

CHALLENGES IN VIDEO QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERWATER WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORKS

Javier Poncela

J.M. Moreno-Roldán, M.A. Luque-Nieto, P. Otero

Communications Engineering Department
University of Málaga, Spain

Motivations

- **Ocean scientists** often need not only sensor measures (temperature, salinity...) but also they **need to watch** underwater environments.
- **Images** from oceanic resources are currently **difficult** and **expensive** to obtain.
 - Exploration expeditions with divers or robots submerging with cameras are needed.
- **Video services in USNs** would allow to **reduce** these **costs**.



Subjective Video Quality Assessment (VQA)


- Subjective tests are considered the most **reliable** approach to quality.
 - The opinion is gathered **directly** from users.
 - It is a **well known** procedure (ITU BT.500 and P.910).
- They also bring important drawbacks.
 - It is a **time-consuming** method.
 - A session for a single user is at least 20 minutes.
 - It requires a fair amount of **human resources**.
 - Viewers should not be experienced in quality assessment.
 - If the same people take part in different experiments, a wide enough time lapse must be used.

Challenges in subjective VQA – Underwater

- Underwater video is currently used for **specific applications**.
 - Ocean scientists, companies managing underwater resources, safety and security specialists...
- It is more difficult to find an **appropriate group** of evaluators.
- In this kind of application, quality is usually related to the tasks the video is used for.
 - Different professionals perform different tasks. The quality can be perceived in a different way.

Challenges in objective VQA – Underwater

- Nodes are virtually **unreachable** once deployed.
 - The original unimpaired video cannot be recovered.



- Nodes must operate as long as possible. **Energy saving** is a priority.
 - Intensive processing tasks that would reduce battery life should be avoided.
- The low bitrate heavily **constrains** the amount of information that can be sent for quality measuring purposes.

Objective Video Quality Assessment

- The quality is estimated with a **mathematical model**.
 - Once the model is built and tested, quality can be assessed without the disadvantages of subjective VQA.
 - Most models compute an approximation to the MOS.

$$MOS = 1 + I_{ofr} \exp\left(\frac{[\ln(Fr) - \ln(Ofr)]^2}{2D_{Fr}^2}\right)$$
$$Ofr = v_1 + v_2 Br$$
$$I_{ofr} = v_3 - \frac{v_3}{1 + \left(\frac{Br}{v_4}\right)^{v_5}}$$

- Models can be classified according to their inputs:
 - *Full Reference*
 - *Reduced Reference*. The **received** signal and some **features from the original** signal are used to compute the quality estimation.
 - *No Reference*. **Only the received** signal required for the quality estimation.

Applicability of VQA methods – Full Reference

- The **received** and the **original** signal are analyzed and compared to compute the quality estimation.
 - Extensively used
 - Standard Algorithms
 - PEVQ algorithm models human visual system (ITU J.247)
 - SSIM performs better than PEVQ (more recent)
 - Drawbacks
 - Original signal is required (UWSNs bitrates are too low)
 - Involve heavy image processing, expensive energy use for underwater nodes
- ➔ Usefulness only in laboratory tests

Applicability of VQA methods – Reduced Reference

- The **received** signal and some **features from the original** signal are used to compute the quality estimation.
 - RR methods in J.249 use 15-256 kbps
 - Data for features should only need a fraction of video bitrate
 - Still too large bitrate
 - Feature extraction still requires intensive image processing
 - Energy concerns
 - New method uses 0.875 kbps (~6% of 15 kbps video flow)
- ➔ Applicable but requires novel algorithms

Applicability of VQA methods – No Reference


- Advantages:
 - Only needs received signal
 - Pixel-based, bit-stream or network parameter analysis
 - No extra processing in intermediate nodes
- Disadvantage: Good performing methods, but none tested in underwater channels
- Standard parametric method G.1070 was intended for videoconferences
 - Cannot be extended to underwater (previous published study) due to mismatch in quality scores [10]

➔ Proposal: New parametric model for underwater

New parametric model


Plane

$$MOS = a_0 + a_1 B_r + a_2 F_r$$



2nd Degree Polynomial

$$MOS = a_0 + a_1 B_r + a_2 F_r + a_3 B_r^2 + a_4 F_r^2 + a_5 B_r F_r$$



Model	GOF Statistics		
	R ²	SSE	RMSE
Plane	0.3781	2.76	0.6789
2nd degree polynomial	0.5419	2.033	0.8232

Conclusion

- Quality assessment is required for development of successful video services (challenges)
- Standard methods:
 - Full, Reduced and No Reference
- For underwater, only RR and NR methods could be suitable but should take into account
 - Processing requirements
 - Bandwidth constraints
 - Application intended

Thanks for your attention

Javier Poncela

J.M. Moreno-Roldán, M.A. Luque-Nieto, P. Otero

Communications Engineering Department
University of Málaga, Spain