

# Illustrative Thumbnails

## BACHELORARBEIT

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

## Bachelor of Science

im Rahmen des Studiums

## Medieninformatik und Visual Computing

eingereicht von

**Rebeka Koszticsak**

Matrikelnummer 1325492

an der Fakultät für Informatik  
der Technischen Universität Wien

Betreuung: Dr. techn. Manuela Waldner, Msc.

Wien, 1. Jänner 2001

---

Rebeka Koszticsak

---

Manuela Waldner



# Illustrative Thumbnails

## BACHELOR'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

## Bachelor of Science

in

## Media Informatics and Visual Computing

by

**Rebeka Koszticsak**

Registration Number 1325492

to the Faculty of Informatics

at the TU Wien

Advisor: Dr. techn. Manuela Waldner, Msc.

Vienna, 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2001

---

Rebeka Koszticsak

---

Manuela Waldner



# Erklärung zur Verfassung der Arbeit

Rebeka Koszticsak  
Address

Hiermit erkläre ich, dass ich diese Arbeit selbständig verfasst habe, dass ich die verwendeten Quellen und Hilfsmittel vollständig angegeben habe und dass ich die Stellen der Arbeit – einschließlich Tabellen, Karten und Abbildungen –, die anderen Werken oder dem Internet im Wortlaut oder dem Sinn nach entnommen sind, auf jeden Fall unter Angabe der Quelle als Entlehnung kenntlich gemacht habe.

Wien, 1. Jänner 2001

---

Rebeka Koszticsak



# Danksagung

---

Ihr Text hier.





# Acknowledgements

---

Enter your text here.



# Kurzfassung

---

Ihr Text hier.



# Abstract

Thumbnails are used to display the screens when switching between them on the computer and on mobile devices. These images make it easier to recognize the opened applications, and help to find the needed window quicker. Thumbnails display however only a screenshot of the windows, so they get potentially confusing if there are more opened windows or if the same application is opened multiple times. Depending on the resolution of the display, the screenshot size decreases as the number of opened windows increases. Furthermore, within the same application (like MS Office World) the screenshots are similar in appearance (eg.: white paper and tool bar), but the important text is not readable. There are several approaches that filter the important areas of the images to make editing less obvious or enhance the main region. In this bachelor thesis an application is implemented that uses these methods on the screencaptured images. The less important areas of the screenshots are cut off, and the thumbnails show only important information, which makes them more illustrative and easier to fulfill their purpose.



# Contents

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Kurzfassung</b>                         | <b>xi</b>   |
| <b>Abstract</b>                            | <b>xiii</b> |
| <b>Contents</b>                            | <b>xv</b>   |
| <b>1 Introduction</b>                      | <b>1</b>    |
| <b>2 Related Work</b>                      | <b>3</b>    |
| 2.1 Processing as UI . . . . .             | 3           |
| 2.2 Processing as common picture . . . . . | 4           |
| <b>3 Methodology</b>                       | <b>7</b>    |
| <b>List of Figures</b>                     | <b>9</b>    |
| <b>List of Tables</b>                      | <b>11</b>   |
| <b>List of Algorithms</b>                  | <b>13</b>   |
| <b>Index</b>                               | <b>15</b>   |
| <b>Glossary</b>                            | <b>17</b>   |
| <b>Acronyms</b>                            | <b>19</b>   |
| <b>Bibliography</b>                        | <b>21</b>   |





# CHAPTER 1



## Introduction

---

Enter your text here.



## Related Work

There are several image processing algorithms, which can be helpful by creating illustrative thumbnails. The main difference between them is, if they consider the fact that the input images always are screenshots. Therefore, this section is divided into two parts. The first one discusses algorithms with UI processing segments. Algorithms, invented for retrieve visual data from common images, are examined in the second section. According to the information visualization method, like combining the most important parts in form of collages or simple resizing, two classes are divided. In the following some of these methods are compared.

### 2.1 Processing as UI

Considering that the input is a screenshot, there is a high chance that common UI elements are shown on the screen. Exceptions are only the cases where graphics, images, videos or application containing these, e.g. video games, gallery program, video player are captured. The applications like that tend to hide all UI elements, "fullscreen" mode, or redefine them, e.g. game menu.

Labeling the image parts as content and non-content, the metadata about the UI elements can be helpful. Forras uses already existing accessibility APIs to segment UI and non-UI data. Matching the metadata with the screen content provides a fast and robust result about the location of any kind of UI content. There are however several disadvantages, that need to be take into account when using such APIs. The range and the granularity of the support is often not wide enough. The use of an accessibilty API does not make sure, that every UI element will be recognized, because some metadata is not reachable or it will be ignored by the application.

Because of that Forras Prefab works with its own prototypes. In the database models and prototypes of common UI elements are saved. The (components of) UI elements

has to be matched with the prototypes in the data base, and after that the predefined metadata can be accessed. Since the Prefab system is able to split complex widgets into their base elements, the database does not need to be unnecessary big, but it is still able to cover the most common UI elements. In the case of special or rare UI widgets, like in a video game application or elements of a not widely used software, the system fails. If a widget is not saved in the database, there is no way, that it will be recognized.

Forras Sikuli offers a solution not for the incompleteness of the database, but for the granularity issues too. It uses its own templates just like the Prefab system, but only in case of small icons and widgets. Since in case of larger objects template matching would be too expensive, after the processing of a training pattern, the Sikuli system is able to create new object models too. Although this feature is used in the application for other purpose, i.e. reduce the matching cost, it can solve the problem of database and of the granularity. Sikuli makes it possible to expand the database and to make the database entry afterwards more detailed.

But in case of accessibility APIs not only the availability of metadata causes possible problems. It has also no information about the actual visibility of the UI elements. One window or rather one widget can hide an other one, some content can be out of the range of the borders of the screen etc. Forras is based on the Prefab system, but it builds a hierarchical tree from the widgets. The content is found at the leafs, and the parents are the widget, where the child is built in. With the help of this tree the order of the UI elements gets clear, and so the misleading information can be eliminated.

After the labeling of the UI elements correctly, they can be processed as needed. They can cut off as whole or processed according to the information content. Forras invented an algorithm to eliminate objects of a picture and fill their place with the texture of the object behind them using the z-buffer information. The tree mentioned above works as a z-buffer in this case. With this cut off algorithm unnecessary widgets can be easily eliminated and more important elements of the UI can so get better visible.

According to the definition of "illustrative" of this thesis the UI elements of a screen has to get cut so the segmentation of the UI elements is not needed. Although the Prefab and Sikuli systems can be helpful for labeling the images as UI and content. But these approaches has the drawback of the usage of the database and the slow template matching. Since there is no need to know, which widgets are on the screen, and processing the actual content can already cause performance issues, the use these methods would overcomplicate the application without providing noteworthy advantages.

## 2.2 Processing as common picture

There are several information retrieving methods for processing images with any content. Furthermore in case of making any kind of image more illustrative, there are important tasks like interesting point recognition, Region of Interest (ROI) selection, image or feature composition etc. which they can handle easily. According to the manner of the

input data there are two different groups of these algorithms, which need to be discussed in the following sections. The first category works with more than one picture in the same time. Its strength is to choose single features which represents the most the whole input data. In exchange it is likely that no input image will be recognizable on the result. On the other hand there are the methods in the second group, which take only one picture for input and process it as one unit. So the result is similar to the input data, but therefore the chance is high that not only the unimportant but the areas with high information ratio are damaged. At the very end of this section some approaches are presented, which can help the work of both of the above mentioned groups.

### 2.2.1 Collage creating methods

A collage is an assembled image, containing parts of a bunch of input images and being representative for the whole input data. There are two cases by creating thumbnails more illustrative where such methods can be helpful. On the one hand the actual information of a screenshot image concentrates only in few regions of the picture. Many parts, for example UI elements, space between the content etc, can be ignored. The other way around the content can be retrieved in form of ROIs, and afterwards they can be combined arbitrary. On the other hand using collage creator algorithms thumbnails for desktop switching can be easily generated, where the input are screenshots of the open application of the desktop instead of some ROIs of one screen.

For a representative collage the most important task is to choose the best images, which information content covers the whole input data. Forras takes the parameters representativeness, importance costs, transition cost and object sensitivity into account. Representativeness means being interesting in this case. A picture tends to have high representativeness value, if there are many special textures on it, and if it is not similar to the rest of the data (so that no image is chosen twice). Importance cost evaluates and collect the ROIs of the input. While transition cost stands for the smooth transition between every two images. At last, the parameter object sensitivity holds the results of object recognition, and it helps in the arrangement, that the object has a reasonable placement.

Forras concentrates however only the first two parameters above. It clusters the images, according their source and the time, and measures the quality. Thank for the clustering by the choice of the final images it is clear, which images are the same or have similar content. This feature, accordingly modified, can be useful by sorting ROIs of a screenshot, i.e.: text content, image content etc. or of the running applications of the desktop, i.e.: textprocessing, gallery application etc. The parameter quality summarizes the value of the results of the following calculations: blurriness, compression, contrast and color balance. Since in this case only screenshots, thus computer generated pictures, can be the input, these measurements invented for camera data would provide less meaningful results than the algorithm above.

Having the best ROIs for the collage the last task is to merge them into one output

picture. For this purpose Forras uses a method called ROI packing. First the central point of every ROI needs to get chosen and every pixel on the canvas needs to get assigned to one of the using the k-Means algorithm. After that the ROIs can be placed on the area calculated for them. To fill the place between the ROIs they have to grow, keeping the aspect ratio, until they overlap. Then every ROI is shifted to the middle of its area. This method can be repeated until no ROI grows anymore. To fill the white areas, neighboring ROIs are allowed to cover them, and so fill the whole image.

Collage methods are very useful to represent a large image dataset only in a small place. They work with numerous input data, and taking the most important parts of them create a new image, that is not similar to any before. That is why they are more useful for making a thumbnail for a desktop but not for one application. Even though taking only the most important ROIs of one screen it would be possible to create an image more illustrative than any other, since the important content is the largest and the best readable. Cutting one screen apart and arranging some parts of them willingly would confuse the user, and even more time would be needed to recognize the screen.

### 2.2.2 Resampling methods

Treating the input image as one unit, has a big advantage against the approaches mentioned before. Even after modification the result will be highly similar to the input. Resampling means, that some parts of the image will be eliminated, but all remaining areas will have the same proportion to each other, not like by the collage algorithms. The image remains recognizable because of the same look, even though the most important areas are less readable.

To select areas, which needs to be kept same, Forras uses several attention models, which defines Attention Objects (AO). AOs usually are objects from the real world, which catch the human eye, because of their familiarity, shape, color etc. With three values AOs can be easily parametrized, these are ROI, Attention Value (AV) and Minimal Perceptible Size (MPS). The attention models fit the AOs into the context. Forras works with three different attention models at the same time, with saliency, face and text attention. Having the importance value of every pixel the most important area can be detected.

The algorithm above after careful calculation chooses only one area, which contains as many AOs as possible. So some possibly important AOs have to be ignored and cut off. With Feature aware Texturing described in Forras this does not have to be the case. The algorithm expects an input image and a feature mask. A grid is generated, which lies on the input image. This grid can be modified in an optional shape, but the gridpoints on the feature mask are not allowed to change their proportion to each other. In that way the picture elements between the AOs fill the new shape, but the AOs get barely distorted.

A detailed importance is essential by creating thumbnails, since a screen usually contains more information and ROIs than a common picture. But the algorithms described above have aspects, like face recognition and grid calculation, which overcomplicate the

calculations, causing performance issues without reaching better quality. A face on a computer screen is not so common as on usual photos, and it is not so important too than text for example. With a grid the input image can get reshaped in any other form, and in addition no important part needs to get damaged. But it is meant to form the input in completely other shape, not for resize it according to aspect ratio. Some aspects however, like definition of AOs, can be useful polishing the actual algorithm, this will be discussed in the future work section.

### 2.2.3 Feature combining methods





CHAPTER 3

# Methodology



# List of Figures



# List of Tables



# List of Algorithms





# Index

distribution, 5



# Glossary

**editor** A text editor is a type of program used for editing plain text files.. 5



# Acronyms

**CTAN** Comprehensive TeX Archive Network. 11

**FAQ** Frequently Asked Questions. 11

**PDF** Portable Document Format. 6, 10, 11, 15

**SVN** Subversion. 10

**WYSIWYG** What You See Is What You Get. 9



# Bibliography

- [Tur36] Alan Mathison Turing. On computable numbers, with an application to the entscheidungsproblem. *J. of Math*, 58:345–363, 1936.