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Abstract: Photometric stereo needs three images taken under three different light directions lit one by one, while color photometric stereo needs only one image taken under three different lights lit at the same time with different light directions and different colors. As a result, color photometric stereo can obtain the surface normal of dynamically moving object from a single image. However, the conventional color photometric stereo cannot estimate a multicolored object due to the colored illumination. This paper use example-based photometric stereo for solving the problem of color photometric stereo. Example-based photometric stereo searches the surface normal from the database of the images of known shapes. Color photometric stereos suffer from mathematical difficulty, and they add many assumptions and constraints, however, example-based photometric stereo is free from such mathematical problems. The process of our method is pixelwise, thus, the estimated surface normal is not oversmoothed, unlike existing methods that use smoothness constraints. To demonstrate the effectiveness of this study, a measurement device that can realize the multispectral photometric stereo method with 16 colors is employed instead of the classic color photometric stereo method with 3 colors.
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1. Introduction

The photometric stereo method is not suitable for modeling a moving object since several images by changing the direction of the light source are needed. The color photometric stereo method can measure the shape of a moving object, which employs red, green, and blue lights in three different directions. Unlike the common color photometric stereo method, we use 16 narrow-band lights with different peak wavelengths while observing the target object with a 16-band multispectral camera.

1.1. Related work

The shape-from-shading method [1–6] and the photometric stereo method [7,8] estimates the surface normal of an object by illuminating the object and analyzing the resulting shadings on the object’s surface. Unlike shape-from-shading which uses one image, photometric stereo captures three images with different light source directions. Therefore, it is impossible to measure a dynamic object. This problem can be resolved using the color photometric stereo method [9–28] (also known as shape-from-color). Color photometric stereo takes one picture with an RGB color camera under red, green, and blue light sources. Such a one-shot photograph enables the measurement of a dynamic object. However, the color photometric stereo has many problems. The major problem of the color photometric stereo method is the fact that it can only be used with white objects. This is an inevitable problem as long as lights are illuminated from colored light sources to estimate the surface normal.
Some methods use multiple images to apply color photometric stereo to multicolored objects. These methods cannot estimate the surface normal from a single image, thus, the optical flow method is used to track the identical point on the object surface among multiple images. Fyffe et al. used three lights that can be recognized as white color by the human eye. The target objects are observed by six band camera. Each three light has different spectral distribution, which can be distinguished by the six band camera. They estimate the surface normal without disturbing the human eye’s appearance. As done by Anderson et al., using the shape from other methods such as multiview stereo enables the color photometric stereo to be applied to multicolored objects. Chakrabarti et al. and Jiao et al. assumed that a certain limited area has the same albedo. This assumption enables color photometric stereo to be applied to multicolored objects which can be segmented for each colored region.

Example-based photometric stereos estimate the surface normal using a database search. Those methods capture some images of objects with known shapes. They assume that the material properties of the objects in the database and the objects to be measured are the same. If the appearances of the pixels among those two types of objects are the same, these pixels might have the same surface normal. The example-based photometric stereo is used for a conventional photometric stereo problem which assumes the same albedo for each light and is not used for the color photometric stereo problem since the albedo differs for each light.

1.2. Our work

In this paper, the problem faced by the color photometric stereo method is solved using a different approach from those used in previous studies. We use the example-based photometric stereo to solve the problem of the color photometric stereo. Our approach solves the problem of shadow, specular reflection, and channel crosstalk.

Unlike Guo et al., our method can be applied to the objects whose chromaticity and albedo are both spatially varying. The techniques of Gotardo et al., Kim et al., and Roubtsova et al. need to employ optical flow to measure a dynamic object, while the technique of Fyffe et al. requires a reflectance database to be prepared prior to the measurement. Our proposed technique does not require a shape obtained from other sensors such as multi-view stereo or laser sensor, unlike the technique of Anderson et al. Moreover, unlike the techniques of Chakrabarti et al. and Jiao et al., our proposed method does not require region segmentation. Our method is not oversmoothed by median filtering and is not affected by randomness.

Previous color photometric stereo methods used three lights with red, green, and blue colors and observed the object with an RGB color camera. In our study, 16 lights with different wavelengths are used to illuminate the object, which is then observed by a 16-band multispectral camera. This paper empirically proves that the example-based photometric stereo is also useful for the color photometric stereo situations.

Section 2 and 3 explain the fundamental theory of color photometric stereo and example-based photometric stereo, respectively. Section 4 explains our example-based multispectral photometric stereo. Especially, Section 5.5 discusses the advantages and disadvantages of our method. Section 5 and 6 show the experimental results and the conclusion, respectively.

2. Color photometric stereo

A photometric stereo method that employs independent colored light is called the color photometric stereo method. A characteristic of this method is that it enables the estimation of the surface normal with one photoshoot. The widespread color photometric stereo method is conducted with three types of colored lights. While the conventional photometric stereo method results in several grayscale images, the color photometric stereo method results in a multi-spectral image.
Figure 1. Conceptual explanation of multispectral color photometric stereo. Target object is illuminated by multiple light sources whose wavelengths are different. One image is taken using multispectral camera.

Given \( \mathbf{n} \) as a normal vector and \( \mathbf{l}_c \) as the light source direction vector of channel \( c \), then the multispectral image can be:

\[
I_c = A_c \max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{l}_c, 0).
\]

(1)

Hereinafter, we call \( A_c \) albedo. Note that the camera sensitivity and light source brightness are included in \( A_c \).

As shown in Fig. 1, this study conducts a photoshoot of a multicolored object using 16 channels. Following Eq. (1), the brightness is obtained from this photoshoot as follows.

\[
I_0 = A_0 \max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{l}_0, 0),
\]

\[
I_1 = A_1 \max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{l}_1, 0),
\]

\[\vdots\]

\[
I_{15} = A_{15} \max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{l}_{15}, 0).
\]

(2)

The surface normal \( \mathbf{n} \) is a 3D vector; however, the degree-of-freedom is two because it is constrained to be a unit vector (such constraint reduces one degree-of-freedom). Albedo \( A_c \) is represented by 16 parameters. There are 16 equations, as shown in Eq. (2), and 18 unknown parameters \( (A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_{15}, n_x, n_y, n_z, \text{s.t., } n_x^2 + n_y^2 + n_z^2 = 1, \text{namely 16 for albedo and 2 for surface normal}) \). Therefore, color photometric stereo is an ill-posed problem.

The most commonly used assumption is to limit the color of the target objects to white \( (A_0 = A_1 = \cdots = A_{15}) \). The color photometric stereo for white objects, or in other words, the conventional photometric stereo can directly solve the surface normal, without iterative optimization nor additional constraints such as smoothness constraints. However, this paper analyzes the methods with multi-colored objects.

3. Example-based photometric stereo

Example-based photometric stereo (Fig. 2) uses the reference objects with known shapes for estimating surface normal which can be applied to non-Lambertian surfaces. Example-based photometric stereo measures two objects with known and unknown shapes under the same scene. Those two objects should have the same material property.

A sphere is often used for reference objects. Both brightnesses coincide if the surface normal of the target object and the surface normal of the reference object coincide because the material property, light direction, and camera direction are the same. Therefore, example-based photometric stereo can
estimate the surface normal of the objects with an arbitrary BRDF (bidirectional reflection distribution function). The disadvantage of example-based photometric stereo is that the reference objects whose material property is the same as the target objects are needed. The interreflection between each surface point is not considered in this method.

4. Proposed method

4.1. Example-based multispectral photometric stereo

Existing methods add some constraints such as smoothness to solve since the unknowns exceed the inputs. Such an approach oversmoothes the albedo and the surface normal. Our method does not require any constraints.

We observe the object illuminated under 16 lights with different wavelengths by the multispectral camera (Fig. 1). The observation vector at pixel \((y_Q, x_Q)\) of query image (the image of target object) is denoted as \((I_{Q,0}, I_{Q,1}, \ldots, I_{Q,15})^\top\) and the observation vector at pixel \((y_R, x_R)\) of reference image (the image of the database) is denoted as \((I_{R,0}, I_{R,1}, \ldots, I_{R,15})^\top\). If query’s albedo \((A_{Q,0}, A_{Q,1}, \ldots, A_{Q,15})^\top\) and reference’s albedo \((A_{R,0}, A_{R,1}, \ldots, A_{R,15})^\top\) coincide and query’s observation vector and reference’s observation vector coincide, the surface normal at \((y_R, x_R)\) and the surface normal at \((y_Q, x_Q)\) coincide. Each element of the 16-dimensional observation vector (Fig. 3) is Eq. (2).

We search the pixel position of the reference object where the query’s observation vector coincides with the reference’s observation vector (Fig. 4). The query’s surface normal is determined
Our approach. Multiple spheres with different paints are used as the reference. The search of the observation vector is performed for all pixels of all reference spheres. Our method (Eq. (3)) searches the pixel position where the squared error of 16-dimensional vector becomes the minimum.

\[
\mathbf{n}(y_Q, x_Q) = \mathbf{n}_R(y_R, x_R),
\]

\[
s.t. \quad (y_R, x_R) = \arg\min_{y_R, x_R} \sum_{c \in C} (I_Q(y_Q, x_Q, c) - I_R(s, y_R, x_R, c))^2, \quad \forall s \in S, \quad \forall (y_R, x_R) \in \mathcal{P}_R.
\]

Here, \(|C|\) is the number of channels (\(|C| = 16\)), \(|S|\) is the number of reference objects, and \(\mathcal{P}_R\) is a set of reference’s pixels. We normalize the observation vectors of both the query image and the reference image. Thanks to the normalization, our method can be applied even if the camera exposure is changed.

In order to apply our method to any objects with any paints, we have to measure all paints in the world. However, the variation of paints is limited due to the limitation of chemical reactions. The number of paints is limited if the paints are based on pure natural pigments since the number of natural pigments is limited. In this paper, we assume that all paints can be expressed in a limited number. We used 18 spheres with different color (\(|S| = 18\)).

4.2. Converting surface normal to height

The shape is represented as the height \(H\) set for each pixel. The partial derivatives of the heights with respect to \(x\) and \(y\) are called gradient, and represented as \(p\) and \(q\), respectively.

\[
p = H_x = \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}, \quad q = H_y = \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}.
\]

The surface normal \(\mathbf{n}\) is represented by these gradients as shown below.

\[
\mathbf{n} = \frac{(-p, -q, 1)^T}{\sqrt{p^2 + q^2 + 1}}.
\]

The cost function that relates the surface normal to the height is shown below.

\[
\int \int (H_x - p)^2 + (H_y - q)^2 \, dx \, dy.
\]
We solve Eq. (6) to calculate the height from the surface normal, using existing techniques.

4.3. Channel crosstalk

Conventional color photometric stereo assumes that the camera spectral response is a delta function. Fig. 5 (b) is an example where only the G channel detects the 550 nm light. On the other hand, Fig. 5 (a) is an example where the sensor has channel crosstalks. Namely, the spectral responses of R, G, and B channels partially overlap in the spectral domain. In this example, the sensor detects \((R, G, B) = (63, 255, 63)\) instead of \((R, G, B) = (0, 255, 0)\) (Fig. 5 (b)) when 550 nm light is observed. Namely, the red and blue channels are excited even if the observed light is completely green. Such channel crosstalk is annoying for conventional color photometric stereo. Conventional color photometric stereo assumes that, for example, only the green channel should detect the green light. Channel crosstalk commonly occurs in most cameras, which makes the color photometric stereo difficult. However, as discussed in Section 5.5, our method is free from the channel crosstalk problem.

5. Experiment

5.1. Experimental setup

We perform our experiment in a dark room as shown in Fig. 6 where the target object is illuminated under 16 different lights. We use IMEC-HS-16-USB-customized (Imec, Belgium) for the multispectral camera. Fig. 7 and Table 1 show the spectral sensitivity of the camera, where channel crosstalks are occurring among all camera channels. Table 2 shows the peak wavelength for each light source used in this experiment. To increase the amount of supplementary information obtained for objects with narrow-wavelength regions, light sources of close wavelength were positioned opposite to each other. Namely, as shown in Table 2, the light of the next larger wavelength is set far apart in more than one Manhattan distance in 4 x 4 grid. The locations of the light sources and the camera were left unchanged during the experiments. We assume that the light source and the camera are infinite far from the target object. This paper represents the surface normal as pseudo-color where \(x, y,\) and \(z\) of the normal vector is mapped to R, G, and B of the image. Each sphere image is trimmed and scaled to 128 x 128 size. The sphere objects shown in Fig. 8 are painted with 18 different paints. The size of the query image is 512 x 256. The target object is opaque objects. Our method can estimate the surface normal of metals if the number of lights is infinity, while it cannot estimate due to the finite number of lights. Transparent objects are more difficult to measure due to the transmission.

5.2. Evaluation

First, we measured a spherical object, shown in Fig. 9 (a), consisting of two types of albedos painted with the paints included in the reference objects. The error is evaluated as an angle between the estimated surface normal and the true surface normal. We have to compare the estimated surface
Figure 6. Experimental apparatus.

Figure 7. Spectral response of the camera.

Table 1. The spectral response for each channel of the camera.

| Channel 1 | Channel 2 | Channel 3 | Channel 4 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Peak 488 nm | Peak 499 nm | Peak 479 nm | Peak 469 nm |
| Peak 50% 488–492 nm | Peak 50% 495–503 nm | Peak 50% 467–486 nm | Peak 50% 464–474 nm |

| Channel 5 | Channel 6 | Channel 7 | Channel 8 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Peak 599 nm | Peak 609 nm | Peak 587 nm | Peak 575 nm |
| Peak 50% 459–465, 595–602 nm | Peak 50% 464–470, 606–615 nm | Peak 50% 583–591 nm | Peak 50% 570–578 nm |

| Channel 9 | Channel 10 | Channel 11 | Channel 12 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Peak 641 nm | Peak 644 nm | Peak 631 nm | Peak 622 nm |
| Peak 50% 483–488, 635–646 nm | Peak 50% 489–497, 637–646 nm | Peak 50% 626–638 nm | Peak 50% 616–627 nm |

| Channel 13 | Channel 14 | Channel 15 | Channel 16 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Peak 539 nm | Peak 552 nm | Peak 525 nm | Peak 513 nm |
| Peak 50% 535–543 nm | Peak 50% 547–555 nm | Peak 50% 521–532 nm | Peak 50% 509–519 nm |
Table 2. Peak wavelength of each light (10 nm width).

| Light 1    | Light 2    | Light 3    | Light 4    |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 488 nm     | 632 nm     | 540 nm     | 500 nm     |
| Light 5    | Light 6    | Light 7    | Light 8    |
| 647 nm     | 600 nm     | 470 nm     | 610 nm     |
| Light 9    | Light 10   | Light 11   | Light 12   |
| 520 nm     | 568 nm     | 620 nm     | 479 nm     |
| Light 13   | Light 14   | Light 15   | Light 16   |
| 636 nm     | 515 nm     | 589 nm     | 550 nm     |

**Figure 8.** Reference objects.

We measured a sphere for evaluation. The mathematically true surface normal can be theoretically derived from the sphere’s center and radius. Suppose that the pixel of interest is \((x, y)\) and the center of the sphere is \((\bar{x}, \bar{y})\). Suppose that the radius of the sphere is \(r\). Then, the true surface normal \((n_x, n_y, n_z)\) can be calculated as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
    n_x &= \frac{(x - \bar{x})}{r}, \\
    n_y &= \frac{- (y - \bar{y})}{r}, \\
    n_z &= \sqrt{1 - n_x^2 - n_y^2}.
\end{align*}
\]

Since we know the true surface normal from Eq. (7)–(9), we can evaluate the performance of the method by measuring a sphere. Fig. 9 (b), (c), and (d) show the error map with pseudo-color representation. We compared our method with the conventional photometric stereo (Fig. 9 (b)). The color photometric stereo that assumes white objects as targets is the same as the conventional photometric stereo. Also, we compared our method with existing method [35] (Fig. 9 (c)). The error of conventional photometric stereo (color photometric stereo with white object) was 0.690 [rad], the error of existing method (Guo et al. [35]) was 0.888 [rad], and the error of our method was 0.198 [rad], which proves the high performances of our method.

5.3. Real objects

We apply the existing method [36] and our method to the object shown in Fig. 10 (a). The estimated surface normals of existing and our methods are shown in Fig. 10 (b) and (c), respectively. Here, the surface normal of \(x\), \(y\), and \(z\) axes are represented as red, green, and blue color. Unlike the existing method which oversmoothes the result (Fig. 10 (b)), our method is a pixelwise approach, and the result is not oversmoothed (Fig. 10 (c)). Existing method [36] needs to segment the object region from the background (Fig. 10 (b)), while our method do not need to distinguish the foreground and
Figure 9. Performance evaluation result: (a) Target spherical object with 2 paints, (b) the error map of conventional photometric stereo, (c) the error map of existing method, and (d) the error map of proposed method.

(a) Photo  (b) Conventional  (c) Related  (d) Proposed

Figure 10. Comparison: (a) Target object, (b) the estimated surface normal of previous method, and (c) the estimated surface normal of proposed method.

(a) Photo  (b) Previous  (c) Proposed

the background. Existing method cannot estimate the surface normal of the background while our method can, however, the surface normal of the background is just a noise since the background has no object with completely dark void with random noise (Fig. 10 (c)).

The target objects are shown in Fig. 11 (a). The paints used in Fig. 11 (3)–(4) are included in the reference data, while the others are not. The results of a multi-colored object, a white object, a single-colored object, an object with dark color, and a deformable object with two different pose are shown in Fig. 11 (1)–(6), respectively. The estimated surface normals of our method are shown in Fig. 11 (b). Fig. 11 (c) and Fig. 11 (d) show the reconstructed shapes under two different viewing directions. The quantitative evaluation shown in Section 5.2 proves the benefit of our method, and the qualitative evaluation shown in Fig. 11 also proves the benefit of our method. As shown in Fig. 11, our method can successfully estimate the surface normals for both achromatic (Fig. 11 (2)) and chromatic (Fig. 11 (1)) objects without oversmoothing them.

5.4. Discussion

We dare not to add smoothness constraints, and thus, our result is not oversmoothed. Adding smoothness constraint results in smoother results which are often required by the users. If we add some constraints, we have to tune the parameters of those constraints. Fig. 12 shows the parameter tuning problem that occurred in the existing method [36]. One of our future work is to add smoothness constraints, but we have to carefully design the algorithm because adding smoothness constraints is not always a good approach due to the oversmoothing and parameter tuning.

Our method is applicable to multi-colored objects as shown in the experiments where error did not occur at the color boundary of the object (Fig. 11 (1)). Our method is robust to specular reflection as shown in the experiments that the spike-like error has not appeared in the result (Fig. 9 (c)). Our method cannot estimate the surface normal of the dark surface, however, this disadvantage is always true to all other photometric stereo methods (Fig. 11 (4)).
Figure 11. Experimental result of (1) multi-colored object, (2) white object, (3) single-colored object, (4) dark object, and (5)(6) deformable object: (a) Target object, (b) estimated surface normal, and (c)(d) reconstructed shape.
Figure 12. Parameter tuning problem of previous method: (a) Sharp normal and sharp albedo, (b) smooth normal and sharp albedo, (c) sharp normal and smooth albedo, and (d) smooth normal and smooth albedo.

5.5. Contribution

Here, we summarize our advantage and disadvantage.

Our method does not suffer from channel crosstalk, since the reference object includes the information of channel crosstalk, and the query object and the reference object are measured under the same light and the same camera. Namely, our method is not affected by the spectral distribution of the lights and the spectral/radiometric response of the camera, since both query and reference objects are measured under the same lights and with the same camera. Our process is pixelwise, and thus, the result is not affected by neighboring pixels. The light source direction is not needed to be measured, because the target and reference objects are illuminated under the same illumination environment. Also, we do not adjust each light source to be the same intensity. Our method is not limited to a Lambertian surface, and our method is not affected by shadows. If we prepare reference objects with specular reflection, our method can be applied to the objects with specular reflection.

The disadvantage of our method is that we need many reference objects. Also, we have to measure the query object with the same device that the reference objects are taken, since the light and the camera information are included in the reference objects.

The number of reference objects is related to both advantages and disadvantages. If we increase reference objects, our method can be applied to various types of paints. However, a similar observation vector might appear in the database if we increase reference objects. These are the characteristics of example-based multispectral photometric stereo compared to example-based conventional photometric stereo. The albedo $A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_{15}$ has 16 degree-of-freedom in our method but has 1 degree-of-freedom in example-based photometric stereo. Due to the wider degree-of-freedom, the unique database search is disabled if we use many reference objects. This is the dilemma of our method whether we should increase or decrease the number of reference objects.

6. Conclusion

Our method estimated the surface normal of multi-colored objects using 16 lights. The light source directions of all lights are not needed to be measured. The query and reference objects are observed by a multispectral camera. We measured many spheres painted with a single color with various paints. Surface normals are the same for the two points on the surface if the material properties are the same, the light source directions are the same, and the camera direction is the same.
We estimated the surface normal of the target object by finding the pixel where the data of the query image becomes the same as the data of the reference images.

Our experimental results show that our method has successfully estimated the surface normal of multi-colored objects. However, the dark albedo has caused some amount of error.

This time, we scanned all reference objects. However, it is well known that the spectral reflectance of any paint can be represented with a small number of basis functions. We conjecture that the bases of the PCA (principal component analysis) can represent the data with a small number of basis functions. Our future work is to install PCA in our method.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, D.M.; methodology, D.M.; software, D.M. and K.U.; validation, D.M. and K.U.; formal analysis, D.M. and K.U.; investigation, D.M.; resources, D.M.; data curation, D.M. and K.U.; writing–original draft preparation, D.M. and K.U.; writing–review and editing, D.M.; visualization, D.M. and K.U.; supervision, D.M.; project administration, D.M.; funding acquisition, D.M.

**Funding:** This research was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 18H04119, and in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 20H00612.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

**Acknowledgments:** The authors thank Ryo Furukawa, Masashi Baba, and Michihiro Mikamo for useful discussions.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**References**

1. T. Rindfleisch, “Photometric method for lunar topography,” *Photogrammetric Engineering*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 262–277, 1966.
2. B. K. P. Horn, “Obtaining shape from shading information,” in *The Psychology of Computer Vision*, P. H. Winston (Ed.), McGraw-Hill, New York, pp. 115–155, 1975.
3. B. K. P. Horn and M. J. Brooks, “The variational approach to shape from shading,” *Computer Vision, Graphics, and Image Processing*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 174–208, 1986.
4. B. K. P. Horn, “Height and gradient from shading,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 5, pp. 37–75, 1990.
5. R. Zhang, P. S. Tsai, J. E. Cryer, and M. Shah, “Shape-from-shading: a survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 21, no. 8, pp. 690–706, 1999.
6. J.-D. Durou, M. Falcone, and M. Sagona, “Numerical methods for shape-from-shading: a new survey with benchmarks,” *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 22–43, 2008.
7. W. M. Silver, “Determining shape and reflectance using multiple images,” *Master’s thesis*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1980.
8. R. J. Woodham, “Photometric method for determining surface orientation from multiple images,” *Optical Engineering*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 139–144, 1980.
9. R. Anderson, B. Stenger, and R. Cipolla, “Color photometric stereo for multicolored surfaces,” In *International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 2182-2189, 2011.
10. G. J. Brostow, B. Stenger, G. Vogiatzis, C. Hernández, and R. Cipolla, “Video normals from colored lights,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 2104–2114, 2011.
11. A. Chakrabarti and K. Sunkavalli, “Single-image RGB photometric stereo with spatially-varying albedo,” In *International Conference on 3D Vision*, pp. 258–266, 2016.
12. M. Drew and L. Kontsevich, “Closed-form attitude determination under spectrally varying illumination,” In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 985–990, 1994.
13. M. S. Drew, “Reduction of rank-reduced orientation-from-color problem with many unknown lights to two-image known-illuminant photometric stereo,” In *Proceedings of International Symposium on Computer Vision*, pp. 419–424, 1995.
14. M. S. Drew, “Direct solution of orientation-from-color problem using a modification of Pentland’s light source direction estimator,” *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 286–299, 1996.
15. M. S. Drew and M. H. Brill, “Color from shape from color: a simple formalism with known light sources,” *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, vol. 17, no. 8, pp. 1371–1381, 2000.
16. G. Fyffe, X. Yu, and P. Debevec, “Single-shot photometric stereo by spectral multiplexing,” *IEEE International Conference on Computational Photography*, pp. 1–6, 2011.
17. C. Hernandez, G. Vogiatzis, G. J. Brostow, B. Stenger, and R. Cipolla, “Non-rigid photometric stereo with colored lights,” *In IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 8, 2007.
18. C. Hernández, G. Vogiatzis, and R. Cipolla, “Shadows in three-source photometric stereo,” *In European Conference on Computer Vision; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany*, 2008; pp. 290–303.
19. H. Jiao, Y. Luo, N. Wang, L. Qi, J. Dong, and H. Lei, “Underwater multi-spectral photometric stereo reconstruction from a single RGBD image,” *In Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference*, pp. 1–4, 2016.
20. H. Kim, B. Wilburn, and M. Ben-Ezra, “Photometric stereo for dynamic surface orientations,” *In European Conference on Computer Vision*, LNCS 6311, pp. 59–72, 2010.
21. L. Kontsevich, A. Petrov, and I. Vergelskaya, “Reconstruction of shape from shading in color images,” *Journal of Optical Society of America A*, vol. 11, pp. 1047–1052, 1994.
22. A. Landstrom, M. J. Thurley, and H. Jonsson, “Sub-millimeter crack detection in casted steel using color photometric stereo,” *In International Conference on Digital Image Computing: Techniques and Applications*, pp. 1–7, 2013.
23. A. P. Petrov and L. L. Kontsevich, “Properties of color images of surfaces under multiple illuminants,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 2745–2749, 1994.
24. S. Rahman, A. Lam, I. Sato, and A. Robles-Kelly, “Color photometric stereo using a rainbow light for non-Lambertian multicolored surfaces,” *In Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 335–350, 2015.
25. N. Roubotsova and J. Y. Guillemaut, “Colour Helmholtz stereopsis for reconstruction of complex dynamic scenes,” *In International Conference on 3D Vision*, pp. 251–258, 2014.
26. G. Vogiatzis and C. Hernández, “Practical 3d reconstruction based on photometric stereo,” pp. 313–345. In: R. Cipolla, S. Battiato, and G. M. Farinella, *Computer Vision: Detection, Recognition and Reconstruction*, *Springer Berlin Heidelberg*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.
27. G. Vogiatzis and C. Hernandez, “Self-calibrated, multi-spectral photometric stereo for 3D face capture,” *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 97, pp. 91–103, 2012.
28. R. J. Woodham, “Gradient and curvature from photometric stereo including local confidence estimation,” *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, vol. 11, pp. 3050–3068, 1994.
29. P. F. U. Gotardo, T. Simon, Y. Sheikh, and I. Mathews, “Photogeometric scene flow for high-detail dynamic 3D reconstruction,” *In IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 846–854, 2015.
30. D. B. Goldman, B. Curless, A. Hertzmann, and S. M. Seitz, “Shape and spatially-varying BRDFs from photometric stereo,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 1060–1071, 2010.
31. A. Hertzmann and S. M. Seitz, “Example-based photometric stereo: shape reconstruction with general, varying BRDFs,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1254–1264, 2005.
32. B. K. P. Horn and K. Ikeuchi, “The mechanical manipulation of randomly oriented parts,” *Scientific American*, vol. 251, no. 2, pp. 100–111, 1984.
33. Z. Hui and A. C. Sankaranarayanan, “Shape and spatially-varying reflectance estimation from virtual exemplars,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 39, no. 10, pp. 2060–2073, 2017.
34. S.-K. Yeung, T.-P. Wu, C.-K. Tang, T. F. Chan, and S. Osher, “Adequate reconstruction of transparent objects on a shoestring budget,” *In IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 2513–2520, 2011.
35. H. Guo, F. Okura, B. Shi, T. Funatomi, Y. Mukaiwawa, and Y. Matsushita, “Multispectral photometric stereo for spatially-varying spectral reflectances: A well posed problem?,” *In IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 963–971, 2021.
36. D. Miyazaki, Y. Onishi, and S. Hiura, “Color photometric stereo using multi-band camera constrained by median filter and occluding boundary,” *Journal of Imaging*, vol. 5, no. 7, article no. 64, 29 pages, 2019.
37. D. Miyazaki and K. Hamaen, “Multi-band photometric stereo using random sampling of channels and pixels,” In *The International Workshop on Frontiers of Computer Vision*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2022; pp. 79–93.

© 2022 by the authors. Submitted to *J. Imaging* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).