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How it all started:

Rick Johnson (Cornell): sabbatical in France visits Van Gogh Museum conservator department use of chemical analysis, X-rays, infrared, .. why no image analysis?
This led to the first IP4AI workshop

IP4AI: Image Processing for Art Investigation

Since then: 5 workshops
Typically held at a museum (van Gogh Museum, MoMA, Belgian Academy, NCMA)
Mix of “art people” & “data people”
First IP4AI workshops: focused tasks.

Example: distinguish work from different periods in artist's life

or: characterize “style”
(movie with swirling paintings)
Analysis method: study images at different scales

In particular:

- determine image content at different scales

- which information “lives” at different scales?

- find local hierarchical relationships governing information at these scales
Determine information at different scales
Determine information at different scales
Determine information at different scales

and find the difference

blur
Determine information at different Scales

Difference = A - B
Determine information at different Scales

Difference = A - B
Determine information at different Scales
For each painting patch: 140 features

Compare paintings:

ensemble of feature vectors for patches within a painting

collection of these ensembles, one for each painting

leads to dissimilarity (distance) between paintings
NOVA: had idea of making a small program.

www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/teach/art-authentication.html
IP4AI1: The NOVA Challenge
The NOVA Challenge
Very Fine Scale Detail: fluency of brush stroke
IP4AI2: Work on Expanded Dataset

To test our capability to detect copies, the dataset for IP4AI2 (2008) included a contemporary copy of a VG painting, as well as datasets for more VG paintings than before.
IP4AI2: Work on Expanded Dataset

We looked at fine scale detail in the 21 newly added paintings to the dataset.
We looked at fine scale detail in the 21 newly added paintings to the dataset.

Our classifier considers **ALL** of the newly added paintings as “copies” or “fakes”
Eric Postma recently purchased a new slide scanner, on which the new images were scanned. New images are crisper than our old ones.
Measuring Blur

We measured blur *quantitatively* in previous sets of paintings examined. For the NOVA 6:
Measuring Blur

We measured blur **quantitatively** in previous sets of paintings examined. For the NOVA 6:

Here the copy is by far the least blurry. This unfairly helped us detect it ...
A Second Validation Test

We asked Charlotte Caspers to paint a series of pairs of small paintings

In each pair: one original one copy

Different pairs painted with different brushes, paint, background, ...
Charlotte Caspers - Reconstructions
Charlotte Caspers - Reconstructions
A Second Validation Test

GIVE DETAILS OF CHARLOTTE DATASET
Some of the originals and copies painted by Charlotte.
Variety of Materials and Styles
Advantages of this Dataset

Ground truth: we **know** which are “hesitating” copies and which are originals.

Uniform digital imaging conditions: Blur, lighting, etc. are same; high-quality direct digital scan of surface.

Variety of materials and styles.
Results

We can distinguish copies from originals in Charlotte's paintings in all cases where she used both soft and hard brushes.

What makes the difference is fairly fine detail, but some other features too.
Follow-up study

We could distinguish copies from originals in Charlotte's paintings in all cases where she used both soft and hard brushes.

Express this in more “painterly” terms? Not only prediction accuracy is important …

Revisited original study in 2013.
Revisiting first study

Revisited original study in 2013.

No “background” patches.
Revisiting first study

Revisited original study in 2013.

No “background” patches.

Different grouping of test/training patches
Revisiting first study

Revisited original study in 2013.

No “background” patches.

Different grouping of test/training patches

With same techniques as before: results less convincing …
Revisiting first study

Revisited original study in 2013.

With same techniques as before: results less convincing ...

but still significative!

In particular, also after “canvas removal”
New data set

Again painted by Charlotte Caspers

on masonite: no canvas structure!
New data set

Again painted by Charlotte Caspers

on masonite: no canvas structure!

Truly blind