BIL 717 Image Processing Mar. 18, 2015

Modern Image Smoothing

Erkut Erdem Hacettepe University Computer Vision Lab (HUCVL)

Review - Smoothing and Edge Detection

- While eliminating noise via smoothing, we also lose some of the (important) image details.
 - Fine details
 - Image edges
 - etc.
- What can we do to preserve such details?
 - Use edge information during denoising!
 - This requires a definition for image edges.

Chicken-and-egg dilemma!

• Edge preserving image smoothing

Today

- Bilateral filtering
- Non-local means denoising
- LARK filter

Today

- Bilateral filtering
- Non-local means denoising
- LARK filter

<u>Acknowledgement:</u> The slides are adapted from the course "A Gentle Introduction to Bilateral Filtering and its Applications" given by Sylvain Paris, Pierre Kornprobst, Jack Tumblin, and Frédo Durand (<u>http://people.csail.mit.edu/sparis/bf_course/</u>).

Notation and Definitions

• Image = 2D array of pixels



- Pixel = intensity (scalar) or color (3D vector)
- $I_{\mathbf{p}}$ = value of image *I* at position: $\mathbf{p} = (p_x, p_y)$
- F[I] =output of filter F applied to image I

Strategy for Smoothing Images

- Images are not smooth because adjacent pixels are different.
- Smoothing = making adjacent pixels look more similar.
- Smoothing strategy pixel ~ average of its neighbors

Box Average









Square Box Generates Defects

- Axis-aligned streaks
- Blocky results

input





output

Strategy to Solve these Problems

- Use an isotropic (*i.e.* circular) window.
- Use a window with a smooth falloff.



box window



Gaussian window

Gaussian Blur









Equation of Gaussian Blur

Same idea: weighted average of pixels.





How to set σ

- Depends on the application.
- Common strategy: proportional to image size
 - -e.g. 2% of the image diagonal
 - property: independent of image resolution

Properties of Gaussian Blur

- Weights independent of spatial location
 - linear convolution
 - well-known operation
 - efficient computation (recursive algorithm, FFT...)

Properties of Gaussian Blur

- Does smooth images
- But smoothes too much: edges are blurred.
 - Only spatial distance matters
 - No edge term



$$GB[I]_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in S} \frac{G_{\sigma}(\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|)}{S_{\mathbf{q}}} I_{\mathbf{q}}$$

input

Blur Comes from Averaging across Edges



Same Gaussian kernel everywhere.

Bilateral Filter [Aurich 95, Smith 97, Tomasi 98] No Averaging across Edges



The kernel shape depends on the image content.

Bilateral Filter Definition: an Additional Edge Term

Same idea: weighted average of pixels.



Illustration a 1D Image

• 1D image = line of pixels



• Better visualized as a plot



Gaussian Blur and Bilateral Filter

Gaussian blur





Space and Range Parameters

$$BF[I]_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{W_{\mathbf{p}}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in S} G_{\sigma_{s}} (\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|) G_{\sigma_{r}} (|I_{\mathbf{p}} - I_{\mathbf{q}}|) I_{\mathbf{q}}$$

- space $\sigma_{\rm s}$: spatial extent of the kernel, size of the considered neighborhood.
- range $\sigma_{\rm r}$: "minimum" amplitude of an edge

Influence of Pixels

Only pixels close in space and in range are considered.





input

 $\sigma_{s} = 2$

Exploring the Parameter Space





input

 $\sigma_{s} = 2$

Varying the Range Parameter













input

Varying the Space Parameter










How to Set the Parameters

Depends on the application. For instance:

- space parameter: proportional to image size
 - e.g., 2% of image diagonal
- range parameter: proportional to edge amplitude
 - e.g., mean or median of image gradients
- independent of resolution and exposure

Bilateral Filter Crosses Thin Lines

- Bilateral filter averages across features thinner than $\sim 2\sigma_{\rm s}$
- Desirable for smoothing: more pixels = more robust
- Different from diffusion that stops at thin lines



Iterating the Bilateral Filter

$$I_{(n+1)} = BF[I_{(n)}]$$

- Generate more piecewise-flat images
- Often not needed in computational photo.









Bilateral Filtering Color Images

For gray-level images intensity difference

$$BF[I]_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{W_{\mathbf{p}}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in S} G_{\sigma_{s}} (\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|) G_{\sigma_{r}} (|I_{\mathbf{p}} - I_{\mathbf{q}}|) I_{\mathbf{q}}$$
scalar

For color images

$$BF[I]_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{W_{\mathbf{p}}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in S} G_{\sigma_{s}} (\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|) G_{\sigma_{r}} (\|\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{q}}\|) C_{\mathbf{q}}$$

$$3D \text{ vector}$$
(RGB, Lab)



Hard to Compute

• Nonlinear

$$BF[I]_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{W_{\mathbf{p}}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in S} G_{\sigma_{s}}(\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|) G_{\sigma_{r}}(|I_{\mathbf{p}} - I_{\mathbf{q}}|) I_{\mathbf{q}}$$

Complex, spatially varying kernels

- Cannot be precomputed, no FFT...









• Brute-force implementation is slow > 10min

<u>Additional Reading:</u> S. Paris and F. Durand, A Fast Approximation of the Bilateral Filter using a Signal Processing Approach, In Proc. ECCV, 2006

Noisy input

Bilateral filter 7x7 window



Bilateral filter

Median 3x3



Bilateral filter

Median 5x5



Bilateral filter

Bilateral filter – lower sigma



Bilateral filter

Bilateral filter – higher sigma



Denoising

- Small spatial sigma (e.g. 7x7 window)
- Adapt range sigma to noise level
- Maybe not best denoising method, but best simplicity/quality tradeoff
 - No need for acceleration (small kernel)
 - But the denoising feature in e.g. Photoshop is better





Today

- Bilateral filtering
- Non-local means denoising
- LARK filter

<u>Acknowledgement:</u> The slides are adapted from the course "A Gentle Introduction to Bilateral Filtering and its Applications" given by Sylvain Paris, Pierre Kornprobst, Jack Tumblin, and Frédo Durand (<u>http://people.csail.mit.edu/sparis/bf_course/</u>).

New Idea: NL-Means Filter (Buades 2005)

- Same goals: 'Smooth within Similar Regions'
- <u>KEY INSIGHT</u>: Generalize, extend 'Similarity'
 <u>Bilateral</u>: Averages neighbors with <u>similar intensities</u>;
 - NL-Means:

Averages neighbors with similar neighborhoods!

• For each and every pixel **p**:



 For each and every pixel p:



- Define a small, simple fixed size neighborhood;



- Define a small, simple fixed size neighborhood;
- Define vector $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{p}}$: a list of neighboring pixel values.

<u>'Similar'</u> pixels p, q → SMALL vector distance;

$$|| V_p - V_q ||^2$$



<u>'Dissimilar'</u> pixels p, q → LARGE vector distance;

$$|| V_p - V_q ||^2$$



<u>'Dissimilar'</u> pixels p, q → LARGE vector distance;

$$||V_{p} - V_{q}||^{2}$$

Filter with this!





pixels **p**, **q** neighbors Set a vector distance;

$$||V_{p} - V_{q}||^{2}$$

Vector Distance to p sets weight for each pixel q



$$NLMF[I]_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{W_{\mathbf{p}}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in S} G_{\sigma_{\mathbf{r}}} \left(\|\vec{V}_{\mathbf{p}} - \vec{V}_{\mathbf{q}}\|^2 \right) I_{\mathbf{q}}$$



Figure 2. Display of the NL-means weight distribution used to estimate the central pixel of every image. The weights go from 1(white) to zero(black).



FIG. 9. NL-means denoising experiment with a natural image. Left: Noisy image with standard deviation 20. Right: Restored image.

 Noisy source image:



Gaussian
 Filter

Low noise, Low detail



• Anisotropic Diffusion

(Note 'stairsteps': ~ piecewise constant)



- Bilateral Filter
- (better, but similar 'stairsteps':



• NL-Means:

Sharp, Low noise, Few artifacts.





Figure 4. Method noise experience on a natural image. Displaying of the image difference $u - D_h(u)$. From left to right and from top to bottom: original image, Gauss filtering, anisotropic filtering, Total variation minimization, Neighborhood filtering and NL-means algorithm. The visual experiments corroborate the formulas of section 2.




original



noisy



denoised



original



noisy



denoised

Today

- Bilateral filtering
- Non-local means denoising
- LARK filter

Acknowledgement: The slides are adapted from the ones prepared by P. Milanfar.

From pixels to patches and to images



Similarities can be defined at different scales..

Pixelwise similarity metrics

- To measure the similarity of two pixels, we can consider
 - Spatial distance
 - Gray-level distance



Euclidean metrics

- Natural ways to incorporate the two Δs :
 - Bilateral Kernel [Tomasi, Manduchi, '98] (pixelwise)
 - Non-Local Means Kernel [Buades, et al. '05] (patchwise)



Bilateral Kernel (BL) [Tomasi et al. '98]



Non-local Means (NLM) [Buades et al. '05]



Smoothing effect

Beyond Euclidean metrics

- Better similarity measures
- More effective ways to combine the two Δs :
 - LARK Kernel [Takeda, et al. '07]
 - Beltrami Kernel [Sochen, et al.'98]



Non-parametric Kernel Regression

• The data fitting problem Zero-mean, i.i.d noise (No other assump.)



Locality in Kernel Regression

• The data model

$$y_i = z(\mathbf{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, P$$

- Local representation (N-term Taylor series expansion) $z(x_i) \approx z(x) + z'(x)(x_i - x) + \frac{1}{2!}z''(x)(x_i - x)^2$ $+ \dots + \frac{1}{N!}z^{(N)}(x)(x_i - x)^N$ $= \beta_0 + \beta_1(x_i - x) + \beta_2(x_i - x)^2$ $+ \dots + \beta_N(x_i - x)^N.$
- Note that with a polynomial basis, we only need to estimate the first unknown β_0

Locality in Kernel Regression

• The data model

$$y_i = z(\mathbf{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, P$$

Local representation (N-term Taylor series expansion)

$$z(\mathbf{x}_i) = z(\mathbf{x}) + \{\nabla z(\mathbf{x})\}^T (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2!} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x})^T \{\mathcal{H}z(\mathbf{x})\} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}) + \cdots$$
$$= \beta_0 + \beta_1^T (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}) + \beta_2^T \operatorname{Vech} \{(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x})^T\} + \cdots,$$
Unknowns

- Note that with a polynomial basis, we only need to estimate the first unknown β_0

Finding the unknowns via optimization

• We have a local representation with respect to each sample:

$$\begin{split} y_1 &= \beta_0 + \beta_1^T \left(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x} \right) + \beta_2^T \operatorname{vech} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x} \right)^T \right\} + \dots + \varepsilon_1, \\ y_2 &= \beta_0 + \beta_1^T \left(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x} \right) + \beta_2^T \operatorname{vech} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x} \right)^T \right\} + \dots + \varepsilon_2, \\ &: \\ y_P &= \beta_0 + \beta_1^T \left(\mathbf{x}_P - \mathbf{x} \right) + \beta_2^T \operatorname{vech} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{x}_P - \mathbf{x} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}_P - \mathbf{x} \right)^T \right\} + \dots + \varepsilon_P, \end{split}$$

• Estimate the parameters $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^N$ from the data while giving the nearby samples higher weight than samples farther away.

$$\min_{\{\beta_n\}} \sum_{i=1} \left[y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 (x_i - x) - \beta_2 (x_i - x)^2 - \dots - \beta_N (x_i - x)^N \right]^2 \frac{1}{h} K\left(\frac{x_i - x}{h}\right)$$

Finding the unknowns via optimization

• We have a local representation with respect to each sample:

 $y_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1^T (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}) + \beta_2^T \operatorname{vech} \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x})^T \right\} + \dots + \varepsilon_1,$ $y_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1^T (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}) + \beta_2^T \operatorname{vech} \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x})^T \right\} + \dots + \varepsilon_2,$ $y_{P} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}^{T} (\mathbf{x}_{P} - \mathbf{x}) + \beta_{2}^{T} \operatorname{vech} \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_{P} - \mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x}_{P} - \mathbf{x})^{T} \right\} + \dots + \varepsilon_{P},$ The regression Optimization order N+1 terms $\min_{\{\boldsymbol{\beta}_n\}_{n=0}^N} \sum_{i=1}^{i} \left[y_i - \beta_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_1^T (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_2^T \text{vech} \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x})^T \right\} - \cdots \right]^2 \mathsf{K} \left(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x} \right)$ The choice of the This term give $K(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x})$ kernel function is the estimated open, e.g. Gaussian. pixel value z(x). $\widehat{z}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum W_i(\mathbf{x}, K, h, N) y_i$ t2

Defining Data-Adaptive Kernels

• *Classic* Kernel: Locally Linear Filter:

$$\hat{z}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\beta}_{0} = \sum_{i} W(\mathbf{x}_{i}, \mathbf{x}, N) y_{i}$$
Uses distance x-x_i

$$Data-Adaptive \text{ Kernel:}$$
Locally Non-Linear Filter:
$$\hat{z}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\beta}_{0} = \sum_{i} W(\mathbf{x}_{i}, \mathbf{x}, y_{i}, y, N) y_{i}$$
Uses x-x_i and y-y_i

Recall - Beyond Euclidean metrics

- Better similarity measures
- More effective ways to combine the two Δs.
 - LARK Kernel [Takeda, et al. '07]
 - Beltrami Kernel [Sochen, et al.'98]







Locally Adaptive Regression Kernel: LARK

$$K(\mathbf{C}_{l}, \mathbf{x}_{l}, \mathbf{x}) = \exp\left\{-(\mathbf{x}_{l} - \mathbf{x})' \mathbf{C}_{l}(\mathbf{x}_{l} - \mathbf{x})\right\}$$

"Structure tensor"

$$C_{l} = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{\Omega}} \begin{bmatrix} z_{x_{1}}^{2}(\mathbf{x}_{k}) & z_{x_{1}}(\mathbf{x}_{k})z_{x_{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{k}) \\ z_{x_{1}}(\mathbf{x}_{k})z_{x_{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{k}) & z_{x_{2}}^{2}(\mathbf{x}_{k}) \end{bmatrix}$$

Gradient Covariance Matrix and Local Geometry

Gradient matrix over a local patch:

$$\mathbf{C}_l = \sum_{k \in \Omega_l} \begin{bmatrix} z_{x_1}^2(\mathbf{x}_k) & z_{x_1}(\mathbf{x}_k) z_{x_2}(\mathbf{x}_k) \\ z_{x_1}(\mathbf{x}_k) z_{x_2}(\mathbf{x}_k) & z_{x_2}^2(\mathbf{x}_k) \end{bmatrix}$$

 $\mathbf{C}_l = \mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{G}$

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{U} \left[egin{array}{cc} s_1 & 0 \ 0 & s_2 \end{array}
ight] \left[egin{array}{cc} \mathbf{v}_1 & \mathbf{v}_2 \end{array}
ight]^T$$

Capturing locally dominant orientations





Image as a Surface Embedded in the Euclidean 3-space $x_1 \xrightarrow{x_1} x_2$ $S(x_1, x_2) = \{x_1, x_2, z(x_1, x_2)\} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ Arclength on the surface

$$ds^{2} = dx_{1}^{2} + dx_{2}^{2} + dz^{2} \operatorname{chain rule}$$

$$= dx_{1}^{2} + dx_{2}^{2} + (z_{x_{1}}dx_{1} + z_{x_{2}}dx_{2})^{2}$$

$$= (1 + z_{x_{1}}^{2})dx_{1}^{2} + 2z_{x_{1}}z_{x_{2}}dx_{1}dx_{2} + (1 + z_{x_{2}}^{2})dx_{2}^{2}$$

$$= (dx_{1} \quad dx_{2}) \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 + z_{x_{1}}^{2} & z_{x_{1}}z_{x_{2}} \\ z_{x_{1}}z_{x_{2}} & 1 + z_{x_{2}}^{2} \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c} dx_{1} \\ dx_{2} \end{array}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow (\mathbf{x}_{l} - \mathbf{x})^{T} (\mathbf{C}_{l} + \mathbf{I}) (\mathbf{x}_{l} - \mathbf{x}) \operatorname{Riemannian metric}_{\operatorname{Regularization term}}$$

$$K(\mathbf{C}_{l}, \mathbf{x}_{l}, \mathbf{x}) = \exp\left\{-(\mathbf{x}_{l} - \mathbf{x})'\mathbf{C}_{l}(\mathbf{x}_{l} - \mathbf{x})\right\}$$

(Dense) LARK Kernels as Visual Descriptors [Seo and Milanfar '10]

$$K(\mathbf{C}_l, \mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{x}) = \exp\left\{-(\mathbf{x}_l - \mathbf{x})'\mathbf{C}_l(\mathbf{x}_l - \mathbf{x})\right\}$$

Measure the similarity of pixels using the metric implied by the local structure of the image





Robustness of LARK Descriptors



A Variant Better-suited for Restoration [Takeda et al. '07]



Film Grain Reduction (Real Noise)



Noisy image

Film Grain Reduction (Real Noise)



LARK

Film Grain Reduction (Real Noise)



KSVD

BM3D

Adaptive Sharpening/Denoising

Sharpening the LARK Kernel



LARK-based Simultaneous Sharpening/Deblurring/Denoising

- Net effect:
 - aggressive denoising in "flat" areas
 - Selective denoising and sharpening in "edgy"



Locally adaptive denoise/deblur filters

Examples



original image

original image



LARK







state-of-the-are methods

Examples



Examples

