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## Introduction

- RIT research prompted by the seven datasets in ISO/PAS 15339-2. These CRPCs exhibit consistent color appearance but the statement lacks scientific verification.


## CRPC1~CRPC7

CMYK (Pictorial, ISO 12642-2)



## Objectives

- Test the hypothesis that CCA depends on multiple datasets with varying gamut volumes, while having consistent tonality, gray balance and hues relative to substrate.
- Examine the suitability of the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ as a CCA metric
- $3 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ ( $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ ) color difference between adjacent datasets in the Control and the Experimental groups.


## Experimental - Sample Preparation

- Use CRPC5 as a starting point to create 7 datasets differing in chroma and gamut volume by $3 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ at $95 \%$ pctl. (Control group).
- Create systematically distorted datasets in terms of
- gray balance
- tone reproduction
- chroma (gamut)
- Differences $3 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ at $95 \% \mathrm{pctl}$. (Experimental group).



## Control Group

- Replace CRPC1~CRPC7 in psychometric testing

- Different C* and gamut
- Same CMYRGB hue angles
- Same tone reproduction
- Same gray balance
- Color differences between adjacent printing conditions are equal.

| 95h $\Delta \mathrm{Exo}^{0}$ | -3d_G7 | -2d_G7 | -1d_G7 | Od_G7 | +1d_G7 | +2d_G7 | +3d_G7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -3d_G7 | ----- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -2d_G7 | 3.1 | ----- |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1d_G7 | 6.2 | 3.1 | ----- |  |  |  |  |
| Od_G7 | 9.2 | 6.2 | 3.1 | ----- |  |  |  |
| +1d_G7 | 12.3 | 9.3 | 6.2 | 3.1 | ----- |  |  |
| +2d_G7 | 15.2 | 12.2 | 9.2 | 6.2 | 3.1 | ----- |  |
| +3d_G7 | 16.8 | 13.8 | 10.8 | 7.9 | 5.5 | 3.0 | ----- |

## Experimental Groups

CMYK (Pictorial, ISO 12642-2)
CMYK (Pictorial, ISO 12642-2)


- Same C* and gamut
- Same CMYRGB hue angles
- Different tone reproduction
- Same gray balance
- Color differences between adjacent printing conditions are equal.

| $95 \mathrm{~h} \Delta \mathrm{E}_{0}$ | -3 TVI | -2 TVI | -1 TVI | 0 | +1 TVI | +2 TVI | +3 TVI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -3 TVI | ---- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -2 TVI | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1 TVI | 6.1 | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 9.0 | 5.9 | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |  |
| +1 TVI | 12.0 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |
| +2 TVI | 14.9 | 11.9 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ---- |  |
| +3 TVI | 17.7 | 14.9 | 11.9 | 9.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ---- |



- Same C* and gamut
- Same CMYRGB hue angles
- Same tone reproduction
- Different gray balance
- Color differences between adjacent printing conditions are equal.

| 95th $\Delta \square_{0}$ | $3 Y$ | 2 Y | $1 Y$ | 0 | 1B | 2B | 3B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 Y$ | ----- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Y | 3.0 | ----- |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Y | 6.1 | 3.0 | ----- |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 3.0 | ----- |  |  |  |
| 1B | 12.2 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 3.0 | --- |  |  |
| 2B | 15.2 | 12.1 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 3.0 | - |  |
| 3B | 18.1 | 15.1 | 12.1 | 9.1 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ----- |

## Experimental - Sample Verification

- Verify all dataset and profiles (Annex C)
- Apply profiles to test images and output hard copy, per flow chart.
- Measure hard copies of the Idealliance 12647-7 digital control strip (84 patches) and calculate the 95 th percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ between adjacent datasets.



## Experimental - Psychometric Testing 1

- There is a 'hole' in the Control group. Rank the candidate images that exhibit (from the most to the least) consistent color appearance in relation to the Control group.



## Visual Variation Between Datasets

- The next five slides visualize the seven basic datasets, and the distorted datasets (TVI, Contrast, Gray balance, Chroma)
- Each dataset in each group differs from it's neighbour by $3 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00} 95$ th pctl.
- The left image is a nominal reference


## 7 datasets



## TVI



## S-curve



## Graybal



## Chroma



## Experimental - Psychometric Testing 2

Which set in pair has higher consistency of color appearance?
Provide rating 1- excellent, 2-good, 3 -fair, 4 - poor, 5 -unacceptable

or


or


## Results - Sample Verification

- Visual simulation meets expectations.
- The average 95th percentile color difference between adjacent datasets in the Control group is $3.1 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$.
- The average 95th percentile color difference between adjacent datasets in the Experimental group is $3.0 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$.
- The average 95th percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ between the Control dataset (2d_G7) and gray balance distorted group is $3 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}, 6 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$, or $9 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$.


## Results - Visual Simulation

## - Control group vs. CRPC1~CRPC7

7 new datasets from CRPC5 by scaling white point, black point and chroma with constant primary hue angles, G7 tonality and gray balance, with the 95th percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ between any two adjacent datasets $=3$

Visual simulation of the Control group (-3d~3d)


Visual simulation of the CRPCs (CRPC1~CRPC7)


## Results - Visual Simulation

- Experimental group (tonal curve shape vs. TVI)

12 datasets varying in tonality ( 3 lighter, 3 darker, 3 lower contrast, 3 higher contrast) and 18 datasets with gray balance ( 3 each +CMYRGB) variations from one reference control dataset, with 395 th percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ between any two adjacent datasets.

- Visual simulation of the Experimental group (S-3 to S+3)

- Visual simulation of the Experimental group (TVI-3 to TVI+3)



## Results - Visual Simulation

- Experimental group (gray balance in complementary hue angles)
- Visual simulation of the Experimental group (GB_C-R)

- Visual simulation of the Experimental group (GB_Y-B)

- Visual simulation of the Experimental group (GB_M-G)



## Results - Analysis of the Experimental Group

- 2 d vs. GB_C1 (B1, G1, M1, R1, Y1 are omitted.)
- $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile CRF: $3.1 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$





## Results - Analysis of the Experimental Group

- 2 d vs. GB_C2 (B2, G2, M2, R2, Y2 are omitted.)
- $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile CRF: $6.1 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$





## Results - Analysis of the Experimental Group

- 2 d vs. $\mathrm{S}+1$ (S-3, $\mathrm{S}-2, \mathrm{~S}-1, \mathrm{~S}+2, \mathrm{~S}+3$ are omitted.)
- $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile CRF: $3.0 \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$




## Results $-95^{\text {th }} \Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ of Adjacent Datasets

- Experimental datasets (GB_3Y~3B)
- '0’ represents ‘+2d_G7’

| 95th $\Delta$ ®o $_{0}$ | $3 Y$ | $2 Y$ | $1 Y$ | 0 | $1 B$ | $2 B$ | $3 B$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 Y$ | ---- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 Y$ | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1Y | 6.1 | 3.0 | ----- |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 3.0 | ----- |  |  |  |
| 1B | 12.2 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |
| 2B | 15.2 | 12.1 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 3.0 | ---- |  |
| 3B | 18.1 | 15.1 | 12.1 | 9.1 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ----- |

- Experimental datasets (-3TVI ~ +3TVI)
- '0’ represents ‘+2d_G7’

| 95th $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{0}$ | $-3 T \mathrm{VI}$ | -2 TVI | -1 TVI | 0 | +1 TVI | +2 TVI | +3TVI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -3 TVI | ---- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -2 TVI | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1 TVI | 6.1 | 3.0 | ----- |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 9.0 | 5.9 | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |  |
| +1 TVI | 12.0 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ---- |  |  |
| +2 TVI | 14.9 | 11.9 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ----- |  |
| +3 TVI | 17.7 | 14.9 | 11.9 | 9.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | ----- |

## Results - Psychometric Testing

- Viewing booth (gti; ISO 3664-2009 compliant)
- 6 Sample sets
- 2 sessions
- 12 participants
- 6 experts
- 6 novices



## Results - Psychometric Testing

1) Rank samples that fit in the image set for best CCA
2) Compare and rate sample sets for demonstrating CCA.


## Results: CCA from ranking images for the best ${ }^{27}$ <br> corrected

| image | relative CCA |
| :---: | :---: |
| Control G7 +2d | 0.78 |
| TVI-1d | 0.02 |
| GB R+1d | -0.06 |
| GB B+1d | -0.17 |
| S+1d | -0.25 |
| S-1d | -0.25 |
| GB G+1d | -0.27 |
| GB C+1d | -0.32 |
| TVI+1d | -0.36 |
| GB Y+1d | -0.55 |
| TVI-2d | -0.84 |
| GB C+2d | -0.90 |
| GB M+1d | -1.00 |
| TVI+2d | -1.07 |
| GB R+2d | -1.15 |
| S-2d | -1.50 |
| GB B+2d | -1.57 |
| S+2d | -1.73 |
| GB M+2d | -1.73 |
| TVI-3d | -1.83 |
| S-3d | -1.96 |
| GB G+2d | -2.40 |

CCA based on ranking candidate images


Color Consistency scale based on Thurstone's Law of Comparative Judgement, Case V (Thurstone, 1927)

## Results: CCA vs measured adjacent 95\% delta E00

| image | relative CCA | adjacent 95\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control G7 +2d | 0.78 | 0.00 |
| TVI-1d | 0.02 | 4.12 |
| GB R+1d | -0.06 | 4.69 |
| GB B+1d | -0.17 | 5.38 |
| S+1d | -0.25 | 3.89 |
| S-1d | -0.25 | 5.47 |
| GB G+1d | -0.27 | 5.21 |
| GB C+1d | -0.32 | 2.87 |
| TVI +1 d | -0.36 | 4.77 |
| GB Y+1d | -0.55 | 3.93 |
| TVI-2d | -0.84 | 6.77 |
| GB C+2d | -0.90 | 8.11 |
| GB M+1d | -1.00 | 10.46 |
| TVI $+2 d$ | -1.07 | 5.54 |
| GB R+2d | -1.15 | 7.95 |
| S-2d | -1.50 | 7.16 |
| GB B+2d | -1.57 | 8.57 |
| S+2d | -1.73 | 7.88 |
| GB M+2d | -1.73 | 9.82 |
| TVI-3d | -1.83 | 10.95 |
| S-3d | -1.96 | 13.80 |
| GB G+2d | -2.40 | 12.92 |

Relative CCA vs Adjacent 95\% delta E 2000


## Results: Measured 95\% delta EOO vs relative CCA

| image | cummulative |
| :---: | :---: |
| Control G7 +2d | 0.00 |
| TVI-1d | 4.12 |
| GB R+1d | 8.81 |
| GB B+1d | 14.19 |
| S +1 d | 18.08 |
| S-1d | 23.55 |
| GB G+1d | 28.76 |
| GB C+1d | 31.63 |
| TVI +1 d | 36.40 |
| GB Y+1d | 40.32 |
| TVI-2d | 47.09 |
| GB C+2d | 55.20 |
| GB M+1d | 65.65 |
| TVI+2d | 71.19 |
| GB R+2d | 79.15 |
| S-2d | 86.31 |
| GB B+2d | 94.87 |
| S $+2 d$ | 102.76 |
| GB M+2d | 112.58 |
| TVI-3d | 123.52 |
| S-3d | 137.32 |
| GB G+2d | 150.24 |

Relative CCA vs cummulative sum of measured adjacent 95\% delta E00


## Results: Consistency of Color Appearance from Ratings of Sets of Images



All 12 participants

## LSMeans Differences Tukey HSD

|  |  | Least |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Level |  | Sq Mean |

# Results: Comparison of Consistency of Color ${ }^{31}$ Appearance Ratings for Sets of Images 



EXPERTS ONLY (6 participants)

LSMeans Differences Tukey HSD $\mathrm{a}=0.050 \quad \mathrm{Q}=2.88174$


# Results: Comparison of Consistency of Color ${ }^{32}$ Appearance Ratings for Sets of Images 




NOVICES ONLY (6 participants)

LSMeans Differences Tukey HSD $a=0.050 \quad Q=2.88174$

|  |  | Least |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Level |  | Sq Mean |

## Conclusions

- A methodology for studying Consistent Color Appearance for a set of printed images was developed.
- Psychometric tests showed that CCA of image set with chroma changes appear to be more consistent than due to other attribute ( $+/-\mathrm{TR},+/-\mathrm{GB}$ ) change.
- There is a discrepancy between experts and novices when judging CCA which may be attributed to the CCA versus image quality perceptions.
- Large range of image variations within a set can be problematic for judging CCA.
- Device-based $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00}$ is shown to be a good predictor for Consistent Color Appearance in the present experiment. The $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{00} \sim 3$ were perceptible in terms of CCA evaluations.
- Additional experiments are needed to evaluate the effects of pictorial scene on CCA.

