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Motivation
Scope

- Various factors influencing 360° video QoE
- Studies on subjective & objective quality evaluation for 360° videos
- Some studies on impacts of framerate for traditional 2D videos
- Important: How smooth are motions appearing to the user?
- Hypothesis: Smoothness important for high subjective quality
- Key questions:
  a) Influence of internal playback processing of HMD on displayed content?
  b) Use motion interpolation (MI) for improving 360° QoE?
  c) If yes: which algorithm to use to achieve higher QoE? Content-dependency?
Experimental Setup & Test Method – Flicker Test (1)

• Key question: Influence internal playback processing on content shown?
• Refresh rate Vive Pro = 90 Hz
• Effect of 30 fps (25/50/60/90 fps) 360° content playout?
• SteamVR installed on fresh VR PC
• Vive Pro considered as blackbox

→ Influence of 360° video player
  – GoPro VR player
  – Virtual Desktop
  – Whirligig
Experimental Setup & Test Method – Flicker Test (2)

- On test tool developed:
  - Flicker test sequences
  - Sensor hardware
- Flicker test sequences: Alternating black/white frames
  - Uneven frames: white
  - Even frames: black
  - 3840x2160 pixels resolution
- Rendered in 25/30/50/60/90 fps, ffmpeg, libx265 encoder (CRF=0)
Experimental Setup & Test Method – Flicker Test (3)

- Analog frontend: photodiode, transimpedance amplifier + buffer
- Photodiode's spectral range adapted to human eye
- Connected to Oscilloscope + placed above HMD's display
- Black/White frame changes visible on oscilloscope
Results Flicker Test (1)

- HMD: HTC VIVE Pro
- Player: Whirligig
- Framerate: 90 fps

- No dropped frames
- Very smooth motion
- No stuttering
- No interpolation pattern
Results Flicker Test (2)

- HMD: HTC VIVE Pro
- Player: VD
- Framerate: 90 fps

✓ No dropped frames
✓ No interpolation pattern
✓ 25, 30, 50, 90 fps same as Whirligig
✓ Less GPU + CPU power than e.g. Whirligig (almost half)
Results Flicker Test (3)

- HMD: HTC VIVE Pro
- Player: GoPro VR Player
- Framerate: 90 fps

- Dropped frames
- Strong stuttering
- No regular pattern
Results Flicker Test (4)

- HMD: HTC VIVE Pro
- Player: Whirligig
- Framerate: 25 fps

- No dropped frames
- Visible stuttering
- Interpolation pattern recognizable
Results Flicker Test (5)

Summary

- Recommendations for smooth playout:
  - Use 90 fps 360° content
  - Use Whirligig, Virtual Desktop or another 360° player
  - We avoid usage of GoPro VR Player
  - Avoid playback of 25 fps 360° content
Experimental Setup & Test Method – Subjective Test (1)

- Influence framerate on 360° video quality? → Lack HFR 360° content
- MI for improving QoE?
  - Which MI methods for 360° videos?
- Content selection (20 s)
  - ERP (3820x1920 px.), ffmpeg 4.1, libx265 (CRF=0)
  - Training: 1 CGI content (Moon), 30/90 fps
  - Part I: 1 CGI content (Starfield), 25/30/50/60/90 fps
  - Part II: 4 contents, 30 fps source + 90 fps interpolated (various MI algorithms)
- Wide range of complexity/motion → Mostly "stuttering-affected" videos
Experimental Setup & Test Method – Subjective Test (2)

CGI contents used

Real contents used

SI/TI values of contents
Experimental Setup & Test Method – Subjective Test (3)

- ACR for training + part I $\rightarrow$ overall quality
- PC in part II
- MI algorithms part II:
  - *Butterflow* (cf. [But19])
  - *ffmpeg* blend frames
  - *ffmpeg* MCI (Motion Compensated Interpolation)
- Subjective test, 12 video expert viewers, randomized playlists

Pre-screening (vision tests, forms) (5 min) $\rightarrow$ Training session (ACR) (3 min) $\rightarrow$ Part I (5 PVSs, ACR) (6 min) $\rightarrow$ Part II (24 PVSs, PC) (30 min) $\rightarrow$ Questionnaire (5 min)
Experimental Setup & Test Method – Subjective Test (4)

- Test method part II: Show participants 2 consecutive videos
- Ask for preferred video
- Answer "equal" also possible
- Source video: 30 fps
- Interpolated video: 90 fps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRC number</th>
<th>Video 1</th>
<th>Video 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRC001</td>
<td>Source (30 fps)</td>
<td>Butterflow (90 fps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC002</td>
<td>Source (30 fps)</td>
<td>Blend (90 fps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC003</td>
<td>Source (30 fps)</td>
<td>MCI (90 fps)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results Subjective Test – Training

- "Moon" sequence
- Quality difference between 30 + 90 fps clearly visible
- Significant in spite of low number of subjects
Results Subjective Test – Part I

- "Starfield" sequence
- Difference in quality for 25/30/50/60/90 fps clearly visible
Results Preference Subjective Test – Part II (1)

HRC001: Source video vs. Butterflow
- Butterflow interpolated video always preferred over source video
- SRC 2: Difference not so clearly visible → slow motion
- SRC 3 + 4: Clear preference for interpolated video
- SRC 5: Fast + sudden movements in video → MI evoking mosquito artifacts → Reference video often preferred
Results Preference Subjective Test – Part II (2)

HRC002: Source video vs. Blend

- MI algorithm "Blend" not good results
- Blending leading to blurred images → reference preferred or pair rated as equal
- Interpolation not leading to significant better quality
Results Preference Subjective Test – Part II (3)

HRC003: Source video vs. MCI

- SRC 3-5: Clear preference for interpolated video
- SRC 2: Difference not clearly visible, slow camera movements
- SRC 5: Probably MCI is better suitable for fast movements than butterflow → higher number of preferences
Conclusions

• Different effects of interpolation patterns on playback clearly visible
• General preference of 90 fps over 30 fps content
• Interpolation of 30 fps to 90 fps generally improving quality
• Fast movement: MCI preferred over butterflow
• Medium movement: butterflow slightly preferred over MCI
• ffmpeg "blend" not recommendable
• CGI sequences publicly available

https://github.com/Telecommunication-Telemedia-Assessment/360_testcontent
Questions?
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