

Classification robustness to common optical aberrations

Patrick Müller^{1,2}, Alexander Braun¹, Margret Keuper^{2,3}

¹Hochschule Düsseldorf - University of Applied Sciences,

²University of Siegen, ³Max-Planck-Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus

Abstract

Computer vision using deep neural networks (DNNs) has brought about seminal changes in people’s lives. Applications range from automotive, face recognition in the security industry, to industrial process monitoring. In some cases, DNNs infer even in safety-critical situations. Therefore, for practical applications, DNNs have to behave in a robust way to disturbances such as noise, pixelation, or blur. Blur directly impacts the performance of DNNs, which are often approximated as a disk-shaped kernel to model defocus. However, optics suggests that there are different kernel shapes depending on wavelength and location caused by optical aberrations. In practice, as the optical quality of a lens decreases, such aberrations increase. This paper proposes OpticsBench, a benchmark for investigating robustness to realistic, practically relevant optical blur effects. Each corruption represents an optical aberration (coma, astigmatism, spherical, trefoil) derived from Zernike Polynomials. Experiments on ImageNet show that for a variety of different pre-trained DNNs, the performance varies strongly compared to disk-shaped kernels, indicating the necessity of considering realistic image degradations. In addition, we show on ImageNet-100 with OpticsAugment that robustness can be increased by using optical kernels as data augmentation. Compared to a conventionally trained ResNeXt50, training with OpticsAugment achieves an average performance gain of 21.7% points on OpticsBench and 6.8% points on 2D common corruptions.

1. Introduction

Deep neural networks (DNN) are present in peoples’ daily lives in various applications to mobility [1, 2, 3], language and speech processing [4] and vision [5, 6].

Although, for example, image classification networks produce excellent results on various challenges, it often remains unclear how well the trained models will generalize from the training distribution to practical test scenarios, that may present them with various domain shifts. For practical deployment, this generalization ability and robust-




Figure 1: Kernel samples available with OpticsBench (a-f) and a disk-like blur kernel (g). All kernels model optical aberrations, while the kernels in (a-f) additionally include chromatic aberration, asymmetric and non-constant shapes.

ness to data degradation is however crucial. Measuring robustness is addressed by various benchmarks introducing targeted corruptions [7, 8, 9], common corruptions and adverse weather conditions [1, 10, 11] to vision datasets. These methods and benchmarks already cover a wide range of corruptions and yet use necessary simplifications.

In this paper, we focus on a practically highly relevant case that has so far not been addressed in the literature: robustness to realistic optical aberration effects. Under high cost pressure, e.g. in automotive mass production on cameras, compromises in optical quality may have to be made and natural production tolerances occur. In practice, even the constant use of a camera can lead to a change in image quality during the period of use, e.g. due to thermal expansion. This can lead to increased aberrations [12], e.g. chromatic aberration and astigmatism, which are not considered in current robustness research.

This paper proposes OpticsBench to close this gap, a benchmark that includes common types of optical aberrations such as coma, astigmatism and spherical aberration. The optical kernels are derived theoretically from an expansion of the wavefront into Zernike polynomials, which can be mixed by the user to create any *realistic* optical kernel. The dataset grounds on 3D kernels (x, y, color) matched in size to the defocus blur corruption of [10] as we consider the disk-shaped kernel as the base type of blur kernels. We evaluate 70 different DNNs on a total of 1M images from the benchmark applied to ImageNet. Our evaluation shows that the performance of ImageNet models varies strongly for different optical degradations and that the disk-shaped blur kernels provide only weak proxies to estimate the mod-

els’ robustness when confronted with optical degradations.

Further, since our analysis indicates a lack of robustness to optical degradations, we propose an efficient tool to use optical kernels for data augmentation during DNN training, which we denote *OpticsAugment*. In experiments on ImageNet-100, *OpticsAugment* achieves on average 18% performance gain compared to conventionally trained DNNs on *OpticsBench*. We also show that *OpticsAugment* allows to improve on 2D common corruptions [10] on average by 5.3% points on ImageNet-100, *i.e.* the learned robustness transfers to other domain shifts.

2. Related work

Vasiljevic et al. [13] investigate the robustness of CNNs to defocus and camera shake. Hendrycks et al. [10] provide a benchmark to 2D common corruptions. The benchmark includes several general modifications to images such as change in brightness or contrast as well as weather influences such as fog, frost and snow. They also include different types of blur, but only consider luminance kernels and more general types such as Gaussian or disk-shaped kernels. Kar et al. [11] build on this work and extend common corruptions to 3D. These include *extrinsic* camera parameter changes such as field of view changes or translation and rotation. Michaelis et al. [1] and Dong et al. [14] provide robustness benchmarks for object detection on common vision datasets. As the field of research grows, more subtle changes in image quality potentially posing a distribution shift are uncovered. This work aims to build on a more general treatment of blur types, which are known in optics research, but less common in computer vision.

A related field of research investigates robustness to adversarial examples created by targeted [15, 16] and untargeted [17] attacks. The goal is to introduce small perturbations of the input data in a way such that the model makes wrong classifications. Successful attacks pose a security risk to a particular DNN, while human observers would not even notice a difference and safely classify [7]. Croce et al. [9] provide a robustness benchmark, originally intended for adversarial robustness testing using AutoAttack [15], while more practical l_p -bounds are discussed in [18]. However, these methods are model specific in that the particular attack is *optimized* for the model using *e.g.* projected gradient descent in the backward pass. Therefore white-box methods require full knowledge about the underlying model. In contrast, model evaluation with *OpticsBench* corruptions can be done by applying simple filters to the validation data and thus requires only a clean image dataset. Therefore, it also works for black-box models. Convolution tensors with kernels is a base task in computer vision and so GPU-optimized implementations exist. These include parallel evaluation of *OpticsBench* for many models and on-the-fly training with *OpticsAugment*.

Since these benchmarks reveal potential distribution shifts or lack of robustness for a given neural network model, concurrently methods are researched to improve robustness [19, 20, 21] on various benchmarks. Hendrycks et al. [22, 23] propose different data augmentation methods to improve classification robustness towards 2D common corruptions. The work of Saikia [24] further builds on this and achieves high accuracy on both clean and corrupted samples. Similarly, methods exist to improve adversarial robustness [25] on benchmarks like [26, 27].

Modeling or retrieving Zernike polynomials [28, 29, 30] is a common process in ophthalmological optics [31, 32] to investigate aberrations of the human eye. The expansion is also widely used in other areas of optics, such as lens design [33], microscopy [34] and astronomy [35, 36]. Therefore several tools [33, 37, 38] exist to generate PSFs from Zernike coefficients or wavefronts. The design is application specific and intended for optical engineers or physicists such as optical design software like Zemax Optic Studio [33]. Our *OpticsBench* and *OpticsAugment* leverage such optical models to evaluate and improve current models with respect to realistic optical effects.

3. Blur kernel generation




Figure 2: Imaging with space-variant PSF: Point sources in object space that pass the optical system appear spread and differently shaped in image space depending on the angle of incident. Kernel sizes are exaggerated for display purposes.

The point spread function (PSF) is the linear system response to a spherical point wave source emanating at some point in object space. With an ideal lens, this spherical wave would simply converge at the focus. Real-world systems create a shape specific to the aberrations present at that field position. Typically the wavelength-dependent PSF varies from the center to the edge and may also depend on azimuth as shown in Fig. 2. Point sources from different locations

lead to different PSFs [28, 39]. This directly impacts the imaged object: depending on the azimuth, the object appears differently blurred. In this article, we follow a similar approach to show possible effects of lens blur on the robustness of DNNs. For small images of size 224×224 we assume a constant PSF and treat them as if they were regions of interest (ROI) from a larger image: Each image is blurred in different severities and optical aberrations. Since the images already contain different corruptions, including blur, the low pass filtering further reduces the image quality. In addition, depth-dependent blur would also control the blur size at a specific pixel. However, if the objects are beyond the hyperfocal distance, the depth-dependent blur variation can be neglected. This hyperfocal distance is for automotive lenses *e.g.* at several meters. Farther objects have the same blur as objects at *infinity*. Blur is more pronounced for these objects than for near objects because they are much smaller.

3.1. Kernel generation

To obtain kernel shapes specific to real optical aberrations, we use the linear system model for diffraction and aberration as in [39, 28] and expand the wavefront in Zernike polynomials. The effect of a non-ideal lens on a point source of wavelength λ can be compactly summarized by a Fourier transform \mathcal{F} over a circular region that propagates the aberrated wave from pupil space to the image space. Fig. 3 visualizes the process. An ideal spherical wave passes through a circular pupil, which then deforms according to the characteristics of the optical system. If there were no aberrations, the phase would be flat. The




Figure 3: Image processing scheme: The circular pupil (a) contains an aberrated phase (b), which is mapped into image space by a 2D Fourier Transform, yielding a PSF (c). This PSF is convolved with an image (d) to produce a blurred image (e). The process is repeated for each color channel.

complex phase factor describing the optical path difference W_λ is transformed to image space at z_i to yield a PSF for wavelength λ : [39]

$$h(u, v, \lambda) = |\mathcal{F}\{Circ(x, y) \cdot e^{-j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda z_i} W_\lambda(x, y, \lambda)}\}|^2. \quad (1)$$

A blurred image is then created with a 2D convolution of the PSF and the image. The model from Eq. (1) assumes scalar diffraction theory and therefore no polarization. Since we use an l_1 -normed discrete PSF to preserve intensity in the final image, any scalar weights are suppressed. In this paper, we consider a very small imager $224 \times 224 \times 3$ that

Table 1: First twelve Zernike Fringe modes. We select numbers 4-11 for OpticsBench. However, an extension to other (higher) modes is easily accomplished.

piston #	name	#	name
1	piston	7	horizontal coma
2	tilt x	8	vertical coma
3	tilt y	9	spherical
4	defocus	10	oblique trefoil
5	oblique astigmatism	11	vertical trefoil
6	vertical astigmatism	12	sec. vert. astigmatism

can be fed with ImageNet data. The model is restricted to represent the lens with a single PSF, no dependence on the object distance and angle, no magnification to concentrate on the kernel’s shape nor its possible variation over the field of view. We observe the PSF h in a region $u, v \in [0, 25)$ pixels and apply it as a convolution kernel to the images. These restrictions allow for fast processing although an extension to space-variant optical models is given in [40, 41, 42, 43].

Now, to model specific PSFs, the expansion of the wavefront W_λ into a complete and orthogonal set of polynomials Z_n^m named after Fritz Zernike [28, 30, 44] is used:

$$W_\lambda(x, y, \lambda) = \lambda \cdot \sum_{n,m} A_n^m(\lambda) \cdot Z_n^m \quad (2)$$

Each coefficient A_n^m in multiples of the wavelengths λ_i represents the contribution of a particular type of aberration and therefore different aspects such as the amount of coma, astigmatism or defocus can be turned off or on. In this article, we choose the eight isolated Zernike Fringe Polynomials, including primary and more complex aberrations. Tilt x and tilt y are not considered here. The concrete list is marked as bold text in Tab. 1. Conversely to Seidel aberrations not occurring isolated but mixed in practice, we select isolated Zernike modes, combining Seidel aberrations by definition, such as astigmatism & defocus. For convenience, we refer to these aberrations here briefly as their Seidel aberration equivalent. However, lens aberrations of real systems usually consist of a bunch of different Zernike modes, see *e.g.* the Zemax sample objectives, we select here single Zernike modes to allow for categorization and encourage researchers to combine different modes and investigate its impact on model robustness. Although we do not show distortion, tilt, and field curvature here, the same framework can be used to model or process entire lens representations. This is particularly useful for image datasets with larger images, as the lens corruptions then may vary significantly over the field of view, *e.g.* the Berkeley Deep Drive (BDD100k). [2] The PSF generation is done in Python and the pupil modeling is based on [37].

3.2. Kernel matching

To compare the impact of different kernel types on each other, it is crucial to have size-matched representations. As a baseline, we use the simple disk-shaped kernel prototype from Hendrycks et al. [10] shown in Fig. 1g. Then, with an educated initial guess of coefficient values two kernels are evaluated on different metrics and optimized by offsetting the coefficients in steps of $\pm 0.1\lambda$. From this, we take the best overall fit as the kernel pair.

First, to compare two kernels, the Modulation Transfer Function (MTF) is obtained and evaluated in differently orientated slices ($0^\circ, 45^\circ, 90^\circ, 135^\circ$) [45, 39]. From this, the frequency value at 50% (MTF50) and the area under the curve (AUC) are obtained. The difference between these metrics provides a distance in optical quality. Further, SSIM and PSNR are reported [46]. These metrics aim to compare the shape. Secondly, the kernels are convolved and then analyzed on established test images used in benchmarking camera image quality as another matching criterion. [47, 48, 49] We evaluate SSIM and PSNR on a slanted edge test chart and the scale-invariant spilled coins test chart, both at the required ImageNet target resolution of 224×224 . The spilled coins chart, shown in Fig. 4a, consists of randomly generated disks of different sizes and is designed to measure texture loss as an image-level MTF. [50, 51] We report here the acutance and MTF50 value as evaluated with the algorithm of Burns [51] from the spilled coins chart and compare once again between the two kernel representations. The evaluated image and optical quality on the spilled coins test chart serves here as proxy for other images from the image datasets.

Although the obtained optical kernels match also for higher severities with the defocus blur corruption [10], blur kernel sizes observed in the real world would be smaller, so this poses rather an upper bound on the observable blur corruption for an entire image. However, small objects such as pedestrians in object detection datasets such as [2] may suffer from such severe blurring as the object size decreases to tens of pixels.

4. OpticsBench - benchmarking robustness to selected optical aberrations

Similar to Hendrycks et al. [10] we define five different severities for each optical aberration. To obtain comparable corruptions, the defocus blur corruption from [10] serves as baseline for OpticsBench. For each severity, our kernels are matched to the defocus blur kernel types using the method and metrics described above. We generate two sets of kernels with different chromatic aberrations: OpticsBenchRG consists of the same kernels as OpticsBench, but with only the red and green channels spread as in Fig. 1b and thus producing severe chromatic aberration. For brevity, we refer




Figure 4: (a) Spilled coins test chart generated with Imatest target generator tool [52]. (b) MTF curves obtained from degraded versions of (a) and the corresponding PSF based MTF (c). The red curves refer to the baseline kernel at severity 3 and black to the corresponding astigmatism.

Table 2: Corruption types used in OpticsBench with their corresponding Zernike mode equivalent from Tab. 1.

Astigmatism	(5, 6)	Trefoil	(10, 11)
Coma	(7, 8)	Defocus & spherical	(4, 9)

to our kernels as *optical kernels*, although the disk-shaped kernel type from [10] is a model for defocus obtained from geometric optics.

Each set of kernels consists of 40 kernels for the eight different Zernike modes. We combine Zernike modes that result in similar shapes into a single corruption as in Tab. 2. This results in four different optical corruptions. Each corrupted dataset is then obtained by randomly assigning one of the two kernel types. A predefined seed of the pseudo-random number generator ensures reproducibility. Before applying the blur kernels, the images are resized to 256×256 and center cropped to 224×224 , to avoid any reduction of the effect.

A set of DNNs is inferred for each severity and corruption, and the classification accuracy ($\text{acc}@1$) is reported. Additionally, the baseline and the clean dataset are evaluated.

To compare accuracies with the baseline, we define the deviation of a specific corruption c_i from the baseline b (defocus blur):

$$\Delta_{c_i, b} = \text{Acc}_{c_i} - \text{Acc}_b \quad (3)$$

Additionally, the Kendall Tau rank coefficient [53] is evaluated on the DNN model ranking to further investigate whether the optical kernels elicit different behavior compared to the disk-shaped kernels for different architectures.

The Python code to re-create both the benchmark inference scripts and the benchmark datasets for all optical corruptions is provided¹. This includes the sets consisting of 40 kernels for OpticsBench and OpticsBenchRG. The script

¹https://github.com/PatMue/classification_robustness

is intended for ImageNet-1k and ImageNet-100, but can be extended to other datasets. Since the benchmark is intended to be modifiable to specific user investigations (e.g. different aberrations), the source code to create kernels is also available but not as part of this contribution. Generating the OpticsBench datasets (five severities, four corruptions) from the 50k ImageNet-1k validation images takes about 120 minutes with six PyTorch workers and batch size 128 on an 8-core i7-CPU and 32GB RAM equipped with NVIDIA GeForce 3080-Ti 12GB GPU. Using smaller kernels than ours ($25 \times 25 \times 3$) may speed up the process.

5. Experiments on ImageNet

OpticsBench is built on the ImageNet validation dataset, consisting of 50k images distributed in 1000 classes. All four corruptions (astigmatism, coma, defocus blur & spherical and trefoil) are divided into 5 different severities each. We evaluate the 65 DNNs from the torchvision model zoo including a wide range of architectures as listed in Tab. 3. All models are pre-trained on ImageNet-1k. MobileNet_v3 is trained using AutoAugment [21], EfficientNet training uses CutMix [54] and MixUp [55] and ConvNeXt and VisionTransformers use a combination of these. In addition to these networks, we evaluate ResNet50 models from the RobustBench [27] leaderboard, which are reportedly robust against common corruptions [22, 23, 56]. Accuracies on the validation set are available in the supplementary material.

Table 3: Selected architectures used from PyTorch vision model zoo in small and large variants.

ConvNeXt [57]	Inception_v3 [58]	ResNet [59]
DenseNet [60]	MobileNet [61]	ResNeXt [62]
EfficientNet [63]	RegNet [64]	ViTransformer [65]

Fig. 5 shows the difference in accuracy compared to the validation data for all corruptions. The severities are plotted from left to right for a single corruption. The different colors refer to representatives from Table 3. The evaluation of all 70 models is found in the supplementary material A. In Fig. 5 the ResNet50 architecture, marked with red triangles for the standard training and with red circles for ResNet50+DeepAugment, clearly benefits from the training with DeepAugment. It drops by almost 65% points for severity 5 and astigmatism compared to the clean data accuracy. The robust model with DeepAugment loses 52% points. In general, the performance at a particular severity and corruption depends on the DNN.

Fig. 6 compares the achieved accuracy at a specific severity and mode with the disk-shaped kernel equivalent from [10]. For each severity the four OpticsBench corruptions are shown from left to right (astigmatism, coma, defocus & spherical, trefoil). The red circles show for the robust




Figure 5: Difference in Accuracy on OpticsBench compared to the clean data. For each corruption five levels of severity are shown from left to right. We also include defocus blur [10], used as baseline to match our kernel sizes. Each color represents a DNN from Table 3.

ResNet50 model that the particular relative performance depends not only on the severity but also on the corruption: the various kernel types challenge each DNN differently. Especially the robust ResNet50 (red circle) and Inception (light blue circle) differ from the mean deviation. This is further justified by the ranking comparisons in the supplementary material A. The different rankings show that the blur types are processed differently by the DNNs and that each blur type needs to be considered.




Figure 6: Comparison of Accuracy for the baseline and the different corruptions and severities. The corruptions per severity are from left to right: astigmatism, coma, defocus & spherical and trefoil.

6. OpticsAugment - augmenting with optical kernels

Since the above results show a clear drop in performance due to the different corruptions, and motivated by the general benefit of training with data augmentation, we propose here a data augmentation method with kernels from the OpticsBench kernel generation, which supplements existing methods.

OpticsAugment follows a similar approach as AugMix [22] and is described in Alg. 1. During dataloading in the training process each image is convolved with an individual RGB-kernel from the kernel stack containing e.g. 40 kernels for the different corruptions and severities. The random selection of the kernel follows a uniform distribution. Additionally, each resulting image is a weighted combination of the original image and the blurred image, following a beta-distribution as in [22], which controls the amount of augmentation. Thus, the total number of images per epoch stays the same. The exact combination varies each epoch, which facilitates generalization to the blur types. Since the processing is accelerated by GPU parallelization, the blurred images do not need to be computed in advance, but can be computed on-the-fly with comparable overhead to other methods such as [11] and a kernel size of 25x25x3. For this, Alg. 1 is implemented using parallelization on full image batches, which results in strong acceleration. For an image batch of 128 images an overhead of about 250ms is generated. Using dataloaders takes much longer since the number of workers is typically about 4-8, while the batch size is typically between 32 and 128. The implementation relies heavily on GPU acceleration using cuda and pytorch. The processed image batch is then normalized to the dataset specific mean and standard deviation. This is crucial, otherwise the training loss won't converge.

Since AugMix [22] provides low-cost data augmentation and promising results but no diverse blur kernel augmentation, we also try pipelining AugMix and OpticsAugment. Since both methods can feed the training algorithm with highly corrupted images, direct chaining leads to non-convergence and low accuracy. Therefore, we model the probability of augmentation with a flat Dirichlet distribution in four dimensions: The first two variables are the probabilities for AugMix and OpticsAugment. The other variables are auxiliary variables and ensure that the overall probability of each augmentation remains uniformly distributed. The output of OpticsAugment is normalized.

7. Experiments on ImageNet-100

On ImageNet-100, which is a smaller dataset with only 100 classes from ImageNet-1k, five different DNNs are trained with OpticsAugment. In addition, we train baseline models on ImageNet-100 with the same hyperparam-

Algorithm 1: OpticsAugment

```

1 augment ( $\mathbf{x}, kernels, severity = 3, \alpha = 1.0$ ) :
   Input : Clean tensor  $\mathbf{x}$  consisting of  $N$ 
           images, kernel stack  $kernels$  and severity
           between 1-5, intensity  $\alpha$ 
   Output: Randomly blurred image batch  $\mathbf{x}$ 
2 for  $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$  do
3    $blurred = zeros\_like(x)$ 
    $h \leftarrow choice(kernels)$  randomly select a
   kernel from  $kernels$  from one of the available
   augmentation types (e.g. oblique astigmatism).
4   for  $color=0,1,\dots,3$  do
5      $blurred[n, color] \leftarrow \mathbf{x}[n, color] * h[color]$ 
     2D convolution for image  $x$  and  $color$ 
6   end
7    $p \leftarrow realization(\alpha)$  sample from a
    $\beta$ -distribution controlling amount of
   augmentation
8    $x \leftarrow (1 - p) \cdot x + p \cdot blurred$ 
9 end
10  $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow normalize(\mathbf{x})$  adapt image batch to dataset
    specific mean and standard deviation
11 return  $\mathbf{x}$ 

```

eter settings, but without the data augmentation. These DNNs are then compared to each other on OpticsBench and 2D Common Corruptions [10] applied to ImageNet-100. We select five different architectures: EfficientNet_b0, MobileNet_v3_large, DenseNet161, ResNeXt50 and ResNet101.

The train split is divided into 5% validation images and 95% train images to ensure that the benchmark data only contains unseen data. On top of the trained DNNs all models are also trained with same settings but include OpticsAugment with severity 3 during training and the amount of augmentations is uniformly distributed, so $\alpha = 1.0$. The hyperparameter settings follow the standard training recipes as reported in the pytorch references [66] using cross-entropy loss, stochastic gradient descent and learning rate scheduling but no data augmentation. However, no additional data augmentation such as CutMix [54] or AutoAugment [21] are used. So, the achieved accuracy for MobileNet would be improved with AutoAugment. The DNNs are trained using the same batch size and number of epochs for clean and OpticsAugment training. Fine-tuning the hyperparameters can further improve the observed benefit.

Tab. 4 gives an overview of the improvement on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench with OpticsAugment. The smaller DNNs (MobileNet, EfficientNet_b0) show significantly lower improvements in accuracy, while ResNeXt50

Table 4: Performance *gain* with OpticsAugment on all ImageNet-100 OpticsBench corruptions. Average difference in accuracy across all corruptions in %-points for each severity. Details are given in supplementary B, tables 9-13.


DNN	1	2	3	4	5
DenseNet161	14.77	21.96	27.26	20.98	13.84
ResNeXt50	17.40	24.49	29.56	22.32	14.76
ResNet101	9.97	16.24	21.15	17.39	12.07
MobileNet	8.12	12.73	13.80	10.09	7.27
EfficientNet	8.45	12.60	12.90	9.43	7.35

gains up to 29.6% points with OpticsAugment. Fig. 7 compares the accuracies with/without OpticsAugment during training for each corruption. The ResNeXt50 in Fig. 7a improves with OpticsAugment (blue) on average by 21.7% points compared to the default model (red). The robustness to coma is significantly improved, especially for higher severities. The results for DenseNet161 in Fig. 7b are similar with an average improvement of 19.8% points. The severity 3 accuracies in Fig. 7b for the default DenseNet161 model are comparable, while OpticsAugment is significantly more robust to OpticsBench corruptions. For instance, trefoil (last data point) is handled overly well while the performance gain for defocus blur is significantly lower. This seems to hold across different severities and DNNs: The corresponding disk-shaped kernel [10] was not present during training, suggesting that diverse blur kernels need to be considered during training. Together with tables supporting this claim the results for the other DNNs can be found in the supplementary material B.


Additionally, the tuples of DNNs (baseline, baseline+OpticsAugment) are evaluated on 2D common corruptions [10]. The benchmark consists of 19 different corruptions including various blur types, noise and weather conditions. The average improvement with OpticsAugment is shown in Tab. 5. On average all DNNs still improve with OpticsAugment under the influence of the 2D common corruptions. As an example, we discuss here the results for ResNeXt50 with and without OpticsAugment in

Table 5: Performance *gain* with OpticsAugment on all 2D common corruptions [10] as average difference in accuracy across all corruptions in %-points for each severity. Details are given in supplementary B, tables 15-19.

DNN	1	2	3	4	5
DenseNet161	5.08	7.55	8.73	7.30	5.38
ResNeXt50	5.11	7.63	8.68	7.18	5.27
ResNet101	1.25	3.07	4.55	4.90	4.10
MobileNet	3.58	4.92	4.78	3.69	3.07
EfficientNet	4.35	6.32	6.70	4.62	3.69



(a) ResNeXt50



(b) DenseNet161

Figure 7: Accuracy on OpticsBench-ImageNet-100 for DNNs with (blue) and without (red) OpticsAugment training. The x-axis shows for each of the five corruptions (Astigmatism, Coma, Defocus [10], Defocus & Spherical, Trefoil) five different severities (from left to right). (a) ResNeXt50 (b) DenseNet161. The accuracy increases by on average 29.6% points for ResNeXt50 compared to the clean trained DNN (red) **with OpticsAugment (blue)** and severity 3 (down-pointing triangles). The performance gain for defocus blur [10] is the lowest for all severities.

Fig. 8. (Results for more models are in the supplementary material B). Fig. 8 compares the accuracies for ResNeXt50 solely trained on ImageNet-100 (red) and augmented with OpticsAugment (blue) respectively. For most of the corruptions the augmentation is beneficial, including blur, weather corruptions (fog, frost) and pixelation. However, some corruptions are not compensated by OpticsAugment, e.g. JPEG compression and contrast. Noise robustness may be improved by chaining OpticsAugment with AugMix.




Figure 8: Accuracy for ResNeXt50 evaluated on ImageNet-100-C 2D common corruptions w/o OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle, diamond, triangles and square markers) at each corruption. **OpticsAugment (blue)** accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red). Results for more DNNs are available in supplementary B, Figs. 13- 15.

In addition, pipelining AugMix with OpticsAugment further improves robustness on 2D Common corruptions (especially to gaussian and speckle noise, cf. Table 25), but reduces the accuracy on OpticsBench. Table 6 shows the average improvement for a cascaded application of AugMix & OpticsAugment and the different severities. The accuracy of EfficientNet increases by an additional 3.4% points on average for 2D common corruptions.

Table 6: Additional average improvement for DNNs with pipelining evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10].

DNN	1	2	3	4	5
EfficientNet	+2.79	+3.89	+4.34	+3.43	+2.61
MobileNet	+1.59	+2.27	+1.75	+0.57	-0.32

Limitations. First, with OpticsBench and the according augmentation, we make only one further step towards realistic benchmarking for robustness. As we can only test for sample classes of aberrations here, we point users to the kernel generation tool to test their specific use case. While we show that the proposed augmentation is beneficial for other types of common corruptions [10], we also evaluate towards adversarial robustness on ImageNet-100 test batches for l_2 bounded attacks from AutoAttack [15] and $\epsilon = 4/255$ in the supplementary material F, table 22. The evaluation is done for both APGD-CE and APGD-DLR attacks using the joint version of APGD and EoT for random defenses [67]

and 5 restarts. However, the analysis does not indicate any benefits from OpticsAugment for adversarial robustness.

8. Conclusion

This paper proposes the use of optical kernels obtained from optics to benchmark model robustness to aberrations. These 3D kernels (x, y, color) have diverse shape compared to disk-shaped kernels and depend on color. To compare their influence to a baseline, they are matched to disk-shaped kernels by minimizing various optical and image quality metrics, and provide OpticsBench, a benchmark aimed at testing for lens aberrations. We show empirically on ImageNet that a large number of DNNs can handle the optical corruptions differently well and conclude that these diverse blur types should be considered.

In addition, we investigate a training method to achieve robustness on OpticsBench: OpticsAugment efficiently generates an augmentation for each image and epoch by randomly selecting a blur kernel and convolving it with the image. Augmentation with OpticsAugment is beneficial beyond OpticsBench, for example for different types of 2D common corruptions. An average performance gain of 6.8% compared to a DNN without augmentation is achieved across a large number of corruptions, with peaks of up to 29% at medium severities.

Acknowledgements The computations were supported by the OMNI Cluster of the University of Siegen.

References

- [1] Claudio Michaelis et al. “Benchmarking Robustness in Object Detection: Autonomous Driving when Winter is Coming”. In: *arXiv:1907.07484 [cs, stat]* (Mar. 31, 2020). arXiv: [1907.07484](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.07484).
- [2] F. Yu et al. “BDD100K: A Diverse Driving Dataset for Heterogeneous Multitask Learning”. In: *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). ISSN: 2575-7075. June 2020, pp. 2633–2642.
- [3] Holger Caesar et al. “nuScenes: A Multimodal Dataset for Autonomous Driving”. In: *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). Seattle, WA, USA: IEEE, June 2020, pp. 11618–11628.
- [4] Geoffrey Hinton et al. “Deep Neural Networks for Acoustic Modeling in Speech Recognition: The Shared Views of Four Research Groups”. In: *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 29.6 (Nov. 2012). Conference Name: IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, pp. 82–97.
- [5] Junyi Chai et al. “Deep learning in computer vision: A critical review of emerging techniques and application scenarios”. In: *Machine Learning with Applications* 6 (Dec. 15, 2021), p. 100134.
- [6] Alan L. Yuille and Chenxi Liu. “Deep Nets: What have They Ever Done for Vision?” In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 129.3 (Mar. 1, 2021), pp. 781–802.
- [7] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. “Adversarial Examples Are Not Easily Detected: Bypassing Ten Detection Methods”. In: *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*. CCS ’17: 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. Dallas Texas USA: ACM, Nov. 3, 2017, pp. 3–14.
- [8] Nicolas Papernot et al. “The Limitations of Deep Learning in Adversarial Settings”. In: *2016 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. 2016 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P). Mar. 2016, pp. 372–387.
- [9] Francesco Croce et al. *RobustBench: a standardized adversarial robustness benchmark*. Oct. 31, 2021. arXiv: [2010.09670 \[cs, stat\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.09670).
- [10] Dan Hendrycks and Thomas Dietterich. “Benchmarking Neural Network Robustness to Common Corruptions and Perturbations”. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations* (2019).
- [11] Oğuzhan Fatih Kar et al. “3D Common Corruptions and Data Augmentation”. en. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2022, pp. 18963–18974.
- [12] Alexander Braun. “Automotive mass production of camera systems: Linking image quality to AI performance”. In: *tm - Technisches Messen* (June 15, 2022). Publisher: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag.
- [13] Igor Vasiljevic, Ayan Chakrabarti, and Gregory Shakhnarovich. “Examining the impact of blur on recognition by convolutional networks”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.05760* (2016).
- [14] Yinpeng Dong et al. “Benchmarking Robustness of 3D Object Detection to Common Corruptions”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 1022–1032.
- [15] Francesco Croce and Matthias Hein. “Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. ISSN: 2640-3498. PMLR, Nov. 21, 2020, pp. 2206–2216.
- [16] Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard. “DeepFool: A Simple and Accurate Method to Fool Deep Neural Networks”. In: *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). Las Vegas, NV, USA: IEEE, June 2016, pp. 2574–2582.
- [17] Maksym Andriushchenko et al. “Square Attack: A Query-Efficient Black-Box Adversarial Attack via Random Search”. In: *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*. Ed. by Andrea Vedaldi et al. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 484–501.
- [18] Peter Lorenz et al. “Is RobustBench/AutoAttack a suitable Benchmark for Adversarial Robustness?” In: *The AAAI-22 Workshop on Adversarial Machine Learning and Beyond*. 2022.
- [19] Sven Gowal et al. “Improving robustness using generated data”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021).

- [20] Robert Geirhos et al. “ImageNet-trained CNNs are biased towards texture; increasing shape bias improves accuracy and robustness”. In: International Conference on Learning Representations. Sept. 27, 2018.
- [21] Ekin D. Cubuk et al. “AutoAugment: Learning Augmentation Strategies From Data”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). Long Beach, CA, USA: IEEE, June 2019, pp. 113–123.
- [22] Dan Hendrycks* et al. “AugMix: A Simple Data Processing Method to Improve Robustness and Uncertainty”. In: International Conference on Learning Representations. 2020.
- [23] Dan Hendrycks et al. “The Many Faces of Robustness: A Critical Analysis of Out-of-Distribution Generalization”. In: *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). Montreal, QC, Canada: IEEE, Oct. 2021, pp. 8320–8329.
- [24] Tonmoy Saikia, Cordelia Schmid, and Thomas Brox. “Improving robustness against common corruptions with frequency biased models”. In: *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). Montreal, QC, Canada: IEEE, Oct. 2021, pp. 10191–10200.
- [25] Hadi Salman et al. “Do adversarially robust imagenet models transfer better?” In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 3533–3545.
- [26] Maura Pintor et al. “ImageNet-Patch: A dataset for benchmarking machine learning robustness against adversarial patches”. In: *Pattern Recognition* 134 (2023), p. 109064.
- [27] Francesco Croce et al. “RobustBench: a standardized adversarial robustness benchmark”. In: *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*. 2021.
- [28] Max Born and Emil Wolf. *Principles of optics: electromagnetic theory of propagation, interference and diffraction of light*. 7th expanded ed. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 952 pp.
- [29] Robert J. Noll. “Zernike polynomials and atmospheric turbulence*”. In: *JOSA* 66.3 (Mar. 1, 1976). Publisher: Optica Publishing Group, pp. 207–211.
- [30] von F. Zernike. “Beugungstheorie des schneidenverfahrens und seiner verbesserten form, der phasenkontrastmethode”. In: *Physica* 1.7 (May 1, 1934), pp. 689–704.
- [31] Larry N. Thibos. “Retinal image quality for virtual eyes generated by a statistical model of ocular wavefront aberrations”. In: *Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics* 29.3 (2009). eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1475-1313.2009.00662.x>, pp. 288–291.
- [32] D.R. Iskander, M.J. Collins, and B. Davis. “Optimal modeling of corneal surfaces with Zernike polynomials”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 48.1 (Jan. 2001). Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, pp. 87–95.
- [33] *OpticStudio — Optical, Illumination & Laser System Design Software - Zemax*. URL: <https://www.zemax.com/products/opticstudio> (visited on 01/15/2023).
- [34] Benjamin P. Cumming and Min Gu. “Direct determination of aberration functions in microscopy by an artificial neural network”. In: *Optics Express* 28.10 (May 11, 2020), p. 14511.
- [35] M. N’Diaye et al. “Calibration of quasi-static aberrations in exoplanet direct-imaging instruments with a Zernike phase-mask sensor”. In: *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 555 (July 2013), A94.
- [36] R. G. Lane and M. Tallon. “Wave-front reconstruction using a Shack–Hartmann sensor”. In: *Applied Optics* 31.32 (Nov. 10, 1992), p. 6902.
- [37] Brandon Dube. “prysm: A Python optics module”. In: *Journal of Open Source Software* 4.37 (May 9, 2019), p. 1352.
- [38] H. Kirshner, D. Sage, and M. Unser. “3D PSF Models for Fluorescence Microscopy in ImageJ”. In: *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Methods and Applications of Fluorescence Spectroscopy, Imaging and Probes (MAF’11)*. Strasbourg, French Republic, Sept. 2011, p. 154.
- [39] Joseph W. Goodman. *Introduction to Fourier optics*. Fourth edition. New York: W.H. Freeman, Macmillan Learning, 2017. 546 pp.
- [40] Michael Hirsch et al. “Efficient filter flow for space-variant multiframe blind deconvolution”. In: *2010 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2010 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). San Francisco, CA, USA: IEEE, June 2010, pp. 607–614.

- [41] Patrick Müller and Alexander Braun. “Simulating optical properties to access novel metrological parameter ranges and the impact of different model approximations”. In: *2022 IEEE International Workshop on Metrology for Automotive (MetroAutomotive)*. 2022 IEEE International Workshop on Metrology for Automotive (MetroAutomotive). July 2022, pp. 133–138.
- [42] M. Řeřábek and P. Páta. “The space variant PSF for deconvolution of wide-field astronomical images”. In: *Adaptive Optics Systems*. Ed. by Norbert Hubin, Claire E. Max, and Peter L. Wizinowich. Vol. 7015. International Society for Optics and Photonics. SPIE, 2008, 70152G.
- [43] James G. Nagy and Dianne P. O’Leary. “Fast iterative image restoration with a spatially varying PSF”. In: *Optical Science, Engineering and Instrumentation ’97*. Ed. by Franklin T. Luk. San Diego, CA, United States, Oct. 24, 1997, p. 388.
- [44] Vasudevan Lakshminarayanan and Andre Fleck. “Zernike polynomials: a guide”. In: *Journal of Modern Optics* 58.7 (Apr. 10, 2011), pp. 545–561.
- [45] Glenn D. Boreman. *Modulation Transfer Function in Optical and Electro-Optical Systems*. SPIE, July 1, 2001.
- [46] Z. Wang et al. “Image Quality Assessment: From Error Visibility to Structural Similarity”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 13.4 (Apr. 2004), pp. 600–612.
- [47] Jonathan B. Phillips and Henrik Eliasson. *Camera Image Quality Benchmarking*. Newark, UNITED KINGDOM: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2018.
- [48] “IEEE Standard for Camera Phone Image Quality”. In: *IEEE Std 1858-2016 (Incorporating IEEE Std 1858-2016/Cor 1-2017)* (May 2017). Conference Name: IEEE Std 1858-2016 (Incorporating IEEE Std 1858-2016/Cor 1-2017), pp. 1–146.
- [49] *ISO12233:2017, Photography — Electronic still picture imaging — Resolution and spatial frequency responses*. Standard. Volume: 2017. Geneva, CH: International Organization for Standardization, 2017.
- [50] Jon McElvain et al. “Texture-based measurement of spatial frequency response using the dead leaves target: extensions, and application to real camera systems”. In: *IS&T/SPIE Electronic Imaging*. Ed. by Francisco Imai, Nitin Sampat, and Feng Xiao. San Jose, California, Jan. 17, 2010, p. 75370D.
- [51] Peter D. Burns. “Refined measurement of digital image texture loss”. In: *IS&T/SPIE Electronic Imaging*. Ed. by Peter D. Burns and Sophie Triantaphillidou. Burlingame, California, USA, Feb. 4, 2013, 86530H.
- [52] *Imatest Target Generator* — Imatest. URL: <https://www.imatest.com/product/imatest-target-generator/> (visited on 03/01/2023).
- [53] M. G. Kendall. “The Treatment of Ties in Ranking Problems”. In: *Biometrika* 33.3 (1945). Publisher: [Oxford University Press, Biometrika Trust], pp. 239–251.
- [54] Sangdoon Yun et al. “CutMix: Regularization Strategy to Train Strong Classifiers With Localizable Features”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). Seoul, Korea (South): IEEE, Oct. 2019, pp. 6022–6031.
- [55] Hongyi Zhang et al. *mixup: Beyond Empirical Risk Minimization*. Apr. 27, 2018. arXiv: [1710.09412](https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.09412) [cs, stat].
- [56] N. Benjamin Erichson et al. *NoisyMix: Boosting Model Robustness to Common Corruptions*. May 22, 2022. arXiv: [2202.01263](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.01263) [cs, stat].
- [57] Zhuang Liu et al. “A ConvNet for the 2020s”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2022).
- [58] Christian Szegedy et al. “Going deeper with convolutions”. In: *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). ISSN: 1063-6919. June 2015, pp. 1–9.
- [59] Kaiming He et al. “Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition”. In: *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). ISSN: 1063-6919. June 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [60] Gao Huang et al. “Densely Connected Convolutional Networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2017, pp. 4700–4708.
- [61] Andrew G. Howard et al. *MobileNets: Efficient Convolutional Neural Networks for Mobile Vision Applications*. Apr. 16, 2017. arXiv: [1704.04861](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.04861) [cs].

- [62] Saining Xie et al. “Aggregated Residual Transformations for Deep Neural Networks”. In: *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). ISSN: 1063-6919. July 2017, pp. 5987–5995.
- [63] Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. “EfficientNet: Rethinking Model Scaling for Convolutional Neural Networks”. In: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. ISSN: 2640-3498. PMLR, May 24, 2019, pp. 6105–6114.
- [64] Ilija Radosavovic et al. “Designing Network Design Spaces”. In: *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). Seattle, WA, USA: IEEE, June 2020, pp. 10425–10433.
- [65] Rene Ranftl, Alexey Bochkovskiy, and Vladlen Koltun. “Vision Transformers for Dense Prediction”. In: *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). Montreal, QC, Canada: IEEE, Oct. 2021, pp. 12159–12168.
- [66] *vision/references/classification at v0.11.0 · pytorch/vision*. URL: <https://github.com/pytorch/vision/tree/v0.11.0/references/classification> (visited on 03/01/2023).
- [67] Anish Athalye, Nicholas Carlini, and David Wagner. “Obfuscated Gradients Give a False Sense of Security: Circumventing Defenses to Adversarial Examples”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*. International Conference on Machine Learning. ISSN: 2640-3498. PMLR, July 3, 2018, pp. 274–283.

Supplementary material

This supplementary provides additional analyses into all evaluated datasets and settings.

- In App. **A** the achieved accuracies on OpticsBench (ImageNet) for the 70 different DNNs are visualized. The ranking compares all corruptions to the baseline (defocus blur) [10] together with Kendall’s τ rank correlation coefficient.
- App. **B** further quantifies with tables the benefit for OpticsAugment training on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench. Additionally, the accuracies for 2D common corruptions w/wo OpticsAugment training are listed. On top of that for all DNNs the comparison plots are shown on both benchmarks.
- Subsequently, App. **C** gives more insight into kernel generation and visualizes all OpticsBench and OpticsBenchRG kernels as used for the presented analysis.
- Image examples can be found in the supplementary material App. **D**
- Additional exemplary analysis on OpticsBenchRG with reddish and greenish kernels only is displayed in App. **E**. The benchmark is both evaluated on ImageNet and ImageNet-100 showing again the ranking for 70 DNNs on ImageNet with Kendall’s τ and on ImageNet-100 the averaged accuracies of w/wo OpticsAugment training.
- App. **F** concludes this supplementary with general implementation details, hyperparameter settings for training and computational resources. Additionally, a DNN trained on ImageNet using OpticsBench supplements existing analysis and an experiment with pipelining OpticsAugment and AugMix on ImageNet during training shows another possible use-case of the proposed OpticsAugment method as described in the main paper.

A. Ranking comparisons

The rank comparisons provided in Figure 9 and Figure 10 show the correlation between defocus blur [10] (baseline) ordering and the different corruptions. This additional analysis confirms that DNNs can handle the blur kernel types from OpticsBench differently well. Additionally to the visualization of the accuracies, the Kendall’s rank coefficient τ is evaluated [53]. A weak correlation is indicated by Kendall’s $\tau \ll 1.0$. The p -value denotes the result of a hypothesis test for $\tau = 0.0$, alternative $\tau \neq 0.0$. Most of the corruptions $\tau_{mean} = 0.276$ are weakly correlated with defocus blur $\tau \leq 0.3$. Robust ResNet50 models from the RobustBench leaderboard using DeepAugment

(hendrycks2020many in our plots) [23] or AugMix [22] are among the top 10 DNNs for different severities. Besides this, VisionTransformer DNNs are always among top 5 and also include augmentation during training. The EfficientNet architecture achieves also good results on OpticsBench.








Figure 9: Ranking comparison of baseline and all corruptions for severities 1-3.



severity 4



severity 5

Figure 10: Ranking comparison of baseline and all corruptions for severities 4-5 .

B. OpticsAugment

This appendix displays additional tables for the ImageNet-100 OpticsBench and ImageNet-100-C analysis to quantify the benefit with OpticsAugment training. The different tables show for OpticsBench accuracies together with the improvement in accuracy Δ between our method and conventionally trained DNNs. We include the same tables for the evaluation on 2D common corruptions. All values are given in %. First, we report the accuracies on the ImageNet-100 validation dataset in Tab. 7.

Tab. 8 gives an overview for the achieved accuracies on OpticsBench ImageNet-100 and Tab. 14 for 2D common corruptions ImageNet-100-C. Although the validation accuracies are similar for w/w/o OpticsAugment training, as the images are corrupted, the benefit with OpticsAugment

DNN	wo	w (ours)	DNN	wo	w (ours)
DenseNet	79.2	80.2	ResNet101	82.6	80.6
EfficientNet	78.0	78.2	ResNeXt50	77.4	75.6
MobileNet	76.2	76.6			

Table 7: Validation accuracies on ImageNet-100 for with (w) and without (wo) OpticsAugment trained DNNs. Both training schemes perform similarly well on the unmodified validation dataset.


becomes clear. The analysis is then extended to OpticsBench corruptions in Tables 9-13. We also report the defocus blur corruption [10] for comparison. All DNNs benefit from the OpticsAugment training scheme. However, the performance gain is almost for all settings lowest for defocus blur, which had been out of domain during training.

This gives further proof that kernel types matter. The tables are visualized in Fig. 12 and 11. The visualization is also offered for DenseNet161 and ResNeXt50 to allow for another point of view compared to Fig. 7a and 7b.


Tables 15-19 show for all 19 corruptions from [10] the particular accuracies and the difference in accuracy Δ .

Model	1	2	3	4	5
DenseNet (ours)	68.22	65.33	56.33	41.60	30.13
DenseNet	53.45	43.37	29.07	20.62	16.30
EfficientNet (ours)	61.00	55.34	42.14	30.27	23.35
EfficientNet	52.55	42.74	29.24	20.84	16.00
MobileNet (ours)	57.59	52.30	38.58	27.51	20.54
MobileNet	49.47	39.57	24.78	17.42	13.27
ResNet101 (ours)	69.90	67.68	61.36	49.04	37.80
ResNet101	59.92	51.44	40.21	31.65	25.73
ResNeXt50 (ours)	65.14	62.68	54.44	39.90	28.45
ResNeXt50	47.74	38.19	24.88	17.58	13.69

Table 8: Accuracies w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench. Average over all corruptions.




(a) ResNet101




(b) ResNeXt50


Figure 11: Accuracy evaluated on OpticsBench-ImageNet-100 for DNNs w/wo OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle, diamond, triangles and square markers) at each corruption. **OpticsAugment (blue) improves** accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red).



(a) DenseNet161



(b) EfficientNet



(c) MobileNet

Figure 12: Accuracy evaluated on OpticsBench-ImageNet-100 for DNNs w/wo OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle, diamond, triangles and square markers) at each corruption. **OpticsAugment (blue) improves** accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red): (a) DenseNet, (b) EfficientNet, (c) MobileNet.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
astigmatism	50.26	67.68	17.42	39.54	65.72	26.18	26.80	57.02	30.22	16.22	32.52	16.30	12.34	18.84	6.50
coma	54.28	70.54	16.26	43.54	67.36	23.82	29.46	57.78	28.32	23.84	50.08	26.24	20.60	42.84	22.24
defocus.blur	55.46	64.80	9.34	46.76	59.84	13.08	31.96	50.44	18.48	21.18	36.00	14.82	14.46	22.40	7.94
defocus.spherical	49.92	67.14	17.22	41.48	66.20	24.72	26.98	56.68	29.70	18.96	39.32	20.36	13.18	23.52	10.34
trefoil	57.34	70.96	13.62	45.52	67.54	22.02	30.14	59.74	29.60	22.90	50.06	27.16	20.90	43.06	22.16
Σ	53.45	68.22	14.77	43.37	65.33	21.96	29.07	56.33	27.26	20.62	41.60	20.98	16.30	30.13	13.84

Table 9: Accuracies for DenseNet w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
astigmatism	47.48	59.48	12.00	36.46	53.42	16.96	25.42	39.78	14.36	15.02	21.98	6.96	10.96	14.98	4.02
coma	53.50	62.40	8.90	44.12	56.22	12.10	30.20	45.94	15.74	23.48	38.76	15.28	20.32	34.64	14.32
defocus.blur	55.46	60.38	4.92	46.42	53.72	7.30	32.20	39.02	6.82	21.94	25.98	4.04	13.92	16.64	2.72
defocus.spherical	49.18	58.82	9.64	39.86	55.72	15.86	26.74	41.32	14.58	18.94	28.76	9.82	12.76	18.66	5.90
trefoil	57.14	63.92	6.78	46.82	57.62	10.80	31.66	44.64	12.98	24.82	35.86	11.04	22.06	31.84	9.78
Σ	52.55	61.00	8.45	42.74	55.34	12.60	29.24	42.14	12.90	20.84	30.27	9.43	16.00	23.35	7.35

Table 10: Accuracies for EfficientNet w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
astigmatism	46.48	56.26	9.78	36.26	50.04	13.78	23.82	37.56	13.74	14.80	21.46	6.66	10.74	14.10	3.36
coma	48.88	59.32	10.44	38.26	53.52	15.26	24.42	40.88	16.46	19.00	33.38	14.38	16.68	29.08	12.40
defocus.blur	51.96	57.96	6.00	42.92	52.80	9.88	26.34	36.26	9.92	17.36	24.10	6.74	11.94	16.18	4.24
defocus.spherical	47.58	54.16	6.58	38.74	50.42	11.68	23.90	37.34	13.44	16.76	25.92	9.16	10.74	16.02	5.28
trefoil	52.46	60.24	7.78	41.66	54.70	13.04	25.40	40.84	15.44	19.16	32.68	13.52	16.24	27.32	11.08
Σ	49.47	57.59	8.12	39.57	52.30	12.73	24.78	38.58	13.80	17.42	27.51	10.09	13.27	20.54	7.27

Table 11: Accuracies for MobileNet w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
astigmatism	57.96	70.36	12.40	49.22	68.74	19.52	39.12	63.32	24.20	27.44	43.30	15.86	21.18	27.88	6.70
coma	60.74	70.72	9.98	52.80	67.88	15.08	42.04	60.66	18.62	35.66	54.36	18.70	32.32	49.68	17.36
defocus.blur	60.30	67.52	7.22	51.82	64.18	12.36	39.78	57.46	17.68	30.04	44.38	14.34	22.42	30.80	8.38
defocus.spherical	58.06	69.18	11.12	50.44	68.72	18.28	39.36	62.44	23.08	30.86	47.88	17.02	22.18	31.54	9.36
trefoil	62.56	71.70	9.14	52.90	68.86	15.96	40.76	62.94	22.18	34.24	55.26	21.02	30.56	49.12	18.56
Σ	59.92	69.90	9.97	51.44	67.68	16.24	40.21	61.36	21.15	31.65	49.04	17.39	25.73	37.80	12.07

Table 12: Accuracies for ResNet101 w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
astigmatism	44.08	65.08	21.00	34.44	63.36	28.92	22.98	55.90	32.92	14.24	33.54	19.30	10.26	19.88	9.62
coma	49.28	66.44	17.16	39.28	63.24	23.96	26.64	55.04	28.40	21.42	47.66	26.24	18.66	41.50	22.84
defocus.blur	48.84	62.54	13.70	40.30	58.68	18.38	25.28	49.46	24.18	16.46	34.54	18.08	11.68	20.82	9.14
defocus.spherical	44.44	64.06	19.62	36.30	63.26	26.96	23.50	55.00	31.50	16.00	37.80	21.80	10.80	21.26	10.46
trefoil	52.04	67.58	15.54	40.62	64.84	24.22	25.98	56.78	30.80	19.78	45.94	26.16	17.04	38.78	21.74
Σ	47.74	65.14	17.40	38.19	62.68	24.49	24.88	54.44	29.56	17.58	39.90	22.32	13.69	28.45	14.76

Table 13: Accuracies for ResNeXt50 w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBench.

Model	1	2	3	4	5
DenseNet (ours)	67.99	57.65	49.24	38.18	28.35
DenseNet	62.91	50.09	40.50	30.88	22.97
EfficientNet (ours)	63.89	53.36	45.14	34.66	26.02
EfficientNet	59.54	47.04	38.44	30.04	22.33
MobileNet (ours)	60.87	50.35	42.43	33.07	25.10
MobileNet	57.29	45.43	37.66	29.38	22.03
ResNet101 (ours)	69.13	60.15	52.93	42.70	33.05
ResNet101	67.89	57.07	48.38	37.80	28.95
ResNeXt50 (ours)	63.19	52.80	45.36	35.29	26.44
ResNeXt50	58.07	45.17	36.68	28.11	21.17

Table 14: Average Accuracies w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10]. Average over all corruptions.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
brightness	76.04	78.24	2.20	72.78	75.34	2.56	67.86	70.52	2.66	59.72	63.08	3.36	48.06	52.70	4.64
contrast	57.78	65.40	7.62	44.76	54.46	9.70	25.98	34.52	8.54	8.08	11.80	3.72	3.00	4.88	1.88
defocus_blur	55.46	64.80	9.34	46.76	59.84	13.08	31.96	50.44	18.48	21.18	36.00	14.82	14.46	22.40	7.94
elastic_transform	71.84	74.28	2.44	60.66	63.94	3.28	71.94	74.20	2.26	67.54	71.34	3.80	53.24	60.34	7.10
fog	55.82	64.80	8.98	47.44	58.12	10.68	36.76	49.70	12.94	34.44	46.88	12.44	21.46	32.94	11.48
frost	64.48	65.92	1.44	46.40	50.12	3.72	33.50	37.72	4.22	31.62	37.02	5.40	24.70	29.38	4.68
gaussian_blur	67.14	72.62	5.48	51.02	62.86	11.84	36.62	54.76	18.14	25.40	44.08	18.68	12.96	17.42	4.46
gaussian_noise	59.12	64.76	5.64	34.46	47.50	13.04	10.22	25.00	14.78	2.34	10.26	7.92	1.02	3.84	2.82
glass_blur	61.28	67.40	6.12	51.34	57.62	6.28	36.56	40.58	4.02	30.02	35.02	5.00	22.16	27.18	5.02
impulse_noise	44.78	54.86	10.08	19.76	35.04	15.28	8.08	23.12	15.04	1.92	8.70	6.78	1.16	3.82	2.66
jpeg_compression	67.14	69.06	1.92	63.42	65.24	1.82	60.14	61.74	1.60	49.52	52.16	2.64	37.26	40.86	3.60
motion_blur	66.16	72.04	5.88	55.62	63.78	8.16	43.54	50.62	7.08	31.78	36.04	4.26	25.40	29.44	4.04
pixelate	73.16	76.48	3.32	72.08	76.66	4.58	65.16	72.28	7.12	56.00	65.38	9.38	51.14	60.14	9.00
saturate	62.00	63.80	1.80	48.16	49.34	1.18	69.68	72.90	3.22	43.26	47.48	4.22	26.76	30.56	3.80
shot_noise	57.84	64.02	6.18	31.70	44.94	13.24	11.72	26.50	14.78	2.60	10.42	7.82	1.58	5.32	3.74
snow	56.42	60.88	4.46	33.52	40.44	6.92	38.68	41.56	2.88	26.24	27.98	1.74	19.70	20.52	0.82
spatter	75.70	77.50	1.80	65.34	68.38	3.04	51.44	57.02	5.58	39.58	45.38	5.80	27.58	35.62	8.04
speckle_noise	62.88	68.10	5.22	51.86	60.58	8.72	21.74	35.46	13.72	11.66	23.98	12.32	6.26	14.52	8.26
zoom_blur	60.28	66.90	6.62	54.72	61.06	6.34	48.00	56.90	8.90	43.82	52.38	8.56	38.50	46.80	8.30
Σ	62.91	67.99	5.08	50.09	57.65	7.55	40.50	49.24	8.73	30.88	38.18	7.30	22.97	28.35	5.38

Table 15: Accuracies for DenseNet w/wo OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10].

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ
brightness	74.12	74.56	0.44	70.66	72.08	1.42	64.90	68.56	3.66	57.76	63.32	5.56	46.82	54.60	7.78
contrast	56.02	60.46	4.44	41.50	49.32	7.82	20.74	29.04	8.30	5.86	7.14	1.28	3.26	2.90	-0.36
defocus_blur	55.46	60.38	4.92	46.42	53.72	7.30	32.20	39.02	6.82	21.94	25.98	4.04	13.92	16.64	2.72
elastic_transform	69.78	69.94	0.16	59.82	57.96	-1.86	69.68	69.48	-0.20	66.26	67.14	0.88	56.10	56.50	0.40
fog	53.38	60.14	6.76	43.82	53.16	9.34	33.48	45.06	11.58	30.60	40.38	9.78	21.10	28.02	6.92
frost	59.98	64.04	4.06	42.96	47.40	4.44	32.08	36.56	4.48	30.80	35.72	4.92	25.16	28.08	2.92
gaussian_blur	66.44	68.24	1.80	50.66	56.92	6.26	36.06	43.50	7.44	24.90	29.60	4.70	12.30	13.32	1.02
gaussian_noise	52.06	61.34	9.28	28.36	45.36	17.00	9.32	24.46	15.14	3.72	9.34	5.62	1.60	3.56	1.96
glass_blur	58.52	61.02	2.50	49.28	51.16	1.88	33.32	35.32	2.00	27.58	29.56	1.98	21.28	21.04	-0.24
impulse_noise	40.72	54.50	13.78	19.78	38.22	18.44	10.22	24.56	14.34	3.22	8.90	5.68	1.50	3.46	1.96
jpeg_compression	63.62	65.04	1.42	58.86	62.00	3.14	55.20	58.68	3.48	44.22	49.98	5.76	32.70	39.30	6.60
motion_blur	66.20	67.96	1.76	56.70	61.18	4.48	44.10	50.54	6.44	32.56	36.22	3.66	24.86	27.84	2.98
pixelate	69.58	71.36	1.78	69.76	70.80	1.04	56.80	65.20	8.40	38.70	57.46	18.76	30.02	51.78	21.76
saturate	59.04	61.32	2.28	41.98	44.48	2.50	69.42	70.70	1.28	47.96	53.02	5.06	30.04	37.38	7.34
shot_noise	49.16	59.42	10.26	25.72	40.36	14.64	10.70	21.76	11.06	4.02	7.68	3.66	2.22	4.30	2.08
snow	55.42	60.36	4.94	36.30	40.02	3.72	39.88	42.92	3.04	30.60	29.66	-0.94	21.20	21.24	0.04
spatter	73.18	73.66	0.48	62.36	64.72	2.36	50.00	55.48	5.48	49.56	48.16	-1.40	39.02	37.28	-1.74
speckle_noise	53.24	62.96	9.72	41.66	54.84	13.18	18.88	30.00	11.12	12.04	17.80	5.76	7.06	9.60	2.54
zoom_blur	55.32	57.28	1.96	47.18	50.08	2.90	43.30	46.82	3.52	38.44	41.40	2.96	34.10	37.60	3.50
Σ	59.54	63.89	4.35	47.04	53.36	6.32	38.44	45.14	6.70	30.04	34.66	4.62	22.33	26.02	3.69

Table 16: Accuracies for EfficientNet w/o OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10].

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ	clean	ours	Δ
brightness	71.08	72.62	1.54	67.70	70.96	3.26	63.58	67.18	3.60	58.14	61.22	3.08	49.98	52.98	3.00
contrast	48.70	58.90	10.20	32.92	47.06	14.14	14.88	27.10	12.22	3.78	7.10	3.32	1.84	3.10	1.26
defocus_blur	51.96	57.96	6.00	42.92	52.80	9.88	26.34	36.26	9.92	17.36	24.10	6.74	11.94	16.18	4.24
elastic_transform	66.50	67.52	1.02	54.58	54.68	0.10	65.56	67.52	1.96	61.90	65.52	3.62	51.68	56.60	4.92
fog	47.88	56.72	8.84	38.46	49.52	11.06	29.20	40.74	11.54	28.14	36.40	8.26	19.34	23.64	4.30
frost	56.04	58.88	2.84	39.88	41.00	1.12	27.54	28.80	1.26	26.80	27.32	0.52	20.18	21.48	1.30
gaussian_blur	62.74	64.66	1.92	46.44	54.92	8.48	30.66	39.44	8.78	20.00	25.70	5.70	10.62	12.42	1.80
gaussian_noise	53.80	55.92	2.12	35.02	39.78	4.76	17.20	21.26	4.06	6.76	9.42	2.66	2.56	3.84	1.28
glass_blur	57.68	60.14	2.46	49.16	50.70	1.54	35.46	35.54	0.08	28.58	31.26	2.68	19.68	24.00	4.32
impulse_noise	46.78	51.76	4.98	27.10	33.56	6.46	16.80	21.50	4.70	5.78	8.48	2.70	2.54	3.50	0.96
jpeg_compression	61.20	62.42	1.22	56.62	58.72	2.10	53.94	55.38	1.44	45.40	47.18	1.78	34.98	37.48	2.50
motion_blur	61.50	65.74	4.24	53.38	58.16	4.78	40.06	44.98	4.92	27.80	31.96	4.16	20.94	25.16	4.22
pixelate	69.04	69.12	0.08	67.76	68.40	0.64	61.80	63.96	2.16	51.62	58.12	6.50	44.00	53.60	9.60
saturate	55.58	57.64	2.06	40.18	41.92	1.74	67.94	68.48	0.54	48.46	48.46	0.00	33.88	33.56	-0.32
shot_noise	49.34	54.30	4.96	31.02	36.80	5.78	17.12	22.12	5.00	6.86	9.04	2.18	3.76	5.08	1.32
snow	52.78	57.84	5.06	31.14	37.48	6.34	35.48	39.78	4.30	24.74	29.14	4.40	16.48	20.14	3.66
spatter	71.16	71.58	0.42	60.28	62.98	2.70	49.54	53.06	3.52	45.52	48.18	2.66	33.70	35.50	1.80
speckle_noise	53.72	57.84	4.12	43.70	49.98	6.28	22.90	29.62	6.72	15.64	20.94	5.30	9.88	13.82	3.94
zoom_blur	50.98	54.98	4.00	44.88	47.18	2.30	39.48	43.54	4.06	34.86	38.76	3.90	30.56	34.76	4.20
Σ	57.29	60.87	3.58	45.43	50.35	4.92	37.66	42.43	4.78	29.38	33.07	3.69	22.03	25.10	3.07


Table 17: Accuracies for MobileNet w/o OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10].

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
brightness	80.00	78.96	-1.04	77.58	76.20	-1.38	74.30	71.74	-2.56	68.16	65.16	-3.00	58.74	55.76	-2.98
contrast	63.62	64.56	0.94	52.90	53.70	0.80	30.66	31.94	1.28	8.56	8.58	0.02	3.02	3.26	0.24
defocus_blur	60.30	67.52	7.22	51.82	64.18	12.36	39.78	57.46	17.68	30.04	44.38	14.34	22.42	30.80	8.38
elastic_transform	74.44	74.46	0.02	62.92	64.22	1.30	74.34	75.20	0.86	71.62	73.02	1.40	58.74	65.06	6.32
fog	63.14	62.56	-0.58	54.54	54.96	0.42	44.88	45.98	1.10	41.04	44.32	3.28	28.24	32.60	4.36
frost	68.52	67.66	-0.86	51.46	54.32	2.86	37.62	42.86	5.24	36.04	41.76	5.72	29.50	35.52	6.02
gaussian_blur	71.12	73.72	2.60	55.70	65.48	9.78	42.64	58.90	16.26	33.54	50.34	16.80	20.96	24.04	3.08
gaussian_noise	67.48	66.42	-1.06	51.34	51.88	0.54	29.38	31.02	1.64	12.72	13.90	1.18	4.20	5.36	1.16
glass_blur	64.54	67.68	3.14	54.66	60.58	5.92	40.18	47.34	7.16	33.90	41.76	7.86	26.98	34.60	7.62
impulse_noise	55.94	57.74	1.80	38.50	41.00	2.50	25.28	28.64	3.36	9.54	12.74	3.20	4.06	5.56	1.50
jpeg_compression	70.52	70.26	-0.26	66.12	66.98	0.86	62.76	64.62	1.86	50.34	56.14	5.80	37.76	45.18	7.42
motion_blur	69.78	73.82	4.04	60.54	69.84	9.30	48.90	61.24	12.34	36.26	47.78	11.52	29.52	37.44	7.92
pixelate	76.08	78.14	2.06	74.62	78.06	3.44	68.12	74.96	6.84	59.92	70.80	10.88	55.34	67.84	12.50
saturate	66.46	66.30	-0.16	53.22	52.04	-1.18	75.32	74.04	-1.28	57.16	53.92	-3.24	40.72	36.40	-4.32
shot_noise	64.52	65.10	0.58	49.62	49.52	-0.10	30.86	32.50	1.64	12.30	14.20	1.90	6.40	7.84	1.44
snow	64.30	65.32	1.02	43.38	47.36	3.98	46.30	47.28	0.98	32.76	34.08	1.32	25.06	27.30	2.24
spatter	79.26	78.28	-0.98	69.94	69.54	-0.40	59.40	61.02	1.62	51.30	55.94	4.64	40.66	45.38	4.72
speckle_noise	68.14	68.18	0.04	60.60	61.78	1.18	38.60	40.72	2.12	27.88	29.62	1.74	17.62	19.72	2.10
zoom_blur	61.66	66.86	5.20	54.94	61.14	6.20	49.94	58.18	8.24	45.12	52.92	7.80	40.08	48.34	8.26
Σ	67.89	69.13	1.25	57.07	60.15	3.07	48.38	52.93	4.55	37.80	42.70	4.90	28.95	33.05	4.10


Table 18: Accuracies for ResNet101 w/wO OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10].

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	clean	ours	Δ												
brightness	73.64	73.18	-0.46	69.64	68.50	-1.14	64.04	61.12	-2.92	54.68	50.54	-4.14	42.40	36.82	-5.58
contrast	50.40	56.58	6.18	33.88	42.60	8.72	16.38	21.86	5.48	4.88	6.78	1.90	2.66	3.10	0.44
defocus_blur	48.84	62.54	13.70	40.30	58.68	18.38	25.28	49.46	24.18	16.46	34.54	18.08	11.68	20.82	9.14
elastic_transform	68.02	71.26	3.24	57.98	60.30	2.32	68.12	70.98	2.86	64.54	68.80	4.26	53.80	60.92	7.12
fog	51.40	55.58	4.18	41.76	46.80	5.04	31.36	38.26	6.90	29.24	35.52	6.28	17.24	23.56	6.32
frost	57.26	58.62	1.36	37.92	40.86	2.94	26.18	28.94	2.76	24.74	29.24	4.50	18.24	22.80	4.56
gaussian_blur	62.92	69.40	6.48	44.28	60.64	16.36	29.20	52.02	22.82	19.70	41.48	21.78	9.98	17.06	7.08
gaussian_noise	52.80	60.16	7.36	29.98	42.82	12.84	9.12	22.44	13.32	2.74	8.90	6.16	1.34	3.38	2.04
glass_blur	56.02	65.42	9.40	45.18	58.72	13.54	31.06	46.34	15.28	25.14	40.94	15.80	18.56	32.40	13.84
impulse_noise	39.94	50.30	10.36	16.52	31.00	14.48	8.30	19.24	10.94	2.18	7.10	4.92	0.96	3.22	2.26
jpeg_compression	64.92	66.40	1.48	60.86	63.30	2.44	58.74	60.10	1.36	48.66	51.38	2.72	38.72	41.42	2.70
motion_blur	62.32	69.18	6.86	53.26	64.08	10.82	41.32	56.18	14.86	30.74	43.20	12.46	24.20	35.00	10.80
pixelate	71.12	72.80	1.68	70.48	72.60	2.12	65.46	71.74	6.28	57.70	68.72	11.02	53.32	65.38	12.06
saturate	55.62	55.64	0.02	41.00	38.56	-2.44	66.84	65.84	-1.00	40.98	35.82	-5.16	26.32	21.88	-4.44
shot_noise	51.26	57.84	6.58	28.32	40.04	11.72	10.84	22.60	11.76	2.80	9.22	6.42	1.64	5.14	3.50
snow	51.98	54.38	2.40	29.66	34.36	4.70	32.56	34.70	2.14	20.02	21.36	1.34	13.96	15.20	1.24
spatter	73.12	73.68	0.56	61.20	64.04	2.84	47.76	53.56	5.80	37.46	45.46	8.00	26.46	36.02	9.56
speckle_noise	56.34	62.44	6.10	46.36	54.10	7.74	20.06	30.14	10.08	11.20	19.80	8.60	5.26	12.28	7.02
zoom_blur	55.46	65.12	9.66	49.62	61.14	11.52	44.24	56.34	12.10	40.26	51.70	11.44	35.46	45.98	10.52
Σ	58.07	63.19	5.11	45.17	52.80	7.63	36.68	45.36	8.68	28.11	35.29	7.18	21.17	26.44	5.27

Table 19: Accuracies for ResNeXt50 w/wO OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10].




(a) DenseNet161




(b) ResNext50

Figure 13: Accuracy evaluated on ImageNet-100-C 2D common corruptions for DNNs w/o OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle, diamond, triangles and square markers) at each corruption. **OpticsAugment (blue)** accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red): (a) DenseNet, (b) ResNeXt50.




(a) EfficientNet



(b) MobileNet

Figure 14: Accuracy evaluated on ImageNet-100-C 2D common corruptions for DNNs w/o OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle, diamond, triangles and square markers) at each corruption. **OpticsAugment (blue)** accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red): (a) EfficientNet, (b) MobileNet.



(a) ResNet101

Figure 15: Accuracy evaluated on ImageNet-100-C 2D common corruptions for ResNet101 w/wo OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle, diamond, triangles and square markers) at each corruption. **OpticsAugment (blue) improves accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red).**

C. Kernels

All kernels share the same baseline optical wavefront model, which is adapted from [41] and evaluated at the center, i.e. at field 0° with little aberrations, but non-zero. Although isolated Zernike modes are used to generate the different kernels, this ensures a more realistic PSF to avoid for instance a PSF depending solely on coma aberration. The baseline model consists of the wavefront description displayed in Tab. 20. The different kernels are then generated by adding the isolated Zernike modes from Tab. 1 to the baseline wavefront model with Eq. 2 and retrieving a PSF with Eq. 1. Although real lenses may consist of dozens of different balanced Zernike modes, the amplifying of a particular Zernike mode allows for categorization and benchmarking to particular aberrations. This creates the kernels from Fig. 17. In practice, a more balanced distribution of coefficients is observed.

Color	4	9	15	16
red	0.32671	0.088223	-0.061867	-4.7631E-06
green	0.11273	0.095923	-0.069497	-5.3967E-06
blue	-0.41772	0.10825	-0.085119	-6.7436E-06

Table 20: Wavefront baseline model used to produce the kernels (a,d,e) in Fig. 1 and Fig. 17. Other coefficients are zero, each value is in multiples of the wavelength λ for RGB color channels red, green and blue: $0.6563 \mu\text{m}$, $0.5876 \mu\text{m}$ and $0.4861 \mu\text{m}$. Zernike modes are in Fringe ordering, from left to right: defocus, spherical, secondary spherical and vertical quadrofoil as from [44].

We also include another experimental set of kernels sharing the baseline model from Tab. 20, but, to further increase chromatic aberrations, with red and blue channels merged. Thus, only the blue and green coefficient values are used and the red channel shares the same coefficients as the blue channel. Wavelength dependent scaling is turned off for the merged channels. The green channel is unchanged. This creates the reddish and greenish PSF kernels from Fig. 18 and the kernels (b,c,f) in Fig. 1, why we call the set of kernels RG or OpticsBenchRG.

The defocus blur kernels from [10] are reproduced in Fig. 16 for all severities to allow for comparison to disk-shaped kernels. As these kernels equally blur all color channels, they are grayscale.



Figure 16: Defocus blur from [10] for severities 1-5 used for kernel matching and as *base blur type* for comparisons.




Figure 17: Kernels used to generate OpticsBench. Each row contains the different severities (1-5) for a single corruption using two Zernike modes. Larger kernel size leads to more severe blurring. (a) Defocus & Spherical, (b) Astigmatism, (c) Coma, (d) Trefoil. All kernels are l_1 -normalized and therefore have the same energy.




Figure 18: Kernels used to generate OpticsBenchRG. Each row contains the different severities (1-5) for a single corruption using two Zernike modes. Larger kernel size leads to more severe blurring. (a) Defocus & Spherical, (b) Astigmatism, (c) Coma, (d) Trefoil. All kernels are l_1 -normalized and therefore have the same energy.

D. Image examples

This section shows images from OpticsBench. Each row contains a single corruption and three image examples with increasing severities (from left to right). The corruptions are sorted as: astigmatism, defocus & spherical, coma, trefoil. The upper left image represents astigmatism at severity 1, the lower right image shows trefoil at severity 5.




Figure 19: Image examples from ImageNet-1k OpticsBench.

E. OpticsBenchRG

This appendix includes exemplary evaluations on OpticsBenchRG on ImageNet and ImageNet-100. The benchmark consists of images blurred with the reddish and greenish optical kernels from Fig. 18 in App. C. Tab. 21 lists the average accuracies for all OpticsBenchRG corruptions. OpticsAugment (ours) achieves constantly better results. For selected DNNs Fig. 20 and Fig. 21 show the accuracies separately for each corruption and w/wo OpticsAugment (out of domain kernels compared to OpticsBenchRG) training.

Additionally, ranking comparisons on ImageNet and OpticsBenchRG for the 70 pretrained DNNs (5 from RobustBench leaderboard and 65 from PyTorch) are shown for selected severities in Fig. 22 for comparison with App. A.

Model	1	2	3	4	5
DenseNet (ours)	64.78	59.41	47.75	36.41	29.66
DenseNet	54.53	45.09	31.37	22.73	18.43
EfficientNet (ours)	60.55	54.23	42.50	32.41	26.13
EfficientNet	53.38	43.99	30.91	22.20	17.61
MobileNet (ours)	56.55	50.49	36.58	25.95	20.91
MobileNet	49.71	39.56	25.60	18.81	15.55
ResNet101 (ours)	67.95	63.90	54.34	43.11	34.75
ResNet101	60.42	52.44	41.21	33.31	27.85
ResNeXt50 (ours)	59.59	54.50	43.57	31.91	25.04
ResNeXt50	47.62	37.87	25.66	18.61	15.29

Table 21: Accuracies w/o OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBenchRG. Average over all corruptions. Even when changing the optics corruption (*i.e.* in an out of domain setting), the proposed augmentation consistently leads to higher classification accuracies.







Figure 20: Accuracy evaluated on **OpticsBenchRG-ImageNet-100** for EfficientNet w/o OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle to square markers) at each corruption. Although the exact kernels haven't been visible during training, still **OpticsAugment (blue) improves** accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red).



(a) DenseNet161




(b) MobileNet




(c) ResNeXt50


Figure 21: **OpticsBenchRG-ImageNet-100** for DNNs w/o OpticsAugment training and all severities 1-5 (circle to square markers). Although the exact kernels haven't been visible during training, **OpticsAugment (blue) improves** accuracy compared to the conventionally trained DNN (red): (a) DenseNet161, (b) MobileNet and (c) ResNeXt50.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 22: Ranking comparison of baseline and all corruptions for severities 1,3 and 5 (a-c).

F. Implementation and additional analysis

Here, we include additional analysis on various datasets and give further implementation details.

F.1. Implementation details

We also provide code for a more detailed insight into the structure and run experiments. The code is organized into two main parts: Benchmark (OpticsBench and OpticsBenchRG) and training (OpticsAugment, variations and baseline training without additional augmentation). The whole code submission uses Python 3.6+ for downward compatibility for training on a high performance cluster (HPC) and Python ≥ 3.8 for the benchmark and pretrained variants. The latter allows to use a more recent pytorch and torchvision version to include VisionTransformer networks and other types.

Training is run on a HPC using slurm job scheduling and V100 GPUs. Training on ImageNet-100 required single V100 GPUs, but also multi GPU training had been utilized. The training for 90 epochs takes about one day for smaller DNNs such as EfficientNet and two days for larger DNNs such as ResNet101. The exact hyperparameter settings can be found in the code submission in recipes, however the particular batch size had been adjusted to increase the speed. For OpticsAugment training $\alpha = 1.0$ and *severity* = 3 is set. For training the ImageNet-100 train split is split again into a validation and train split to avoid any overlap with the original validation dataset, which is used as test dataset.

F.2. Additional analysis

First, an evaluation of adversarial robustness for different ImageNet-100 trained DNNs is presented in Tab. 22. Ours uses the OpticsAugment training scheme and is compared to a conventionally trained DNN on the same dataset. To allow for evaluation on ImageNet’s validation dataset, the train set is split into a validation and train split. To lower the computational resources needed for the computation, 1000 validation images are randomly selected and saved as test dataset for adversarial robustness. The attacks had been lowered to l_2 and $\epsilon = 4/255$ to avoid exclusively successful attacks. Still, with this setting no clear trend can be observed, the overall robustness to the attacks is low, but on average OpticsAugment does not lower adversarial robustness compared to a conventionally trained DNN. The evaluation for each DNN takes several hours on a NVIDIA GeForce 3080Ti 12GB VRAM GPU.

Additionally, in Tab. 24 and 23 the results for a pipelining of AugMix and OpticsAugment during ImageNet-100 training are listed for an evaluation on OpticsBenchRG. EfficientNet and MobileNet are either trained with only OpticsAugment (red) or with OpticsAugment and AugMix [22]. Fig. 23 visualizes the same DNNs on 2D common corrup-

DNN	Robust Acc	APGD-CE	APGD-DLR
DenseNet	5.2	13.9	5.7
DenseNet (ours)	6.4	14.5	6.4
EfficientNet	2.1	8.8	2.4
EfficientNet (ours)	1.7	8.4	1.9
MobileNet	1.2	6.2	1.6
MobileNet (ours)	1.8	7.6	2.2
ResNeXt50	1.2	11.3	1.6
ResNeXt50 (ours)	3.1	8.9	3.6

Table 22: Adversarial robustness in % to adversarial attacks using APGD-CE and APGD-DLR from AutoAttack [15], l_2 and $\epsilon = 4/255$, batch size 32 and 5 restarts on 1000 validation images of ImageNet-100.

tions. This shows another application scenario of OpticsAugment.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ												
astigmatism	59.52	59.58	0.06	53.00	54.58	1.58	38.82	43.04	4.22	23.38	27.32	3.94	16.06	18.62	2.56
coma	64.96	61.54	-3.42	57.74	55.66	-2.08	46.32	45.54	-0.78	37.70	39.14	1.44	32.50	34.86	2.36
defocus_spherical	58.00	57.84	-0.16	50.38	51.38	1.00	33.14	36.24	3.10	22.64	25.22	2.58	17.98	17.62	-0.36
trefoil	65.30	63.22	-2.08	57.42	55.30	-2.12	45.12	45.16	0.04	38.30	37.94	-0.36	34.82	33.42	-1.40
Σ	61.95	60.55	-1.40	54.64	54.23	-0.40	40.85	42.50	1.64	30.50	32.41	1.90	25.34	26.13	0.79


Table 23: Accuracies for EfficientNet & OpticsAugment w/wo AugMix. Evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBenchRG.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ
astigmatism	56.14	55.14	-1.00	48.26	49.96	1.70	32.64	37.48	4.84	18.72	20.90	2.18	12.98	14.52	1.54
coma	60.12	58.26	-1.86	53.12	51.90	-1.22	39.46	39.36	-0.10	32.08	32.58	0.50	26.50	27.80	1.30
defocus_spherical	55.50	54.06	-1.44	47.14	47.24	0.10	29.12	30.16	1.04	20.70	19.30	-1.40	15.20	13.68	-1.52
trefoil	61.48	58.76	-2.72	53.54	52.84	-0.70	39.36	39.32	-0.04	32.40	31.04	-1.36	29.38	27.64	-1.74
Σ	58.31	56.55	-1.76	50.51	50.49	-0.03	35.14	36.58	1.44	25.98	25.95	-0.02	21.02	20.91	-0.10


Table 24: Accuracies for MobileNet & OpticsAugment w/wo AugMix. Evaluated on ImageNet-100 OpticsBenchRG.

Corruption	1			2			3			4			5		
	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ	ours & AugMix	ours	Δ
brightness	76.52	74.56	-1.96	74.48	72.08	-2.40	71.42	68.56	-2.86	66.14	63.32	-2.82	57.98	54.60	-3.38
contrast	67.00	60.46	-6.54	58.10	49.32	-8.78	40.84	29.04	-11.80	11.06	7.14	-3.92	3.50	2.90	-0.60
defocus_blur	61.48	60.38	-1.10	54.42	53.72	-0.70	39.92	39.02	-0.90	25.38	25.98	0.60	15.58	16.64	1.06
elastic_transform	71.82	69.94	-1.88	60.76	57.96	-2.80	73.10	69.48	-3.62	70.28	67.14	-3.14	59.38	56.50	-2.88
fog	65.32	60.14	-5.18	59.26	53.16	-6.10	52.22	45.06	-7.16	50.18	40.38	-9.80	38.58	28.02	-10.56
frost	65.82	64.04	-1.78	50.56	47.40	-3.16	38.68	36.56	-2.12	37.30	35.72	-1.58	29.62	28.08	-1.54
gaussian_blur	69.90	68.24	-1.66	57.54	56.92	-0.62	44.44	43.50	-0.94	27.66	29.60	1.94	11.90	13.32	1.42
gaussian_noise	64.34	61.34	-3.00	52.40	45.36	-7.04	33.36	24.46	-8.90	15.78	9.34	-6.44	5.52	3.56	-1.96
glass_blur	61.94	61.02	-0.92	49.70	51.16	1.46	32.32	35.32	3.00	27.08	29.56	2.48	21.84	21.04	-0.80
impulse_noise	60.38	54.50	-5.88	45.02	38.22	-6.80	32.86	24.56	-8.30	14.06	8.90	-5.16	5.32	3.46	-1.86
jpeg_compression	67.26	65.04	-2.22	62.96	62.00	-0.96	59.88	58.68	-1.20	50.24	49.98	-0.26	38.86	39.30	0.44
motion_blur	70.16	67.96	-2.20	63.10	61.18	-1.92	51.04	50.54	-0.50	38.42	36.22	-2.20	29.78	27.84	-1.94
pixelate	72.04	71.36	-0.68	71.76	70.80	-0.96	63.44	65.20	1.76	52.42	57.46	5.04	46.02	51.78	5.76
saturate	64.52	61.32	-3.20	48.36	44.48	-3.88	71.92	70.70	-1.22	51.48	53.02	1.54	34.58	37.38	2.80
shot_noise	63.28	59.42	-3.86	50.86	40.36	-10.50	34.32	21.76	-12.56	15.50	7.68	-7.82	7.90	4.30	-3.60
snow	63.20	60.36	-2.84	46.24	40.02	-6.22	48.48	42.92	-5.56	37.14	29.66	-7.48	29.72	21.24	-8.48
spatter	75.66	73.66	-2.00	67.54	64.72	-2.82	57.40	55.48	-1.92	55.28	48.16	-7.12	45.18	37.28	-7.90
speckle_noise	66.56	62.96	-3.60	61.46	54.84	-6.62	43.86	30.00	-13.86	32.82	17.80	-15.02	21.58	9.60	-11.98
zoom_blur	59.88	57.28	-2.60	53.10	50.08	-3.02	50.58	46.82	-3.76	45.46	41.40	-4.06	41.28	37.60	-3.68
Σ	66.69	63.89	-2.79	57.24	53.36	-3.89	49.48	45.14	-4.34	38.09	34.66	-3.43	28.64	26.02	-2.61

Table 25: Accuracies for EfficientNet with pipelining of AugMix [22] & OpticsAugment and only OpticsAugment evaluated on ImageNet-100-c 2D common corruptions [10].



(a) MobileNet



(b) EfficientNet

Figure 23: Pipelining of AugMix [22] and OpticsAugment: Blue represents now a cascaded application of AugMix and OpticsAugment. Red represents the OpticsAugment trained version from Fig. 14b and 14a respectively. (a) MobileNet and (b) EfficientNet. Evaluated on 2D common corruptions on ImageNet-100-C [10].