

Image Denoising and Deblurring

Applied Math 515 Final Project

Samuel Rudy, Kelsey Maass, Riley Molloy, and Kevin Mueller

March 12 2016

Contents

- 1 Motivation
- 2 De(noise/blur)ing Objective Functions
- 3 Optimization with L1 Wavelet Regularization
- 4 Optimization with Total Variation Regularization
- 5 Discussion

Image Denoising and Deblurring



Mathematical Formulation

$$Ax + w = b$$

True image

Observed image

Blur operator

Noise

- Blur: Ax is a discrete convolution of the true image with a Gaussian kernel (reflexive boundary conditions).
- Noise: w is noise drawn from a Gaussian or Student's t distribution.

Naive Solution: $x = A^{-1}b$



True image



Blurred image



Recovered image

Naive Solution: $x = A^{-1}(b - w)$



True image



Blurred and noisy image



Recovered image

Since the blur operator is ill-conditioned, a better approach is to minimize a regularized loss function.

General Objective Function

$$L_b(x) = \underbrace{f(Ax - b)}_{\text{Fidelity term}} + \underbrace{\lambda R(x)}_{\text{Regularization}}$$

Fidelity Terms

$$f = \begin{cases} \|\cdot\|_F^2 \\ h_\gamma(\cdot) \\ \gamma^{-1} \log(\cosh(\gamma \cdot)) \end{cases}$$



Regularization Terms

$$R = \begin{cases} \|Wx\|_1 \\ TV(x) \end{cases}$$

Fidelity Term Penalty Functions

The fidelity term $f(Ax - b)$ measures how well our results comply with the linear blurring model. Depending upon the type of noise present in the observed image, the choice of penalty function may influence the efficacy of our deblurring/denoising procedure.


Gaussian Noise



Due to the lack of outliers, the quadratic penalty is sufficient

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2} \|z\|^2$$

Student's t Noise




Huber penalty preferred since it is more robust to heavy-tailed noise

$$f(z) = \min_y \frac{1}{2} \|z - y\|^2 + \gamma \|y\|_1$$

L1 Wavelet Regularization

$$R(x) = \|Wx\|_1$$




Haar Transform (2 Levels)

Images are often sparse in wavelet domains, so the L1 wavelet regularizer can be used to encourage this property in our recovered image.

For our examples, we let W be the orthogonal 2D Haar or Daubechies wavelet transform using 5 levels.

Total Variation Regularization

$$R(x) = TV(x)$$



words words words words words
words

$$|x_{ij} - x_{i+1,j}| + |x_{ij} - x_{i,j+1}|$$

L1 Wavelet Regularization

Objective Function


$$L_b(x) = f(Ax - b) + \lambda \|Wx\|_1$$

Proximal Gradient Step

$$x^{k+1} = \text{prox}_{\alpha^{-1}\lambda\|W\cdot\|_1} \left(x^k - \alpha^{-1} A^T \nabla f(Ax^k - b) \right)$$

Results: Gaussian Noise (Haar)

Original Image



Frobenius Loss



Blurred and Noisy




Huber Loss



Results: Gaussian Noise (Daubechies)

Original Image



Frobenius Loss



Blurred and Noisy




Huber Loss



Results: Student's t Noise (Haar)

Original Image



Frobenius Loss



Blurred and Noisy




Huber Loss



Results: Student's t Noise (Daubechies)

Original Image



Frobenius Loss



Blurred and Noisy



Huber Loss



Choosing λ

Haar



Daubechies

 $\lambda = 10^{-4}$ $\lambda = 10^{-3}$ $\lambda = 10^{-2}$

Total Variation Regularization

Objective Function

$$L_b(x) = f(Ax - b) + \lambda \text{TV}(x) + \delta(x|[0, 1])$$

Proximal Gradient Step

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= \text{prox}_{\alpha^{-1}(\lambda \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}} + \delta_{[0,1]})} \left(\underbrace{x^k - \alpha^{-1} A^T \nabla f(Ax^k - b)}_u \right) \\ &= \arg \min_z \left(\|u^k - z\|_F^2 + \alpha^{-1} \lambda \|z\|_{\text{TV}} + \delta(z|[0, 1]) \right) \\ &= P_{[0,1]} \left(\arg \min_z \left(\|u^k - z\|_F^2 + \alpha^{-1} \lambda \|z\|_{\text{TV}} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Dual Form of Total Variation

A Few Definitions

- $\mathcal{P} = \{(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-1)} : |p_{i,j}| \leq 1, |q_{i,j}| \leq 1\}$,
- $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}(p, q)_{i,j} = p_{i,j} + q_{i,j} - p_{i-1,j} - q_{i,j-1}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$p_{0,j} = p_{m,j} = q_{i,0} = q_{i,n} = 0.$$

- P_C is the usual projection operator onto the set C

Total Variation

$$\text{TV}(x) = \max_{p,q \in \mathcal{P}} T(x, p, q) \implies T(x, p, q) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{L}(p, q)^T x).$$

Dual Form of TV Denoising with $\|\cdot\|_F^2$

The problem:

$$\min_{x \in C} \|x - b\|_F^2 + 2\lambda \text{TV}(x), C = [0, 1]$$

Dual problem:

$$\min_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{P}} \underbrace{-\|H_C(b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q))\|_F^2}_{h(p,q)} + \underbrace{\|b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q)\|_F^2}_{}$$

$$H_C(x) = \underbrace{x - P_C(x)}_{\text{prox}}$$

Optimality conditions:

$$x = P_C(b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q)).$$

Optimization of Dual Form

Problem Statement

$$\min_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \|b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q)\|_F^2 - \|(I - P_{[0,1]})(b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q))\|_F^2 \right\}$$

$$\min_{(p,q)} \left\{ \underbrace{\|b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q)\|_F^2 - \|(I - P_{[0,1]})(b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q))\|_F^2}_{=h(p,q)} + \delta((p, q) | \mathcal{P}) \right\}$$

$$\nabla h(p, q) = -2\lambda \mathcal{L}^T P_{[0,1]}(b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q))$$

Lipschitz with constant $\leq 16\lambda^2$

\Rightarrow Use projected gradient

Optimization in Dual Form

Projection onto \mathcal{P}

Recall $\mathcal{P} = (p, q) \in [-1, 1]^{m-1 \times n} \times [-1, 1]^{m \times n-1}$

$$P_{\mathcal{P}}(p, q) = (r, s) \text{ with } \begin{cases} r_{ij} = \operatorname{sgn}(p_{ij}) \min\{1, |p_{ij}|\} \\ s_{ij} = \operatorname{sgn}(q_{ij}) \min\{1, |q_{ij}|\} \end{cases}$$

Projected Gradient Step

$$(p^{k+1}, q^{k+1}) = P_{\mathcal{P}} \left((p^k, q^k) + \frac{1}{8\lambda} \mathcal{L}^T P_{[0,1]} (b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p, q)) \right)$$

Monotone FISTA TV Regularization

MFISTA(b, f, λ)

$$y^1 = x^0 = b; t^1 = 1$$

$$\alpha \geq \text{Lip}(\nabla f)$$

for $k = 1 : N$ **do**

$$u^k = y^k - \frac{A^T \nabla f(Ay^k - b)}{\alpha}$$

$$z^k = FGP(u^k, \frac{\lambda}{2\alpha})$$

$$x^k = \underset{x \in \{x^{k-1}, z^k\}}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_b(x)$$

$$t^{k+1} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t^k}}{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} y^{k+1} = & x^k + \frac{t^k}{t^{k+1}}(z^k - x^k) \\ & + \frac{t^{k-1}}{t^{k+1}}(z^k - x^k) \end{aligned}$$

end for

return x^N

FGP(b, λ)

$$(r_{ij}^1, s_{ij}^1) = (p_{ij}^0, q_{ij}^0) = 0; t^1 = 1$$

for $k = 1 : N$ **do**

$$(p^k, q^k) = P_{\mathcal{P}} \left((r^k, s^k) - \frac{\mathcal{L}^T P_{[0,1]}(b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(r^k, s^k))}{8\lambda} \right)$$

$$t^{k+1} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t^k}}{2}$$


$$(r^k, s^k) = (p^k, q^k) + \frac{t^k - 1}{t^{k+1}}(p^k - p^{k-1}, q^k - q^{k-1})$$

end for


return $P_{[0,1]}(b - \lambda \mathcal{L}(p^N, q^N))$

Results: Gaussian Noise

Frobenius Loss



Original Image



Blurred and Noisy




Huber Loss

Results: Student's t Noise

Frobenius Loss Original Image



Blurred and Noisy Huber Loss



Conclusions

Wavelet vs. Total Variation

- Total variation seems to do better for high amounts of noise.
- **How do they compare on timing???? Any advantages of Wavelet???**

Frobenius vs Huber

- On Gaussian noise, the two are comparable.
- Huber outperforms Frobenius on noise with heavier tail.

Challenges

- Ideal parameter values change image to image.
- How can we quantitatively evaluate performance?
- How can we optimize parameters without performance metric?

Questions?

-  J. G. Nagy, P. C. Hansen, and D. P. O'Leary. *Deblurring Images: Matrices, Spectra, and Filtering*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2006.
-  A. Beck and M. Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problem. *SIAM Journal of Imaging Sciences*, 2(1):183-202, 2009.
-  A. Beck and M. Teboulle. Fast gradient-based algorithms for constrained total variation image denoising and deblurring problems. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 18(11):2419-2434, 2009.