

Multifractal classification of bread crumb digital images

Rodrigo Baravalle[†], Juan Carlos Gómez[†] y Claudio Delrieux[‡]

[†]Laboratorio de Sistemas Dinámicos y Procesamiento de Información

FCEIA, Universidad Nacional de Rosario, - CIFASIS - CONICET

{baravalle,gomez}@cifasis-conicet.gov.ar

[‡]DIEC, Universidad Nacional del Sur - IIIE-CONICET

cad@uns.edu.ar

Abstract— Adequate models of the bread crumb structure can be critical for understanding flow and transport processes in bread, creating synthetic bread crumb images for photo-realistic rendering, evaluating similarities and establishing quality features of different bread crumbs types.

In this article multifractal analysis, employing the multifractal spectrum (MFS), has been applied to classify among different bread crumb types. Four varieties of breads (*baguette*, *sliced*, *bran*, and *sandwich*) were analysed. Results demonstrate that the MFS is an appropriate tool for characterizing the internal structure of the bread crumb and thus may be used to establish important quality properties it should have. The MFS has shown to provide local and global image features that are both robust and low-dimensional, leading to features vectors that capture essential information for classification tasks. The MFS based classification is able to distinguish among different bread crumbs with very high accuracy. The multifractal modeling of the bread crumb structure can be an appropriate method for parameterizing and simulating the appearance of different bread crumbs.

Keywords— multifractal, bread, classification

1 INTRODUCTION

One of the most important factors of the quality of a bread loaf is related to its crumb structure. Close examination of different slices reveals considerable variation in the cell size even within a single sample of the same bread type.

Fractals methods could be appropriate to characterize this structure. Fractal and multifractal analysis of images have proved to capture useful properties of the underlying material being represented. These features have been successfully applied in different areas, such as medicine [1, 2] and texture classification [3]. In food research, fractal and multifractal analysis has been applied in the study of apple tissues [4], pork sirloins [5] and others [6]. Through several procedures [7, 8], it is possible to obtain different Fractal Dimensions (FD), each of them capturing a different property of the material (e.g., porosity, ru-

gosity).

For each material, the results obtained in classification tasks are useful in quality measurements of real samples and also in the validation of synthetic representations of them. In other words, these processes are useful to determine if a given image presents the observed features in that material, allowing to associate quality measure parameters to it. In [9], a quality bread crumb test based on Gabor filters was performed in that paper, obtaining good results. Nevertheless, a small database was used (30 images). In [8] several fractal features were obtained for one type of bread, demonstrating that a vector of FDs would be capable of obtaining key features of its crumb texture more accurately than using a single FD.

In this work we propose the application of the Multifractal Spectrum (MFS) [10] to classify among different bread crumb types. One of the main features of the MFS is its bi-Lipschitz invariance, which includes perspective transforms (viewpoint changes) and smooth texture surface deformations. It is shown that the MFS is also locally invariant to affine changes in illumination.

The proposed method is compared to other classifiers that uses state-of-the-art features for texture classification. The results of this feature extraction procedure show that the classifier is robust and presents good discrimination properties to distinguish between different bread types and also bread from non bread images.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 the theory underlying fractal sets is introduced, and the materials and methods employed in this work are presented. In section 3 the results obtained in the classification procedures are shown and discussed. In section 4 the conclusions are summarized, as well as possible future works.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Fractals and Multifractals

The term *fractal* was first employed by the mathematician Mandelbrot in [11]. Fractal objects have the property of self-similarity (*i.e.*, the structure is repeated at different scales), and they are characterized by a non-integer dimension. The fractal dimension is an exponent which relates the statistical self-similarity of the object at different scales. Fractal objects can have one or more FDs. On the one hand, deterministic fractals are characterized

by one FD. They are called *monofractals* (for instance, Koch Curve, Sierpinsky triangle). On the other hand, *multifractals* [12] are characterized by a sequence of FDs. It is assumed that these structures are composed by different fractals coexisting simultaneously. The result is a vector containing several FDs. The multifractal approach characterizes better the objects than the fractal one, since variations in local regions are captured in a more accurate manner. The following definition is used in fractal and multifractal measurements.

2.1.1 Box Dimension

On the one hand, mathematical objects such as the Koch curve and the Sierpinsky triangle have exact self-similarity. Natural phenomena, on the other hand, is better described by statistical self-similarity. In such cases, the Box FD is used. Box FD is a simplification of the Hausdorff (originally Minkowski - Bouligand) dimension for non strictly self-similar objects [7]. Given a binarised image, it is subdivided in a grid of size $M \times M$ where the side of each box formed is ϵ . If N_ϵ represents the amount of boxes that contains at least one pixel in the binarisation of the set for that ϵ , then the box dimension D_b is defined as

$$D_b \triangleq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log(N_\epsilon)}{\log(1/\epsilon)}. \quad (1)$$

The algorithm uses a binarised image and selects different values of ϵ in it, making a count of the boxes that contains pixels in each case (to avoid numerical instabilities, a mean of cases is computed, establishing different positions in the grid over the image). Finally, a linear regression adjustment is made with the obtained data, in the $\log - \log$ space, and the slope of the straight line is by definition the box dimension of the image.

2.2 Theory behind Multifractal Analysis

In [8], several procedures were applied to the bread crumb structure. In that paper, it was depicted that a vector of FDs could better characterize that structures. Based on that assumption, in this work multifractal analysis of the bread crumb is analysed. The intuition behind multifractal analysis is to examine, in the limit, the local behavior of a measure μ at each point of the set under study. This means, to find the Hölder exponent α in that point. The *multifractal spectrum* $f(\alpha)$ (MFS) is obtained applying this procedure to the entire set, in this case, an image.

Let E be an structure divided in disjoint substructures E_i of size ϵ in such a way that

$$\bigcup_i E_i = E. \quad (2)$$

Each substructure E_i is characterized by a measure $\mu(E_i)$. From the point of view of multifractal analysis, it is useful to define this value as a function of ϵ , *i.e.*

$$\alpha_i \triangleq \frac{\ln(\mu(E_i))}{\ln(\epsilon)}, \quad (3)$$

and to take the limit when ϵ tends to 0. The limit represents the value of the Hölder exponent at a point in the structure, that is

$$\alpha = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha_i. \quad (4)$$

The exponent characterizes the local regularity of the structure at a point. To obtain a global characterization of the regularity of the structure it is necessary to obtain the distribution of α in E . The range of Hölder exponent values found in the image is partitioned in M sub-ranges (in practice, M is a parameter: the number of FDs). Each α_i defines one sub-range. Then a counting N_ϵ of boxes characterized by α_i must be done for each of them, related to the value of ϵ , *i.e.*

$$f_\epsilon(\alpha_i) = -\frac{\ln(N_\epsilon(\alpha_i))}{\ln(\epsilon)}. \quad (5)$$

When ϵ tends to 0, the limiting value is the FD of the structure E characterized by α , the Hausdorff dimension (which is calculated by using the Box procedure described) of the α distribution, also known as the *multifractal spectrum* $f(\alpha)$ (MFS) [13], *i.e.*

$$f(\alpha) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f_\epsilon(\alpha). \quad (6)$$

2.2.1 Practical procedure for the MFS

There are several techniques described in the literature to obtain the MFS, which led to different representations of the multifractal information present in the structure. Usually, the method of moments is used [4, 5], but it produces a feature vector which is not always suitable for classification tasks. In this work, the implementation presented in [10] is employed, due to its better classification performance. The implementation first calculates the method of moments and then uses a Legendre transform to obtain the MFS. The procedure consists in partitioning the domain into non-overlapping boxes of length r . The q -th moment of a measure μ is defined as

$$M_r(q) = \sum \mu(B(x, r))^q, \quad (7)$$

where the sum is over the r mesh squares for which $\mu(B(x, r)) > 0$. To denote the power law behavior of $M_r(q)$, $\beta(q)$ is defined as a straight line fit of the values $M_r(q)$ with respect to r , for r in $1, \dots, n$. It is shown in [14], that the MFS and $\beta(q)$ are related to each other by a Legendre transform as

$$f(\alpha(q)) = q\alpha(q) - \beta(q), \quad (8)$$

where

$$\alpha(q) = \frac{d\beta(q)}{dq}. \quad (9)$$

As previously stated, the $f(\alpha)$ spectrum (MFS) and the generalized dimensions $\beta(q)$ contains the same information, but in this work the first is employed, since it also outperforms the method of moments in classification

tasks. Using equations 8 and 9 the MFS is estimated. The implementation is set with the default parameters (except for the number of FDs, since they are chosen based on its classification performance).

2.2.2 Multifractal Measures

Defining different μ functions counts for different image features. The first approach is to define μ in the intensity domain, *i.e.*

$$\mu(B(x, r)) = \int_{B(x, r)} (G_r * I) dx, \quad (10)$$

where $*$ is the 2D convolution operator and G_r is a Gaussian smoothing kernel with variance r , *i.e.*, μ is the average intensity value in the disk of radius r centered at x ($B(x, r)$). This is the density of the intensity function, and it describes how the intensity at a point changes over scale.

The definition of μ could serve to specific purposes. For instance, if robustness to illumination changes is needed, one choice is to define $\mu(B(x, r))$ on the energy of the gradients. Let $f_k, k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ be four directional differential operators along the vertical, horizontal, diagonal and anti-diagonal directions. Then we define the measurement function $\mu(B(x, r))$ for the image I as in Equation 11.

$$\mu(B(x, r)) = \left(\int_{B(x, r)} \sum_k (f_k * (G_r * I))^2 dx \right)^{1/2}. \quad (11)$$

Another choice is to define $\mu(B(x, r))$ as the sum of the Laplacians of the image inside $B(x, r)$ (12).

$$\mu(B(x, r)) = \int_{B(x, r)} |\nabla^2 (G_r * I)| dx. \quad (12)$$

2.3 Image Acquisition

20 images of four different commercial bread types (*sliced, baguette, bran* and *sandwich*), counting 80 images, were obtained using an electric slicer. The images were taken in the same day of purchase and were digitalised using an HP PSC 1210 scanner with the following settings: highlight 190, shadows 40, and midtones 1, and they were saved in TIFF format. Images showed a resolution of 380×380 pixels (the maximum possible area for the four bread types) and 350 dpi (1 pixel = $0.00527mm^2$). Then the images were converted to gray scale (8 bits). In addition, 20 images of each bread type were acquired with a digital camera, using the same spatial resolution, counting 80 images. The illumination conditions of these images were different from that of the scanner in order to test for the robustness of the method. We also employed one hundred randomly selected images from the CalTech101 [15] dataset in order to test the method's performance with non-bread images. In Fig. 1 three examples of the images used in this paper are shown. In the figure, two images of the *baguette* bread

type, digitalised using a scanner (left) and a digital camera (center) are shown with a random non bread image from the Caltech101 dataset (right).

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The MFS, using 20 FDs, was applied for each of the 200 images (*i.e.*, 40 images of each bread type, and 40 randomly selected nonbread images, getting 5 balanced classes).

3.1 Bread Classification

Five classes are defined, *e.g.*, *baguette, sliced, bran, sandwich* and *non-bread*, assigning 40 images to each class. A comparison is made between the MFS and state of the art features in the computer vision literature. This classification scheme corresponds to an intra-class problem, which is harder to solve than an ordinary inter-class one.

K-fold cross validation is applied to the entire set (with $K = 4$), employing three different classifiers: Support Vector Machines (SVM), Random Forests (RF), and Nearest Neighbors (NN). Results show that the MFS presents good classification performance regardless of the classifier employed. The libsvm implementation [18] was used for the SVM classifier (with RBF kernel). In the case of the RF (100 trees) and the NN (1 neighbor) classifiers, the scikit-learn python library was employed.

In Table 1, the classification performance of the method is tested using different numbers of FDs. When 20 FDs are used, an useful combination of performance and low-dimensionality is achieved, so this number of FDs is used in the following calculations. The goal of this work is to show the impact of the features, rather than that of the classifier. The Nearest Neighbor results are considered the most relevant among the three classifiers, since it presents the simplest classification rules.

In Table 2, several combinations of different MFS obtained from the images, and their classification performance are shown. The MFS used in the study were the density of the intensity (MFS in the table), the Laplacian of the intensity (L), and the gradient of the intensity (G). In addition, another test is made, using the CIELab color space. The key advantage of this color space is that it tends to reduce the dependency of the resulting image color on the dispositive used in the capture. The intensity of the images is transformed to the CIELab space, and the MFS of the three separated channels (L , a , and b) are combined together, obtaining a vector of 60 FDs. This combination showed the best classification performance. It means that adding color information in the a and b channels is useful for better classification of different types of bread crumbs, when different capturing dispositives are used (in this case, a scanner and a digital camera).

In Table 3, state-of-the-art features (Haralick, Local Binary Pattern and SIFT features) are computed for the images. The best classification performance is obtained using the SIFT features, but a 128 feature length vector is obtained per image, and, in addition, computational

Figure 1: Digitalized images of *baguette* bread type and an image of the CalTech101 dataset

Table 1: classification results with different number of FDs for the MFS

#FDs	10	20	30
SVM	96%	94.5%	95.5%
RF	91.5%	93.5%	93%
NN	88.5%	90.5%	90%

Table 2: classification results using different combinations of the MFS

Method	MFS	MFS+L	MFS+G	CIElab
SVM	94.5%	95.5%	97.5%	97.5%
RF	93.5%	96%	95%	96%
NN	90.5%	90%	87%	92%
#FDs	20	40	40	60

space and time is needed to build internal structures (e.g. a *codebook*). The classification performance of the MFS for the bread crumb database is the highest among the algorithms studied. The MFS captures robust and useful information for classification in low dimensional features. These results also agree with results obtained in [19] for the classification of other food products.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The use of multifractal features in bread crumb texture classification showed excellent performance. The MFS demonstrated to be accurate enough to perform a classification of different bread types and also to discriminate non bread from bread images. The classification performance of the MFS for the bread crumb database outperforms other state-of-the-art techniques employed in the computer vision literature. The information present in the MFS of the *L*, *a* and *b* channels of the CIElab space

Table 3: classification results for different features

Method	Haralick	Lbp	SIFT
SVM	94%	78.5%	96.5%
RF	91%	71.5%	92%
NN	79%	70%	86%

color obtained the best classification performance in all the developed tests. This result appears as a consequence of the different capturing dispositives used in this work.

The results found can be applied to validate synthetic samples, *i.e.*, the latter should have similar features to the bread type that is trying to simulate. These results can be extended to be used as quality parameters for these products.

References

- [1] J. Andjelkovic, N. Zivic, B. Reljin, V. Celebic, and I. Salom, "Classifications of digital medical images with multifractal analysis," in *Proceedings of the 8th conference on Signal, Speech and image processing*, ser. SSIP'08. Stevens Point, Wisconsin, USA: World Scientific and Engineering Academy and Society (WSEAS), 2008, pp. 88–92.
- [2] L. Yu and D. Qi, "Holder exponent and multifractal spectrum analysis in the pathological changes recognition of medical ct image," in *Control and Decision Conference (CCDC), 2011 Chinese*, may 2011, pp. 2040–2045.
- [3] H. Wendt, P. Abry, S. Jaffard, H. Ji, and Z. Shen, "Wavelet leader multifractal analysis for texture classification," in *16th IEEE International Conference Image Processing (ICIP)*, nov. 2009, pp. 3829–3832.
- [4] F. Mendoza, P. Verboven, Q. T. Ho, G. Kerckhofs, M. Wevers, and B. Nicolai, "Multifractal properties of pore-size distribution in apple tissue using x-ray imaging," *Journal of Food Engineering*, Feb. 2010.
- [5] S. Serrano, F. Perán, F. J. Jiménez-Hornero, and E. Gutiérrez de Ravé.
- [6] R. Quevedo, L.-G. Carlos, J. M. Aguilera, and L. Cadoche, "Description of food surfaces and microstructural changes using fractal image texture analysis," *Journal of Food Engineering*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 361–371, 2002.
- [7] H. O. Peitgen, H. Jürgens, and D. Saupe, "Chaos and fractals: new frontiers of science," 2004.

- [8] U. Gonzales-Barron and F. Butler, "Fractal texture analysis of bread crumb digital images," *European Food Research and Technology*, vol. 226, pp. 721–729, 2008, 10.1007/s00217-007-0582-3.
- [9] Y. Fan and H. Zhang, "Application of gabor filter and multi-class svm in baking bread quality classification," in *Mechatronics and Automation, Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE International Conference on*, june 2006, pp. 1498–1502.
- [10] Y. Xu, H. Ji, and C. Fermuller, "A projective invariant for textures," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, vol. 2, pp. 1932–1939.
- [11] B. B. Mandelbrot, *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. New York: W. H. Freedman and Co., 1983.
- [12] B. B. Mandelbrot, "Multifractal measures, especially for the geophysicist," *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, vol. 131, pp. 5–42, Mar. 1989.
- [13] S. A. and D. C., "Multifractal analysis of medical images." ser. Actas de la trigésimo novena Jornada Argentina de Informática e Investigación Operativa (JAIIO), 2010, pp. 1575 – 1581.
- [14] K. J. Falconer, *Techniques in Fractal Geometry*. John Wiley, 1997.
- [15] L. Fei-Fei, R. Fergus, and P. Perona, "Learning generative visual models from few training examples an incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories," in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Generative-Model Based Vision*, Washington, DC, June 2004.
- [16] J. M. White and G. D. Rohrer, "Image thresholding for optical character recognition and other applications requiring character image extraction," *IBM J. Res. Dev.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 400–411, Jul. 1983.
- [17] L.-K. Huang and M.-J. J. Wang, "Image thresholding by minimizing the measures of fuzziness," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 41 – 51, 1995.
- [18] C.-C. Chang and C.-J. Lin, "LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines," *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, vol. 2, pp. 27:1–27:27, 2011.
- [19] M. Bosch, F. Zhu, N. Khanna, J. Boushey Carol, and E. J. Delp, "Food texture descriptors based on fractal and local gradient information," in *European Signal Processing Conference*, ser. EUSIPCO 2011, 2011.