Optimizing data acquisition for scaling methods , particularly MLCM

Bachelor Thesis Exposé Jan Zabel

Trial: Which side does the participant perceive as brighter?





Perceptual Encoding Function

- Empirical estimation of brightness perception in our visual system
- Transfer function f(x):
 - x: Luminance and Context
 - Luminance: 10 Levels between 0 and 1
 - Contexts: "On white" and "On Black"
 - f: x to perceived brightness R

1.0

0.8

0.6

0.4

0.2

0.0

0.00

(x)∳





Percentage of a participant choosing either x-axis-stimuli or y-axis-stimuli. 1: X-Axis 0: Y-Axis 15 Repeats

- 1.0

0.8

0.0



4





Maximum Likelihood Conjoined Measurement (MLCM)

- Used to estimate perceptual scales
 - Models relationship between stimulus and response

(0.035.0)

(0.07, 0) (0.131, 0) (0.26, 0)

(0.39, 0)

(0.64, 0)

(0.9, 0)

(0.035, 1) (0.07, 1) (0.131, 1) (0.26, 1) (0.39, 1) (0.52, 1) (0.64, 1) (0.77, 1) (0.9, 1)

- Luminance and perceived brightness
- Maximum likelihood
- Perceptual scales represent Perceptual Encoding Function
 - How the illusion affects our perception
 - Response to a unique stimulus



The Problem

- Trials accumulate
- Some trials have consistent results
- Consistent results aren't precious
- Consistent results take up time and energy

Lumi- nance	Context	Trials	Total
10	2	190	2850
13	2	325	4875
10	3	435	6525
20	4	3160	47400

$$Unique Trials = \frac{20 \times (20 - 1)}{2}$$
10 Luminance Levels × 2 Contexts – Itself

Research Question:

Can we reduce the amount of trials and consequently the experiment's duration, for a fixed set of unique stimuli, without impacting the quality of the encoding function recovered using MLCM?

Proposed Method 1:

Remove trials with luminance difference of >0.2 for same context

Remove trials with luminance difference of >0.5 for different context



- 1.0

0.8

0.6

0.4

0.2

1

0.8

0

0

0

1

0.93

'on white')

(0.8, '

(0.9, 'on white')

(1.0, 10, 10)

0.13 0.93

0.4

0.2

0.13 0.47

0.93

0.93

Cut down Matrix 1560/2850 Trials 45,3%

Preliminary results Static



- 45,3% efficiency increase
- No decrease in accuracy (<0.4%)

How do actual results look like?



What else can be done?

- Fine tune static method
- Use other methods
- Vary the ground truth function
- Vary noise levels
- More Luminance Levels
- More Contexts (Size of Targets)

