

University of Southern Queensland

Development and Characterisation of a Modified Smartphone Camera
for Determining UVA Aerosol Optical Depth

A Dissertation submitted by

Damien Igoe, BAppSci, BSc (Hons), BSpecEd, DipEd, MEd, MSc

For the award of

Doctor of Philosophy

Supervisor: Professor Alfio Parisi

Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Brad Carter

2013

Abstract

This research evaluates a specifically-written, calibrated and validated Android app installed on an inexpensive smartphone with bandpass and neutral density filters attached for measuring and quantifying direct solar UVA irradiances and aerosol optical depth. Currently, the equipment normally used to perform these observations is specialised, expensive and is available at a relatively small number of sites. The continuing proliferation of and the increasing number and type of sensors included in smartphones makes feasible the use of specifically designed apps as a cost effective supplementary means of monitoring direct ultraviolet A solar irradiance and air quality for research, education and community outreach purposes.

Most aerosols from both human and natural sources attenuate the UV wavebands; this has far reaching implications for UV irradiance studies and by extension, important public awareness metrics such as the UV index (UVI). Combined, closer observations and subsequent studies of aerosol optical depth and UVA irradiance are critical given that in recent studies, UVA irradiances have been found to be a major agent in skin cancer, photoaging and eye conditions. Therefore, this research involved the development, calibration and validation of a specifically written Android app on a smartphone in separate environments and across different seasons.

The smartphone camera image sensor's response to UVA was first tested in the laboratory using a monochromator. Once it was shown that the response could be characterised, calibration and validation tests of the response to solar UVA and aerosol optical depth (AOD) were performed, with correlations of over 99% and a maximum discrepancy of 10% observed respectively. *Android* automation was then developed, calibrated and validated with similar results.

The results obtained in this research show that a consumer smartphone image sensor, fitted with narrow bandpass and neutral density filters, automated using a specifically written app that uses the camera input produces direct UVA irradiances and aerosol optical depth data with comparable accuracy to that obtained from more expensive and specialised equipment, with correlations of over 0.98 and discrepancies only up to 4%. Such an outcome can promote a greater spatial resolution in monitoring UVA irradiance and air quality, allowing a greater awareness of individual UVA exposure and local air quality.

Certification of Dissertation

I certify that the ideas, experimental and field work results, analyses, software and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

Signature of Damien Igoe

Endorsement

Signature of Professor Alfio Parisi, Principal Supervisor

Signature of Associate Professor Brad Carter, Associate Supervisor

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I wish to extend my utmost gratitude and genuine admiration for my Principal Supervisor, Professor Alfio Parisi, and my Associate Supervisor, Associate Professor Brad Carter – Their knowledge, patience, wisdom and kindness have been unparalleled, how they dealt with me as their student would be the subject of another thesis.

Many thanks are also extended to Dr. Leigh Brookshaw, whose expertise in and passion for Android programming assisted greatly. Also, gratitude is extended to Oliver Kinder, of the Faculty of Sciences workshop, whose expertise and dedication are appreciated.

The participants of the question and answer website, StackOverflow.com have kindly assisted me in understanding the structure and techniques of Android programming.

Thanks are also extended to owners of the private residences in Emerald and Plainland, Queensland for allowing me to conduct observations in their backyards. A special thanks goes to their pet dogs for keeping me company throughout the 3 hour experiments.

Finally, a big thanks is extended to my parents whose encouragement, tolerance and humour saw me through many bad times when I “hit a wall” in the research.

Contents

Abstract	I
Certification of Dissertation	III
Acknowledgements	IV
List of Figures	VIII
List of Tables	XIII
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Rationale.....	2
1.2 Hypothesis	4
1.3 Objectives	5
1.4 Dissertation Outline.....	7
2. Solar UV	8
2.1 What is Ultraviolet Radiation?	9
2.2 Ultraviolet Radiation in the Atmosphere.....	10
2.3 Effects of Ultraviolet Radiation on the Biosphere	13
2.4 Effects of Ultraviolet Radiation on Human Health	14
2.4.1 Vitamin D Synthesis	15
2.4.2 Skin Cancers	17
2.4.3 Photoaging	19
2.4.4 Eye Conditions.....	20
2.4.5 Immune Response.....	21
2.5 Chapter Discussion.....	22
3. Aerosols	23
3.1 Attenuation of Radiation due to Aerosols	24
3.1.1 Visible.....	27
3.1.2 Ultraviolet	28
3.2 Aerosol and Gaseous Species.....	29

3.3 Aerosols over Australia	31
3.4 Chapter Discussion	32
4. Measurement	33
4.1 Current Measurement Techniques.....	34
4.2 Image Sensors.....	37
4.2.1 Noise Summary	40
4.3 Chapter Discussion	41
5. Experimental Results	42
5.1 Standard Equipment Used	43
5.2 Smartphone Selection	46
5.2.1 Lens Attenuation.....	47
5.2.2 Lens Fluorescence	49
5.2.3 Noise Tests.....	49
5.3 Feasibility Tests.....	50
5.3.1 Methodology	50
5.3.2 Results.....	53
5.4 Calibration Field Tests	56
5.4.1 Methodology.....	56
5.4.2 Results.....	60
5.4.3 Signal to Noise Ratio	81
5.5 Discussion	82
5.6 Chapter Summary	85
6. Android Automation.....	87
6.1 Android Schematics	88
6.2 Android Requirements to Calculate Direct Irradiance and AOD.....	90
6.3 Recalibration of Direct Irradiance and AOD.....	98

6.4 Calibration and Validation test results	99
6.4.1 Locations.....	99
6.4.2 Potential sources of error	99
6.4.3 Recalibration results	100
6.4.4 Validation results	103
6.5 Chapter Discussion.....	107
7. Conclusions	108
7.1 Conclusions	109
7.2 Future Research.....	113
References	115
Appendix 1: Published Papers	A

List of Figures

Figure 1: The gamma ray to microwave portion of the electromagnetic spectrum, with emphasis on the ultraviolet (UV) wavebands (Soehnge et al. 1997).....	9
Figure 2: Example of solar UV spectrum data collected by a Bentham DmC300 spectroradiometer on a clear day for a solar zenith angle of 11.2°. The troughs in the data are due to atmospheric Fraunhofer absorption.....	10
Figure 3: Labelled sections of the ozone absorption cross section spectrum for the UV, visible and infrared wavebands (Orphal, 2003).....	11
Figure 4: Action spectrum for the synthesis of previtamin-D ₃ in human skin (CIE, 2006). The response from wavelengths greater than 330 nm are far lower than what is shown.	16
Figure 5: Action spectra for erythema (solid line) and fish melanoma (dashed line) (CIE, 1998; Setlow et al. 1993).	18
Figure 6: Relative UV absorption and transmission into the human eye (Behar-Cohen et al. 2011).....	20
Figure 7: Map of the Lake Eyre Basin being the main source of dust aerosols in Australia (Radhi et al. 2012; Maroulis et al. 2007).	31
Figure 8: Basic architectural and functional differences between CCD and CMOS showing pixel structure of each type of image sensor (Medina, 2012).	38
Figure 9: Structure of backside illumination (BSI) showing the difference in how incidental light is received from the image sensor photodiode (Goldman, 2011).....	39
Figure 10: Irradiation monochromator used for producing a stable beam of approximately 10 nm FWHM for the feasibility studies.	44
Figure 11: Spectroradiometer used for the irradiance measurements in the feasibility tests.	45

Figure 12: Microtops II Model 540 sunphotometer, used in field calibration tests for measuring direct UV and AOD (Image by Solar Light).....45

Figure 13: Comparison of the spectral irradiance from the irradiation monochromator (solid lines) to the attenuated irradiance through the excised outer lens (dashed lines) (Igoe et al. 2013a).47

Figure 14: Percentage transmission curve through a smartphone excised outer lens (Igoe et al. 2013).....48

Figure 15: Feasibility experimental setup. The UV radiation is from the irradiation monochromator and the smartphone is in position in front of the output optics.53

Figure 16: Raw smartphone camera response as a function of irradiance for 340 nm (squares), 360 nm (triangles) and 380 nm (diamonds) (Igoe et al. 2013a). Exposure time was not changed.54

Figure 17: UVA characterisation of a Samsung Galaxy 5 (Igoe et al. 2013a).....55

Figure 18: Smartphone camera and filter setup. Bandpass filter is at A; ND2 neutral density filter (for 380 nm tests) at B; and ND1% neutral density filter at C. The smartphone is at D.58

Figure 19: Field setup, including smartphone with filters on top of the tripod. The Microtops sunphotometer pictured was used to calibrate the smartphone camera’s image sensor data.58

Figure 20: A grayscale image of the sun, taken with a 340 nm filter covered Samsung Galaxy 5 smartphone camera (magnified image). (Igoe et al. 2013b).59

Figure 21: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and the Samsung Galaxy 5 derived cosine grey for observations made at 340 nm.63

Figure 22: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and the Samsung Galaxy 5 derived cosine grey for observations made at 380 nm. Error bars are too small to be seen.64

Figure 23: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and the Huawei U8180 derived cosine grey for observations made at 340 nm.65

Figure 24: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and the LG Optimus derived cosine grey for observations made at 340 nm.....66

Figure 25: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and the LG Optimus derived cosine grey for observations made at 380 nm. Error bars too small to be seen.....67

Figure 26: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and all smartphones derived cosine grey for observations made at 340 nm.68

Figure 27: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and all smartphones derived cosine grey for observations made at 380 nm.69

Figure 28: Calibration regression between the Microtops derived $\ln(I)$ and all smartphones derived cosine grey observations.....70

Figure 29: $\ln(I)$ comparison for the Samsung Galaxy 5 observed at 340 nm. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold.72

Figure 30: $\ln(I)$ comparison for the Huawei U8180 observed at 340 nm. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold.....72

Figure 31: $\ln(I)$ comparison for the LG Optimus observed at 340 nm. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold (Igoe et al. 2013c).73

Figure 32: $\ln(I)$ comparison for all observations at 340 nm. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold.73

Figure 33: $\ln(I)$ comparison for the Samsung Galaxy 5 observed at 380 nm. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold.74

Figure 34: $\ln(I)$ comparison for the LG Optimus observed at 380 nm. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold (Igoe et al. 2013c).75

Figure 35: $\ln(I)$ comparison for the combined smartphone observations at 380 nm. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold.....75

Figure 36: $\ln(I)$ comparison for all combined observations of all smartphones at both target wavelengths. The one-to-one equivalence line is in bold.....	76
Figure 37: Comparisons between smartphone and Microtops sunphotometer data for combined smartphone calibration.....	79
Figure 38: Comparisons between smartphone and Microtops sunphotometer data for target wavelength calibrations (as indicated by the key).....	79
Figure 39: Comparisons between smartphone and Microtops sunphotometer data for individual smartphone calibrations (as indicated by the key).	80
Figure 40: SNR values for each smartphone test.	81
Figure 41: User interface of the automated Android app for determining direct solar UVA irradiance and AOD on a smartphone. (Photo taken using another smartphone).	91
Figure 42: Raw data dialog box as the final stage of the Android app calculations (note, the irradiance value is actually its natural log). The apparent precision in the data is due to the simplicity in the app code.	96
Figure 43: Flowchart of tasks and their dependencies in the Android app used for measuring direct solar irradiance and AOD at 340 nm and 380 nm.	97
Figure 44: Recalibrated regression comparing the smartphone app derived cosine grey values with the natural log of Microtops measured direct irradiance at 340 nm.	101
Figure 45: Recalibrated regression comparing the smartphone app derived cosine grey values with the natural log of Microtops measured direct irradiance at 380 nm. The error bars at this target wavelength are too small to be seen.....	102
Figure 46: Comparison of the natural log of direct irradiances derived from observations from the smartphone app and the Microtops at the 340 nm waveband. The diamonds represent the recalibration data and the circles are the validation data. The line represents an exact match.	103

- Figure 47: Comparison of the natural log of direct irradiances derived from observations from the smartphone app and the Microtops at the 380 nm waveband. The diamonds represent the recalibration data and the circles are the validation data. The line represents an exact match. The error bars are too small to be seen..... 104
- Figure 48: Comparison of the aerosol optical depths derived from observations from the smartphone app and the Microtops at the 340 nm waveband. The diamonds represent the recalibration data and the circles are the validation data. The line represents an exact match. 105
- Figure 49: Comparison of the aerosol optical depths derived from observations from the smartphone app and the Microtops at the 380 nm waveband. The diamonds represent the recalibration data and the circles are the validation data. The line represents an exact match. 106

List of Tables

Table 1: Dark fixed pattern noise (DFPN) at 17°C and 37°C for the Samsung Galaxy 5, Huawei U8180 and LG Optimus, measured in grayscale digital numbers (DN).....	50
Table 2: The percentage transmissions of each and combinations of the lens and filter elements used in this part of the study (Igoe et al. 2013a).....	52