separately for 250k iterations. Then, both the reflectance and shading stacks are trained for a total of 750k iterations. More details about the network architecture and losses can be found in the supplementary material.

3.4. Datasets

The proposed method is trained and assessed on the Natural Environment Dataset (NED) (Baslamisli et al., 2018a). The dataset consists of synthetic garden scenes. All scenes are rendered using the physics-based Blender’s Cycles Renderer. Ambient light is simulated using real HDR sky images. The dataset consists of around 32K images of which 25K images are used for training. The dataset contains around 40 different parks/gardens under 5 lighting conditions. Our network is also fine-tuned and evaluated on the MIT (Grosse et al., 2009) and Sintel (Butler et al., 2012) datasets. To test real-world performance, visual results on the NYU Dataset (Silberman et al., 2012) and the Trimbot dataset (Sattler et al., 2017) are provided. An ablation study on the influence of the different parts of the proposed method is provided in the supplementary material.

4. Experiments and results

4.1. Influence of physics-based cues for IID

In this experiment, the influence of CR and CCR for IID is assessed for two off-the-shelf networks. ShapeNet (Shi et al., 2017) is used to test an IID network and VGG19 (Simonyan and Zisserman, 2015) is taken to test a higher learning capacity network. VGG19 is configured as an encoder–decoder architecture for image-to-image translation. ShapeNet is based on a non-Lambertian assumption. Therefore, the network will learn reflectance and shading simultaneously. Since the reflectance cues will not be sufficiently converged for the network at the beginning, the reflectance prior for shading is not guaranteed to be correct.

An overview of the network is given in Fig. 1. Scale Invariant MSE losses (Shi et al., 2017) are used for reflectance, shading and reconstructed images to train the network. To further integrate the physical constraints, the CCR loss is used to train the reflectance. The reflectance prediction of the network is used to compute the CCR invariants, using Eq. (10). This is then compared with the CCR invariants obtained from the input RGB image. Since CCR is an illumination and geometry invariant descriptors, the CCR invariants obtained from the reflectance should match the CCR calculated from the input RGB, enforcing an explicit physics constraint.

Finally, the mutual exclusion of reflectance and shading edges is further exploited in the form of an edge divergence regularisation. Reflectance and shading edges are obtained from the network predictions using a Canny edge operator. The edges are thresholded to obtain a binary mask. These binary edges are used as a regularisation to the network, where the overlap between the reflectance and shading edges are minimised. This allows the network to learn a physical model which prevents shading leakages in the reflectance prediction and vice-versa. The edge regularisation is defined by:

\[
E_R = \frac{1}{N} \sum ||r_c + s_c) - 1||
\]

where, \( r_c \) and \( s_c \) are the reflectance and shading edges, respectively and \( N \) is the number of edge pixels. \( E_R \) is the edge divergence regularisation, which penalises when reflectance and shading edges overlaps.

The network is optimised with Adam optimiser with a learning rate of \( 2e^{-4} \). The reflectance stack is trained separately for 250k iterations. Then, both the reflectance and shading stacks are trained for a total of 750k iterations. More details about the network architecture and losses can be found in the supplementary material.
Table 1
Influence of physics-based cues for two off-the-shelf architectures. Adding CCR to the reflectance stack and CR to the shading stack yields better results. Using CCR and CR as loss, however degrades the performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditioning</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>LMSE</th>
<th>DSSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflectance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShapeNet</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.0910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>0.0800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.0792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR &amp; CR</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>0.0046</td>
<td>0.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGG</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.0579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR &amp; CR</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR Loss</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Loss</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0.0491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for both the components, and (4) with CCR as the prior for reflectance and CR for shading. Both networks are trained on the NED dataset using the same data split. Stacks are not included for the ShapeNet and VGG networks.

The proposed network, with the stacked learning, uses the VGG backbone. The quantitative results are presented in Table 1. It is shown that adding physics-based invariant priors to existing architectures improves the performance, regardless of the underlying architecture. The additional modifications of the priors are simple copies of the encoder blocks. However, using CR and CCR only as a loss instead of a prior, degrades the performance, even when the proposed stacked learning is used. Subsequently, enabling the stack with explicit physics constraints in the form of an invariant descriptor consistency loss and edge regularisation improves the performance. This shows not only the flexibility of the use of physics-based cues, but also the physics-based learning capability of the network. Additional details can be found in the supplementary material.

4.2. Comparison to state of the art

In this experiment, performance of the proposed method to different state-of-the-art methods is studied. The proposed method is trained on the NED (synthetic garden scenes) (Baslamisli et al., 2018a) dataset. Each epoch takes about 20 min for the first stack and 30 min for the full pipeline with the NED dataset, on a Nvidia RTX A6000 GPU.

MIT Intrinsics (real objects) (Grosse et al., 2009) and Sintel (synthetic animated scenes) (Butler et al., 2012) datasets are used to test the generalisation of the proposed method. For all methods, the train and test splits provided by the authors are used. All experimental settings are kept the same according to the respective publications.

4.2.1. Comparison on the NED dataset

Results are shown in Table 2. Qualitative results are shown in Fig. 5. Despite being trained on a single type of loss, the proposed method outperforms all baselines. Fig. 5 shows a better disentanglement of IIDs by the proposed method, while preserving fine details (e.g. the bush in the third row). The baselines miss fine details and generate blurry outputs. Additionally, shadow leakages are shown to be minimised (row 5, shadow at the base of the tree), which are misclassified as reflectance cues by the baselines.

4.2.2. Comparison on MIT and sintel

Numerical results are presented in Tables 3 and 4. MIT visuals are provided in Fig. 6. The results for Grosse et al. (2009), Barron and Malik (2015) and Gehler et al. (2011) are computed by the code provided by the authors. The results for Narhira et al. (2015), Shi et al. (2017), and Li and Snavely (2018) are obtained from Li and Snavely (2018).

Baslamisli et al. (2018b, 2020) are provided by the author. The missing values are due to the missing results in the original work.

The proposed method with finetuning is shown to outperform other baselines for almost all metrics. Fig. 6 shows better recovery of reflectance and shading patterns by the proposed method. The baselines may incorrectly classify shadows by reflectance cues. In the second row, the shadow on the frog’s mouth is missed by the baselines, while the proposed method can disentangle the IID components correctly. The fifth row demonstrates a challenging case for the turtle. The proposed method preserves texture while removing shadows. The baselines methods employ specialised loss functions and specific datasets. Our method is only trained on a synthetic garden dataset and a simple loss, showing that the (generalised) invariant representation and component separation is beneficial in modelling the image formation process.
Table 2
Comparison of the proposed method with state-of-the-art baselines for the NED dataset. The proposed method shows an improvement across all evaluation metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>LMSE</th>
<th>DSSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflectance</td>
<td>Shading</td>
<td>Reflectance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosse et al. (2009)</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.0193</td>
<td>0.1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell et al. (2014)</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narihira et al. (2015)</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi et al. (2017)</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li and Snively (2018)</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>0.0175</td>
<td>0.0447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baslamisli et al. (2018b)</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>0.0449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu and Smith (2019)</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.0505</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al. (2020)</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>0.0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Comparison of performance on the MIT dataset with current baselines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>LMSE</th>
<th>DSSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflectance</td>
<td>Shading</td>
<td>Reflectance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehler et al. (2011)</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron and Malik (2015)</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baslamisli et al. (2018b)</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.0304</td>
<td>0.0854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li and Snively (2018)</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>0.0319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu and Smith (2019)</td>
<td>0.0234</td>
<td>0.0186</td>
<td>0.0573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan et al. (2019)</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu et al. (2020)</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.0614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al. (2020)</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>0.0640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma et al. (2020)</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.0212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baslamisli et al. (2020)</td>
<td>0.0060</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed (MIT Finetuned)</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Numerical results for the Sintel dataset. The proposed method is finetuned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>LMSE</th>
<th>DSSIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflectance</td>
<td>Shading</td>
<td>Reflectance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retinex</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>0.0727</td>
<td>0.0366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee et al. (2012)</td>
<td>0.0465</td>
<td>0.0507</td>
<td>0.0224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron and Malik (2013)</td>
<td>0.0420</td>
<td>0.0436</td>
<td>0.0298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Koltn (2013)</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>0.0277</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narihira et al. (2015)</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan et al. (2018)</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Real world dataset evaluation

In this experiment, the generalisation capability of the network is tested. The proposed method is trained only on synthetic images. Since there are no dense ground truth annotations for these datasets, only the qualitative evaluations are shown. The datasets are real world gardens (Sattler et al., 2017) and indoor (Silberman et al., 2012) images. The results are shown in Figs. 7 & 8, respectively.

The proposed method can separate reflectance and shading for complex light and object interactions (Fig. 7). The cast shadows around bushes and trees are removed from reflectance images. The bushes, grass and the trees are shown to maintain more uniformity in reflectance predictions.

The proposed method trained and fine-tuned on only the synthetic dataset before it is applied to indoor images (NYU Dataset). Fig. 8 shows that it can recover reflectance and shadings. Predicted reflectance for the wall behind the toilet is flat (third row, fifth column). Similarly, the shadow under the sink is mostly removed (second row, fifth column). This shows that the proposed method has generalisation capabilities.

Some failure cases are shown in Fig. 9. For extreme cases like nearby light sources or specularities, the proposed method falls short to obtain the correct decomposition.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, the use of physics-based descriptors to constrain the problem of intrinsic image decomposition has been investigated.
Physics-based cues in the form of Colour Ratios and Cross Ratios have been explored. Inter-dependency of reflectance and shading have been exploited through a stacked approach. Component specific physics-based priors and stacked learning have shown to improve IID performance. Qualitative and quantitative improvement on two standard benchmark datasets were discussed. The network has shown to be able to cope well with dataset bias and generalise well by training on synthetic data and testing on real world, unseen images.

For future directions, stricter guidance from the illumination invariant descriptors could be integrated in the form of edges. Further, explicit edge guidance and attention could be used.
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