

УДК 621.391

V.G. Labunets¹, D.E. Komarov¹, I.Artemov¹, E. Ostheimer²

¹Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

²Capricat LLC, Pompano Beach, Florida, USA

MANY FACTOR MIMO-FILTERS



Introduction

We develop a conceptual framework and design methodologies for multichannel image many factor (bilateral, 3-, and 4-lateral) aggregation filters with assessment capability. The term “multichannel” (multicomponent, multispectral, hyperspectral) image is used for an image with more than one component. They are composed of a series of images in different optical bands at wavelengths $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$, called spectral channels: $\mathbf{f}(x, y) = (f_{\lambda_1}(x, y), f_{\lambda_2}(x, y), \dots, f_{\lambda_k}(x, y)) = (f_1(x, y), f_2(x, y), \dots, f_k(x, y))$ where K is the number of different optical channels, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^K$, where \mathbf{R}^K is multicolor space. The bold font for \mathbf{f} emphasizes the fact that images may be multichannel. Each pixel in $\mathbf{f}(x, y)$, therefore, represents the spectrum at the wavelengths $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$ of the observed scene at point $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$.

Let us introduce the observation model and notions used throughout the paper. We consider noised image in the form $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$ is the original grey-level image and $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the noise introduced into $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$ to produce the corrupted image $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$. The aim of image enhancement is to reduce the noise as much as possible or to find a method which, given $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$, derives an image $\hat{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x})$ as close as possible to the original $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x})$, subjected to a suitable optimality criterion.

The standard bilateral filter (BF) (Astola et al., 1990; Tang et al, 1996; Tomasi, Manduchi, 1998; Barash, 2001, 2002; Durand, Dorsey, 2002; Elad, 2002a; Elad, 2002b; Fleishman et al., 2003) with a square N -cellular window $M(\mathbf{x})$ is located at \mathbf{x} , the weighted average of pixels in the moving window replaces the central pixel

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{BilMean} \left[w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}) \right] = \frac{1}{k(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}), \quad (31)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the filtered image and $k(\mathbf{p})$ is the normalization factor

$$k(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}). \quad (32)$$

Equation (1) is simply a normalized weighted average of a neighborhood of a N -cellular window $M(\mathbf{x})$ (*i.e.*, the mask around pixel \mathbf{x} , consisting of N pixels). The scalar-valued weights $w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ are computed based on the content of the neighborhood. For pixels $\{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}$

around the centroid $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, the weights $\{w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})\}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}$ are computed by multiplying the following two factors:

$$w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = w_{Sp}(\mathbf{p}) \cdot w_{Rn}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = w_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|) \cdot w_{Rn}(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2).$$

The weight includes two factors – spatial $w_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|)$ and radiometric weights $w_{Rn}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = w_{Rn}(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2)$. The first weight measures the geometric distance $\|\mathbf{p}\|$ between the center pixel $f(\mathbf{x})$ and the pixel $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})$ (note, the centroid \mathbf{x} has the position $\mathbf{0} \in M(\mathbf{x})$ inside of the mask $M(\mathbf{x})$). Here the Euclidean metric $\|\mathbf{p}\| = \|\mathbf{p}\|_2$ is applied. This way, close-by pixels influence the final result more than distant ones. The second weight measures the radiometric distance between the values of the center sample $f(\mathbf{x})$ and the pixel $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})$, and again, the Euclidean metric $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2$ is chosen, too. Therefore, pixels with close-by values tend to influence the final result more than those having distant value.

This paper considers two natural extensions to the bilateral filter. Firstly, instead of the center pixel $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ in $w_{Rn}(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|)$, we use a certain mean or median $\bar{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})$ (for example, the *Fréchet median* $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$ [11,12]) of a neighborhood of a N -cellular window $M(\mathbf{x})$ for calculating of weighs $w_{Rn}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = w_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2)$. Secondly, instead of a scale-valued weighs, we use a matrix--valued ones

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{BilMean}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}[\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})], \quad (33)$$

where $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ are the matrix--valued weighs.

The first modification of bilateral filters

In this modification we use the *Fréchet median* $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$ for calculating of weighs $w_{Rn}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ instead of the center pixel $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ in w_{Rn} : $w_{Rn}(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|) \rightarrow w_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|)$.

Let $\langle \mathbf{R}^K, \rho \rangle$ be a metric spaces, where ρ is a distance function (i.e., $\rho: \mathbf{R}^K \times \mathbf{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$). Let w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N be N weights summing to 1 and let $\{\mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N\} = \mathbf{D} \subset \mathbf{R}^K$ be N pixels in the N -cellular window $M(\mathbf{x})$

Definition 1 (Fréchet, 1948; Ostheimer et al., 2015). The *optimal Fréchet point* associated with the metric ρ , is the point, $\mathbf{f}_{opt} \in \mathbf{R}^K$, that minimizes the Fréchet cost function (FCF)

$\sum_{i=1}^N w_i \rho(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{f}^i)$ (the weighted sum distances from an arbitrary point $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ to each point $\mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N \in \mathbf{R}^K$). It is formally defined as:

$$\mathbf{f}_{opt} = \mathbf{FrechMed}(\rho | \mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N) = \mathbf{argmin}_{\bar{\mathbf{f}} \in \mathbf{R}^K} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \rho(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{f}^i). \quad (34)$$

Note that **argmin** means the argument, for which the sum is minimized. This generalizes the ordinary median, which has the property of minimizing the sum of distances for one-dimensional data, and provides a central tendency higher dimensions.

In computation point of view, it is better to restrict the search domain from \mathbf{R}^K until the set $\mathbf{D} = \{\mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N\} \subset \mathbf{R}^K$. In this case, we obtain definition of the *suboptimal Fréchet point* or the *optimal vector Fréchet median*.

Definition 2 [10,11]. The *suboptimal weighted Fréchet point* or *optimal Fréchet median* associated with the metric ρ is the point, $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt} \in \{\mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N\} \subset \mathbf{R}^K$, that minimizes the FCF over the the restrict search domain $\mathbf{D} \subset \mathbf{R}^K$:

$$\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt} = \mathbf{FrechMed}(\rho | \mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N) = \mathbf{argmin}_{\bar{\mathbf{f}} \in \mathbf{D}} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \rho(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{f}^i). \quad (35)$$

Example 1. If observation data are real numbers, *i.e.*, $f^1, f^2, \dots, f^N \in \mathbf{R}$ and distance function is the city distance $\rho(f, g) = \rho_1(f, g) = |f - g|$, then the optimal Fréchet point (4) and optimal Fréchet medians (5) for grey-level pixels $f^1, f^2, \dots, f^N \in \mathbf{R}$ to be the classical *Fréchet point* and *median*, respectively, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbf{f}_{opt} = \mathbf{FrechPt}(\rho_1 | f^1, f^2, \dots, f^N) = \mathbf{argmin}_{f \in \mathbf{R}} \sum_{i=1}^N |f - f^i|, \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt} &= \mathbf{FrechMed}(\rho_1 | f^1, f^2, \dots, f^N) = \mathbf{argmin}_{f \in \mathbf{D}} \sum_{i=1}^N |f - f^i| = \\ &= \mathbf{Med}(f^1, f^2, \dots, f^N). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Example 2. If observation data are vectors, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N \in \mathbf{R}^K$, and distance function is the city distance $\rho(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \rho_1(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$, then the optimal Fréchet point (4) and optimal Fréchet medians (5) for vectors $\mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N \in \mathbf{R}^K$ to be the *Fréchet point* and *the Fréchet vector median*, associated with the same metric $\rho_1(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$,

$$\mathbf{f}_{opt} = \mathbf{FrechPt}(\rho_1 | \mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N) = \mathbf{argmin}_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{R}^K} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}^i\|_1 \right), \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt} &= \mathbf{FrechMed}(\rho_1 | \mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N) = \mathbf{argmin}_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{D}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}^i\|_1 \right) = \\ &= \mathbf{VecMed}(\rho_1 | \mathbf{f}^1, \mathbf{f}^2, \dots, \mathbf{f}^N). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Now we use Fréchet median $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}$ for calculating radiometric weights: $w_{Rn}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = w_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2)$. The modified bilateral filter is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{BilMean}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} [w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})] = \\ &= \frac{1}{k(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} w_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|) \cdot w_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the filtered image.

4-Factor MIMO-filters

In the case of the multichannel images, processed data are vector-valued $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}): \mathbf{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^K: \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_K(\mathbf{x})) = [f_c(\mathbf{x})]_{c=1}^K$. By this reason, we must use matrix-valued weights $\{\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})\}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}$, where $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ is a $(K \times K)$ -matrix, and K is the number of different channels in $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}): \mathbf{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^K$. The 4-factor MIMO-filter suggests a weighted average of pixels in the given image

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{MIMO}^4 \mathbf{FactMean}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} [\bar{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})] = \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbf{diag}\{k_1(\mathbf{x}), k_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, k_K(\mathbf{x})\}} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

or in component-wise form

$$\hat{s}_a(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{k_a(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{b=1}^K w^{ab}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot f_b(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{b=1}^K \bar{w}^{ab}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot f_b(\mathbf{p}), \quad (42)$$

where $\hat{s}(\mathbf{x})$ is the filtered multichannel image, $\hat{s}_a(\mathbf{x})$ is its a th channel, $\bar{w}^{ab} = w^{ab} / k_a$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \text{diag}\{k_1^{-1}(\mathbf{x}), k_2^{-1}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, k_K^{-1}(\mathbf{x})\} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ $k_a(\mathbf{p})$ is the normalization factor in the a th channel:

$$k_a(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{b=1}^K w^{ab}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \quad (43)$$

and $\text{diag}\{k_1(\mathbf{x}), k_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, k_K(\mathbf{x})\}$ is diagonal matrix with channel normalization factors. Note, that

$$\frac{1}{\text{diag}\{k_1(\mathbf{x}), k_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, k_K(\mathbf{x})\}} \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}) = \bar{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}) =$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} k_1^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) & \vdots & & & \\ & k_2^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) & \vdots & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ & & & & k_K^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w^{11}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) & w^{12}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) & \dots & w^{1K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \\ w^{21}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) & w^{22}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) & \dots & w^{2K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ w^{K1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) & w^{K2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) & \dots & w^{KK}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_1(\mathbf{p}) \\ f_2(\mathbf{p}) \\ \vdots \\ f_K(\mathbf{p}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The normalized matrix-valued weights $\bar{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ are computed based on the content of the neighborhood. For pixels $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})$ around the Fréchet centroid $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$, the scalar-valued weights $\bar{w}^{cd}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ of the matrices $\bar{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})$ are computed by multiplying the following four factors:

$$\bar{w}^{cd}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) =$$

$$= \bar{w}_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|) \cdot \bar{w}_{Ch}(|c-d|) \cdot \bar{w}_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2) \cdot \bar{w}_{Rn}(|\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x}) - f_d(\mathbf{p})|).$$

The weight includes four factors: spatial $\bar{w}_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|)$, inter-channels $\bar{w}_{Ch}(|c-d|)$, global radiometric $\bar{w}_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2)$, and radiometric inter-channels weights $\bar{w}_{Rn}(|\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x}) - f_d(\mathbf{p})|)$. The first factor $\bar{w}_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|)$ measures the geometric distance between the center pixel $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$ and the neighborhood pixel $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})$. The second factor $\bar{w}_{Ch}(|c-d|)$ measures the spectral (inter-channel) distance. The third factor $\bar{w}_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2)$ measures the global radiometric distance between the values of the Fréchet center $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$ and the pixels $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})$. The fourth factor $\bar{w}_{Rn}(|\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x}) - f_d(\mathbf{p})|)$ measures the radiometric distance between the values of the center sample $\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x})$ of the c -channel and the pixel $f_d(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})$ of the d -channel.

All weights $\bar{w}_{Rn}^{cd}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \bar{w}_{Rn}(|\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x}) - f_d(\mathbf{p})|)$ form N radiometric inter-channel $(K \times K)$ -matrices

$$\{\bar{\mathbf{W}}_{Rn}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})\}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} = \left\{ \left[\bar{w}_{Rn}^{cd}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \right]_{c,d=1}^K \right\}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})} = \left\{ \left[\bar{w}_{Rn}(|\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x}) - f_d(\mathbf{p})|) \right]_{c,d=1}^K \right\}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}.$$

if N -cellular window is used.

If is used three ingredient, for example,

$$\bar{w}^{cd}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \bar{w}_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|) \cdot \bar{w}_{Rn}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{opt}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\|_2) \cdot \bar{w}_{Rn}(|\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x}) - f_d(\mathbf{p})|)$$

or

$$\bar{w}^{cd}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \bar{w}_{Sp}(\|\mathbf{p}\|) \cdot \bar{w}_{Ch}(|c-d|) \cdot \bar{w}_{Rn}(|\bar{f}_{c,opt}(\mathbf{x}) - f_d(\mathbf{p})|)$$

then we obtain 3-factor MIMO-filters.

Simulation Experiments

Some variants of the proposed filters are tested. They are compared on real image “LENA”. Noise is added Fig. 1) with different the Peak Signal to Noise Ratios (PSNRs). The noised images has 1% noised pixels (PSNR = 25.36 dB), 5% noised pixels (PSNR = 18.34

dB), 10% noised pixels (PSNR = 15.41 dB), 20% noised pixels (PSNR = 12.64 dB), 50% noised pixels (PSNR = 9.22 dB).







Fig. 1. Original (a) and noised (b) images; noise: Salt-Pepper; denoised images (c)-(f).




a) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 1% noised pixels




b) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 5% noised pixels



c) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 10% noised pixels




d) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 20% noised pixels




e) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 50% noised pixels


Fig. 2. The results for “Salt and Pepper” noise and bilateral filters with Laplacian weights for $\alpha = 0.035$.




a) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 1% noised pixels




b) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 5% noised pixels



c) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 10% noised pixels




d) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 20% noised pixels




e) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 50% noised pixels


Fig. 3. The results for “Salt and Pepper” noise and bilateral filters with Laplacian weights for $\alpha = 0.07$.




a) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 1% noised pixels




b) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 5% noised pixels



c) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 10% noised pixels



d) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 20% noised pixels



e) Filtration of “Salt and Pepper” noise with 50% noised pixels

Fig. 4. The results for “Salt and Pepper” noise and bilateral filters with Laplacian weights for $\alpha = 0.1$.

Fig. 2-4 summarize the results for “Salt and Pepper” noise and bilateral filters with Laplacian weights $w(f, g) = \exp(-\alpha|f - g|)$ for different $\alpha = 0.035$ (Fig. 2), $\alpha = 0.07$ (Fig. 3), $\alpha = 0.1$ (Fig. 4). Fig. 2-4 show the results obtained by the following bilateral filters with (3 -mask

- the classical bilateral filter (1) (**BF3x3**),
- modified bilateral filter (10) (**BF3x3Med**), where $\bar{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is calculating as classical median in each channel,
- modified bilateral filter (10) (**BF3x3Fr1**), where $\bar{f}(\mathbf{x})$ are calculating as Fréchet median $\bar{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{f}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$ with distance $\rho(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \rho_1(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$,
- modified bilateral filter (10) (**BF3x3Fr2**), where $\bar{f}(\mathbf{x})$ are calculating as Fréchet median $\bar{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{f}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$ with distance $\rho(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \rho_2(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$,
- modified bilateral filter (10) (**BF3x3Fr ∞**), where $\bar{f}(\mathbf{x})$ are calculating as Fréchet median $\bar{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{f}_{opt}(\mathbf{x})$ with distance $\rho(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \rho_\infty(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$.

It is easy to see that results for all modified bilateral filters are better, compared to the classical bilateral filter **BF3x3**.

Conclusion and future work

A new class of nonlinear generalized 2-, 3-, and 4-factor MIMO-filters for multichannel image processing is introduced in this paper. Weights in 4-factor MIMO-filters include four components: spatial, radiometric, interchannel and interchannel radiometric weights. The fourth weight measures the radiometric distance (for grey-level images) between the interchannel values of the center scalar-valued channel pixel and local neighborhood channel pixels. Here, the 1D Euclidean metric is used, too. We are going to use in (10) and (11) a generalized average (aggregation) (Kolmogorov, 1930; Mayor, Trillas, 1986; Ovchinnikov, 1998) instead of ordinary mean.

The aggregation problem (Kolmogorov, 1930; Mayor, Trillas, 1986; Ovchinnikov, 1998) consist in aggregating n -tuples of objects all belonging to a given set S , into a single object of the same set S , i.e., $\mathbf{Agg}: S^n \rightarrow S$. In the case of mathematical aggregation operator the set S is an interval of the real $S = [0, 1] \subset \mathbf{R}$ or integer numbers $S = [0, 255] \subset \mathbf{Z}$. In this setting, an AO is simply a function, which assigns a number y to any N -tuple (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) of numbers: $y = \mathbf{Aggreg}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ that satisfies:

- $\mathbf{Agg}(x) = x$,
- $\mathbf{Agg}(\underbrace{a, a, \dots, a}_N) = a$. In particular, $\mathbf{Agg}(0, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$ and $\mathbf{Agg}(1, 1, \dots, 1) = 1$, or
- $\mathbf{Agg}(255, 255, \dots, 255) = 255$.
- $\min(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \leq \mathbf{Agg}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \leq \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$.

Here $\min(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ and $\max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ are respectively the *minimum* and the *maximum* values among the elements of (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) .

All other properties may come in addition to this fundamental group. For example, if for every permutation $\forall \sigma \in \mathbf{S}_N$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ the AO satisfies:

$$\mathbf{Agg}(x_{\sigma(1)}, x_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(N)}) = \mathbf{Agg}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N),$$

then it is invariant (symmetric) with respect to the permutations of the elements of (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) . In other words, as far as means are concerned, the *order* of the elements of (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) is - and must be - completely irrelevant.

We list below a few particular cases of means:

- 5) Arithmetic mean ($K(x) = x$): $\mathbf{Mean}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$.

6) Geometric mean ($K(x) = \log(x)$): $\mathbf{Geo}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ln x_i\right)$.

7) Harmonic mean ($K(x) = x^{-1}$): $\mathbf{Harm}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{x_i}\right)^{-1}$.

8) A very notable particular case corresponds to the function $K(x) = x^p$. We obtain then a quasi arithmetic (power or Hölder) mean of the form: $\mathbf{Power}_p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

This family is particularly interesting, because it generalizes a group of common means, only by changing the value of p .

A very notable particular cases correspond to the logic functions (min; max; median): $y = \mathbf{Min}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$, $y = \mathbf{Max}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$, $y = \mathbf{Med}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$.

In a 2D standard linear and median scalar filters with a square N -cellular window $M(\mathbf{x})$ and located at \mathbf{x} the mean and median replace the central pixel

$$\hat{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{Mean}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}[f(\mathbf{p})], \quad \hat{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{Med}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}[f(\mathbf{p})], \quad (44)$$

where $\hat{s}(\mathbf{x})$ is the filtered grey-level image, $\{f(\mathbf{p})\}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}$ is an image block of the fixed size N extracted from f by moving N -cellular window $M(\mathbf{x})$ at the position \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{Mean} and \mathbf{Med} are the mean (average) and median operators. When filters (14) are modified as follows

$$\hat{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Agg}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}[f(\mathbf{p})], \quad (45)$$

we get the unique class of nonlinear *aggregation SISO-filters* proposed in the papers (Labunets, 2014; Labunets et al., 2014a,b,c), where $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{Agg}$ is an aggregation operator on the mask $M(\mathbf{x})$.

For MIMO-filters we have to introduce a vector-valued aggregation. Note, that for ordinary vector-matrix product $\mathbf{g} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{f}$ we have in component-wise form

$$g_c = \bar{w}_{c1}f_1 + \bar{w}_{c2}f_2 + \dots + \bar{w}_{cK}f_K = \sum_{d=1}^K \bar{w}_{cd}f_d. \quad (46)$$

Let us introduce vector-matrix aggregation product $\mathbf{g} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathbf{Agg}} \square \mathbf{f}$ in component-wise form by the following way

$$g_c = \mathbf{Agg}\{\bar{w}_{c1}f_1, \bar{w}_{c2}f_2, \dots, \bar{w}_{cK}f_K\} = \mathbf{Agg}_{d=1}^K\{\bar{w}_{cd}f_d\}, \quad (47)$$

where \mathbf{Agg} is an aggregation operator. Obviously, we can use different aggregation operators in different channels

$$g_c = {}^c \mathbf{Agg}\{\bar{w}_{c1}f_1, \bar{w}_{c2}f_2, \dots, \bar{w}_{cK}f_K\} = {}^c \mathbf{Agg}_{d=1}^K\{\bar{w}_{cd}f_d\}, \quad (48)$$

for $c = 1, 2, \dots, K$, where $\mathbf{Agg} = \{{}^1 \mathbf{Agg}, {}^2 \mathbf{Agg}, \dots, {}^K \mathbf{Agg}\}$ is the a K -element set of aggregation operators. In this case we write $\mathbf{g} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathbf{Agg}} \square \mathbf{f}$

When 4factor MIMO-filter (11) is modified as follows

$$\hat{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{MIMO}^4 \mathbf{Fact}^M \mathbf{Agg}\left[\bar{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathbf{Agg}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \square \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})\right], \quad (49)$$

or in component-wise form

$$\hat{s}_c(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Agg}_{\mathbf{p} \in M(\mathbf{x})}\left\{{}^c \mathbf{Agg}_{d=1}^K\{\bar{w}^{cd}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot f_d(\mathbf{p})\}\right\} \quad (50)$$

we get the unique class of nonlinear *aggregation MIMO-filters* that we a going to research in future works. They are based on $K+1$ of aggregation operators $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{Agg}$ (aggregation on the mask $M(\mathbf{x})$) and $\mathbf{Agg} = \{{}^1 \mathbf{Agg}, {}^2 \mathbf{Agg}, \dots, {}^K \mathbf{Agg}\}$ (inter-channel aggregation), which could be changed independently of one another. For each set of aggregation operators, we get the unique class of new nonlinear filters

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by grants the RFBR nos. 13-07-12168, RFBR and 13-07-00785.

References

- Astola J., Haavisto P., Neuvo Y.* Vector median filters // Proc. IEEE Trans. Image Processing. 1990. Vol. 78. P. 678–689.
- Barash D.* Bilateral Filtering and Anisotropic Diffusion: Towards a Unified View Point // Third International Conference on Scale- Space and Morphology. 2001. P. 273-280.
- Barash D.* A fundamental relationship between bilateral filtering, adaptive smoothing and the non-linear diffusion equation // IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence. 2002. Vol. 24. No. 6. P. 844-847.
- Durand F., Dorsey J.* Fast Bilateral Filtering for the Display of High-Dynamic-Range Images // Proceedings of ACM SIGGRAPH. 2002. P. 257-266.
- Elad M.* Analysis of the Bilateral Filter // The 36th Asilomar on Signals, Systems and Computers, Pacific Grove, CA., 2002a.
- Elad M.* On the Origin of the Bilateral Filter and Ways to Improve It // IEEE Trans. On Image Processing. 2002b. Vol. 11. No. 10. P. 1141—1151.
- Fleishman S., Drori I., Cohen D.* Bilateral Mesh Filtering // Proceedings of ACM SIGGRAPH, San Diego, TX. 2003. P. 950—953.
- Fréchet M.* Les elements aleatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distance // Ann. Inst. H. Poincare. 1948. Vol. 10. No. 3. P. 215–310.
- Kolmogorov A.* Sur la notion de la moyenne // Atti. Accad. Naz. Lincei. 1930. Vol. 12. P. 388—391.
- Labunets V.G.* Filters based on aggregation operators. Part 1. Aggregation Operators // Proc. of the 24th Int. Crimean Conference Microwave & Telecommunication Technology, Sevastopol, Crimea, Russia. 2014. Vol. 24. P. 1239—1240.
- Labunets V.G., Gainanov D.N., Ostheimer E.* Filters based on aggregation operators. Part 2. The Kolmogorov filters // Proc. of the 24th Int. Crimean Conference Microwave & Telecommunication Technology, Sevastopol, Crimea, Russia. 2014a. Vol. 24. P. 1241-1242.
- Labunets V.G., Gainanov D.N., Tarasov A.D., Ostheimer E.* Filters based on aggregation operators. Part 3. The Heron filters // Proc. of the 24th Int. Crimean Conference Microwave & Telecommunication Technology, Sevastopol, Crimea, Russia. 2014b. Vol. 24. P. 1243-1244.
- Labunets V.G., Gainanov D.N., Arslanova R.A., Ostheimer E.* Filters based on aggregation operators. Part 4. Generalized vector median filters // Proc. of the 24th Int. Crimean Conference Microwave & Telecommunication Technology, Sevastopol, Crimea, Russia. 2014c. Vol. 24. P. 1245—1246.
- Mayor G., Trillas E.* On the representation of some Aggregation functions // Proceeding of ISMVL. 1986. Vol. 20. P. 111–114.
- Ostheimer E., Labunets V., Komarov D., Fedorova T.* Frechet MIMO-Filters // This Proceedings, 2016.
- Ovchinnikov S.* On Robust Aggregation Procedures // Aggregation and Fusion of Imperfect Information (ed. Bernadette Bouchon-Meunier). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1998. P. 3–10.
- Tang K., Astola J., Neuvo Y.* Nonlinear multivariate image filtering techniques // IEEE Trans. Image Processing. 1996. Vol. 4. P. 788–798.
- Tomasi C., Manduchi R.* Bilateral filtering for gray and color images // Proc. 6th Int. Conf. Computer Vision, New Delhi, India. 1998. P. 839–846.

Рецензент статьи: кандидат технических наук, доцент Института экономики и управления Уральского государственного лесотехнического университета М.П. Воронов.