

the talk previously known as... Is there a role for melanopsin in chromatic adaptation?

Danny Garside

 PhD student at UCL

 orcid:
 orcid.org/0000-0002-4579-003X

 slides:
 doi.org/10.6084/mg.figshare.6613919

20/06/2018, LS16

I've jokily added the previously known as bit because for quite a lot of this presentation it won't seem like I'm giving the presentation with this title, but bear with me, we'll get there.

The reason for that is this:

Links between vision research and lighting research.

Take a step back, and give an overview of the overall narrative, the logic flow, of my phd.

Overview

- 1. Museum lighting
- 2. Damage functions
- 3. Colour Temperature
- 4. 'Preference' prediction
 - 1. Kruithof
 - 2. Colour rendering
 - 3. Melanopsin
- 5. My research



- As we can see, this is frankly a disaster; it has the power to turn what was once an truly stunning suit into a rather drab, and un-matching, pile of sadness.



- Provision of energy through light, to make a chemical reaction happen



- UV is the real bad guy, easy win because it's invisible, we get rid of it, no-one notices (now standard practice)
- Controversial, because each material has it's own damage function, dependent on material and various other environmental conditions such as humidity and temperature.
 - In a museum with many different types of object, what's the value?



- DI is an average, but does it mean anything?
- It applies most well to objects which absorb and reflect most wavelengths relatively equally, white paper for example.
- It is much trickier to apply it to objects which absorb and reflect different wavelengths preferentially, or in other words, coloured objects.
 - Grotthuss-Draper law, damage can only be caused where light is absorbed
 - Thornton lamp, Durmus thesis
- But let's have a look at multiple damage functions, for different materials



- DI is an average, but does it mean anything?
- It applies most well to objects which absorb and reflect most wavelengths relatively equally, white paper for example.
- It is much trickier to apply it to objects which absorb and reflect different wavelengths preferentially, or in other words, coloured objects.
 - Grotthuss-Draper law, damage can only be caused where light is absorbed
 - Thornton lamp, Durmus thesis
- But let's have a look at multiple damage functions, for different materials



- DI is an average, but does it mean anything?
- It applies most well to objects which absorb and reflect most wavelengths relatively equally, white paper for example.
- It is much trickier to apply it to objects which absorb and reflect different wavelengths preferentially, or in other words, coloured objects.
 - Grotthuss-Draper law, damage can only be caused where light is absorbed
 - Thornton lamp, Durmus thesis
- But let's have a look at multiple damage functions, for different materials



- Let's just assume for a moment that I've convinced you of the utility of an average object damage function, let's have a look at some predictions it makes for available lighting
- We do see a trend
- If we compare a light source from this clump around (3000, 0.8) and one of these higher ones (6500, 1.6) we notice that this is a doubling of damage potential.
- That's a doubling of lifetime of an object, or a doubling of the amount of time it can be displayed.
- That seems worth caring about.
- Vision models would suggest that these are the same
- But some are preferred to others, and we're not quite sure why.

Overview

- 1. Museum lighting
- 2. Damage functions
- 3. Colour Temperature
- 4. 'Preference' prediction
 - 1. Kruithof
 - 2. Colour rendering
 - 3. Melanopsin
- 5. My research



- Fotios meta-study. Looked at 29 studies, concluded that 9 provided credible data.
- Found that of those 9, there was no strong support.
- An interesting idea came up in published responses from the article: that maybe we're not asking quite the right questions, and also that maybe the questions we think we're asking aren't the ones being answered.
 - Cuttle hotel example



- Fotios meta-study. Looked at 29 studies, concluded that 9 provided credible data.
- Found that of those 9, there was no strong support.
- An interesting idea came up in published responses from the article: that maybe we're not asking quite the right questions, and also that maybe the questions we think we're asking aren't the ones being answered.
 - Cuttle hotel example

Visual effect of different CCTs

...

One reason for disagreement between studies is an imprecise specification of the SPD of the light sources.

"Lighting designers continue to refer to it with reverence ... " [Cuttle 2015], which suggests that there is something regarding the interaction of SPD and illuminance still to be teased out. Further work would be interesting if it explored SPD metrics beyond CCT.



One area where people have been thinking a great deal about the reduction of the many-dimensional spectrum into fewer dimensions is the world of colour rendering. Here, the implicit purpose is to communicate how good a light source is, as efficiently as possible.

The incumbent Ra received criticism on many fronts. The most boring, but probably the only one that anyone will ever be able to agree on, was that the maths was out of date. It used out of date colour spaces.

The replacement looks set now to be IES TM-30-15, and one of the neat things about this metric is that it uses a great deal more (99) reflectance samples in it's calculation, which gives us a framework to ask more interesting questions than we could before.

To pull out one such example: Royer found, in a post hoc analysis, that he could predict preference for light sources really well by taking a combination of the average fidelity measure and Rcsh16.

For those of your who don't speak colour rendering jargon, that means that we like it when reddy-purples are increased slightly in saturation.

I think that there might be great promise in this type of research.



- Melanopsin found when people were looking for something which controls our circadian rhythm
- As Mariana Figueiro said yesterday, it's likely that ipRGCs combine various inputs as well as their own photosensitivity
- Assumed initially to be non-image forming (we've been doing colorimetry and photometry fine for ages, thank you very much)



- But recently there's been a few papers that have seemed to show evidence to the contrary
- I'll highlight two here

Chromatic Adaptation and melanopsin – why?

- Spatial
- Temporal
- Absolute
- Downstream

And why do we care?

We think that colour constancy uses **multiple cues***. If one of them uses a melanopic signal and this conflicts with other cues, this would probably result in a percept of '**unnatural**', and quite possibly '**unpleasant**'.

- So why do I think that it might be a contender for chromatic adaptation?
- Well, the spatial and temporal qualities are on the right track they're both lousy
- They seem as a population to signal absolute rather than relative light levels
- And they're downstream from the traditional visual receptors, which means that they would be well placed to calibrate the signal that they receive
- (which under natural illuminants would be a reliable cue)

* Kraft, J.M., Brainard, D.H., 1999. Mechanisms of color constancy under nearly natural viewing. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 96, 307–312.

Experimental work:

- 1. Computational
- (VSS 2018): doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.6280865.v1 2. Psychophysics in lab (ICVS 2017):
- 3. Psychophysics in real world (AIC 2016): doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4269680.v1



- Strong correlation for natural light -
- Not so much for artificial lighting
- Elements that make it good candidate for CA: speed, spatial, absolute (population) -(pubs drop)

Conclusion:

If we can work out exactly what we do and don't like about lighting,

that gives us much improved tools to decide on lighting which is

both minimally **damaging** and maximally **pleasing**.



Supervisors:

Lindsay MacDonald – CEGE, UCL Kees Teunissen – Philips Lighting Research Stuart Robson – CEGE, UCL Katherine Curran – ISH, UCL Capucine Korenberg – British Museum

Funders: EPSRC Philips Lighting Research



Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council



The British Museum



Studies have found 'preference' for:	
 3700K 5100K 2900-5950K 5500/5700K 	(Scuello et al., 2003) (Pinto, Linhares, Nascimento, 2008) (Liu et al. 2013) (Nascimento and Masuda, 2014)
Although there are some studies suggesting that for occidental viewers a correlated colour temperature (CCT) of about 5000K is optimal for visual appreciation there is not yet general agreement in the museum community about this issue. S. Nascimento, J. Linhares, C. Herdeiro, T. Kondo, Y. Misaki, and S. Nakauchi, 2017 "Influence of cultural factors in preferred ilumination for pairtings" in "Book of Abstracts, Museum Lighting Symposium and Workshops", 49, <u>https://doi.org/10.14324/000.bk.10048078</u> , also: <u>https://youtu.be//LDXvBMtW0</u>	

The general trend seems to be for higher CCTs, around 5000K There has been a great range in the found preferences The advice from Fotios might be particularly apt here