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## Introduction: Image Near-Duplicates

Near duplicate images in this work:

- Zoomed-in panorama with scale change
- Flipped or flipped sub-image
- Shifted image
- Rotated sub-image
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Approaches to detect the correlation between images

- Non-deterministic approaches: RANSAC, PROSAC, LMEDS
- Pro: low computing costs
- Contra: performance decreases when the false feature matches increase
- Deterministic approaches
- Pro: detect the false feature matches
- Contra: high computation costs, cannot detect all kinds of transformations
- Detect the correlation between two image
- When false feature matches more than $50 \%$ of total matches
- Too few feature matches are detected (lesser than six)
- Reduce the computation costs
- Split the feature matches into inliers and outliers
- Based on the correlated features (inliers) define the kind of transformation between near-duplicate images


## Proposed Approach: ECOTA

## Extended Congruent Triangles Approach:

## Extension of our previous approach COTA



## Proposed Approach:

## Extended Congruent Triangles Approach

In addition to edge in COTA we compute the gradient of edges


$$
\begin{gathered}
\varphi_{i j}=\tan 2\left(m_{i j}\right)=\tan 2\left(\frac{y_{j}-y_{i}}{x_{j}-x_{i}}\right) \quad \varphi_{i j}^{\prime}=\tan 2\left(m_{i j}^{\prime}\right)=\tan 2\left(\frac{y_{j}^{\prime}-y^{\prime}}{x_{j}^{\prime}-x_{i}^{\prime}}\right) \\
\left|\varphi_{i j}-\varphi_{i j}^{\prime}\right|<\vartheta
\end{gathered}
$$

## Proposed Approach: ECOTA

Extended Congruent Triangles Approach: Estimate rotation \& flipping

Rotation:

$$
\left|\varphi_{i j}-\varphi_{i j}^{\prime}\right|<\theta \pm \vartheta
$$

Flipping:

$$
\left|\varphi_{i j}-\varphi_{i j}^{\prime}\right|=0 \pm \vartheta \quad \text { or } \quad\left|\varphi_{i j}-\varphi_{i j}^{\prime}\right|=\pi \pm \vartheta
$$

| Time Complexity Employing various Keypoints |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Method | RANSAC | PROSAC | LMEDS | ECOTA |
| SIFT | 1.58 ms | 0.72 ms | 9.61 ms | $\mathbf{0 . 6 1} \mathbf{~ m s}$ |
| SURF | 1.59 ms | $\mathbf{0 . 5 2} \mathbf{~ m s}$ | 7.94 ms | 0.66 ms |
| BRISK | 2.63 ms | $\mathbf{0 . 6 2} \mathbf{~ m s}$ | 8.64 ms | 0.69 ms |

## Results/ Benchmarks

The performance of ECOTA is evaluated using the following settings:

- Five Datasets are used that contain images of different structures i.e. panoramas, paintings or aerial images (PANO, XOB, Aerial, PAIN, ATRANS)
- Query images are transformed images that are downscaled, rotated, flipped, shifted or cropped from the datasets



## Results/ Panorama Images

- Panorama benchmark: 20,000 sub-images of different scales and resolutions
- Three kinds of keypoints are utilized: SIFT, SURF and BRISK
- 200 queries (full panoramas)


## Comparison of RANSAC, PROSAC, LMEDS \&ECOTA

| Scale | Method | Detected Correlation |  |  |  | Localization Error |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | RANSAC | PROSAC | LMEDS | ECOTA | RANSAC | PROSAC | LMEDS | ECOTA |
| 100\% | SIFT | 83.74 | 83.71 | 81.91 | 99.92 | 0.0016 | 0.0016 | 0.0016 | 0.0013 |
|  | SURF | 96.75 | 95.52 | 96.67 | 98.20 | 0.0024 | 0.0020 | 0.0020 | 0.0018 |
|  | BRISK | 85.37 | 81.65 | 85.60 | 93.16 | 0.0028 | 0.0029 | 0.0028 | 0.0025 |
| 30\% | SIFT | 78.86 | 65.98 | 76.14 | 97.10 | 0.0033 | 0.0036 | 0.0031 | 0.0024 |
|  | SURF | 81.30 | 72.28 | 82.46 | 87.02 | 0.0040 | 0.0046 | 0.0038 | 0.0035 |
|  | BRISK | 69.75 | 59.30 | 67.44 | 75.58 | 0.0049 | 0.0057 | 0.0049 | 0.0045 |
| 200\% | SIFT | 84.55 | 83.53 | 80.96 | 99.96 | 0.0016 | 0.0016 | 0.0016 | 0.0013 |
|  | SURF | 81.30 | 96.83 | 97.38 | 98.38 | 0.0020 | 0.0019 | 0.0019 | 0.0018 |
|  | BRISK | 95.94 | 90.18 | 91.72 | 96.51 | 0.0027 | 0.0025 | 0.0024 | 0.0021 |

## Results: Discussion of Outliers Filtering

RANSAC, PROSAC, LMEDS fail in correlation detection, since there are too many outliers or too few feature matches
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ECOTA detects the correlation even only four matches are correct (green lines)

## Results: Qualitative Discussion

Localization of sub-images in whole scene using RANSAC (red), PROSAC (yellow), LMEDS (white) \& ECOTA (blue). The ground-truth is the Green box.
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Localization by all methods correct


Correct localization only by ECOTA


Wrong localization by all methods

- ECOTA applies the property of congruency triangles with gradient to classify features matching into correlating group (inliers) and non-correlating (outliers).
- ECOTA uses the correlating group of matched features to:
- Exclude the outliers of feature matches
- Define the non-relevant images in the list of retrieved images
- Describe the correlation between two images without any previous details about the content
- ECOTA reduces the computational time of correlation detection
- ECOTA outperforms RANSAC, PROSAC, LMEDS and COTA models in estimating and categorization image correlations
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