# Wavelet for Graphs and its **Deployment to Image Processing\***

#### Michael Elad

The Computer Science Department The Technion – Israel Institute of technology Haifa 32000, Israel



The research leading to these results has been received funding **E** from the European union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) ERC grant Agreement ERC-SPARSE- 320649

#### \*Joint work with



Israel Cohen Idan Ram The Electrical Engineering department Technion – Israel Institute of Technology

### **SPARS 2013**

Signal Processing with Adaptive Sparse Structured Representations. July 8-11, 2013. EPFL, Lausanne.





# Patch-Based Processing of Images

In the past decade we see more and more researchers suggesting to process a signal or an image with a paradigm of the form:





canvas

V

# Patch-Based Processing of Images

In the past decade we see more and more researchers suggesting to process a signal or an image with a paradigm of the form:

Surprisingly, these methods are very effective, actually leading to today's state-ofthe-art in many applications





Common theme: The image patches are believed to exhibit a highly-structured geometrical form in the embedding space they reside in



## Patches ... Patches ... Patches ...

Who are the researchers promoting this line of work? Many leading scientists from various places



#### Various Ideas:

Non-local-means Kernel regression Sparse representations Locally-learned dictionaries BM3D Structured sparsity Structural clustering Subspace clustering Gaussian-mixture-models Non-local sparse rep. Self-similarity Manifold learning

...



# This Talk is About ...

A different way to treat an image using its overlapped patches





# Surprisingly, This Talk is Also About ...



Processing of Non-Conventionally Structured Signals



Many signalprocessing tools (filters, alg., transforms, ...) are tailored for uniformly sampled signals Now we encounter different types of signals: e.g., pointclouds and graphs. Can we extend classical tools to these signals? Our goal: Generalize the wavelet transform to handle this broad family of signals

In the process, we will find ourselves returning to "regular" signals, handling them differently

In fact, this is how this work started in the first place



# Part I – GTBWT Generalized Tree-Based Wavelet Transform – The Basics

This part is taken from the following two papers:

- □ I. Ram, M. Elad, and I. Cohen, "Generalized Tree-Based Wavelet Transform", IEEE Trans. Signal Processing, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 4199–4209, 2011.
- □ I. Ram, M. Elad, and I. Cohen, "Redundant Wavelets on Graphs and High Dimensional Data Clouds", IEEE Signal Processing Letters, Vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 291–294, May 2012.



# **Problem Formulation**

- U We are given a graph:
  - The i th node is characterized by a d-dimen. feature vector  $\underline{x}_i$
  - $\circ$  The *i th* node has a value  $f_i$
  - The edge between the i th and j th nodes carries the distance  $w(\underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j)$  for an arbitrary distance measure  $w(\cdot, \cdot)$ .
- Assumption: a "short edge" implies close-by values, i.e.

$$w(\underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j)$$
 small  $\rightarrow |f_i - f_j|$  small

#### for almost every pair (i, j).





# Different Ways to Look at This Data

- □ We start with a set of *d*-dimensional vectors  $\mathbf{X} = \{\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \dots, \underline{x}_N\} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ These could be:
  - Feature points for a graph's nodes,
  - Set of coordinates for a point-cloud.
- □ A scalar function is defined on these coordinates,  $f: \mathbf{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ , giving  $\mathbf{f} = [f_1, f_2, ..., f_N]$ .
- □ We may regard this dataset as a set of *m* samples taken from a high dimensional function  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ .



□ The assumption that small  $w(\underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j)$  implies small  $|f_i - f_j|$  for almost every pair (i, j) implies that the function behind the scene, f, is "regular".



# Our Goal



# Why Wavelet?

- Wavelet for regular piece-wise smooth signals is a highly effective "sparsifying transform". However, the signal (vector) f is not necessarily smooth in general.
- We would like to imitate this for our data structure.



# Wavelet for Graphs – A Wonderful Idea

I wish we would have thought of it first ...

"Diffusion Wavelets"

R. R. Coifman, and M. Maggioni, 2006.



"Multiscale Methods for Data on Graphs and Irregular .... Situations" M. Jansen, G. P. Nason, and B. W. Silverman, 2008.



"Wavelets on Graph via Spectal Graph Theory" D. K. Hammond, and P. Vandergheynst, and R. Gribonval, 2010.



"Multiscale Wavelets on Trees, Graphs and High ... Supervised Learning" M . Gavish, and B. Nadler, and R. R. Coifman, 2010.



"Wavelet Shrinkage on Paths for Denoising of Scattered Data" D. Heinen and G. Plonka, 2012.

•••



# The Main Idea (1) - Permutation





# The Main Idea (2) - Permutation

In fact, we propose to perform a different permutation in each resolution level of the multi-scale pyramid:



- Naturally, these permutations will be applied reversely in the inverse transform.
- Thus, the difference between this and the plain 1D wavelet transform applied on **f** are the additional permutations, thus preserving the transform's linearity and unitarity, while also adapting to the input signal.



# Building the Permutations (1)

- $\square$  Lets start with  $P_0$  the permutation applied on the incoming signal.
- □ Recall: the wavelet transform is most effective for piecewise regular signals. → thus,  $P_0$  should be chosen such that  $P_0 \mathbf{f}$  is most "regular".
- $\Box$  So, ... for example, we can simply permute by sorting the signal **f** ...





# Building the Permutations (2)

- □ However: we will be dealing with corrupted signals **f** (noisy, missing values, ...) and thus such a sort operation is impossible.
- □ To our help comes the feature vectors in **X**, which reflect on the order of the signal values,  $f_k$ . Recall:

Small  $w(x_i, x_j)$  implies small  $|f(x_i) - f(x_j)|$  for almost every pair (i, j)

☐ Thus, instead of solving for the optimal permutation that "simplifies" f, we order the features in X to the shortest path that visits in each point once, in what will be an instance of the Traveling-Salesman-Problem (TSP):

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}} \sum_{i=2}^{N} |f^{p}(i) - f^{p}(i-1)| \qquad \min_{\mathbf{P}} \sum_{i=2}^{N} w(x_{i}^{p}, x_{i-1}^{p})$$



# Building the Permutations (3)



We handle the TSP task by a greedy (and crude) approximation:

- $\circ$  Initialize with an arbitrary index *j*;
- Initialize the set of chosen indices to  $\Omega(1)=\{j\}$ ;
- Repeat k=1:1:N-1 times:
  - Find  $x_i$  the nearest neighbor to  $x_{\Omega(k)}$  such that  $i \notin \Omega$ ;
  - Set  $\Omega(k+1) = \{i\};$
- $\circ$  Result: the set  $\Omega$  holds the proposed ordering.





# **Building the Permutations (4)**

- $\Box$  So far we concentrated on P<sub>0</sub> at the finest level of the multi-scale pyramid.
- □ In order to construct  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ , ...,  $P_{L-1}$ , the permutations at the other pyramid's levels, we use the same method, applied on propagated (reordered, filtered and sub-sampled) feature-vectors through the same wavelet pyramid:





# Why "Generalized Tree ..."?



Our proposed transform: Generalized Tree-Based Wavelet Transform (GTBWT).

□ We also developed a Redundant version of this transform based on the stationary wavelet transform [Shensa, 1992] [Beylkin, 1992] – also related to the "A-Trous Wavelet" (will not be presented here).



# Treating Graph/Cloud-of-points

- Just to complete the picture, we should demonstrate the (R)GTBWT capabilities on graphs/cloud of points.
- We took several classical machine learning train + test data for several regression problems, and tested the proposed transform in
  - Cleaning (denoising) the data from additive noise;
  - Filling in missing values (semi-supervised learning); and
  - Detecting anomalies (outliers) in the data.
- The results are encouraging. We shall present herein one such experiment briefly.





# **Treating Graphs: The Data**

#### Data Set: Relative Location of CT axial axis slices



More details: Overall 53500 such pairs of feature and value, extracted from 74 different patients (43 male and 31 female).



# Treating Graphs: **Denoising**





# **Treating Graphs: Denoising**





# Treating Graphs: Semi-Supervised Learning





# Treating Graphs: Semi-Supervised Learning





# Treating Graphs: Semi-Supervised Learning





# Part II – Handling Images Using GTBWT by Handling Image Patches

This part is taken from the same papers mentioned before ...

- □ I. Ram, M. Elad, and I. Cohen, "Generalized Tree-Based Wavelet Transform", IEEE Trans. Signal Processing, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 4199–4209, 2011.
- □ I. Ram, M. Elad, and I. Cohen, "Redundant Wavelets on Graphs and High Dimensional Data Clouds", IEEE Signal Processing Letters, Vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 291–294, May 2012.



# Could an Image Become a Graph?



- Now, that the image is organized as a graph (or pointcloud), we can apply the developed transform.
- The distance measure  $W(\bullet, \bullet)$  we will be using is Euclidean.
- It seems that after this "conversion", we forget all about spatial proximities.



# **Our Transform**



Lexicographic ordering of the N pixels



All these operations could be described as one linear operation: multiplication of <u>f</u> by a huge matrix Ω.
 This transform is adaptive to the specific image.





# Lets Test It: M-Term Approximation



# Lets Test It: M-Term Approximation

For a 128×128 center portion of the image Lenna, we compare the image representation efficiency of the

GTBWT

- A common 1D wavelet transform
- □ 2D wavelet transform





## **Comparison Between Different Wavelets**





# The Representation's Atoms – Synthetic Image





# The Representation's Atoms – Lenna





# Lets Test It: Image Denoising





Cycle-spinning: Apply the above scheme several (10) times, with a different GTBWT (different random ordering), and average.





Sub-image averaging: A by-product of GTBWT is the propagation of the whole patches. Thus, we get *n* transform vectors, each for a shifted version of the image and those can be averaged.





Sub-image averaging: A by-product of GTBWT is the propagation of the whole patches. Thus, we get *n* transform vectors, each for a shifted version of the image and those can be averaged.





Restricting the NN: It appears that when searching the nearestneighbor for the ordering, restriction to near-by area is helpful, both computationally (obviously) and in terms of the output quality.



Patch of size  $\sqrt{d} \times \sqrt{d}$ 

Search-Area of size  $\sqrt{B} \times \sqrt{B}$ 



Improved thresholding: Instead of thresholding the wavelet coefficients based on their value, threshold them based on the norm of the (transformed) vector they belong to:

Recall the transformed vectors as described earlier.
 Classical thresholding: every coefficient within C is passed through the function:

$$c_{i,j} = \begin{cases} c_{i,j} & |c_{i,j}| \ge T \\ 0 & |c_{i,j}| < T \end{cases}$$

The proposed alternative would be to force "joint-sparsity" on the above array of coefficients, forcing all rows to share the same support:

$$c_{i,j} = \begin{cases} c_{i,j} & \|c_{*,j}\|_{2} \ge T \\ 0 & \|c_{*,j}\|_{2} < T \end{cases}$$



# Image Denoising – Results

- We apply the proposed scheme with the Symmlet 8 wavelet to noisy versions of the images Lena and Barbara
- For comparison reasons, we also apply to the two images the K-SVD and BM3D algorithms.

σ/PSNR	Image	K-SVD	BM3D	GTBWT
10/28.14	Lena	35.51	35.93	35.87
	Barbara	34.44		34.94
25/20.18	Lena	31.36	32.08	32.16
	Barbara	29.57	30.72	30.75

- □ The PSNR results are quite good and competitive.
- □ What about run time?



# Relation to BM3D?

BM3D



### Our scheme



Reorder, GTBWT, and threshold



# Relation to BM3D?

### BM3D

### **Our scheme**

3D Transforn & threshold In a nut-shell, while BM3D searches for patch neighbors and process them locally, our approach seeks one path through all the patches (each gets its own neighbors as a consequence), and the eventual processing is done globally.

3D Transform & threshold

> Reorder, GTBWT, and threshold



## What Next?

We have a highly effective sparsifying transform for images. It is "linear" and image adaptive



A: Refer to this transform as an abstract sparsification operator and use it in general image processing tasks

**B:** Streep this idea to its bones: keep the patchreordering, and propose a new way to process images



# Part II – Frame Interpreting the GTBWT as a Frame and using it as a Regularizer

This part is documented in the following draft:

□ I. Ram, M. Elad, and I. Cohen, "The RTBWT Frame – Theory and Use for Images", working draft to be submitted soon.

We rely heavily on

 Danielyan, Katkovnik, and Eigiazarian, "BM3D frames and Variational Image Deblurring", IEEE Trans. on Image Processing, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 1715-1728, April 2012.



# Recall Our Core Scheme



Or, put differently,  $\hat{x} = \mathbf{D} \cdot T{\{\mathbf{\Omega}y\}}$ : We refer to GTBWT as a redundant frame, and use a "heuristic" shrinkage method with it, which aims to approximate the solution of

Synthesis: 
$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{D} \cdot \underset{\alpha}{\operatorname{Argmin}} \|\mathbf{D}\alpha - \mathbf{y}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\alpha\|_{p}^{p}$$

or

nalysis: 
$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \underset{f}{\operatorname{Argmin}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\mathbf{\Omega}\mathbf{x}\|_{p}^{p}$$



# Recall: Our Transform (Frame)



We obtain an array of *dNJ* transform coefficients



Lexicographic ordering of the N pixels



All these operations could be described as one linear operation: multiplication of <u>f</u> by a huge matrix Ω
 This transform is adaptive to the specific image



# **Our Notations**





# What Can We Do With This Frame?

We could solve various inverse problems of the form:

y = Ax + v

where: x is the original imagev is an AWGN, andA is a degradation operator of any sort

We could consider the synthesis, the analysis, or their combination:

$$\{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \widehat{\alpha}\} = \underset{\alpha, \mathbf{x}}{\operatorname{Argmin}} \begin{array}{l} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{\beta} \|\mathbf{D}\alpha - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} + \\ +\lambda \|\alpha\|_{p}^{p} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathbf{\Omega}\mathbf{x} - \alpha\|_{2}^{2} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \beta = 0 \\ \mu = \infty \end{array} \rightarrow \text{Synthesis} \\ \beta = \infty \\ \mu = 0 \end{array} \rightarrow \text{Analysis} \end{array}$$



# Generalized Nash Equilibrium\*

Instead of minimizing the joint analysis/synthesis problem:

$$\{\widehat{\mathbf{x}},\widehat{\alpha}\} = \underset{\alpha,\mathbf{x}}{\operatorname{Argmin}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{\beta} \|\mathbf{D}\alpha - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} + +\lambda \|\alpha\|_{p}^{p} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathbf{\Omega}\mathbf{x} - \alpha\|_{2}^{2}$$

break it down into two separate and easy to handle parts:

and solve  
iteratively  
$$\alpha_{k+1} = \underset{\alpha}{\operatorname{Argmin}} \|y - Ax\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{\beta} \|D\alpha_{k} - x\|_{2}^{2}$$
$$\alpha_{k+1} = \underset{\alpha}{\operatorname{Argmin}} \lambda \|\alpha\|_{p}^{p} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\Omega x_{k+1} - \alpha\|_{2}^{2}$$

\* Danielyan, Katkovnik, and Eigiazarian, "BM3D frames and Variational Image Deblurring", IEEE Trans. on Image Processing, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 1715-1728, April 2012.



# **Deblurring Results**





# **Deblurring Results**

Image	Input PSNR	BM3D-DEB ISNR	IDD-BM3D ISNR init. with BM3D-DEB	Ours ISNR Init. with BM3D-DEB	Ours ISNR 3 iterations with simple initialization
Lena	27.25	7.95	7.97	8.08	8.20
Barbara	23.34	7.80	7.64	8.25	6.21
House	25.61	9.32	9.95	9.80	10.06
Cameraman	22.23	8.19	8.85	9.19	8.52

$$\mathsf{Blur}\,\mathsf{PSF} = \frac{1}{1+i^2+j^2} \quad -7 \leq i,j \leq 7$$

σ²=2



# Part IV – Patch (Re)-Ordering Lets Simplify Things, Shall We?

This part is based on the paper:

□ I. Ram, M. Elad, and I. Cohen, "Image Processing using Smooth Ordering of its Patches", IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, Vol. 22, No. 7, pp. 2764–2774 , July 2013.



# **Returning to the Basics**



permutation on the image pixels

### What should we expect from this permutation?



# Spatial Neighbor ≠ Euclidean Neighbor

### What should we expect?

Spatial neighbors are not necessarily expected to remain neighbors in the new ordering





# The Reordered Signal is More Regular

### What should we expect?

□ The new path is expected to lead to very smooth\*

 (or at least, piece-wise smooth) 1D signal.
 □ The ordering is expected to be robust to noise and
 degradations → the underlying signal should still be smooth.





\* Measure of smoothness:

$$\frac{1}{L}\sum_{k=2}^{L}|f[k] - f[k-1]|$$

- 1. Raster scan:9.57
- 2. Hilbert curve: 11.77
- 3. Sorted (ours): 5.63



# Processing the Permuted Pixels

#### Assumptions:

- After a shortest-path reordering of the patches form a clean image, we expect a highly regular signal.
- Reordering a corrupted image is likely to lead to a good quality sort as well, due to the robustness brought by the patch-matching.



An Idea: Given a corrupted image of the form:

where: x is the original image

v is an AWGN, and

M is a point-wise degradation operator,

#### Apply this process:





# Use the Reordering for Denoising





# Intuition: Why Should This Work?





# The "Simple Smoothing" We Do



Noisy image

Naturally, this is done off-line and on other images



# Filtering – A Further Improvement

#### Cluster the patches to smooth and textured sets, and train a filter per each separately



# The results we show hereafter were obtained by:

- (i) Cycle-spinning
- (ii) Sub-image averaging
- (iii) Two iterations
- (iv) Learning the filter , and
- (v) Switched smoothing.







#### Based on patch-STD



# **Denoising Results Using Patch-Reordering**

Image		σ/PSNR [dB]		
		10 / 28.14	25 / 20.18	50 / 14.16
Lena	K-SVD	35.49	31.36	27.82
	1 <sup>st</sup> iteration	35.33	31.58	28.54
	2 <sup>nd</sup> iteration	35.41	31.81	29.00
Barbara	K-SVD	34.41	29.53	25.40
	1 <sup>st</sup> iteration	34.48	30.46	27.17
	2 <sup>nd</sup> iteration	34.46	30.54	27.45
House	K-SVD	36.00	32.12	28.15
	1 <sup>st</sup> iteration	35.58	32.48	29.37
	2 <sup>nd</sup> iteration	35.94	32.65	29.93

Bottom line: (1) This idea works very well;

(2) It is especially competitive for high noise levels; and

(3) A second iteration almost always pays off.



# What About Inpainting?

#### 0.8 of the pixels are missing





# The Rationale





## Inpainting Results – Examples





# **Inpainting Results**

Reconstruction results from 80% missing pixels using various methods:

Image	Method	PSNR [dB]
	Bi-Cubic	30.25
Lena	DCT + OMP	29.97
	Proposed (1 <sup>st</sup> iter.)	30.25
	Proposed (2 <sup>nd</sup> iter.)	31.80
	Proposed (3 <sup>rd</sup> iter.)	31.96
Barbara	Bi-Cubic	22.88
	DCT + OMP	27.15
	Proposed (1 <sup>st</sup> iter.)	27.56
	Proposed (2 <sup>nd</sup> iter.)	29.34
	Proposed (3 <sup>rd</sup> iter.)	29.71
House	Bi-Cubic	29.21
	DCT + OMP	29.69
	Proposed (1 <sup>st</sup> iter.)	29.03
	Proposed (2 <sup>nd</sup> iter.)	32.10
	Proposed (3 <sup>rd</sup> iter.)	32.71

Bottom line:

- (1) This idea works very well;
- (2) It is operating much better than the classic sparse-rep. approach; and
- Using more (3) iterations always pays off, and substantially so.



# **Part IV – Time to Finish Conclusions and a Bit More**



# Conclusions

We propose a new wavelet transform for scalar functions defined on graphs or high dimensional data clouds The proposed transform extends the classical orthonormal and redundant wavelet transforms We demonstrate the ability of these transforms to efficiently represent and denoise images

Finally, we show that using the ordering of the patches only, quite effective denoising and inpainting can be obtained We also show that the obtained transform can be used as a regularizer in classical image processing Inverse-Problems



# What Next ?





Thank you for your time

### thanks to the organizers of this event Volkan Cevher and Matthias Seeger

# **Questions?**

# Post-Docs Are Needed

