Surface Differentiation and Localization by Parametric Modeling of Infrared Intensity Scans
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Abstract—In this study, surfaces with different properties are differentiated with simple low-cost infrared (IR) emitters and detectors in a location-invariant manner. The intensity readings obtained from such sensors are highly dependent on the location and properties of the surface, which complicates the differentiation and localization process. Our approach, which models IR intensity scans parametrically, can distinguish different surfaces independent of their positions. The method is verified experimentally with wood, Styrofoam packaging material, white painted wall, white and black cloth, and white, brown, and violet paper. A correct differentiation rate of 100% is achieved for six surfaces and the surfaces are localized within absolute range and azimuth errors of 0.2 cm and 1.1°, respectively. The differentiation rate decreases to 86% for seven surfaces and to 73% for eight surfaces. The method demonstrated shows that simple IR sensors, when coupled with appropriate processing, can be used to differentiate different types of surfaces in a location-invariant manner.

Index Terms—surface differentiation, infrared sensors, position estimation, Lambertian reflection, feature extraction

I. INTRODUCTION

Surface differentiation and localization is of considerable interest for intelligent autonomous systems that need to explore their environment and identify different types of surfaces in a cost-effective manner. In this study, we propose the use of a simple IR sensor consisting of one emitter and one detector, where the emitted light is reflected from the target and the return intensity is measured at the detector. Although these devices are inexpensive, practical, and widely available, their use has been mostly limited to the detection of the presence or absence of objects in the environment for applications such as obstacle avoidance or counting. Gathering further information about the objects with simple IR sensors has not been much investigated. However, due to the limited resources of autonomous systems, the available resources need to be exploited as much as possible. This means that the ability of simple sensor systems to extract information about the environment should first be maximally exploited before more expensive sensing modalities with higher resolution and higher resource requirements (such as computing power) are considered for a given task. Therefore, one of the aims of this study is to explore the limits of simple and inexpensive IR sensors for surface differentiation and localization in order to extend their usage to tasks beyond simple proximity detection.

One problem with the use of simple IR detectors is that it is not possible to deduce the surface properties and the geometry of the reflecting target based on a single intensity return without knowing its position and orientation, because the reflected light depends highly on the distance and the angular orientation of the reflecting target. Similarly, one cannot make accurate range estimates based on a single intensity return. Due to single intensity readings not providing much information about an object’s properties, the recognition capabilities of IR sensors have been underestimated and underused in most work. One way around this problem is to employ IR sensors in combination with other sensing modalities to acquire information about the surface properties of the object once its distance is estimated. Such an approach is taken in [1] and [2] where colors are differentiated by employing IR and ultrasonic sensors in a complementary fashion. Reference [3] is based on a similar approach where the properties of planar surfaces at a known distance (measured by an ultrasonic sensor) are determined first. Once the surface type is determined, the IR sensor is used as a range finder for the same type of surface at other distances. In this paper, we propose a scanning technique to collect intensity signals and a method for surface differentiation by parametric modeling of IR intensity scans. The proposed approach can differentiate a moderate number of surfaces and estimate their positions accurately.

IR sensors are used in robotics and automation, process control, remote sensing, and safety and security systems. More specifically, they have been used in simple object and proximity detection [4], counting, distance and depth
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monitoring, floor sensing, position measurement and control, obstacle/collision avoidance [5], and map building [6]. IR sensors are used in door detection and mapping of openings in walls [7], as well as monitoring doors/windows of buildings and vehicles, and “light curtains” for protectingings in walls [7], as well as monitoring doors/windows of buildings and vehicles, and “light curtains” for protecting.

In our earlier works [8]–[10], we considered the differentiation and localization of objects using a template-based approach, which uses distinctive natures of the IR intensity scans. Our approach in these earlier works can be considered as non-parametric, unlike the approach taken in this paper.

II. MODELING OF IR INTENSITY SCANS

Light reflected from objects depends on the wavelength, the distance, and the properties of the light source (i.e., point or diffuse source), and the surface properties of the objects such as reflectivity, absorptivity, transmittivity, and orientation [11]. Depending on the surface properties, reflectance can be modeled in different ways:

Matte materials can be approximated as ideal Lambertian surfaces which absorb no light and reflect all the incident light with equal intensities in all directions with respect to the cosine of the incidence angle [11]. When a Lambertian surface is illuminated by a point source of radiance $l_a$, then the radiance reflected from the surface will be

$$l_{r,L} = l_a[k_d(l,n)]$$

where $k_d$ is the coefficient of the diffuse reflection for a given material and $l$ and $n$ are the unit vectors representing the directions of the light source and the surface normal, respectively, as shown in Figure 1(a).

In perfect or specular (mirror-like) reflection, the incident light is reflected in the plane defined by the incident light and the surface normal, making an angle with the surface normal which is equal to the incidence angle $\alpha$ [Fig. 1(b)].

The Phong model [12], which is frequently used in computer graphics applications to represent the intensity of energy reflected from a surface, combines the three types of reflection, which are ambient, diffuse (Lambertian), and specular reflection, in a single formula:

$$l_{r,total} = l_a[k_a] + l_d[k_d(l,n)] + l_s[k_s(r,v)^m]$$

where $l_{r,total}$ is the total radiance reflected from the surface, $l_a$ and $l_i$ are the ambient and incident radiances on the surface, $k_a$, $k_d$, and $k_s$ are the coefficients of ambient light, diffuse, and specular reflection for a given material, $l$, $n$, $r$, and $v$ are the unit vectors representing the directions of the light source, the surface normal, the reflected light, and the viewing angle, respectively, as shown in Figure 1(b), and $m$ refers to the order of the specular fall-off or shine. The scalar product in the second term of the Phong model equals $\cos \alpha$, where $\alpha$ is the angle between the vectors $l$ and $n$. Similarly, the scalar product in the last term of the Phong model equals $\cos \beta$ where $\beta$ is the angle between $r$ and $v$. Since the IR emitter and receiver are situated at approximately the same position, then the angle $\beta$ between the reflected vector $r$ and the viewing vector $v$ is equal to $2\alpha$.

In [3], the simple non-empirical mathematical model represented by (2) is used to model reflections from planar surfaces located at a known distance (10 cm) by fitting the reflectance data to the model to improve the accuracy of the range estimates of IR sensors over a limited range interval (5–23 cm). A similar approach with a simplified reflection model is employed in [13], where an IR system can measure distances up to 1 m. The requirement of prior knowledge of the distance to the surface is eliminated in [14] by considering two angular intensity scans taken at two different known distances (10 and 12 cm). The distance error is less than 1 cm over a very limited range interval (10–18 cm) for the reflection coefficients found based on the scans at 10 and 12 cm. As the distance increases to the maximum operating range (24 cm), the distance error increases. For five different surfaces, a correct classification rate of 75% is achieved by considering the invariance property of the sum of the reflection coefficients below a certain range (14 cm).

Our approach differs from those in [3] and [13] in that it takes distance as a variable and does not require prior knowledge of the distance. Another difference is that, those works concentrate mainly on range estimation over a very limited range interval rather than the determination of the surface type, whereas in this study, we focus on the determination of the surface type over a broader range interval. When we compare our results with those of [14], we can conclude that the proposed approach is better in terms of the correct differentiation rate and the number of surfaces considered.

The surface materials considered are wood, Styrofoam packaging material, white painted wall, white and black cloth, and white, brown, and violet paper. The IR sensor [15] [Fig. 2(a)] is mounted on a 12 inch rotary table [16] to obtain angular intensity scans from these surfaces. A photograph of the experimental setup and its schematics can be seen in Figs. 2(b) and 3, respectively.

Reference intensity scans are collected for each surface
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The distance increments, at \( \theta \) type by locating the surfaces between 30 to 52.5 cm with
Fig. 3. Top view of the experimental setup. Both the scan angle \( \theta \) azimuth
to the surface and is modeled with three parameters as
area and inversely proportional to the square of the distance
received return signal intensity is proportional to the detector
approximating the surfaces as ideal Lambertian surfaces. The
scans for the eight surfaces are shown in Fig. 4 using
is lumped into the constant \( C \). In (3), the product of the intensity of the emitter, the area
IR filter, covering the detector window, filters out this term.
be neglected with respect to the other terms because the
component, which corresponds to the first term in (2), can
model represented by (2). In our case, the ambient reflection
which is a modified version of the second term in the
similar dependence on \( C \) is an additional
coefficient to compensate for the change in the basewidth
of the intensity scans with respect to distance (Fig. 4). A
similar dependence on \( C_1 \) is used in sensor modeling in [17].
The \( z \) is the horizontal distance between the rotary platform
and the surface as shown in Fig. 3. The denominator of \( I \)
is the square of the distance \( d \) between the IR sensor and
the surface. From the geometry of Fig. 3, \( d + R = \frac{z}{\cos(\alpha)} + R(\frac{1}{\cos(\alpha)} - 1) \), where \( R \)
is the radius of the rotary platform and \( \alpha \) is the angle made
between the IR sensor and the horizontal.

Besides the model represented by (3), we tried to fit a
number of other models to our experimental data, which
were basically different variations of (2). The increase in
the number of model parameters results in overfitting to the
experimental data, whereas simpler models result in larger
curve fitting errors. The model represented by (3) was the
most suitable in the sense that it provided a reasonable trade-off.

Based on the model represented by (3), parameterized
curves have been fitted to the reference intensity scans by
using a nonlinear least-squares technique based on a model-
trust region method using MATLAB [18]. Resulting curves
are shown in Fig. 4 in solid lines. For the reference scans,
\( z \) is not taken as a parameter since the distance between the
surface and the IR sensing unit is already known. The initial
guesses of the parameters must be made cleverly so that the
algorithm does not converge to local minima and curve fitting
is achieved in a smaller number of iterations. The initial guess
for \( C_0 \) is made by evaluating \( I \) at \( \alpha=0^\circ \), and corresponds
to the product of \( I \) with \( z^2 \). Similarly, the initial guess for
\( C_1 \) is made by evaluating \( C_1 \) from (3) at a known angle \( \alpha \)
other than zero, with the initial guess of \( C_0 \) and the known
value of \( z \). While curve fitting, \( C_0 \) value is allowed to vary
between \( \pm 2000 \) of its initial guess and \( C_1 \) is restricted to
be positive. The variations of \( C_0 \), \( C_1 \), and \( z \) with respect to
the maximum intensity of the reference scans are shown in
Fig. 5. As the distance \( d \) decreases, the maximum intensity
increases and \( C_0 \) first increases then decreases but \( C_1 \) and \( z \)
both decrease, as expected from the model represented by (3).
The model fit is much better for scans with smaller maximum
intensities because our model takes only diffuse reflections
into account, but the contribution of the specular reflection
components around the maximum value of the intensity scans
increases as the distance decreases. This effect can be seen in
the \( C_0 \) coefficient, where \( C_0 \) value begins to decrease beyond
a certain range, whose average value over all surfaces is
approximately 36 cm. However, the same effect cannot be
observed in the variation of \( C_1 \) [Fig. 5(b)], which is critical
in our decision process. This way, the operating range of our
system is extended at the expense of the error in curve fitting
at smaller ranges.

III. EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we experimentally verify the proposed
method. In the test process, the surfaces are randomly located
at azimuth angles varying from \(-45^\circ \) to \(45^\circ \), and range values
between 30 to 52.5 cm. In the given region, the return signal
Fig. 4. Intensity scans of the eight surfaces collected between 30 to 52.5 cm with 2.5-cm increments. Solid lines indicate the model fit and the dotted lines indicate the actual data.

intensities do not saturate. In fact, we have experimented with fitting models to the saturated scans so that the operating range of the system is extended to include the saturation regions. However, these trials have not been very successful. For unsaturated scans, first, the maximum intensity of the observed intensity scan is found and the angular value where this maximum occurs is taken as the azimuth estimate of the surface. If there are multiple maximum intensity values, the average of the minimum and maximum angular values where the maximum intensity values occur is calculated to find the azimuth estimate of the surface. Then, the observed scan is shifted by the azimuth estimate and the model represented by (3) is fitted using a model-trust region based nonlinear least-squares technique. The initial guess for the distance $z$ is found from Fig. 5(c) by taking the average of the maximum possible and the minimum possible range values corresponding to the maximum value of the recorded intensity scan. (Linear interpolation is used between the data points in the figure.) This results in a maximum absolute range error of approximately 2.5 cm. Therefore, the parameter $z$ is allowed to vary between $\pm 2.5$ cm of its initial guess. Using the initial guess for $z$, the initial guesses for $C_0$ and $C_1$ are made in the same way as explained before for the reference scans. After nonlinear curve fitting to the observed scan, we get three parameters $C_{0*}$, $C_{1*}$, and $z*$. In the decision process, the maximum intensity of the observed scan is used and a value of $C_1$ is obtained by linear interpolation between the data points in Fig. 5(b) for each surface type. In other words, Fig. 5(b) is used like a look-up table. Surface-type decisions are made based on the absolute difference of $C_1 - C_{1*}$ for
Each surface because of the more distinctive nature of the $C_1$ variation with respect to the maximum intensity. The surface type giving the minimum difference is chosen as the correct one. The decision could have also been made by comparing the parameters with those at the estimated range. However, this would not give better results because of the error and the uncertainty in the range estimates. We have also considered taking different combinations of the differences $C_0 - C_0^*$, $C_1 - C_1^*$, and $z - z^*$ as our error criterion. However, the criterion based on $C_1 - C_1^*$ difference was the most successful.

The best differentiation results are achieved for a set of surfaces including Styrofoam packaging material, white painted wall, white or black cloth, and white, brown, and violet paper. We get a correct differentiation rate of 100% for these six surfaces and the surfaces are located with absolute range and azimuth errors of 0.2 cm and $1.1^\circ$, respectively. We can increase the number of surfaces differentiated at the expense of a decrease in the correct differentiation rate. For example, if we add wood to our test set keeping either white or black cloth, we get a correct differentiation rate of 86% for seven surfaces (Table I). For the same six surfaces considered as in the previous case (where the initial range to the surface is estimated using the maximum intensity of the scan), the same correct classification rate of 100% is achieved. If we add wood to our test set keeping either white or black cloth, we get a correct differentiation rate of 87% for seven surfaces (see Ref. [19] for the detailed results). Similarly, if we form a set of surfaces excluding wood but keeping both white and black cloth, we achieve a correct differentiation rate of 88% for seven surfaces. The differentiation result over all eight surfaces is 78%. When we compare these results with those obtained without exact knowledge of the distance to the surface, we can conclude that similar surfaces are confused with each other.

To investigate the effect of the initial range estimate of the surface on the differentiation process, we now assume that the distance to the surface is known beforehand. For this case, only the two variables $C_0$ and $C_1$ are taken as parameters. For the same six surfaces considered as in the previous case (where the initial range to the surface is estimated using the maximum intensity of the scan), the same correct classification rate of 100% is achieved. If we add wood to our test set keeping either white or black cloth, we get a correct differentiation rate of 87% for seven surfaces (see Ref. [19] for the detailed results). Similarly, if we form a set of surfaces excluding wood but keeping both white and black cloth, we achieve a correct differentiation rate of 88% for seven surfaces. The differentiation result over all eight surfaces is 78%. When we compare these results with those obtained without exact knowledge of the distance to the surface, we can conclude that similar surfaces are confused with each other.

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Differentiation Result</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Differentiation Result</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Differentiation Result</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main accomplishment of this study is that we achieved position-invariant surface differentiation and localization with simple IR sensors despite the fact that their individual intensity readings are highly dependent on the surface position and properties, and this dependence cannot be represented by a simple analytical relationship. The intensity scan data acquired from a simple low-cost IR emitter and detector pair was processed and modeled. Different parameterized reflection models were considered and evaluated to find the most suitable model fit to our experimental data which also best represents and classifies the surfaces under consideration. The proposed approach can differentiate six different surfaces with 100% accuracy. In [9], where we considered differentiation and localization of surfaces by employing non-parametric approaches, a maximum correct differentiation rate of 87% over four surfaces was achieved. Comparing this rate with that obtained in this study, we can conclude that the parametric approach is superior to non-parametric ones, in terms of the accuracy, number of surfaces differentiated, and memory requirements, since the non-parametric approaches we considered require the storage of reference scan signals. By parameterizing the intensity scans and storing only their parameters, we have eliminated the need to store complete reference scans.

This work demonstrates that simple IR sensors, when coupled with appropriate processing, can be used to extract substantially more information about the environment than such devices are commonly employed for. We expect this flexibility to significantly extend the range of applications in which such low-cost single sensor based systems can be used. Specifically, we expect that it will be possible to go beyond relatively simple tasks such as simple object and proximity detection, counting, distance and depth monitoring, floor sensing, position measurement, obstacle/collision avoidance, and deal with tasks such as differentiation, classification, recognition, clustering, position estimation, map building, perception of the environment and surroundings, autonomous navigation, and target tracking. The approach presented here would be more useful where self-correcting operation is possible due to repeated observations and feedback.

The demonstrated system would find application in intelligent autonomous systems such as mobile robots whose task involves surveying an unknown environment made of different surface types. Current and future work involves designing a more intelligent system whose operating range is adjustable based on an initial range estimate to the surface. This will eliminate saturation and allow the system to accurately differentiate and localize surfaces over a wider operating range. Another issue we are considering is the extension of the model to include specular reflections from glossy surfaces. We are also working on the recognition of surfaces through the use of artificial neural networks in order to improve the accuracy. Parametric modeling and representation of intensity scans of different geometries is also being considered to employ the proposed approach in the simultaneous determination of the geometry and the surface type of targets.
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