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We present a glasses-free 3D display design with the potential to provide viewers with nearly correct accommodative depth cues, as well as motion parallax and binocular cues. Building on multilayer attenuator and directional backlight architectures, the proposed design achieves the high angular resolution needed for accommodation by placing spatial light modulators about a large lens: one conjugate to the viewer’s eye, and one or more near the plane of the lens. Nonnegative tensor factorization is used to compress a high angular resolution light field into a set of masks that can be displayed on a pair of commodity LCD panels. By constraining the tensor factorization to preserve only those light rays seen by the viewer, we effectively steer narrow high-resolution viewing cones into the user’s eyes, allowing binocular disparity, motion parallax, and the potential for nearly correct accommodation over a wide field of view. We verify the design experimentally by focusing a camera at different depths about a prototype display, establish formal upper bounds on the design’s accommodation range and diffraction-limited performance, and discuss practical limitations that must be overcome to allow the device to be used with human observers.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Within the last few years, stereoscopic image display has become common in cinemas and in consumer televisions. Professionally produced stereoscopic content is now widely available and the technology for creating stereo images for both synthetically rendered scenes and captured footage has matured to a point where many newly released movies can be enjoyed in 3D. Next-generation displays will remove the need for additional eyewear, while presenting high-quality imagery; emerging computational light field displays show promise to satisfy the high standards set by the consumer market. State-of-the-art light field displays provide thin form factors, high resolution, and light-efficient display modes, while supporting binocular disparity and smooth motion parallax over a wide field of view. Unfortunately, most available 3D displays share a common limitation: lack of the focus depth cues, accommodation and retinal blur.

Accommodation is an important depth cue driven by the focal state of the lens in a human eye; the ciliary muscles contract and relax to change the shape of the lens, causing a change in focus. Takaki [2006] experimentally verified that projecting as few as two different perspectives in one pupil stimulates accommodative responses in a human observer. Retinal blur is a complementary depth cue stimulated by the sensed magnitude of focal blur on the retina;
inclusion of this cue has been shown to improve the performance of certain visual tasks [Hoffman and Banks 2010]. When these focus cues are correct or nearly correct (i.e., they closely match the depths of the displayed scene), as in a natural environment, the performance of the visual system is enhanced; however, displays lacking these cues cause significant viewer fatigue, due to a conflict with other cues [Hoffman et al. 2008]. Since retinal blur is preserved by most displays that support accommodation, we concentrate on accommodation in the majority of this article while also discussing retinal blur in Section 3.5.

With the exception of ultra-high-resolution displays, such as holograms, small volumetric displays, and multifocal devices requiring specialized eye-worn equipment, no existing 3D display simultaneously supports correct accommodation, binocular disparity, and motion parallax over a wide field of view. We propose a new computational display design, dubbed Focus 3D, that has the potential to synthesize light fields with sufficient angular resolution to allow near-correct viewer accommodation and retinal blur in addition to smooth motion parallax and binocular disparity. The key innovation is a combination of display optics and compressive light field synthesis through nonnegative light field tensor factorization. Inspired by Tensor Displays [Wetzstein et al. 2012], we explore multilayer display architectures with directional backlighting; however, instead of synthesizing a low-angular-resolution light field with a predefined field of view, we introduce High-Angular-Resolution (HAR) backlighting that allows high-resolution view cones to be steered into an observer’s eyes. Due to the novel architecture, each view cone has a significantly larger depth of field than previously proposed solutions, offering the potential for the visual system to focus the eyes. We demonstrate the viability of this design through the construction of a prototype display that allows a camera to focus at multiple depths about the display (see Figure 1).

1.1 Contributions

We explore a computational approach to synthesizing light fields as a set of narrow, but ultra-high-resolution view cones that are steered only where required: into the viewer’s eyes. Specific contributions are as follows.

Fig. 1. Photograph of prototype display focused at two different depths. Bottom row shows magnifications of inset regions. The prototype shown was configured with a single LCD layer placed directly in front of a high angular resolution backlight (HARB) and was photographed with a large aperture at a distance of 127 cm. Dragon model courtesy of Stanford Computer Graphics Laboratory.

1.2 Overview of Benefits and Limitations

Benefits. We describe a new optical display architecture, consisting of stacked display layers and a high-resolution directional backlight, that provides a significantly increased depth of field over a small set of view cones steered into the eyes of the viewer, offering the potential to provide binocular disparity, motion parallax, and near-correct accommodation. As a compressive light field display, Focus 3D increases the display brightness and field of view while reducing the required number of time-multiplexed frames as compared to conventional displays. As illustrated in Figure 2, previous displays providing correct accommodation cues require either additional eyewear or a significantly higher optical and computational complexity. To the authors’ best knowledge, Focus 3D is the first practical display that has the potential to support near-correct accommodative depth cues while allowing the viewer to move around the device from a wide range of viewpoints, including multiple distances from the screen.

Limitations. As with other multilayer displays, stacking multiple display elements increases moiré and color-channel crosstalk, decreases the overall display brightness, and presents an alignment challenge. Obtaining good performance in the proposed multilayer framework also requires display panels which exceed currently available refresh rates, although upcoming display technologies have been demonstrated with much higher rates [Hagood et al. 2007]. While our current prototype is about 50 cm thick, future generations of the proposed display may benefit from optical folding techniques such as wedge optics [Travis et al. 2013]. We employ an efficient GPU-based implementation of nonnegative tensor factorization to compute content-adaptive light field decompositions.
While this approach adds to the computational complexity of the system, no heuristics are known to drive multilayer displays with the proposed type of directional backlighting.

Our prototype display is suitable for testing with a camera; several engineering enhancements would allow the display to be tested with human viewers. Constructing a display with sufficient angular resolution to support multiple depths of focus over a human-sized pupil diameter requires high-quality optics. Although we provide simulations with such an aperture, our prototype display is limited to focus over a larger 2 cm camera aperture due to the performance of the inexpensive integrated Fresnel lens, which exhibited poor focus, especially off-axis. Our approach also requires high-speed eye tracking; although in this article we assume the eye positions of the observers are known, we note high-speed (≥500 Hz) encumbrance-free commercial trackers are available from such vendors as SensoMotoric Instruments. Finally, the brightness of the display’s backlight must be improved to permit human viewing.

2. RELATED WORK

Light Field Displays

Light field displays generally aim to create motion parallax and stereoscopic disparity so that an observer perceives a scene as 3D without having to wear encumbering glasses. Invented more than a century ago, two fundamental techniques enable most light field displays: parallax barriers [Ives 1903] and integral imaging with lenslet arrays [Lippmann 1908]. The former technology has evolved into fully dynamic display systems supporting head tracking and view steering [Perlin et al. 2000; Peterka et al. 2008], as well as high-speed temporal modulation [Lanman et al. 2010]. Today, lenslet arrays are often used as programmable rear illumination in combination with a high-speed LCD to steer different views toward tracked observers [Stolle et al. 2008]. Inspired by the evolution of both parallax barrier and lenslet-based displays, we explore computational displays that exploit adaptive view steering to extend the capabilities of current display technology.

Within the 21st century, a variety of glasses-free 3D display technologies have been proposed, including optically switchable diffusers [Sullivan 2003], multilayer architectures [Putilin et al. 2001; Gotoda 2010; Wetzstein et al. 2011, 2012; Lanman et al. 2011] as well as directional backlighting for stereoscopic [Chu et al. 2005; Chien and Shieh 2006; Brott and Schultz 2010] and multiview [Toyooka et al. 2001; Mather et al. 2009; Kwon and Choi 2012] displays. All of these technologies support a low angular resolution that provides only binocular disparity and motion parallax depth cues. We propose a new computational display architecture with the potential to support correct accommodation through the joint design of display optics and compressive light field synthesis.

Travis [1990] proposed mounting a Fresnel lens behind a transparent, light-modulating front panel with an additional high-resolution backlight placed at a distance behind the lens. Subsequently, this backlight was improved by engineering a wedge-shaped light guide that allows for the same functionality to be integrated into a thin, transparent optical element [Travis et al. 2013]. These displays are driven in a time-sequential mode: display optics illuminate a single view direction at each time step while the corresponding view is displayed. While this optical design provides a sufficiently high angular resolution to support correct accommodation, currently available display refresh rates (~120 Hz) prevent its use beyond a tracked stereoscopic display. We propose a display architecture that combines this high angular resolution backlight with stacks of light-attenuating layers. When driven by compressive light field synthesis, this approach is capable of nearly correct accommodation with currently available display refresh rates.

Displays Supporting Correct Accommodation

Displays supporting correct accommodation are able to create a light field with enough angular resolution to allow subtle, yet crucial, variation over the pupil (see Figure 3). Such displays utilize three main approaches. Ultra-high-angular-resolution displays, such as super multiview displays [Takaki 2006; Takaki et al. 2011; Pamplona et al. 2012], take a brute-force approach: all possible views are generated and displayed simultaneously, incurring high hardware costs. In practice, these drawbacks have limited the size, field of view, and spatial resolution of the devices. Multifocal displays [Akeley et al. 2004; Hoffman and Banks 2009; Shibata et al. 2005] virtually place conventional monitors at different depths via refractive optics. This approach is effective, but requires encumbering glasses. Volumetric displays [Favalora 2005] physically generate light rays at the perceived 3D position, but are limited to small volumes and cannot reproduce occlusion. Closely related light field displays with anisotropic diffusion surfaces [Jones et al. 2007; Cossairt et al. 2007] can reproduce small volumes with occlusion, but accommodation has been demonstrated in the horizontal dimension only within a limited depth range [Jones et al. 2007]. Unlike these approaches, the Focus 3D design is capable of generating near-correct accommodation cues with high spatial resolution, in both the horizontal and vertical dimensions, over a wide field of view. The design uses simple hardware (e.g.,
2–3 LCD panels and a lens), is scalable to large displays, and does not require glasses.

3. FOCUS 3D ARCHITECTURE

The goal of the Focus 3D architecture is to efficiently provide accommodation, stereo, and motion parallax by steering a set of narrow high-resolution light cones directly into the viewer’s eyes. Our approach is a hybrid of the view-sequential Cambridge display design [Travis 1990] and the multilayer display architecture of Tensor Displays [Wetzstein et al. 2012]; a brief overview follows.

In one variation of the Cambridge display design, an LCD layer is placed against a lens and illuminated by a backlight (refer to Figure 7). If the backlight and viewer are placed at conjugate distances with respect to the lens, a point light source from the backlight will illuminate the LCD layer and rays will subsequently converge to a point at the viewing plane. Thus an image displayed on the LCD layer will be visible only to an observer in the viewing position corresponding to the illuminated region of the backlight. To create a time-multiplexed multiview display, a set of views are displayed in rapid sequence on the LCD layer, each while the corresponding region of the backlight is illuminated. We observe that it is straightforward to extend this design to support accommodation by incorporating a High-Angular-Resolution (HAR) backlight; with sufficient backlight resolution, multiple viewpoints can be created within the area of the pupil, providing the focus cues to the eyes. However, such a design would require display rates that far exceed currently technology; for example, a set of 5 × 5 views over each eye with a 60 Hz refresh rate would require a 3000 Hz display. The result would also be very dim, as each of the M views would be illuminated only a fraction 1/M of the time.

Our key innovation is to exploit the correlation between this large set of views using the compressive tensor factorization framework recently introduced by Wetzstein et al. [2012], enabling eye accommodation with brighter imagery using the refresh rates of current and upcoming displays. In this embodiment, a compressed set of correlated view patterns is displayed in sequence on the LCD layer, each while multiple regions of the backlight (and thus the eyes) are illuminated simultaneously. Furthermore, we can replace the single LCD layer in front of the lens with an N-layer stack of LCDs, increasing the spatial and angular resolution of the display as well as compression performance.

In the remainder of the this section, we describe the details of this approach and analyze performance and limitations. Section 3.1 establishes how to emit a light field to support correct accommodation using an N-layer, M-frame multilayer display illuminated by a High-Angular-Resolution (HAR) backlight. We show that such a display can be optimized using the aforementioned tensor display framework, albeit with a modified backlight illumination model. Section 3.2 assesses the structure of the backlight illumination and layer patterns produced by the decomposition; this analysis reveals the source of enhanced brightness achieved with Focus 3D over prior methods utilizing direct time-multiplexed backlight illumination schemes. Section 3.3 derives upper bounds on the accommodation range for both existing display architectures and Focus 3D. Section 3.4 analyzes how the design is affected by diffraction, and Section 3.5 concludes by showing the influence of diffraction and light field compression on retinal blur quality.

3.1 Displays with HAR Backlighting

As described before and shown in Figures 4 and 7, Focus 3D consists of an N-layer stack of light-attenuating panels illuminated by a High-Angular-Resolution (HAR) backlight capable of synthesizing multiple uniform light sources that converge along a closely spaced set of points spanning the viewer’s pupils. Similar to Travis [1990], such a backlight can be fashioned by placing a large lens (e.g., a Fresnel lens or folded waveguide) against the rear layer. If another display is placed at a distance d_{db} behind the lens, then a virtual layer will be created at a distance d_{v} = (f d_{db})/(d_{db} − f) in front of the lens. A HAR backlight is obtained when d_{db} is selected such that d_{v} equals the distance d_{l} from the lens to the viewer’s pupil.

3.1.1 Representing Emitted Light Fields. As shown in Figure 4, we propose Focus 3D as a generalization of prior displays capable of supporting near-correct accommodation through high-angular-resolution backlighting. Rather than using a single layer placed directly in front of the lens, we propose placing a stack of light-attenuating layers. For greater generality, we further assume that these layers support a higher refresh rate than the human eye, such that the viewer perceives the time average of an M-frame sequence. Such N-layer, M-frame displays have been optimized using the tensor display framework of Wetzstein et al. [2012]. As shown in that work, the emitted light field I(x, v) can be modeled using the following image formation model

$$\bar{I}(x, v) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \bar{b}_m(x, v) \prod_{n=1}^{N} f_m^{(n)}(x + (d_n/d_{db}) v),$$

(1)

where \(\bar{b}_m(x, v)\) is the light field emitted by the backlight during frame \(m\), \(f_m^{(n)}(\xi_n)\) is the transparency of layer \(n\) during frame \(m\) at position \(\xi_n\), and \(d_n\) is the distance of layer \(n\) from the lens. In this section we adopt a two-plane light field parameterization, such that a ray \((x, v)\) is defined by its intersection with the \(\eta\)-axis, coincident with the lens, and the \(\nu\)-axis, located a distance \(d_{db}\) from the lens.

The tensor display framework considers two cases: uniform backlighting, such that \(b_n(x, v) = 1\), and directional backlighting, such that \(b_n(x, v)\) is a low-resolution light field produced by an auxiliary system (e.g., a lenticular display). We observe that Eq. (1) can be modified to support high-angular-resolution backlighting, as depicted in Figure 4, such that

$$\bar{I}(x, v) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} f_m^{(n+1)}(\phi(x, v)) \prod_{n=1}^{N} f_m^{(n)}(x + (d_n/d_{db}) v),$$

(2)

where \(\phi(x, v)\) defines the point of intersection \(\xi_{N+1}\) of ray \((x, v)\) with the backlight layer, \(f_m^{(n+1)}(\xi_{N+1})\) denotes the emitted irradiance...
of the backlight layer during frame \( m \), and \( \{ f_m^{(n)}(\xi_n) \} \), for \( n \in [1, N] \), remain the transparencies of the \( N \) layers in front of the lens. We observe that the point of intersection is found by tracing the ray \((x, v)\) backwards through the lens, with focal length \( f \), and propagating a distance \( d_e \) to the backlight layer. Using ray transfer matrix analysis [Hecht 2001] with paraxial ray and thin lens approximations, these operations are given by

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\phi(x, v) \\
-\eta/d_e
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & d_e \\
0 & 1 \\
-1/f & 1 \\
0 & -v/d_e
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\
\eta
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( \eta/d_e \) denotes the slope of the ray leaving the backlight layer. Thus, \( \phi(x, v) \) is given by the following expression.

\[
\phi(x, v) = \left(1 - \frac{d_e}{f}\right)x - \frac{d_e}{d_v} v
\]

3.1.2 Decomposing Light Fields Using Weighted NTF. Following the tensor display framework, the light field emitted by an \( N \)-layer display can be decomposed into a set of \( M \) time-multiplexed layer patterns using Nonnegative Tensor Factorization (NTF). Substituting Eq. (4) into Eq. (2) provides a closed-form expression for the light field emitted by such a display, \( I(x, v) \), in terms of the time-multiplexed layer patterns, \( \{ f_m^{(n)}(\xi_n) \} \). In practice, the decomposition of a target light field, \( I(x, v) \), into the layer patterns requires solving the following nonlinear least squares problem.

\[
\arg \min_{\{ f_m^{(n)}(\xi_n) \}} \int \int (I(x, v) - \tilde{I}(x, v))^2 dx dv, \text{ for } 0 \leq f_m^{(n)}(\xi_n) \leq 1 \quad (5)
\]

To solve this optimization problem, having proven the equivalence of Eq. (1) and (2), we refer the reader to Wetzstein et al. [2012] and supplementary Section B; however, for completeness we briefly summarize the tensor-based decomposition framework next.

Assuming discrete pixels, the decomposition into layer patterns, \( \{ f_m^{(n)}(\xi_n) \} \), is given by the solution of the following optimization problem

\[
\arg \min_{\{ F^{(m)} \}} \| \beta \mathcal{L} - \mathbf{W} \odot \mathbf{T} \|^2, \text{ for } 0 \leq F^{(m)} \leq 1 \quad (6)
\]

where \( \odot \) is the Hadamard (elementwise) product, \( \mathcal{L} \) denotes the target light field, \( I(x, v) \), represented as a light field tensor, \( \mathbf{W} \) is a binary-valued weight tensor (selecting for each ray that passes through a pupil), and \( F^{(m)} \) is a matrix defining the transparency of each pixel in layer \( n \), with the \( m \)-th column \( f_m^{(n)} \) denoting the values during frame \( m \). Note that \( \beta \) is a brightness scaling factor, controlling the trade-off between brightness and image fidelity. In this expression, \( \mathbf{T} \) is the CP decomposition [Cichocki et al. 2009] of the emitted light field tensor, such that

\[
\mathbf{T} = [F^{(1)}, \ldots, F^{(N+1)}] = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} F_m^{(1)} \odot \cdots \odot F_m^{(N+1)},
\]

where \( \odot \) is the vector outer product. Eq. (6) can be solved by applying weighted Nonnegative Tensor Factorization (NTF), with the following update rule

\[
F^{(m)} \leftarrow F^{(m)} \odot \left( \frac{(W_m^{(n)} \odot (\beta \mathbf{L}^{(m)}) F_m^{(n)})}{(W_m^{(n)} \odot (F_m^{(n)} \odot (F_m^{(n)} \odot \ldots \odot F_m^{(1)}))}) \right),
\]

where \( W_m^{(n)} \) and \( \mathbf{L}^{(m)} \) correspond to the matricization (unfolding) of the weight and target light field tensors along the \( n \)-th mode, respectively [Kolda and Bader 2009]. In this expression, we define \( F_0 \) as

\[
F_0 = F^{(N+1)} \odot \cdots \odot F^{(m+1)} \odot F^{(m)} \cdots \odot F^{(1)}.
\]

where \( \odot \) is the Khatri-Rao product.

Figure 5 evaluates the performance of the weighted NTF decomposition for varying display architectures. From these simulations, we conclude that the addition of High-Angular-Resolution (HAR) backlighting to the prior tensor display framework is a viable approach to eliminate accommodation convergence conflicts using current-generation and upcoming display technologies. Assuming the viewer’s position is known, such a design has the potential to deliver all five “missing” perceptual depth cues for a single user: binocular disparity, convergence, accommodation, retinal blur, and motion parallax.

3.2 Focus 3D Decompositions

While Figure 5 confirms that the Focus 3D design can successfully synthesize accommodation cues with a sufficient number of layers and frames in simulation, it does not provide intuition into the decomposed patterns. In this section we briefly examine decomposed layer and backlight illumination patterns to understand the expected benefits of our decomposition algorithm over prior direct time-multiplexed backlight illumination schemes. As shown at the top of Figure 6, direct time-multiplexing requires a single layer placed in contact with the lens and a secondary layer placed behind the lens, conjugate to the viewer’s pupil. In this mode of operation, each pixel on the backlight that maps to a region of the pupil is sequentially illuminated; simultaneously, the front layer displays the perspective corresponding to a center of projection located in the center of the pupil region. As shown in the refocused images, the depicted light field preserves accommodation cues, but suffers severe attenuation since each backlight pixel only illuminates the eye for a brief period.

As shown at the bottom of Figure 6, the decomposition algorithm used with Focus 3D exploits correlations between views to enable each backlight pixel to illuminate the pupil for a longer duration, yielding a brighter image (see supplementary Section A.2 for additional mask decompositions). Yet, similar to prior layered displays described in Section 2, reconstruction artifacts result from the compression process. In summary, Focus 3D opens the door to a new design trade space between brightness, reconstruction fidelity, and effective frame rate, one that may enable near-term display technologies to resolve the accommodation-convergence conflict.

3.3 Upper Bound on Accommodation Range

In this section we formally assess the benefits of high-angular-resolution (HAR) backlighting for extending the range over which accommodation cues can be achieved. We adapt the prior frequency-domain analysis of light field displays developed by Zwicker et al. [2006] and Wetzstein et al. [2011, 2012]. While these works derive an upper bound on the depth of field, we perform a similar analysis to reveal an upper bound on the accommodation range for multilayer displays, including those with HAR backlighting.

3.3.1 Accommodation Threshold. Consider the arrangement depicted in Figure 7, in which a virtual point light source is located a distance \( d_v - d_e \) in front of the viewer’s pupil, where \( d_v \) and \( d_e \) are the distance from the eye to the display and from the virtual point to the display, respectively. Following Takaki et al. [2006, 2011], we assume that a minimum of two rays must enter the pupil from this point to support correct accommodation. Let each ray \((\xi, \eta)\) passing through the virtual point be defined using a two-plane...
Fig. 5. Performance of computational displays vs. display complexity. We simulate the ability to refocus the light field emitted from various displays, with and without HAR backlighting, following the design proposed in Section 3.1. Up to three layers were placed in front of a Fresnel lens, with focal length \( f = 30 \text{ cm} \), each separated by 0.5 cm. We decompose the target light field to emit 5\times5 views spanning each viewer pupil, separated by a distance \( d_o = 100 \text{ cm} \) from the lens. Left: The light field corresponding to a dragon model is provided as input to the decomposition algorithm. Right: The first four columns show the received images for the left and right eye, when focused in front of and behind the lens. The remaining two columns show inset regions centered on the dragon’s eye. Five system architectures are compared from top to bottom, with varying numbers of layers and frames. The first three rows evaluate tensor display designs using a uniform backlight (\( b_{\text{lb}}(x, v) = 1 \)). The last two rows illustrate the benefits of HAR backlighting, demonstrating that its inclusion enables clear focus cues; note that the dragon’s eye can be brought into sharp focus, in contrast to cases without HAR backlighting. Quantitative assessment of focus is provided by the Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) with reference to the original refocused light field, confirming that increasing layers and frames reduces artifacts. Dragon model courtesy of Stanford Computer Graphics Laboratory.

Parameterization, where the \( \xi \) -axis is coincident with the point and the \( \eta \) -axis is located a distance \( d_l \) in front. Under this parameterization, the maximum angular sampling rate \( \Delta \eta_{\text{max}}(d_l) \) supporting accommodation is

\[
\frac{\Delta \eta_{\text{max}}(d_l)}{d_l} = \frac{a}{2(d_o - d_l)}.
\]

As proven shortly, the angular sampling rate for a light field display is invariant to the depth of a virtual point. In other words, the maximum angular sampling rate \( \Delta \eta_{\text{max}}(d_l) \) equals \( \Delta \eta_{\text{max}}(d_s) \), as defined in the two-plane parameterization of the emitted light field (see Figure 4). As a result, the angular sampling rate required for accommodation \( \omega_o \) must satisfy the following expression.

\[
\omega_o(d_l) \geq \frac{1}{2 \Delta \eta_{\text{max}}(d_l)} = \frac{d_o - d_l}{d_l a}
\]

As shown at the bottom of Figure 8, the supported accommodation range for a given light field display can be estimated by determining the point of intersection of the maximum angular frequency, \( \omega_o_{\text{max}} \), supported by the display architecture with the accommodation threshold given by Eq. (11). Points closer to the eye than this point of intersection (i.e., \( 0 < d_o - d_l \leq d_o \omega_o_{\text{max}} \)) will emit a minimum of two rays into the viewer’s pupil, whereas points further away will not.

### 3.3.2 Maximum Angular Frequency for a Multilayer Display

To estimate the accommodation range, the maximum angular frequency \( \omega_v \) is required for a given light field display. A direct analysis for conventional architectures, including parallax barriers and integral imaging displays, is possible. Yet, for multilayer displays, it is not clear how to estimate the maximum angular frequency. We propose an upper bound on the maximum angular frequency, based on frequency-domain analyses previously applied to characterize the depth of field of such displays.

\[
\tilde{l}(x, v) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left[ \prod_{n=1}^{N+1} f_m^{(n)}(x + (d_o/d_l)v) \right].
\]

where \( f_m^{(N+1)}(\xi_{N+1}) \) now denotes the effective transparency of the virtual layer corresponding to the image of the backlight layer formed by the lens. In this interpretation, the virtual layer is located a distance \( d_{v,+1} = d_o = (f d_o)/(d_o - f) \) in front of the lens. Taking the 2D Fourier transform of this expression yields an estimate of the emitted light field spectrum in terms of angular frequency \( \omega_o \) and spatial frequency \( \omega_v \) for a display with HAR backlighting

\[
\tilde{l}(\omega_o, \omega_v) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \left[ \ast \sum_{m=1}^{M} f_m^{(n)}(\omega_o) \delta(\omega_v - (d_o/d_l)\omega_v) \right].
\]

where \( \ast \) denotes convolution and the repeated convolution operator is defined such that

\[
\ast f_m^{(n)}(\omega_o, \omega_v) \equiv f_m^{(1)}(\omega_o, \omega_v) \ast \cdots \ast f_m^{(N+1)}(\omega_o, \omega_v).
\]
Fig. 6. Comparing direct vs. compressive display modes. A single-layer Focus 3D prototype is considered, comprising one layer in front of a large lens and a backlight conjugate to the viewer’s pupil. These examples evaluate a light field with $5 \times 5$ views spanning a single pupil located along the optical axis. Top: Using direct time-multiplexing, following the approach of Travis [1990], only a single backlight pixel is active in each frame, resulting in a dim image. Bottom: Focus 3D exploits correlations between views to illuminate each pupil region for a longer duration, increasing image brightness, as shown in photographs of prototype. Dragon model courtesy of Stanford Computer Graphics Laboratory.

Fig. 7. A virtual point source is created, with accommodation cues. A geometric argument is made for the angular resolution requirements for accommodation in Section 3.3.1. Here, we observe that the angular sampling frequency at the eye, $\Delta \eta$, equals $\Delta \nu$, the angular sampling frequency of the HAR backlight, enforcing a lower bound such that at least two rays enter the pupil of the eye.

multilayer display is determined by the region of nonzero support in the emitted light field spectrum $\hat{l}(\omega_x, \omega_v)$. Intersecting the line $\omega_x = (d_v/d_x)\omega_v$ with the spectral support provides a geometric construction for the upper bound on the depth of field. Figure 8 compares the upper bound on the depth for field for two competing display architectures: a two-layer display with uniform backlighting and a single-layer display with HAR backlighting. However, this upper bound does not account for limitations of our decomposition algorithm; in practice, the number of ray constraints (i.e., nonzero values of tensor $W$ in Eq. (6)) and the compressibility of the input light field determine actual performance. Section 5 provides a performance evaluation in simulation and on a prototype device.

A similar upper bound on the maximum angular frequency $\omega_v^{\text{max}}$ can be derived by analyzing the spatio-angular bandwidth of a given multilayer display. Depth-of-field analysis is facilitated by

Fig. 8. HAR backlighting is required to support accommodation within the depth of field of a multilayer display. We compare a two-layer display with uniform backlighting and a single-layer display with HAR backlighting. Top: The spatio-angular bandwidths, evaluated following Section 3.3.2. Note that HAR backlighting significantly increases the maximum angular frequency. Middle: Upper bounds of depth of field. The dashed black line denotes the maximum spatial frequency corresponding to the physical pixel pitch. The dashed gray line denotes the maximum spatial frequency supported by the virtual panel, given by the magnified image of the backlight layer. The magenta lines illustrate the relationship between the spatio-angular bandwidth and depth-of-field plots for a reference plane at $d_v = 25$ cm. Bottom: Accommodation is supported for virtual plane distances $d_v$ where the display’s angular cutoff frequency (blue and green lines) is above the accommodation threshold (Eq. (11), red dotted line). Note that without HAR backlighting a two-layer display only supports accommodation when the virtual layer is separated by $d_v \gtrsim 65$ cm from the display (well outside the depth of field). With HAR backlighting, accommodation is predicted throughout the depth of field, as reflected in experiments. The plots reflect our prototype testing configuration: a pupil diameter $a = 2.0$ cm, an eye to display distance $d_e = 127$ cm, and an $f = 31.8$ cm focal length lens. The two-layer display used a layer separation of 4 cm.
considering the frequency-domain properties of a Lambertian surface located a distance $d_e$ in front of the display. For such a surface, the emitted light field, $\tilde{l}(x, v)$, equals $f(x + (d_e/d_i)v)$, corresponding to the line $\omega_i = (d_e/d_i)\omega_i$ in the frequency domain (see Figure 8, top and center row). Similarly, a uniform directional area source emits a light field $\tilde{l}(x, v)$ such that

$$\tilde{l}(x, v) = f(v). \quad (15)$$

Taking the 2D Fourier transform of this expression yields an estimate for the corresponding light field spectrum

$$\tilde{l}(\omega_x, \omega_v) = f(\omega_v) \delta(\omega_x), \quad (16)$$

where $\delta(\xi)$ is the Dirac delta function. Thus, the spectrum of a directional source located any distance $d_e$ from a light field display is approximated by a vertical line in the emitted light field spectrum.

As a result, the maximum angular frequency $\omega_{\text{max}}$ supported by any light field display is provided by the intersection of the spatio-angular bandwidth with a vertical line, evaluated along the $\omega_v$-axis.

In summary, we present a new connection linking depth-of-field analysis to bounds on the accommodation range of a light field display. As shown in Figure 8, the accommodation range is found by intersecting the maximum angular frequency $\omega_{\text{max}}$ with the accommodation threshold given by Eq. (11). In this example, we find that HAR backlighting is necessary to support accommodation within the depth of field centered near the display surface.

3.4 Diffraction

Light passing through an aperture spreads out angularly (diffracts) to a degree inversely related to the aperture size. For a multiview display, this relationship enforces a limit on the maximum angular resolution that can be achieved for a given spatial resolution; for a given display pixel aperture size, views can be spaced no more closely than the corresponding angular spread of diffraction without overlapping. For multiview displays supporting correct accommodation, diffraction is an important consideration as ultra-high-angular-resolution is required. In this section, we analyze the relationship between the maximum spatial and angular resolution that can be attained by a diffraction-limited multiview display utilizing spatial light modulators.

In the following analysis we assume that each pixel consists of a round aperture, and light is focused on the plane of the eye. Views are evenly spaced over the observer’s pupil, where the outermost views are centered on the pupil edges. Diffraction causes light to spread out to form an Airy disk; as an approximation, we consider the central element of the disk, which is bound by the first minimum at the following angle

$$\theta_d \approx \arcsin \frac{1.22\lambda}{p}, \quad (17)$$

where $\lambda$ is the wavelength of the light and $p$ is the diameter of the pixel aperture. Using this model, adjacent views will not overlap due to diffraction at viewing distance $d_e$ if the diameter of the central element of the Airy disk is less than or equal to the view spacing over the pupil, that is,

$$2d_e \tan \theta_d \leq \frac{a}{n - 1}. \quad (18)$$

where $a$ is the pupil diameter and $n$ is the number of views spaced over the pupil. If the diameter of the central element of the Airy disk exceeds this value, adjacent views will begin to overlap and degrade. By the Rayleigh criterion, two point-light sources are considered “just resolved” when the central element of the Airy disk of one source coincides with the minimum of the other. By this definition, when the diameters of the Airy disk center elements exceed $4d_e \tan \theta_d$, the maximum of the disk corresponding to each view will extend beyond the first minimum of the neighboring views, and adjacent views are no longer resolvable.

Figure 9 shows the diffraction-limited spatial and angular resolution configuration space for multiview displays that support multiple focal depths. The analysis assumes a human-sized pupil diameter, $a = 5$ mm, and optimal viewing distance of our prototype display, $d_e = 127$ cm. The figure shows that reasonable configurations (spatial resolution of 20–30 cycles/degree, angular resolution of 2–3 views over pupil) are attainable, but lie close to the diffraction limits. Section 3.5 provides simulations to show how diffraction affects the focus quality of a light field.

3.5 Retinal Blur

Along with the ability to focus at different depths about a display, it is also important that the blur of out-of-focus imagery is accurate; retinal blur has been shown to help the human visual system solve the binocular correspondence problem and interpret monocular occlusions [Hoffman and Banks 2010]. From a theoretical standpoint, the quality of retinal blur in our proposed display design is influenced by two primary factors: the light field compression...
performance of the tensor factorization algorithm and diffraction. (In practice, the blur quality will also be affected by the performance of the optical components.)

To analyze the effect of diffraction on retinal blur, we simulate the effect of diffraction on a light field. Following the assumptions of Section 3.4, we approximate the diffracted energy distribution using the following Gaussian function [Zhang et al. 2007].

\[
I(v) = e^{-\frac{v^2}{2w^2}}, \quad w = 0.42\lambda \frac{d_v}{p},
\]

where \(v\) is the radial distance from the view center on the pupil, \(\lambda\) is the wavelength of the light, \(d_v\) is the viewing distance, and \(p\) is the diameter of the pixel aperture. A diffracted light field is created according to

\[
\tilde{I}_d(x, v) = I(v) * \tilde{I}(x, v),
\]

where \(\tilde{I}\) is the emitted light field without diffraction, such that the \(v\)-axis is coincident with the viewer’s pupil (\(d_v\) equals \(d_e\) in Figure 4), and \(*\) denotes convolution. This process is performed separately on each color channel using the appropriate wavelength, \(\lambda\), in \(I\).

Figure 10 provides a comparison of retinal blur between a ground-truth light field and light fields compressed through tensor factorization while simulating diffraction as described before. Note that most of the test cases fall above the diffraction limits shown in Figure 9 in order to provide an estimate of maximum performance in a diffraction-limited system. We make the following observations from the results.

1. In the nominal compressed case, the average PSNR is 31 dB for the in-focus images and 37 dB for the out-of-focus images. It is clear that diffraction and compression limit the performance of our approach, but performance on the order of lossy video compression (\(\geq 30\) dB) can still be achieved.

2. As expected, the in-focus performance decreases as the number of views and time-multiplexed frames are reduced. With too many constraints for the available degrees of freedom (e.g., \(5 \times 5\) views, 2 frames), focus performance is poor.

3. High PSNR is not indicative of qualitative blur performance. The most numerically accurate out-of-focus blur occurred in the \(2 \times 2\) view case, in which the radius appears most accurate. However, the blur accuracy is low as compared to the nominal \(5 \times 5\) view case; two distinct out-of-focus images can be seen. This issue can be resolved in future work by employing error metrics inspired by the human visual system.

From these observations we conclude that the proposed design theoretically supports focus at multiple depths over a human-sized pupil with high-quality retinal blur. We also note that the most accurate blur required many views over the pupil, an approach that is only practical with a compressive framework. In Section 5, we describe the actual performance of a prototype display.

4. IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Hardware

As shown in Figure 11, our Focus 3D prototype is constructed using off-the-shelf components: three spatial light-modulating layers and a large Fresnel lens. The entire optical train is suspended from rails, enabling the placement of the lens and spatial light-modulating layers at various distances from the viewer to support the experiments detailed in Section 5. The light-modulating layers and backlight consist of modified Viewsonic VX2268wm 120 Hz LCD panels. The diffusing front polarizers were removed from the two front panels and replaced with clear polarizers, enabling image formation through the panels. The lens element is a Fresnel Technologies Inc. #32, 254 mm diameter Fresnel lens with \(f = 318\) mm, optimized for conjugates at 424 mm and 1270 mm. We address the impact of the low optical quality of Fresnel lenses in Section 5.

Both simulation and driver software for our prototype run on an Intel Core i7 workstation with 6GB RAM and an external Nvidia QuadroPlex 7000 unit containing two Quadro 7000 GPUs and a G-Sync card. This configuration enables us to drive all three LCDs synchronously at 120 Hz over standard dual-link DVI connections.
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sections and multiple focal depths. The matryoshka doll images were photographed from two different positions spaced 64 mm apart and were optically focused on three different depths at each viewpoint. Note the focus/defocus effect in the closeups. This scene contains 5 × 5 viewpoints for each eye—50 views total—and was successfully decomposed into 12 available frames displayed on a single LCD in front of a Fresnel lens and another LCD at the conjugate distance to the pupil plane behind the lens. Figure 13 evaluates the image quality, using peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) as a metric, for a varying number of time-multiplexed frames and light-attenuating layers placed within close proximity in front of the lens. Compared to the previous state-of-the-art multilayer displays [Wetzstein et al. 2012], the proposed work shows improved performance under the same conditions and a greater ability to scale with the number of time-multiplexed frames, even with a single layer. While the PSNR is theoretically improved for multiple stacked layers, designing such systems in practice is challenging due to the necessity of precise layer alignment. Experiments with our prototype show the difficulty of achieving the necessary precision in practice (see Figure 14); hence, all photographs of the prototype display utilize only a single LCD and the directional backlight.

5.3 Motion Parallax and View Steering

Motion parallax and view steering are evaluated in Figure 15. We capture three different viewpoints, centered around the display normal, within a lateral range of 30 cm at a viewing distance of 127 cm. The display optically steers a small light cone into the direction of each view without consideration of any other view. Motion parallax is clearly visible in the three rows of Figure 15. Additionally, two different focal settings show, for each viewpoint, the front and rear of the shark in focus, respectively. The lateral range of supported viewpoints is practically limited by the quality of the refractive display element; the inexpensive Fresnel lens used in our prototype exhibits significant radial image distortion, coma, and dispersion for off-axis viewpoints at steeper angles. To show the theoretical performance of our system with higher-quality optics, we simulate a tracked observer moving around the display at a much wider range in supplementary Section A.1.

5.4 Moving Away from the Conjugate Plane

Moving away from the conjugate plane results in an optical configuration in which the pupil plane does not correspond to the conjugate plane of the backlight. If the observer moves far enough from the display, this optical arrangement practically results in a multilayer display; the backlight is a virtual layer placed at the conjugate plane.
in front of the physical display enclosure. This approach is similar to that of Gotoda [2011], who noted that placing a lens over an LCD in a multilayer display changes its apparent position. Figure 16 simulates this case for an observer at a distance of 127 cm, while the conjugate plane of the backlight is located 57 cm in front of the screen. The decompositions use six time-multiplexed frames and the target light field has $5 \times 5$ viewpoints over an eye aperture of 5 mm. As shown in the top row, multiple focal depths are still supported. The decompositions (see Figure 16, bottom row), however, differ from the case where the conjugate plane is in the pupil plane (see Figure 6); they show a flipped version of the mask patterns that appear on the virtual layer floating in front of the other layers.

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

**Future Work.** The incorporation of tracking, a brighter backlight, and a higher-quality lens would improve the practicality of our display and allow evaluation on human subjects. Investigation of optical folding techniques, such as wedge optics [Travis et al. 2013] may also allow the form factor of our current prototype to be...
significantly reduced, resulting in a thin, light-efficient glasses-free 3D display that overcomes many of the limitations of current-generation devices. Optimization criteria can also be adjusted to compensate for diffraction through the display layers, as well as optical aberrations in the human eye [Huang et al. 2012]. Furthermore, exploring the combination of multiple stacked layers and arbitrary refractive optical elements holds much promise. A single, planar backlight, for instance, will be reimaged onto the focal surface of an arbitrary refractive element; more sophisticated elements, such as parabolic lenses or catadioptric systems, will be fruitful to explore.

Summary. Within the past few years, stereoscopic 3D displays have become commonplace in the home and in theaters, yet many users lament the visual discomfort induced by the accommodation-vergence conflict. By harnessing the emerging field of computational displays—joint designs of display optics and compressive light field synthesis—we have developed a display design with the potential to support the widely sought accommodative depth cue while avoiding the impractical resolution and bandwidth requirements of existing designs. We have demonstrated that computationally flexible architectures can further augment the visual experience by supporting nearly correct accommodation cues over a wide field of view and without the need for glasses. We are inspired by the promise of future generations of displays that approach the realism of the physical world, and offer comfortable, natural viewing for a wider audience.
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