A new sparse representation framework for compressed sensing MRI
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Abstract

Compressed sensing based Magnetic Resonance imaging (MRI) via sparse representation (or transform) has recently attracted broad interest. The tight frame (TF)-based sparse representation is a promising approach in compressed sensing MRI. However, the conventional TF-based sparse representation is difficult to utilize the sparsity of the whole image. Since the whole image usually has different structure textures and a kind of tight frame can only represent a particular kind of ground object, how to reconstruct high-quality of magnetic resonance (MR) image is a challenge. In this work, we propose a new sparse representation framework, which fuses the double tight frame (DTF) into the mixed-norm regularization for MR image reconstruction from undersampled $k$-space data. In this framework, MR image is decomposed into smooth and nonsmooth regions. For the smooth regions, the wavelet TF-based weighted $L_{1}$-norm regularization is developed to reconstruct piecewise-smooth information of image. For nonsmooth regions, we introduce the curvelet TF-based robust $L_{1,\alpha}$-norm regularization with the parameter to preserve the edge structural details and texture. To estimate the reasonable parameter, an adaptive parameter selection scheme is designed in robust $L_{1,\alpha}$-norm regularization. Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed method can achieve the best image reconstruction results when compared with other existing methods in terms of quantitative metrics and visual effect.

© 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has been widely used in clinical diagnosis, since it enables superior visualization of anatomical structure with noninvasive and nonionizing radiation nature [1]. However, the speed of scanning samples in MRI is fundamentally limited by physical and physiological constraints [2]. The recent theory of Compressed Sensing (CS) has been widely utilized to reconstruct Magnetic Resonance (MR) image from a few of undersampled $k$-space data, if the image is sparse under a given sparse transform [3,4].

Mathematically, The $k$-space data acquisition model for MR image reconstruction can be modeled as follows:

$$y = \Phi x + e$$

where $y \in \mathbb{C}^{M}$ denotes the undersampled $k$-space data, $\Phi \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$ ($M < N$) is an undersampled Fourier encoding matrix, $x \in \mathbb{C}^{N}$ is the desired image and $e \in \mathbb{C}^{M}$ is the noise.

It is well known that the above problem (1) is an ill-posed inverse problem due to under-sampling. To make it well-posed, regularization techniques based on prior information are often explored, such as sparsity [2,5]. The sparsity-based image prior assumes that the image is sparse (or compressible) in sparse transform domain. Thus, the reconstruction process can be modeled by minimizing the regularization function that promotes the sparse solution. It is confirmed that a sparser representation usually leads to lower reconstruction error [6]. To this end, various sparse transforms have been designed, ranging from wavelets, framelets to adaptive transforms [7]. Recently, Tight Frame (TF) is exploited for sparse representation (SR) that leads to an efficient reconstruction result [8], including wavelets [7], shift-invariant wavelets [9], curvelet [10] etc.

In general, each kind of TF-based sparse transform only represents a particular kind of ground object or texture in the sparsity of the whole image, which is inflexible in practical application. For example, the wavelet transform has been well known for sparse representation in image processing community, such as image compression [11], image denoising [12], and image reconstruction [13]. However, the wavelet is usually suitable for dealing with the smooth regions, and are not suitable for discontinuity along a general curve with bounded curvature. MR images often contain curves and edges, wavelet transform may fail in...
reconstruction some of edge structural details and texture information [10]. In [10,14], curvelet transform is developed to offer a more optimal performance than wavelets when representing edges of ground objects. Although the data-driven tight frame is proposed and achieving better performance, it is complicated to implement and the high computational overhead [15,16].

Obviously, the existing approaches have limitation in practical application, since the structure of the whole image at different regions are diversification. To enhance the sparse representation, in this paper, a Double Tight Frame (DTF) is developed to construct the sparse representation framework, which is more likely to give a high quality of the reconstructed MR image. In reconstruction processing, MR image is decomposed into two meaningful regions, namely the smooth and the nonsmooth regions. The specific method is to make the sparse representation of wavelet TF in the smooth regions and the sparse representation of curvelet TF in nonsmooth regions, separately.

Once the sparsity is improved by the DTF, another important issue is how to regularize the sparsity in sparse transform domain. The $L_0$-norm is the most ideal regularization term. However, the $L_0$-norm minimization is non-convex and NP-hard problem. Although greedy algorithm aims at solving $L_0$-norm minimization, it often leads to a sub-optimal solution [17]. To tackle this problem, one of the commonly used regularization methods is Tikhonov regularization based on $L_2$-norm minimization [18]. A common criticism of such regularization method is known to over-smooth edges in the reconstructed result and sensitive to outliers such that it can introduce residual artifacts into reconstructed results [19,20]. In [21], authors used a smoothed $L_1$-norm regularization to overcome over-smooth edges in a certain sense. Another technique is to use the $L_1$-norm as a convex relaxation of the $L_0$-norm [22]. However, the $L_1$-norm regularization model ignores the structure information of the image [23]. It points out in [24] that the result of the $L_1$-norm minimization is not sparse enough and reconstructed result generally deviates from the solution we desired. In [25], a non-convex $L_p$-norm regularization is employed to reconstruct the MR image, which approximates the $L_0$-norm better than the $L_1$-norm. However, the $L_p$-norm (0 < p < 1) minimization problem is more difficult to solve than the $L_1$-norm minimization problem, since it is non-convex and non-smooth. In addition, Zheng et al. [26] pointed out that $p = 1$ outperforms the $p(0 < p < 1)$ value, when the measurement noise is very large or very small. To avoid the difficulty in solving non-convex problem, some weighted $L_1$-norm ($\|wL\|_1$) regularization are introduced to improve the reconstruction performance [27,28].

More recently, some mixed-norm regularization models have been proposed to overcome above defects [29–31]. In addition, other various techniques have been proposed to improve the reconstruction quality, such as smoothed $L_0$-norm regularization [32], StructAE [33], low rank matrix approximation [34], $L_2$-$L_1$ norm regularization [35] and TV-$L_1$ norm regularization [36]. Compared with all of the above methods, the mixed-norm regularization method often leads to more accurate reconstruction though at the cost of higher computational complexity. Therefore, a new mixed-norm regularization will be exploited in this paper.

### 1.1. Contribution

Based upon the above works, we propose a new method for MR image reconstruction, using the DTF-based sparse representation framework with mixed-norm regularization. The DTF-based sparse representation offers a powerful mechanism of combining wavelet sparsity with curvelet sparsity simultaneously. Unlike the previous sparse representation on the whole image, we assume that the image consists of smooth and nonsmooth regions. The wavelet TF and the curvelet TF are applied to the smooth and nonsmooth regions, separately. To improve the reconstruction quality, the mixed-norm regularization model is proposed. For the smooth regions, the weighted $L_1$-norm with the wavelet TF is employed to reconstruct the piecewise-smooth information of the image. The robust $L_1$-$\sigma$-norm with curvelet TF is used to preserve the edge structural details in the nonsmooth regions. The alternating iterative algorithm is then utilized to solve the proposed optimization problem. Furthermore, an adaptive strategy is introduced to obtain the reasonable parameter in each iteration. Extensive experiments on the MR data demonstrate that the proposed approach attains a significant performance improvement over the existing methods in terms of both quantitative metrics and visual quality.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce some basics of CS-based MRI (CS-MRI) and the DTF-based sparse representation that will be used in later sections. In Section 3, the mixed-norm regularization model and its associated algorithm are proposed for MR image reconstruction. Experiment results are shown in Section 4. The conclusion is conducted at the end of the section.

### 2. Preliminaries

#### 2.1. Conventional CS-MRI

Let $x$ be a $\sqrt{N} \times \sqrt{N}$ MR image in a vector form and it can be represented sparsely in the sparse transform $\Psi x \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times N}$. Under this transform, the sparse coefficient $\theta \in \mathbb{C}^l$. A typical CS-MRI problem is to reconstruct an unknown original MR image $x$ from the undersampled $k$-space data $y \in \mathbb{C}^M$ that is modeled as

$$\min_{x} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x\|^2_2 + \lambda g(\Psi x),$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization parameter and $g(\Psi x)$ is a regularization term.

As analysis above, one of the key problems for CS-MRI is the choice of sparsity regularization $g(\Psi x)$, which can make the underlying image has a perfectly sparse approximation. To improve the reconstruction quality, many works are dedicated to exploiting the sparsity regularization by the sparse prior. Particularly, the TF-based sparse prior is proposed to enhance the performance of image reconstruction.

#### 2.2. Sparse representation with double tight frame

The TF is a kind of sparse transform,\(^1\) and can be employed for the sparse representation of an image. It is confirmed that the design of TF can provide a better sparse approximation to reconstruct MR image [8]. However, conventional TF is to exploit the sparsity of the whole image, so it is not possible to have it both ways, smooth regions and nonsmooth regions. To reconstruct more edge structural details (nonsmooth regions) and offer the piecewise-smooth information (smooth regions) simultaneously, we assume that the reconstructed image $x$ consists of two parts: the smooth regions $x_s$ and the nonsmooth regions $x_n$.

For the smooth regions, the weighted $L_1$-norm regularization with the wavelet TF-based transform $\Psi w$ is employed to characterize the piecewise-smooth information. By the TF property, $\Psi w = 1$, the sparse coefficient $\theta$, can be expressed as $\theta = \Psi w x$. The weighted $L_1$-norm regularization model can be rewritten as

$$g_1(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} w(i) |\theta(i)|,$$

\(^1\) Tight frame $\Psi^d w = 1$, but $\Psi^d \Psi \neq I$ [37].
where $\theta(i)$ is $i$th element of $\theta$, the weight $w(i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} w(i)}}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is a small constant, whose role is to prevent the denominator from reaching zero.

For the nonsmooth regions, we find that the nonsmooth regions of the image often contain edges structural details and textures. Using the weighted $L_1$-norm model to reconstruct nonsmooth regions will result in over smooth in outline information of the image. To seek the solution, a robust $L_1,\alpha$-norm is exploited to preserve the edges structural details and textures. The idea is inspired by the adaptive $L_1$-norm regularization for different values $p$. It has been proven that edge regions prefer a lower value $p$ to preserve the detailed information, and smooth regions require a larger value $p$ to avoid artifacts such as staircase effects [39]. Since the $L_p$-norm model is non-convex, it is difficult to solve it and the value $p$ is difficult to adjust. Taking this into account, we use the curvelet TF-based robust $L_{1,\alpha}$-norm regularization with the parameter $a$ to replace with the adaptive $L_p$-norm, which can be given as follows

$$g_a(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \log (\cosh(a\theta(i))).$$  \hfill (4)

where $\theta_n = \Psi_n x_n$ is the sparse coefficient of $x_n$ under the curvelet TF-based transform $\Psi_n$, $\theta(i)$ is $i$th element of $\theta_n$ and $a > 0$ is a parameter.

The function $g_a(\theta_n)$ is convex and twice continuously differentiable so that the optimum value can be obtained by the convex optimization algorithm. The corresponding function $g_a(\theta_n)$ and its derivative are shown in Fig. 1. As shown in Fig. 1, for a relatively larger parameter $a$, the $g_a(\theta_n)$ may close to $L_1(p = 1)$-norm minimization, whereas a smaller parameter $a$, $g_a(\theta_n)$ may close to $L_p(p = 2)$-norm minimization. Therefore, the robust $L_{1,\alpha}$-norm regularization model has the advantage of the adaptive $L_p$-norm regularization by adjusting the parameter $a$. However, how to choose the parameter $a$ is a challenge. To overcome this problem, an adaptive strategy will be introduced to obtain the value of parameter in each iteration.

3. The proposed MRI reconstruction framework

In this section, we introduce the proposed sparse representation framework for MR image reconstruction in details. We assume that the image is decomposed into smooth regions and non-smooth regions. The decomposition is automatically realized that we use weighted $L_1$-norm to reconstruct the smooth regions from the undersampled $k$-space data. And the residuals are the non-smooth regions that are reconstructed by the robust $L_{1,\alpha}$-norm regularization model. An alternating iteration method is employed to solve the corresponding optimization problem. Furthermore, the parameter $a$ is updated with a closed form in each iteration.

As shown in Fig. 2, we assume $x = x_s + x_n$, where $x_s$ and $x_n$ denote the smooth and nonsmooth regions, separately. Here, the smooth regions are the piecewise-smooth of image without textures and structural details. The residuals are the nonsmooth regions, which mainly consists of edge structural details and textures. Thus, the reconstructed framework of CS-MRI can be formulated as follows

$$\min_{x, \theta_n, \theta_s} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x\|_2^2 + \lambda_s \Psi_s x_s^T \theta_s + \lambda_n g_n(\theta_n).$$  \hfill (5)

where $\lambda_s, \lambda_n > 0$ are the regularization parameters, the $x_s$ is expressed as $x_s = \Psi_s^T \theta_s$ with respect to $\Psi_s$ and $x_n = \Psi_n^T \theta_n$ with respect to $\Psi_n$.

Let $y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_n \end{bmatrix}$, $x = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_s^T \theta_s \\ \Psi_n^T \theta_n \end{bmatrix}$, the above optimization problem (5) can be rewritten as:

$$\min_{\theta_s, \theta_n, \theta_s} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x\|_2^2 + \lambda_s \Psi_s x_s^T \theta_s + \lambda_n g_n(\theta_n).$$  \hfill (6)

The optimization problem (6) can be solved by following alternative optimizations between $\theta_s$ and $\theta_n$, iteratively.

1. smooth regions: The $\theta_s$ is obtained from the subproblem for the fixed $\theta_n$.

$$\min_{\theta_s} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x_s^T \theta_s\|_2^2 + \lambda_s \Psi_s x_s^T \theta_s,$$  \hfill (7)

where $y_s = y - \Phi x_s^T \theta_s$.

Let $A_s = \Phi \Psi_s^T$, its solution can be given by iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm [40]

$$\theta_{s(i+1)} = T_{\lambda_u w}(\theta_{s(i)}) - \eta_s A_s^T (\Psi_s^T y_s - y_s),$$  \hfill (8)

where $\eta_s$ is step-size and the $T_{\lambda_u w}(\theta_s)$ is defined as

$$T_{\lambda_u w}(\theta_s) = \text{sign} (\theta_s) \max \{ |\theta_s| - \lambda_u w, 0 \}.$$  \hfill (9)

and $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, L$.

2. nonsmooth regions: Given the fixed $\theta_s$, update the $\theta_n$ via solving the minimization

$$\min_{\theta_n} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x_n^T \theta_n\|_2^2 + \lambda_n \frac{1}{a} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \log (\cosh(a\theta(i))).$$  \hfill (10)

where $y_n = y - \Phi x_n^T \theta_n$.

Let $h(\theta_n) = \log (\cosh(\theta_n))$, then $h(\theta_n)$ can be approximated by first-order Taylor expansion

$$h(\theta_n) = h(\theta_n^k) + \langle \nabla h(\theta_n^k) , \theta_n - \theta_n^k \rangle,$$  \hfill (11)

where $\theta_n^k$ is the solution obtained at the $k$th iteration.

After ignoring constant terms in Eq. (10), the minimization problem (9) can be solved by iteratively

$$\min_{\theta_n} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x_n^T \theta_n\|_2^2 + \lambda_n \frac{1}{a} \log (\cosh(a\theta_n)).$$  \hfill (12)

Using the Karush-Kuhn-Tucher (KKT) condition, the derivative of the minimization subproblem (11) can be solved as

$$\theta_{n(k+1)} = (A_n^T A_n)^{-1} \left( A_n^T A_n \theta_{n(k)} + \lambda_n \text{tan} h(\theta_{n(k)}) \right),$$  \hfill (13)

where $A_n = \Phi \Psi_n^T$ and $(A_n^T A_n)^{-1}$ can be calculated ahead, making above computation more effective.

3.1. Choice of the parameter $a$

Note that the parameter $a$ in (9) might not be the best choice for MRI reconstruction problem. To make our method more competitive, we propose an adaptive strategy to obtain the parameter value, which can successfully preserve the detailed information and avoid artifacts. For expression convenience, we rewrite $\sum_{i=1}^{L} \log (\cosh(a\theta(i)))$ as $\log (\cosh(a\theta_n))$. Accordingly, the minimization problem (9) can be rewritten as

$$\min_{\theta_n} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \Phi x_n^T \theta_n\|_2^2 + \lambda_n \frac{1}{a} \log (\cosh(a\theta_n)).$$  \hfill (14)

Thus, we set the derivative of (13) with respect to $\theta_n^k$ equal to zero. That is

$$a^k \theta_n^k = \text{arctanh} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_n} A_n^T (A_n \theta_n^k - y_n^k) \right).$$  \hfill (15)
Taking the L2-norm of both sides of (14) gives rise to
\[
d^{(k)} \| \theta_n^{(k)} \|^2_2 = \| \arctanh(\frac{1}{\lambda_n} A_n^H (A_n \theta_n^{(k)} - y_n^{(k)})) \|^2_2
\]  
(15)

Thus the estimated regularization parameter \( d^{(k)} \) is given by
\[
d^{(k)} = \frac{\| \arctanh(\frac{1}{\lambda_n} A_n^H (A_n \theta_n^{(k)} - y_n^{(k)})) \|^2_2 + \epsilon}{\| \theta_n^{(k)} \|^2_2}
\]  
(16)

where \( \epsilon > 0 \) is a small constant, whose role is to prevent the denominator from reaching zero. It is clear that the parameter \( d^{(k)} \) can be updated adaptively during the iterations.

The proposed algorithm is listed as follows.

**Algorithm 1** The DTF-based sparse representation for CS-MRI (DTF-MRI)

1. **Initialization:** Set \( y, \) wavelet tight frame \( \Psi_n, \) curvelet tight frame \( \Psi_n, \lambda_n, \lambda_s, d^{(0)}; \) undersampled matrix \( \Phi; \) \( \theta_n^{(0)} = \Psi_n \Phi^H y, \)
2. **While:** the stopping criterion is not met do
3. For smooth regions:
4. Estimate \( y_n, y_n^{(k)} = y - A_n \theta_n^{(k)}; \)
5. Update \( \theta_n^{(k+1)} \) by computing Eq. (8);
6. **For** nonsmooth regions:
7. Estimate \( y_n, y_n^{(k)} = y - A_n \theta_n^{(k+1)}; \)
8. Update \( \theta_n^{(k+1)} \) by computing Eq. (12);
9. Update the parameter \( d^{(k)} \) by computing Eq. (16);
10. **end while**
11. \( x^{(k+1)} = \Psi_n^H \theta_n^{(k+1)} + \Psi_n^H \theta_n^{(k+1)}; \)
12. Output \( \hat{x} \)

4. **Numerical experiments**

To validate the effectiveness of the proposed method, we conduct a set of MR data for reconstruction applications. The first presents the implementation details and some quantitative indices are provided to measure the quality of image reconstruction. We test the proposed method over MR images with different features including the reconstruction errors, sampling patterns/ ratios and noise levels. The proposed method will be shown to have better performance in comparison with some existing methods, such as NNM-MRI [41], pFISTA [8] and FTVNRR [42]. The implementation of above methods are obtained from their authors' website. To be fair, the counterparts used in the comparisons are obtained with the best performances via careful adjustment of their parameters in the algorithms. The regularization parameters \( \lambda_n, \) and \( \lambda_s \) are set as 0.001 and 0.3. The experiments are performed on MATLAB on PC with Intel Core i3 processor, 8G RAM and Microsoft Windows 7 operation system.

For quantitative comparison of the reconstructed results, the relative L2 norm error (RLNE) is used to depict the difference between the reconstructed image and the original image. Generally speaking, the smaller the RLNE value, the better the image reconstruction quality. It is defined as
\[
\text{RLNE} \triangleq \frac{\| \hat{x} - x \|_2}{\| x \|_2}
\]  
(17)

where \( x \) is the original image, while \( \hat{x} \) is the reconstructed image.

We also use the Structure Similarity Index Measure (SSIM), which is good at measuring quality of the reconstructed image in terms of image structure [43]. More formally, SSIM is given by
\[
\text{SSIM}(a,b) \triangleq \frac{(2\mu_a \mu_b + C_1)(2\sigma_{ab} + C_2)}{(\mu_a^2 + \mu_b^2 + C_1)(\sigma_a^2 + \sigma_b^2 + C_2)}
\]  
(18)

Fig. 1. Left: illustrations of the regularization function \( g_a(\theta_n(i)) = \frac{1}{a} \log(\cosh(\alpha \theta_n(i))) \). Right: the derived function \( g_a(\theta_n(i)) = \tanh(\alpha \theta_n(i)) \) with different value \( a \).

Fig. 2. Structure decomposition of MR image. (a) smooth regions; (b) nonsmooth regions.
Fig. 3. Gold standard images used in the experiment. (a)–(f) MRI1, MRI2, MRI3, MRI4, MRI5 and MRI6. (g)–(j) sampling pattern: radial, Circle, random and Cartesian sampling.

Fig. 4. Reconstructed MR image (MRI5) under the noiseless case. (I) is the original image and (II) is the radial sampling pattern. (III)–(VI) are the reconstructed results using NNM-MRI, pFISTA, FTVNR and the proposed method, respectively.

Fig. 5. Reconstructed MR image (MRI4) under the noiseless case. (I) Above is the original image and below is the radial sampling pattern. (II)–(V) Above are the reconstructed results using NNM-MRI, pFISTA, FTVNR and the proposed method, respectively; below are the corresponding reconstruction errors.

where \( \mu_a \) is the mean intensity of \( a \); \( \mu_b \) is the mean intensity of \( b \); \( \sigma_a^2 \) is the variance of \( a \); and \( \sigma_b^2 \) is the variance of \( b \). Constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are used to avoid instabilities when the denominator is very close to zero. A large value of SSIM indicates that the two images are highly similar in the structure. It means that the details of the original image are preserved. In addition, Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) is used for result evaluation:

\[
\text{SNR} = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{B_{\text{Var}}}{A_{\text{Mean}}} \right),
\]

where \( A_{\text{Mean}} \) is the mean square error between the original image \( x \) and the reconstructed image \( \hat{x} \). \( B_{\text{Var}} \) denotes the variance of the original image \( x \). The test images used in our experiments are shown in Fig. 3.

4.0.1. Comparison on visual quality

In order to demonstrate the superiority of proposed method, the reconstruction qualities are evaluated from visual inspection. Figs. 5–6 exhibit reconstructed results of the MR image and corresponding reconstructed errors. For a visual comparison, we magnify the same detail region of reconstructed results. As shown in Figs. 4 and 7, the visible artifacts can be observed on the reconstructed image by NNM-MRI. The quality of the reconstructed images by using pFISTA, FTVNR are better than that of NNM-MRI, but they still loses some subtle information that degrade clearness of edge contour structure. All of these methods deal with the image as a whole, which is difficult to seek a tradeoff between the preservation of edge structural details in the nonsmooth regions and the avoidance of staircase effects in the smooth regions. We utilize the DTF-based regularization
terms to deal with the smooth and nonsmooth regions separately, in which some of subtle edges texture are better preserved, and the image sharpness is improved significantly.

To show the effects of the DTF-based regularization terms, the smooth and nonsmooth regions obtained by our method are shown in Fig. 7(b). The results show that the most of structure
Fig. 8. Left: The RLNEs versus noise level $\sigma^2$. Right: SNRs versus noise level $\sigma^2$.

Fig. 9. Reconstructed T2 brain image under the noise case ($\sigma^2 = 0.02$). (I) Above is the original image; middle is the partial enlargement of the original image and below is the Circle sampling pattern. (II)–(V) Above are the reconstructed images using NNM-MRI, pFISTA, FTVNNR and the proposed method, respectively; middle are the corresponding partial enlargement of the reconstructed results and below are the corresponding reconstruction errors.

Fig. 10. Left: RLNEs versus the parameters $\lambda_s$ (fixed $\lambda_n = 0.3$). Right: RLNEs versus the parameters $\lambda_n$ (fixed $\lambda_s = 10^{-3}$).

In image can be reconstructed by the weighted $L_1$-norm regularization method, but there are loss of edge structural details and textures. Therefore the robust $L_{1,a}$-norm regularization is helpful to improve the reconstructed results. In Fig. 7, we further address the MR image reconstruction after the ablation surgery, which are associated with nucleus accumbens lesion. As can be seen in Fig. 7, the peripheral edema after the operation can be discerned by the proposed method, while the other methods are difficult to obtain clear identification.

In order to further illustrate the superiority of the proposed method, we show quantitative comparisons of the different methods. The RLNE, SSIM and SNR of the reconstructed MR images with 18% sampling ratio are given in Table 1. MRI3, MRI4 and MRI6 are test images used in Fig. 3. Clearly, the proposed method achieves the lowest RLNE index and the highest SSIM and SNR. This comparisons show the superior reconstruction ability of the proposed method. It further confirms the effectiveness of the proposed method, which is beneficial in clinical diagnosis.
4.0.2. Comparison on the noise case

For practical consideration, we conduct experiments on sampled data polluted by different noise levels to evaluate the performance of the proposed method. In the experiments, Gaussian noise is added to the real and imaginary parts of sampled data. The noise variance is set from 0.01 to 0.05 respectively. In Fig. 8, the performance reduces when noise level increases, while the proposed DTF-MRI still achieves best results than all competing methods.

To reflect the qualitative nature of reconstruction in noise case, the reconstructed results together with the corresponding errors are shown in Fig. 9. It is easy to see that the results obtained with other methods are both noisy and blurry. The result obtained with our method is relatively clear. Compared with the reconstruction errors, we can conclude that the proposed method is still superior to that of the competing methods in the noise case.

4.0.3. Discussions of the regularization parameters

In this subsection, we discuss how to select the best regularization parameters, $\lambda_s$, $\lambda_n$, for the performance of the proposed DTF-MRI method. For these two parameters, FTVNNR set $\lambda_s = 0.01$ and $\lambda_n = 1$ empirically. However, if $\lambda_s$ and $\lambda_n$ are determined in an appropriate manner, this may yield a better reconstruction effect. To investigate the sensitivity of our method against $\lambda_s$, $\lambda_n$, two experiments are conducted with respect to different $\lambda_s$, $\lambda_n$ in Fig. 10.

The first experiment verifies that the reconstructed performance is influenced by different values $\lambda_s$ and the fixed parameter $\lambda_n = 0.3$. As shown in Fig. 10(left), it is found that the performance of the proposed method is less affected, if the parameter $\lambda_s$ is smaller than 0.001. Therefore, in this work $\lambda_s$ is empirically set to be $\lambda_s = 0.001$. We also conduct the experiments with the fixed parameter $\lambda_s = 0.001$ under variable $\lambda_n$ in Fig. 10(right). We can see that the RLNE varies slightly if $\lambda_n$ is in the range of 0.3 to 1. To this end, the regularization parameters $\lambda_s$ and $\lambda_n$ are set as 0.001 and 0.3 for MRI reconstruction.

4.0.4. Reconstruction with different sampling patterns

In this subsection, the different sampling patterns are considered to demonstrate the performance of the proposed method. The RLNE index of all methods under different sampling patterns can be found in Fig. 11. As a result, we see that our method consistently outperforms all other approaches for all sampling patterns in terms of RLNE index, which implies that the advantages of the proposed method are not change under the different sampling patterns.

4.0.5. Convergence of the proposed algorithm

To demonstrate the effectiveness and applicability of our method, the convergence of the proposed method is empirically conducted in Fig. 12. All of test images are given in Fig. 3. Fig. 12 illustrates the convergent performance of the proposed DTF-MRI in the noiseless and noise cases, respectively. It is observed that with the increasing of iteration number, all of the RLNE curves decrease gradually and ultimately become flat and stable. It implies that the proposed method has a good astringency.

4.0.6. Reconstruction with sampling ratios

In this subsection, we evaluate the performance of the proposed method using the different undersampling ratios. Fig. 13 depicts the RLNE/SNR curves as a function of sampling ratios for the different methods. It is obvious that the proposed method outperforms all competing methods under the different sampling ratios on both RLNE and SNR index.

From the left of Fig. 13, it is seen that the reconstructed quality obtained by the proposed method with 30% sampling, while FTVNNR requires 44% sampling and the others need more sampling. It is also observed that the RLNE index of proposed method is gradually close to that of FTVNNR, with the sampling ratios increasing. It implies that the proposed method is more effective for MR image reconstruction in the low sampling ratios case.

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>MRI3</th>
<th>MRI4</th>
<th>MRI6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RLNE</td>
<td>SSIM</td>
<td>SNR</td>
<td>RLNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM-MRI</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.9920</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pFISTA</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.9901</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTVNNR</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.9902</td>
<td>12.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.9961</td>
<td>14.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11. RLNEs versus sampling patterns with the 15% sampling ratios. (a)–(d) Sampling patterns: Cartesian, Circle, random and radial sampling.
Fig. 12. The convergence of the proposed algorithm. Progression of the RLNE results achieved by proposed method for test images with respect to the iteration number, under the noiseless (left) and noise (right) case (noise variance $\sigma^2 = 0.02$).

Fig. 13. Left: The RLNEs versus sampling ratios. Right: SNRs versus sampling ratios.

5. Conclusion

This paper presented a new sparse representation framework for the application of CS-MRI. The proposed method employed two kinds of TF-based transform to establish a mixed-norm regularization model, which can exploit the advantage of the wavelet TF-based transform and curvelet TF-based transform domain, simultaneously. The solution of the proposed method was given by the alternating iterative algorithm. The key point is to combine DTF-based sparse representation with a new mixed regularization model together, which preserve the edge structural details in nonsmooth regions and piecewise-smooth information of image in smooth regions, separately. Various experimental results demonstrate that the proposed DTF-MRI can achieve the superior performance in detail clarity and noise suppression from the objective and subjective visual evaluation.
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