

(19) World Intellectual Property Organization
International Bureau



(43) International Publication Date
22 June 2006 (22.06.2006)

PCT

(10) International Publication Number
WO 2006/065023 A1

(51) International Patent Classification:
H04N 17/00 (2006.01)

(21) International Application Number:
PCT/KR2005/003468

(22) International Filing Date: 18 October 2005 (18.10.2005)

(25) Filing Language: English

(26) Publication Language: English

(30) Priority Data:
10-2004-0105087
13 December 2004 (13.12.2004) KR

(71) Applicant (for all designated States except US): **ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE** [KR/KR]; 161 Gajeong-dong, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 305-350 (KR).

(72) Inventors; and

(75) Inventors/Applicants (for US only): **OH, Weon Geun** [KR/KR]; Dasol Apt. 103-103, Gung-dong, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 305-335 (KR). **CHO, Ik Hwan** [KR/KR]; Department of Electrical Engineering, Inha University 253 Yonghyun-dong, Nam-gu, Incheon 402-020 (KR).

JEONG, Dong Seok [KR/KR]; Department of Electrical Engineering, Inha University 253 Yonghyun-dong, Nam-gu, Incheon 402-020 (KR). **KIM, Hae Gwang** [KR/KR]; Department of Software Engineering, Sejong University 98 Kunja-dong, Kwangjin-gu, Seoul 143-747 (KR).


(74) Agent: **SHIN, Young Moo**; Ace Tower 4th Floor 1-170, Soonhwa-dong, Chung-gu, Seoul 100-130 (KR).

(81) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of national protection available): AE, AG, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DZ, EC, EE, EG, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KM, KP, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, LY, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MZ, NA, NG, NI, NO, NZ, OM, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RU, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, SY, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, YU, ZA, ZM, ZW.

(84) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of regional protection available): ARIPO (BW, GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, MZ, NA, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZM, ZW), Eurasian (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European (AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU, LV, MC, NL, PL, PT,

[Continued on next page]

(54) Title: METHOD AND SYSTEMS FOR SELECTING TEST STIMULI FOR USE IN EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF VIDEO WATERMARKING METHODS



(57) Abstract: Provided is a method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a video watermarking algorithm, including the steps of: calculating an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into L (where L is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated ICR values; calculating an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates, and classifying them into M (where M is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated EDR values; calculating a motion rate (MR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into N (where N is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the calculated MR values; and selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the L levels, M levels, the N levels of the test stimuli, respectively.

WO 2006/065023 A1



RO, SE, SI, SK, TR), OAPI (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA,
GN, GQ, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).

Published:

— with international search report

For two-letter codes and other abbreviations, refer to the "Guidance Notes on Codes and Abbreviations" appearing at the beginning of each regular issue of the PCT Gazette.

Description

METHOD AND SYSTEMS FOR SELECTING TEST STIMULI FOR USE IN EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF VIDEO WA- TERMARKING METHODS

Background Art

[1] 1. Field of the Invention

[2] The present invention relates to a performance evaluation mechanism of a video watermarking algorithm, and more specifically, to a method and system for selecting test stimuli to insure a reliable evaluation result in evaluating performance of a video watermarking method.

[3]

[4] 2. Description of Related Art

[5] Robustness is one of the important factors to consider in the evaluation of a video watermarking method. The robustness refers to a performance capable of detecting the existence of a watermark embedded in images even when distortion attacks are intentionally or unintentionally applied. In general, in order to evaluate the robustness of a video watermark algorithm, a specific watermark is embedded in a test stimuli, i.e., video data, with the associated watermarking algorithm, and then, various attack functions are applied to the stimuli in which the watermark has been embedded, in order to produce intentional distortion. Finally, by measuring the similarity between the detected watermark and the original watermark, the robustness of the watermark algorithm can be evaluated.

[6] These kinds of robustness evaluation methods have been proposed in many scientific papers and utilized in real applications. However, although a lot of attack functions have been proposed and categorized, there has been no report or publication on the selection of the test stimuli in the evaluation process.

[7] To insure reliable evaluation results for the robustness of each video watermarking method (or algorithm), it should be guaranteed that the evaluation process gives the same or very similar results for each test stimulus. However, it is impossible to achieve without establishing some criteria for the selection of the test stimuli. Therefore, in order to reliably evaluate the robustness of the video-watermarking algorithm, it is necessary to establish a standardized guideline for the selection of video stimuli.

[8]

[9] **SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION**

[10] The present invention is directed to providing certain criteria for the selection of test stimuli used in performance evaluation of a video watermarking algorithm.

- [11] The present invention is also directed to insuring the reliability of performance evaluation of a video watermarking algorithm by providing selection criteria based on a spatial domain, a frequency domain, and a motion domain of test stimuli, in the selection of test stimuli used in evaluating performance of the video-watermarking algorithm.
- [12] One aspect of the present invention is to provide a method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a watermarking algorithm. The method includes the steps of: calculating an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates; classifying said plurality of test stimulus candidates into L (where L is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the test stimuli, based on the calculated ICR values; and selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the L levels of the test stimuli.
- [13] Another aspect of the present invention is to provide a method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a watermarking algorithm, the method includes the steps of: calculating an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates; classifying said plurality of test stimulus candidates into M (where M is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the test stimuli, based on the calculated EDR values; and selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the M levels of the test stimuli.
- [14] Still another aspect of the present invention is to provide a method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a watermarking algorithm, the method includes the steps of: calculating a motion rate (MR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates; classifying the plurality of test stimulus candidates into N (where N is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the test stimuli, based on the calculated MR values; and selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the N levels of the test stimuli.
- [15] Yet another aspect of the present invention is to provide a method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a video watermarking algorithm, the method includes the steps of: calculating an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into L (where L is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated ICR values; calculating an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates, and classifying them into M (where M is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated EDR values; calculating a motion rate (MR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into N (where N is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the calculated MR values; and selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the L levels, each of the M levels, each of the N levels of the test stimuli, respectively.

- [16] Yet another aspect of the present invention is to provide a system for selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a video- watermarking algorithm. The system includes: first classification means for calculating an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into L (where L is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated ICR values; second classification means for calculating an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates, and classifying them into M (where M is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated EDR values; third classification means for calculating a motion rate (MR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into N (where N is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated MR values; and selection means for selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the L levels, each of the M levels, each of the N levels of the test stimuli, respectively.

[17]

Brief Description of the Drawings

- [18] The above and other features and advantages of the present invention will become more apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art by describing in detail exemplary embodiments thereof with reference to the attached drawings in which:
- [19] FIG. 1 is a schematic block diagram of a test stimulus selection system for evaluating performance of a video watermarking algorithm according to an embodiment of the present invention;
- [20] FIG. 2 is a diagram showing 5 sample images used to calculate an image complexity rate and respective complexity rate measures according to the present invention;
- [21] FIG. 3 is a flowchart schematically showing a process of calculating an EDR according to an embodiment of the present invention;
- [22] FIG. 4 is a diagram illustrating a concept of a zigzag scan method used for reordering 2D frequency images into 1D images;
- [23] FIGS. 5A and 5B show plots of the 1D energy distribution and the normalized energy distribution for a Lena image of FIG. 2, respectively;
- [24] FIGS. 6A and 6B show plots of the 1D energy distribution and the normalized energy distribution for a Text image, respectively; and
- [25] FIGS. 7A and 7B show the motion vectors of two video stimuli, respectively.

[26]

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS

- [28] The present invention will now be described more fully hereinafter with reference to the accompanying drawings, in which preferred embodiments of the invention are

shown. This invention may, however, be embodied in different forms and should not be construed as limited to the embodiments set forth herein. Rather, these embodiments are provided so that this disclosure will be thorough and complete, and will fully convey the scope of the invention to those skilled in the art.

- [29] First, we assume that the performance evaluation system of the present invention is unaware of a video-watermarking algorithm. Accordingly, test stimuli can be selected independent of the watermarking algorithm to be evaluated. For the performance evaluation of the watermarking algorithm, the present invention proposes a guideline for the selection of the test stimuli rather than a fixed database of the test stimuli.
- [30] To insure reliable results of the watermarking algorithm evaluation, evaluation should be performed using a number of test stimuli having a wide range of features, which is impractical. It is difficult not only to produce a number of test stimuli having a wide range of features, but also to establish a definite guideline for each of the characteristics of these test stimuli.
- [31] Therefore, in order to establish a guideline for the selection of test stimuli, the present invention classifies the test stimuli into some different levels according to three criteria, i.e., an image complexity rate (ICR), an energy distribution rate (EDR), and a motion rate (MR).
- [32] FIG. 1 is a schematic block diagram of a test stimulus selection system for evaluating performance of a video watermarking algorithm according to an embodiment of the present invention. Blocks 110, 120 and 130 indicate independent modules, respectively, and those skilled in the art will readily appreciate that some of these blocks can be omitted in other embodiments.
- [33] As shown in FIG. 1, an ICR classification module 110 calculates an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a number of test stimuli candidates, and classifies them into L ($L > 1$) predefined levels according to the calculated ICRs.
- [34] An EDR classification module 120 calculates an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of a number of test stimuli candidates, and then classifies them into M ($M > 1$) predefined levels according to the calculated EDRs. An MR classification 130 calculates a motion rate (MR) for each of a number of test stimuli candidates, and classifies them into N ($N > 1$) predefined levels according to the calculated MRs.
- [35] A test stimuli selection module 140 selects a final group of the test stimuli among a number of the candidates. It determines a final group of the test stimuli so that each stimulus is selected from a different level of the stimuli classified by the ICR classification module 110, the EDR classification module 120 and the MR classification module 130, respectively.
- [36] The following Table 1 indicates a relation between video watermarking evaluation domains and their criteria in the evaluation of the video-watermarking algorithm

according to the present invention.

[37] Table 1

Domain	Criteria
Spatial domain	Image Complexity Rate (ICR)
Frequency domain	Energy Distribution Rate (EDR)
Motion domain	Motion Rate (MR)

[38] Test video stimuli have various features that need to be considered in the evaluation process. Some features are related to a specific watermarking algorithm, while other features are rather general in nature. In general, the features of a video sequence can be classified into the spatial and frequency domains, in a similar manner to a still image. In addition, however, a video sequence also has a motion domain, which is a key element distinguishing it from the still image. These three domain elements are the most general domains to be considered in establishing criteria for the selection of the test stimuli. Therefore, as described in Table 1, the present invention proposes three criteria for the classification of the stimuli from each of the spatial, frequency and motion domains.

[39] Image Complexity Rate (ICR)

[40] First, in order to consider the spatial domain features of the video, an ICR is used as a selection criterion. A video is essentially a sequential set of still images, and each frame in the video (as in the case of a still image) consists of homogenous regions and edges. Therefore, the robustness of the watermarking process may differ depending on the number of edges and their amplitude. To quantify the number and amplitude of the edges, the concept of ICR is used. In general, the complexity of an image is considered to increase as the number of edges increases. However, it is not sufficient to define the complexity of an image based solely on such a simple concept as the number of edges. Edges can be treated as an intensity differences among pixels. Therefore, it may be desirable that the image complexity rate (ICR) be treated through an intensity level-dependent method rather than an edge-dependent one. The standard deviation of the overall image and entropy of the histogram are two of the simplest measures of contrast. However, it is too simple to measure the uniformity of the overall frame image. Therefore, the present invention uses the following function, which was proposed by Bhanu as an image complexity measure.

[41] [Equation 1]

[42]

$$U = -\frac{1}{w \times h} \sum_{x=1}^w \sum_{y=1}^h \left[f(x, y) - \bar{f}(x, y) \right]^2$$

where $f(x, y)$ is the intensity -level at pixel (x, y)

and $\bar{f}(x, y)$ is the average gray -level in a 3×3 window centered at (x, y)

and w and h are the width and height of the image.

[43] The image complexity rate function defined in Eq. 1 is a global average of a local intensity level gradient and therefore can measure both the uniformity and contrast of an image. In another embodiment, to emphasize the edges, Eq. 1 can be modified to counter the number of local gradient whose value is greater than a predefined threshold value. However, the resulting complexity values are still very similar to each other.

[44] FIG. 2 is a diagram showing 5 sample images used to calculate an image complexity rate and respective complexity rate measures according to the present invention. From FIG. 2, it can be seen that the image complexity rate measure does not always depend solely on the number of edges. For example, in the Cross image 240 and the Text image 250, the measure value sometimes depends on the number of edges, but in the Lena image 210, it does not. Instead, it can be appreciated that the contrast of the edge may affect the overall measure value.

[45] According to an embodiment, the video stimuli can be classified into 4 levels as shown in Table 2 according to the image complexity rate described above. In an embodiment of the watermarking algorithm evaluation process according to the present invention, the ICR of each stimulus is calculated, and more than 4 stimuli included in each level should be selected as the final test stimuli. While the number of the levels of the image complexity rate is determined to be 4 in the present invention, the present invention is not limited thereto, but it will be appreciated that the test stimuli can be classified into more or less levels of the image complexity rate, if required.

[46] Table 2

Level	Range
ICR 1	0~100
ICR 2	100~300
ICR 3	300~600
ICR 4	600~

[47]

[48] Energy Distribution Rate (EDR)

[49] Many watermarking algorithms have used a frequency domain as an embedding domain of the information used to improve robustness. In general, those watermarking

algorithms using the frequency domain are known to be more robust than those using the spatial domain, even if they have several disadvantages in certain areas. The main point to consider when using the frequency domain in a watermarking algorithm is to modify the data of a specific frequency band to embed the information. In general, the data of the mid-frequency range are widely used, because the modification of low-frequency information induces a large distortion of the source image, while the modification of the high-frequency range does not guarantee the robustness.

[50] According to an embodiment of the present invention, the EDR is used to classify the stimuli according to the frequency domain. The EDR is a reflection of how the energy of a video sequence is distributed within a specific frequency band. The EDR can be implemented using various methods. In an embodiment of the present invention, the EDR is implemented using a reordering method of DCT-AC coefficients. In order to obtain frequency information, many transforms, such as the Fourier transform, DCT transform and Wavelet transform can be used. In a preferred embodiment, the DCT transform, which is the most generally employed in the video compression, is used herein. In reality, both JPEG and MPEG are based on the DCT transform.

[51] FIG. 3 is a flowchart schematically showing a process of calculating an EDR according to an embodiment of the present invention. First, in step 310, the whole DCT transform is applied to the image (or each frame) to generate the DCT coefficient. Then, the 2D spatial image is converted to the 2D frequency image, which consists of frequency coefficients of equal dimension. In step 320, all of the AC coefficients, except for the DC coefficient, are reordered using a zigzag scan method. The zigzag scan method is typically used in JPEG and MPEG compression.

[52] FIG. 4 illustrates a concept of the zigzag scan method. Once the DCT transform has been applied, the energy is generally concentrated in the top left position, which corresponds to the low-frequency range, whereas the right-bottom corresponds to the high-frequency range. Therefore, the 2D energy distribution is converted to the 1D distribution by using the zigzag scan method, which is a simple method and the one that is the most general.

[53] Referring again to FIG. 3, in step 330, the energy of the AC coefficients is calculated from the reordered 1D data in step 320 using the following Equation 2, and then the 1D energy distribution is normalized for length and amplitude.

[54] [Equation 2]

[55]

$$E(s) = T(s)^2, s \in [0, N]$$

[56] where s is the position in the 1-D distribution, N is the number of AC coefficients, and T is the reordered AC coefficients and E is the energy distribution. FIGS. 5A and 5B show plots of the 1D energy distribution and the normalized energy distribution for a Lena image 110 of FIG. 2, respectively; and FIGS. 6A and 6B show plots of the 1D energy distribution and the normalized energy distribution for a Text image 120, respectively.

[57] Next, in FIG. 340, the energy distribution rate (EDR) is calculated using a normalization value calculated in the above step 330. Because the whole DCT transform is applied, it is difficult to identify the rate of the energy concentration on full bandwidth. In the case of a 256x256 grayscale image, recognizing the difference between two EDRs is not easy, even if two different images are used. Because the image information is mostly concentrated in the low-frequency range, the amount of information stored in the right-bottom AC coefficients is very small relative to that stored in the low-frequency range. In general, performing a block-by-block transform solves this problem more or less. In some blocks, approximating the energy distribution is more convenient, because the number of coefficients is limited. However, in the present invention, the whole DCT transform is used, so that a priority is given to the global distribution rather than the local distribution. Therefore, in the classification of the stimuli, some parts of the energy distribution will be used except for some partial high-frequency information (e.g., more than 70%).

[58] The EDR according to an embodiment of the present invention is calculated using the following Equation 3. Preferably, in the following Equation 3, the log scale is used to perceive a change in the distribution in the high frequency range, considering that the energy in the high frequency range has a relatively small value. The EDR has a small value for a low-frequency concentrated image, and a large value for a high-frequency concentrated image.

[59] [Equation 3]

[60]

$$EDR = \frac{1}{N_{limit}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{limit}} \frac{i}{N} \cdot \log(E(i))$$

[61] where N_{limit} is the number of AC coefficients except 30% of high frequency.

[62] In step 350, the test stimuli are classified using the EDR calculated in step 340. According to an embodiment of the present invention, the EDR is classified into 3 levels. In the evaluation process of the test stimuli, the EDR of the stimuli is calculated, and more than 3 of the stimuli included in each level should be selected as the final test stimuli. While the number of the EDR levels is 3 in the above

embodiment, the present invention is not limited thereto, but it will be appreciated that the test stimuli can be classified into more or less EDR levels, if required.

[63] Motion Rate (MR)

[64] Motion is the most specific feature to video, in that it has temporal information. Video compression algorithms such as MPEG4 and H.264/AVC estimate and compensate for motion in the images between successive frames. Therefore, in the evaluation of video watermarking algorithms, motion has to be considered in selecting the test stimuli. Although not many algorithms using motion information have been proposed yet, it is expected that motion will be utilized in many algorithms in the future. Because motion may be used directly for embedding information, the present invention defines the MR as a criterion for the classification of the stimuli, considering the motion information. The following Equation 4 represents the MR for a video stimulus.

[65] [Equation 4]

[66]

$$M = \frac{1}{NF} \sum_{i=1}^{NF} \sum_{j=0}^{TMV_i} |v_{i,j}|$$

[67] where NF is the number of frames of stimulus and TMV_i is the number of motion vectors in the i th frame and $v_{i,j}$ is the j th motion vector in the i th frame. The MR calculated in the Equation 4 is the average amount of motion resulting from all of the motion vectors, where the motion vectors are calculated block-by-block. According to an embodiment, a block size for the motion vector is fixed to 8x8, which is the most general case. The more motion the video sequence contains, the higher the MR value.

[68] FIGS. 7A and 7B show the motion vectors of two video stimuli, respectively, in which white lines indicate the motion vectors and block dots indicate the center of the motion block. As illustrated herein, the image of Akiyo shown in FIG. 7A has few motion vectors, whereas that of Stefan shown in FIG. 7B has a large number of motion vectors.

[69] As in the case of the ICR and EDR, the video stimuli can be divided into 3 levels according to the MR value. In the evaluation process of the video compression algorithm, the MR of each test stimuli is calculated and more than 3 of the stimuli included in each of the 3 predefined levels should be selected as the final test stimuli. While the number of the levels is determined to be 3 in the present invention, the present invention is not limited thereto, but it will be appreciated that the test stimuli can be classified into more or less levels, if required.

[70] For performance evaluation of a video-watermarking algorithm, a plurality of test stimuli are selected based on a stimulus selection method according to the present invention, to thus ensure reliability of the evaluation results.

[71] Although exemplary embodiments of the present invention have been described with reference to the attached drawings, the present invention is not limited to these embodiments, and it should be appreciated to those skilled in the art that a variety of modifications and changes can be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the present invention.

[72]

Claims

- [1] 1. A method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a watermarking algorithm, the method comprising the steps of:
calculating an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates;
classifying said plurality of test stimulus candidates into L (where L is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the test stimuli, based on the calculated ICR values; and
selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the L levels of the test stimuli.
- [2] The method according to Claim 1, wherein the ICR is calculated using the following Equation:
- $$U = -\frac{1}{w \times h} \sum_{x=1}^w \sum_{y=1}^h [f(x, y) - \bar{f}(x, y)]^2$$
- where $f(x, y)$ is the intensity -level at pixel (x, y)
and $\bar{f}(x, y)$ is the average gray -level in a 3×3 window centered at (x, y)
and w and h are the width and height of the image.*
- [3] The method according to Claim 1, wherein the L value is 4, and a range of the ICR for a level 1 is more than or equal to 0 to less than 100, a range of the ICR for a level 2 is more than or equal to 100 to less than 300, a range of the ICR for a level 3 is more than or equal to 300 to less than 600, and a range of the ICR for a level 4 is more than or equal to 600.
- [4] A method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a watermarking algorithm, the method comprising the steps of:
calculating an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates;
classifying the plurality of test stimulus candidates into M (where M is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the test stimuli, based on the calculated EDR values; and
selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the M levels of the test stimuli.
- [5] The method according to Claim 4, wherein said step of calculating the energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates includes the steps of:
applying DCT transformation to each 2D image(s) of each of the test stimulus candidates;
reordering AC coefficients of the DCT transformed image(s) to generate 1D image data;

calculating and normalizing energy distribution (E) of the AC coefficients from the generated 1D image data using the following Equation:

$$E(s) = T(s)^2, s \in [0, N]$$

where s is the position in the 1-D distribution, N is the number of AC coefficients, and T is the reordered AC coefficients and E is the energy distribution.; and

calculating the EDR based on the normalized energy distribution (E) using the following Equation:

$$EDR = \frac{1}{N_{limit}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{limit}} \cdot \frac{i}{N} \cdot \log(E(i))$$

where N_{limit} is the number of AC coefficients except 30% of high frequency.

[6] The method according to Claim 4, wherein the M value is 3.

[7] A method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a video watermarking algorithm, the method comprising:

calculating a motion rate (MR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates; classifying the plurality of test stimulus candidates into N (where N is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the test stimuli, based on the calculated MR values; and

selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the N levels of the test stimuli.

[8] The method according to Claim 7, wherein the MR is calculated using the following Equation:

$$M = \frac{1}{NF} \sum_{i=1}^{NF} \sum_{j=0}^{TMV_i} |v_{i,j}|$$

where NF is the number of frames of stimulus and TMV_i is the number of motion vectors in the ith frame and $v_{i,j}$ is the jth motion vector in the ith frame.

[9] The method according to Claim 7, wherein the N value is 3.

[10] A method of selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a watermarking algorithm, the method comprising the steps of:

calculating an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into L (where L is an integer more than or equal

to 2) levels based on the calculated ICR values;
 calculating an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates, and classifying them into M (where M is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated EDR values;
 calculating a motion rate (MR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into N (where N is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels of the calculated MR values; and
 selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the L levels, each of the M levels, each of the N levels of the test stimuli, respectively.

- [11] A system for selecting test stimuli for use in evaluating performance of a video watermarking algorithm, the system comprising:
 first classification means for calculating an image complexity rate (ICR) for each of a plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into L (where L is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated ICR values;
 second classification means for calculating an energy distribution rate (EDR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates, and classifying them into M (where M is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated EDR values;
 third classification means for calculating a motion rate (MR) for each of the plurality of test stimulus candidates and classifying them into N (where N is an integer more than or equal to 2) levels based on the calculated MR values; and
 selection means for selecting at least one test stimulus from each of the L levels, each of the M levels, each of the N levels of the test stimuli, respectively.
- [12] The system according to Claim 11, wherein the first classification means calculates the ICR using the following Equation :

$$U = -\frac{1}{w \times h} \sum_{x=1}^w \sum_{y=1}^h \left[f(x, y) - \bar{f}(x, y) \right]^2$$

*where $f(x, y)$ is the intensity-level at pixel (x, y)
 and $\bar{f}(x, y)$ is the average gray-level in a 3×3 window centered at (x, y)
 and w and h are the width and height of the image.*

- [13] The system according to Claim 11, wherein said second classification means includes:
 means for applying DCT transformation to each 2D image(s) of each of the test stimulus candidates;
 means for reordering AC coefficients of the DCT transformed image(s) to

generate 1D image data;

means for calculating and normalizing energy distribution (E) of the AC coefficients from the generated 1D image data using the following Equation:

$$E(s) = T(s)^2, s \in [0, N]$$

where s is the position in the 1-D distribution, N is the number of AC coefficients, and T is the reordered AC coefficients and E is the energy distribution.; and

means for calculating the EDR based on the normalized energy distribution (E) using the following Equation:

$$EDR = \frac{1}{N_{limit}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{limit}} \cdot \frac{i}{N} \cdot \log(E(i))$$

where N_{limit} is the number of AC coefficients except 30% of high frequency.

[14]


The system according to Claim 11, wherein said third classification means calculates the MR value using the following Equation:

$$M = \frac{1}{NF} \sum_{i=1}^{NF} \sum_{j=0}^{TMV_i} |v_{i,j}|$$

where NF is the number of frames of stimulus and TMV_i is the number of motion vectors in the ith frame and $v_{i,j}$ is the jth motion vector in the ith frame.



[Fig. 1]

A PLURALITY OF TEST STIMULI








[Fig. 2]


(A)

	$f(x,y)$	$\bar{f}(x,y)$	U
Lena(210) (256x256, 8bit)			85.71
Boat(220) (512x512, 8bit)			56.31


(B)

France(230) (627x496, 8bit)			637.09
Cross(240) (256x256, 8bit)			506.67
Text(250) (256x256, 8bit)	<pre> MT-LEVEL {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf Makefile compress.c fi Makefile~ display.c fr {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf Makefile compress.c fi Makefile~ display.c fr {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf Makefile display.c im Makefile~ fileio.c im compress.c fractal.h im {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf {spinet}/home/u/rjkroeger/vf </pre>		2685.2


[Fig. 3]




[Fig. 4]



[Fig. 5]



[Fig. 6]




[Fig. 7]

(A)



(B)



INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.
PCT/KR2005/003468

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER***H04N 17/00(2006.01)i***

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

H04N, G06K, G06F, G06T

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Korean Patents and applications for inventions since 1975.

Korean Utility models and applications for Utility models since 1975

Japanese Utility models and applications for Utility models since 1975

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search terms used)

NPS, PAJ, Delphion, USPTO, KIPRIS, TIMEPASS : " watermark, test, evaluation, video, image"

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	US 2005/0069168 A (Lucent Technologies) 31 Mar. 2005 Abstract, Fig.1	1-14
A	US 6546114 B (Microsoft Corp.) 3 Apr. 2003 Abstract, Fig.1	1-14
A	US 2004/0071312 A (Hiroshi Ogawa et al.) 15 Apr. 2004 Abstract, Fig.1	1-14
A	US 2004/0001607 A (Youngha Hwang et al.) 1 Jan. 2004 Abstract, Fig.1	1-14
A	US 2002/0051560 A (Ioana donescu et al.) 2 May 2002 Abstract, Fig.1	1-14
A	JP 2004-348293 A (NTT) 9 Dec. 2004 Abstract, Fig.1	1-14
A	JP 2001-231017 A (KDDI) 24 Aug. 2001 Abstract, Fig.1	1-14

☐ Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.

☒ See patent family annex.

* Special categories of cited documents:

"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

"E" earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date

"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of citation or other special reason (as specified)

"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means

"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art

"&" document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

06 JANUARY 2006 (06.01.2006)

Date of mailing of the international search report

10 JANUARY 2006 (10.01.2006)

Name and mailing address of the ISA/KR



Korean Intellectual Property Office
920 Dunsan-dong, Seo-gu, Daejeon 302-701,
Republic of Korea

Facsimile No. 82-42-472-7140

Authorized officer

LEE Jin Ick

Telephone No. 82-42-481-5770



INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International application No.

PCT/KR2005/003468

Patent document cited in search report	Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
AU2004214592A1	14.04.2005	AU2004214592AA	14.04.2005
		BR200405538A	24.05.2005
		CA2477517AA	29.03.2005
		CN1606351A	13.04.2005
		EP01519562A1	30.03.2005
		EP1519562A1	30.03.2005
		JP17110259	21.04.2005
		JP2005110259A2	21.04.2005
		KR1020050031438	06.04.2005
		US2005069168AA	31.03.2005
US06546114	08.04.2003	AU200067871A1	10.04.2001
		AU200067871A5	10.04.2001
		US6546114B1	08.04.2003
		US6546114BA	08.04.2003
		W00118752A1	15.03.2001
		W0200118752A1	15.03.2001
US20040071312A1	15.04.2004	EP0984616A2	08.03.2000
		EP984616A2	08.03.2000
		EP984616A3	04.12.2002
		JP13016438	19.01.2001
		JP2001016438A2	19.01.2001
		JP3589111B2	17.11.2004
		US06704431	09.03.2004
		US2004071312A1	15.04.2004
		US2004071312AA	15.04.2004
		US2005175214A1	11.08.2005
		US2005175214AA	11.08.2005
		US6704431BA	09.03.2004
US20040001607A1	01.01.2004	US2004001607A1	01.01.2004
		US2004001607AA	01.01.2004
US20020051560A1	02.05.2002	FR2816153A1	03.05.2002
		FR2816153B1	20.12.2002
		US2002051560AA	02.05.2002
JP16348293	09.12.2004	JP16348293	09.12.2004
		JP2004348293A2	09.12.2004
JP13231017	24.08.2001	JP13231017	24.08.2001
		JP2001231017A2	24.08.2001