A Linear Extrinsic Calibration of Kaleidoscopic Imaging System from Single 3D Point
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Abstract

This paper proposes a new extrinsic calibration of kaleidoscopic imaging system by estimating normals and distances of the mirrors. The problem to be solved in this paper is a simultaneous estimation of all mirror parameters consistent throughout multiple reflections. Unlike conventional methods utilizing a pair of direct and mirrored images of a reference 3D object to estimate the parameters on a per-mirror basis, our method renders the simultaneous estimation problem into solving a linear set of equations. The key contribution of this paper is to introduce a linear estimation of multiple mirror parameters from kaleidoscopic 2D projections of a single 3D point of unknown geometry. Evaluations with synthesized and real images demonstrate the performance of the proposed algorithm in comparison with conventional methods.

1. Introduction

Virtual multiple-view system with planar mirrors is a practical approach to realize a multi-view capture of a target by synchronized cameras with an identical intrinsic parameter, and it has been widely used for 3D shape reconstruction by stereo [5, 6, 17], shape-from-silhouette [2, 9, 21], structured-lighting [13, 26], ToF [18], and also for reflectance analysis [10, 11, 25], for light-field imaging [3, 15, 23], etc.

This paper is aimed at proposing a new extrinsic calibration of kaleidoscopic system with planar mirrors to provide an accurate and robust estimate of the mirror geometry for such applications (Figure 1).

The problem addressed in this paper is to estimate all mirror parameters, i.e. their normals and the distances from the camera, consistent throughout multiple reflections simultaneously in a linear manner. While conventional methods utilize a reference object of known geometry to estimate the mirror parameters on a per-mirror basis, the proposed method provides a linear solution of the mirror parameters from kaleidoscopic projections of a single 3D point without knowing its 3D geometry beforehand.

The key idea is to utilize the 2D projections of multiple reflections to form a linear system on the mirror parameters. While the 3D positions of multiple reflections of a 3D point is defined as a nonlinear function of the mirror parameters as described later in Eq (6), their 2D projections can be used as a linear constraint on the mirror parameters.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews related studies on kaleidoscopic mirror calibrations. Section 3 defines the measurement model and Section 4 introduces a single mirror calibration algorithm from two pairs of projections based on the mirror-based binocular epipolar geometry [28]. Section 5 introduces our key contribution, a linear estimation of multiple mirror parameters from kaleidoscopic 2D projections of a single 3D point of unknown geometry. Section 6 evaluates the proposed method quantitatively and qualitatively in comparison with conventional methods, and Section 7 concludes the paper and outlines future work.

2. Related work

In the context of kaleidoscopic imaging, Ihrke et al. [10] and Reshetouski and Ihrke [19, 20] have proposed a theory on modeling the chamber detection, segmentation, bounce tracing, shape-from-silhouette, etc. In these studies, how-
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Figure 2: Measurement model. A 3D point $p$ is reflected to $p'$ by a mirror $\pi$ of normal $n$ and distance $d$, and they are projected to $q$ and $q'$ respectively.

However, the geometric calibration of the mirrors is simply achieved by detecting chessboards first [29], and then by estimating the mirror normals and the distances from chessboard 3D positions in the camera frame.

By considering kaleidoscopic imaging as a system of observing reflections of a single object via different mirrors, another possible approach is to utilize calibration techniques from such mirrored observations [8,12,16,22,24,27]. While their original motivation is to estimate the 3D structure from its indirect views via mirrors, they can be used for calibrating the kaleidoscopic system by supposing the direct view were not available. For example, the orthogonality constraint on mirrored 3D points proposed by [27] can be considered as another approach for kaleidoscopic system calibration in [10, 20].

These conventional calibration approaches utilize 3D positions of a reference object and its reflections. That is, they first recover the 3D pose of the reference object from each of the virtual views, and then compute the mirror parameters from their 3D positions. While the first step and the second step can be done linearly, 3D pose estimation without nonlinear optimizations (i.e. reprojection error minimization) is not robust to observation noise.

On the other hand, the proposed method directly estimates the mirror parameters linearly from kaleidoscopic projections of a single 3D point of unknown geometry. Since our algorithm is based on a reprojection constraint, the result is as accurate as those with nonlinear optimizations.

3. Kaleidoscopic imaging system

Figure 2 illustrates the measurement model with a mirror. Let $p$ denote a 3D point in the camera coordinate system. The mirror $\pi$ of normal $n$ at distance $d$ from the camera generates its mirror as $p'$, and $p$ and $p'$ are captured as $q$ and $q'$ respectively in the camera image

$$\lambda q = Ap, \quad \lambda' q' = Ap',$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $A$ is the intrinsic matrix of the camera calibrated beforehand, and $\lambda$ and $\lambda'$ are the depths from the camera.

The 3D points $p$ and $p'$ satisfy

$$p = p' + 2tn,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $t$ denotes the distance from $p$ to the mirror plane. Also the projection of $p'$ to $n$ gives

$$t + d = -n^T \cdot p'.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

These two equations yield

$$p = -2(n^T \cdot p' + d)n + p',$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

and can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{p} = S\tilde{p}' = \begin{bmatrix} H & -2dn \\ 0_{1 \times 3} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{p},$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $H = I_{3 \times 3} - 2nn^T$ is a $3 \times 3$ Householder matrix, $\tilde{x}$ denotes the homogeneous coordinate of $x$, and $0_{m \times n}$ denotes the $m \times n$ zero matrix.

Kaleidoscopic imaging system utilize multiple mirrors to generate multiple viewpoints virtually (Figure 3), and the
images captured by the camera consist of chambers corresponding to images captured by the real and the virtual cameras as shown in Figure 4. Here we assume three mirrors system while our calibration can be adopted to other configurations.

Let \( M_0 \) denote the base chamber corresponding to the direct view of the target. The three mirrors \( \pi_1, \pi_2 \) and \( \pi_3 \) generate first reflection chambers \( M_1, M_2 \) and \( M_3 \) respectively. These three mirrors also generate virtual mirrors \( \pi_{ij} \) by mirroring \( \pi_i \) by \( \pi_j \) \((i, j = 1, 2, 3, i \neq j)\). The matrices \( S_{ij} \) and \( H_{ij} \) of \( \pi_{ij} \) are given by

\[
S_{ij} = S_i S_j, \\
H_{ij} = H_i H_j,
\]

and the camera observes the second reflection chamber \( M_{ij} \) as the mirror of \( M_j \) by \( \pi_i \). The third and further reflections are defined by

\[
\Pi^{n'}_{k=1} S_{ik} \quad (i_k = 1, 2, 3, i_k \neq i_{k+1}),
\]

where \( n' \) is the number of reflections.

The goal of our extrinsic calibration is to estimate the parameters \( n \) and \( d \) of the real mirror \( \pi_i \) from projections of a single 3D point in the base chamber \( M_0 \) and its mirrors in \( M_1, M_2, \) and so on.

### 4. Single mirror calibration from projections of two 3D points

Suppose the camera observes a 3D point of unknown geometry \( p \). The mirror \( \pi \) of matrix \( S \) defined by the normal \( n \) and the distance \( d \) reflects \( p \) to \( p' = Sp \) (Eq (5)).

Based on the epipolar geometry \([7, 28]\), \( n \), \( p \) and \( p' \) are coplanar and satisfy

\[
(n \times p)^\top p' = 0.
\]

By substituting \( p \) and \( p' \) by \( \lambda A^{-1}q \) and \( \lambda' A^{-1}q' \) respectively (Eq (1)), we obtain

\[
q^\top A^{-\top} [n]_x A^{-1}q' = 0,
\]

where \([n]_x\) denotes the \( 3 \times 3 \) skew-symmetric matrix representing the cross product by \( n \) and this is the essential matrix of this mirror-based binocular geometry \([28]\).

By representing the normalized image coordinates of \( q \) and \( q' \) by \((x, y, 1)^\top = A^{-1}q \) and \((x', y', 1)^\top = A^{-1}q' \) respectively, Eq (9) can be rewritten as

\[
(y - y' \quad x' - x \quad xy' - x'y)^\top n = 0.
\]

This equation allows estimating \( n \) up to scale by using projections of more than or equal to two 3D points and their mirrors. Since \( n \) is a unit vector, we can obtain a unique solution by assuming the mirror is front-facing to the camera.

It should be noted the distance \( d \) from the camera to the mirror cannot be estimated since it is identical to the scale factor.

5. Multiple mirrors calibration from kaleidoscopic projections of single 3D point

This section introduces our linear algorithm which estimates the mirror normals and the distances from the kaleidoscopic projections of a single 3D point. Notice that the algorithm is first introduced by utilizing up to the second reflections, but they can be extended to third or further reflections intuitively as described later.

#### 5.1. Mirror normals \( n_1, n_2, \) and \( n_3 \)

The algorithm in Section 4 realizes a mirror calibration on a per-mirror basis. That is, it can estimate the parameters of \( \pi_1, \pi_2 \) and \( \pi_3 \) independently. Furthermore, it can also estimate those of virtual mirrors such as \( \pi_{13}, \pi_{23} \), and so forth.

However, such real mirror and virtual mirror parameters are not guaranteed to be consistent with each other and Eq (6) does not hold strictly. This results in inconsistent triangulations in 3D geometry estimation for example.

Instead of such mirror-wise estimations, this section proposes a new linear algorithm which calibrates the kaleidoscopic mirror parameters simultaneously by observing a single 3D point in the scene.

Suppose a 3D point \( p_0 \) is projected to \( q_0 \) in the base chamber, and its mirror \( p_i \) by \( \pi_i \) in the chamber \( M_i \). Likewise, the second mirror \( p_{ij} \) by \( \pi_{ij} \) is projected to \( q_{ij} \) in the chamber \( M_{ij} \), and so forth.

Here \( p_1 = S_1 p_0 \) indicates that \( q_0 \) and \( q_1 \) satisfy Eq (10) and provide a constraint for estimating the mirror normal \( n_1 \) of \( \pi_1 \) as described in Section 4. In addition, if \( p_2 = S_2 p_0 \) holds as well, we obtain \( S_1 p_2 = S_1 S_2 p_0 \iff p_{12} = S_1 p_2 \).

That is, the projection \( q_2 \) corresponding to the first reflection \( p_2 \) and the projection \( q_{12} \) corresponding to the second reflection \( p_{12} \) also satisfy Eq (10) on \( n_1 \). Similarly, if \( p_3 = S_3 p_0 \) holds, \( q_3 \) and \( p_{12} \) provides a linear constraint on \( n_1 \) as well. From these three constraints, \( n_1 \) can be esti-
mated by solving
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
y_0 - y_1 & x_1 - x_0 & x_0y_1 - x_1y_0 \\
y_2 - y_1 & x_2 - x_1 & x_1y_2 - x_2y_1 \\
y_3 - y_1 & x_3 - x_1 & x_1y_3 - x_3y_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} n_1 = 0_{3 \times 1}.
\]
(11)

Similarly, \( n_2 \) and \( n_3 \) can be estimated by solving
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
y_0 - y_2 & x_2 - x_0 & x_0y_2 - x_2y_0 \\
y_3 - y_2 & x_3 - x_2 & x_2y_3 - x_3y_2 \\
y_2 - y_2 & x_2 - x_2 & x_2y_2 - x_2y_2 \\
\end{bmatrix} n_2 = 0_{3 \times 1},
\]
(12)
and
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
y_0 - y_3 & x_3 - x_0 & x_0y_3 - x_3y_0 \\
y_1 - y_3 & x_1 - x_3 & x_3y_1 - x_1y_3 \\
y_2 - y_3 & x_2 - x_3 & x_3y_2 - x_2y_3 \\
\end{bmatrix} n_3 = 0_{3 \times 1}.
\]
(13)

An important observation in this simple algorithm is the fact that (1) this is a linear algorithm while it utilizes multiple reflections, and (2) the estimated normals \( n_1, n_2 \) and \( n_3 \) are enforced to be consistent with each other while they are computed on a per-mirror basis apparently.

The first point is realized by using not the multiple reflections of a 3D position but their 2D projections. Intuitively a reasonable formalization of kaleidoscopic projection is to define a real 3D point in the scene, and then to evaluate a reasonable formalization of kaleidoscopic projection intuitively. For example, if \( q_{ij} \) is defined as the projection of \( p_{ij} \) and \( q_{ij} \) is also collinear with its projection \( q_{ij} \):
\[
(A^{-1} q_{ij}) \times p_{ij} = [x_{ij}] \times [H_i p_{ij} - 2d_i n_i] = [x_{ij}] \times [H_i H_j - 2n_i - 2H_i n_j] = 0_{3 \times 1}.
\]

By using these constraints, we obtain a linear system of \( p_0, d_1, d_2, \) and \( d_3 \):
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x_0 & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_1 & -2[x_1] & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_2 & 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_2] & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_3 & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_3] & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_{1,2} & -2[x_{12}] & -2h_{1,2} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_{2,1} & -2[x_{21}] & -2h_{2,1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_{2,3} & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_3] & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_{3,2} & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_3] & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_{3,1} & -2h_{3,1} & 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_3] & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
h_{1,3} & -2h_{1,3} & 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_3] & 0_{3 \times 1} \\
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p_0 \\ d_1 \\ d_2 \\ d_3 \\ \end{bmatrix} = 0_{30 \times 1},
\]
(19)
where \( h_i = [x_i] \times H_i \), \( h'_{ij} = [x_{ij}] \times H_i H_j \), \( h''_{ij} = [x_{ij}] \times H_i n_j \). By computing the eigenvector corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of \( K^T K \), \( p_0, d_1, d_2, d_3 \) can be determined up to a scale factor. In this paper, we choose the scale that normalizes \( d_1 = 1 \).

5.2. Mirror distances \( d_1, d_2, \) and \( d_3 \)

Once the mirror normals \( n_1, n_2, \) and \( n_3 \) are given linearly, the mirror distances \( d_1, d_2, \) and \( d_3 \) can also be estimated linearly as follows.

**Kaleidoscopic reprojection constraint** The perspective projection Eq (1) indicates that a 3D point \( p_i \) and its projection \( q_i \) should satisfy the collinearity constraint:
\[
(A^{-1} q_i) \times p_i = x_i \times p_i = 0_{3 \times 1},
\]
where \( x_i = (x_i, y_i, 1)^T \) is the normalized camera coordinate of \( q_i \) as defined earlier. Since the mirrored points \( p_i (i = 1, 2, 3) \) are then given by Eq (5) as
\[
p_i = H_i p_0 - 2d_i n_i,
\]
and we obtain
\[
x_i \times p_i = x_i \times (H_i p_0 - 2d_i n_i)
\]
\[
= [x_i] \times [H_i - 2n_i] [p_0 \quad d_i] = 0_{3 \times 1}.
\]
Notice that Eq (19) apparently has 30 equations, but only 20 of them are linearly independent. This is simply because each of the cross products by Eqs (15) and (18) has only two independent constraints by definition.

Also, as discussed in Section 5.1, the above algorithm can be extended to third or further reflections as well. For example, given the reflection of \( p_{23} \) by \( n_1 \) as \( \lambda_{123} q_{123} = A p_{123} = A S_1 p_{23} \), then it provides

\[
\begin{bmatrix} x_{123} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (H_1 H_2 H_3)_{11} & -2n_1_{11} & -2n_1_{12} & -2(H_1 n_2)_{11} & -2(H_1 n_3)_{11} \\ -2n_1_{21} & (H_1 H_2 H_3)_{22} & -2n_1_{22} & -2(H_1 n_2)_{22} & -2(H_1 n_3)_{22} \\ -2n_1_{31} & -2n_1_{32} & (H_1 H_2 H_3)_{33} & -2(H_1 n_2)_{33} & -2(H_1 n_3)_{33} \\ d_1 & d_2 & d_3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} p_0 = 0_{3 \times 1},
\]

and can be integrated with Eq (19).

### 5.3. Kaleidoscopic bundle adjustment

Once estimated the mirror normals \( n_i \) and the distances \( d_i (i = 1, 2, 3) \) linearly, the triangulation from kaleidoscopic projections of a single 3D point can be given in a DLT manner by solving:

\[
K' p_0 = -K'' d,
\]

as \( p_0 = -(K'^T K')^{-1} K'^T K'' d \), where \( d = (d_1, d_2, d_3)^{\top} \), \( K' \) is the 30x3 matrix corresponding to the first three columns of \( K \):

\[
K' = \begin{bmatrix} x_{1}^T, h_1^T, h_2^T, h_3^T, h_{1,2}^T, h_{2,1}^T, h_{3,2}^T, h_{3,1}^T, h_{1,3}^T \end{bmatrix}^T,
\]

and \( K'' \) is the 30x3 matrix corresponding to the 4th to 7th columns of \( K \):

\[
K'' = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ -2[x_1]_{\times} n_1 & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_2]_{\times} n_2 & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_3]_{\times} n_3 \\ -2[x_1]_{\times} n_1 & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ -2[x_2]_{\times} n_2 & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ 0_{3 \times 1} & -2[x_3]_{\times} n_3 & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ -2 h_{3,1}'' & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ -2 h_{3,2}'' & 0_{3 \times 1} & 0_{3 \times 1} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

By reprojecting this \( p_0' \) to each of the chambers as

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda \hat{q}_0 &= A p_0', \\
\lambda \hat{q}_i &= A S_i p_0' (i = 1, 2, 3), \\
\lambda \hat{q}_{i,j} &= A S_i S_j p_0' (i, j = 1, 2, 3, i \neq j),
\end{align*}
\]

we obtain a reprojection error as

\[
E(n_1, n_2, n_3, d_1, d_2, d_3) = \begin{bmatrix} q_0 - \hat{q}_0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_{1,2}', e_{2,1}', e_{2,3}', e_{3,2}', e_{3,1}', e_{1,3}' \end{bmatrix}^T,
\]

Figure 6: A capture of a chessboard used as the reference object for conventional methods

where \( e_i = q_i - \hat{q}_i \) and \( e_{i,j}' = q_{i,j}' - \hat{q}_{i,j}' \). By minimizing \( ||E(\cdot)||^2 \) nonlinearly over \( n_1, n_2, n_3, d_1, d_2, d_3, \) we obtain a best estimate of the mirror normals and the distances.

### 6. Evaluations

To demonstrate the performance of the proposed algorithm, this section provides evaluations using synthesized and real images in comparison with the following two conventional algorithms both utilize a reference object of known geometry as shown in Figure 6.

#### Baseline

Since the 3D geometry of the reference object is known, the 3D positions of the real image \( p_i^{(l)} \) and their reflections \( p_i^{(l)} \) and \( p_i^{(l)} \) can be estimated by solving PnP [14]. Here the superscript \( l \) indicates the \( l \)th landmark in the reference object. Once \( L \) such landmark 3D positions are given, then the mirror normals can be computed simply by

\[
\begin{align*}
n_1 &= \sum_{l} L_{1,2,3}^{(l)} / \sum_{l} L_{1,2,3}^{(l)} \text{,} \\
n_2 &= \sum_{l} L_{2,3,1}^{(l)} / \sum_{l} L_{2,3,1}^{(l)} \text{,} \\
n_3 &= \sum_{l} L_{3,1,2}^{(l)} / \sum_{l} L_{3,1,2}^{(l)} \text{,}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( L_{i,j,k}^{(l)} = p_i^{(l)} - p_0^{(l)} + p_i^{(l)} - p_j^{(l)} + p_i^{(l)} - p_k^{(l)} \), and then the mirror distances can be computed by

\[
\begin{align*}
d_1 &= \frac{1}{6L} n_1^{\top} \sum_{l} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{3} (p_i^{(l)} + p_{12}^{(l)} + p_{13}^{(l)}) \right) \text{,} \\
d_2 &= \frac{1}{6L} n_2^{\top} \sum_{l} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{3} (p_i^{(l)} + p_{23}^{(l)} + p_{21}^{(l)}) \right) \text{,} \\
d_3 &= \frac{1}{6L} n_3^{\top} \sum_{l} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{3} (p_i^{(l)} + p_{31}^{(l)} + p_{32}^{(l)}) \right).
\end{align*}
\]
Notice that the above PnP procedure requires a non-linear reprojection error minimization process in practice.

Takahashi et al. [27] As pointed out by Takahashi et al. [27], two 3D points \( p_i \) and \( p_j \) defined as reflections of a 3D point by different mirrors of normal \( n_i \) and \( n_j \) respectively satisfy an orthogonality constraint:

\[
(p_i - p_j)^\top (n_i \times n_j) = (p_i - p_j)^\top m_{ij} = 0.
\]

As illustrated by Figure 7, this constraint on \( m_{12} \) holds for four pairs \( \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle, \langle p_0, p_{21} \rangle, \langle p_{12}, p_0 \rangle \), and \( \langle p_{13}, p_{23} \rangle \) as the reflections of \( p_0, p_1, p_2, \) and \( p_3 \) respectively. Similarly, \( \langle p_2, p_3 \rangle \), \( \langle p_{21}, p_{31} \rangle \), \( \langle p_0, p_{32} \rangle \), and \( \langle p_{23}, p_0 \rangle \) can be used for computing \( m_{23} = n_2 \times n_3 \), and \( \langle p_3, p_1 \rangle \), \( \langle p_{31}, p_0 \rangle \), \( \langle p_{32}, p_{12} \rangle \), and \( \langle p_0, p_{13} \rangle \) can be used for \( m_{31} = n_3 \times n_1 \). Once obtained the intersection vectors \( m_{12}, m_{23}, \) and \( m_{31} \), the mirror normals and the distances can be estimated linearly as described in [27].

The following three error metrics are used in this section in order to evaluate the performance of the proposed method in comparison with the above-mentioned conventional approaches quantitatively. The average estimation error of normal \( E_n \) measures the average angular difference from the ground truth by

\[
E_n = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left| \cos^{-1}(n_i^\top \hat{n}_i) \right|,
\]

where \( \hat{n}_i \) \( (i = 1, 2, 3) \) denotes the ground truth of the normal \( n_i \). The average estimation error of distance \( E_d \) is defined as the average \( L_1 \)-norm to the ground truth:

\[
E_d = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} |d_i - \hat{d}_i|,
\]

where \( \hat{d}_i \) \( (i = 1, 2, 3) \) denotes the ground truth of the distance \( d_i \). Also, the average reprojection error \( E_{\text{rep}} \) is defined as:

\[
E_{\text{rep}} = \frac{1}{10L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \left| E^{(l)}(n_1, n_2, n_3, d_1, d_2, d_3) \right|
\]

where \( E^{(l)}(\cdot) \) denotes the reprojection error \( E(\cdot) \) defined by Eq (25) at \( l \)th point.

6.1. Quantitative evaluations with synthesized images

This section provides a quantitative performance evaluation using synthesized dataset. A virtual camera and three mirrors are arranged according to the real setup (Figure 12).
The intrinsic parameter $A$ of the camera (Nikon D600, 6016×4016 resolution) is calibrated beforehand [29], and it observes the target object $cat$ (about $4 \times 5 \times 1$ cm) with three planar first surface mirrors. The projector (MicroVision SHOWWX+ Laser Pico Projector, 848×480 resolution) is used to cast line patterns to the object for simplifying the correspondence search problem in a light-sectioning fashion (Figure 12 left), and the projector itself is not in-

6.2. Qualitative evaluations with real images

Figure 12 shows our kaleidoscopic capture setup. The intrinsic parameter $A$ of the camera (Nikon D600, 6016×4016 resolution) is calibrated beforehand [29], and it observes the target object $cat$ (about $4 \times 5 \times 1$ cm) with three planar first surface mirrors. The projector (MicroVision SHOWWX+ Laser Pico Projector, 848×480 resolution) is used to cast line patterns to the object for simplifying the correspondence search problem in a light-sectioning fashion (Figure 12 left), and the projector itself is not in-

points used in the conventional methods (yellow and cyan) performs better, even without the final non-linear optimization.

Also in particular in the cases of $\sigma_q \geq 1$, we can observe Takahashi et al. (yellow) do not show robust behavior. This is because the method degenerates obviously if the intersection vectors $m_{12}$, $m_{23}$ and $m_{31}$ are parallel since the normal is recovered by $n_i = m_{ij} \times m_{ki}$. Therefore if the estimated 3D reference points by PnP return the intersection vectors close to such a singular configuration due to noise, then it will not perform robustly [1, 27].
From these results, we can conclude that the proposed method performs reasonably and provides a sufficiently accurate calibration for 3D shape reconstruction.

7. Conclusion

This paper proposed a new linear calibration of kaleidoscopic mirror system from 2D kaleidoscopic projections of a single 3D point in the scene. The key point to realize our linear method is to utilize not 3D positions of multiple reflections but their 2D projections.

One of the advantages of our approach is the fact that the proposed method does not require knowing the 3D geometry of the 2D points for calibration, while the conventional methods require 2D-to-3D correspondences. This indicates that our method can utilize 3D points on the target object surface of unknown geometry, and this point is verified by the evaluations in which the proposed method with non-planar calibration points outperforms the conventional methods even without bundle adjustment.

Inversely, our method assumes the 2D correspondences are given a priori. This is not a trivial problem [19], and integration with such automatic correspondence search and chamber segmentation should be further investigated to realize a complete calibration procedure for kaleidoscopic imaging system.
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