

# Network flows for image processing

## Part II-Bis: Total Variation and Applications

Jerome Darbon

CNRS / CMLA-ENS Cachan  
Mathematics Department UCLA

Variational Methods and Compressive Sensing in Imaging

Fields Institute, Toronto, May 2012

# Acknowledgements

Joint work with:

- Marc Sigelle (Telecom Paris)
- Antonin Chambolle (Ecole Polytechnique)

- I) Total Variation Minimization and parametric max-flow
  - Both continuous and discrete point of view
  - Separable cases: Rudin-Osher-Fatemi, curve evolution

# Generalized perimeters and Coarea-Formula

- Idea:  $\mathcal{J}$  is a "generalized perimeter"

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be nonnegative, defined on measurable subsets of  $\Omega$  be such that

- $\mathcal{J}$  is l.s.c. with respect to the  $L^1$  convergence
- $\mathcal{J}(A \cup B) + \mathcal{J}(A \cap B) \leq \mathcal{J}(A) + \mathcal{J}(B)$  [**Submodular** Lovasz 82]
- $\mathcal{J}(\emptyset) = \mathcal{J}(\Omega) = 0$

- Idea:  $J$  is a "Total Variation"

Extension to any  $u \in L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow J(u)$

by the **Generalized coarea formula** [Choquet, Lovasz, Visintin]:

$$J(u) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}(\{u > \lambda\}) d\lambda$$

where  $\{u > \lambda\} = \{x \in \Omega \mid u(x) > \lambda\}$  (level sets)

# Generalized perimeters and Coarea-Formula

- Idea:  $\mathcal{J}$  is a "generalized perimeter"

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be nonnegative, defined on measurable subsets of  $\Omega$  be such that

- $\mathcal{J}$  is l.s.c. with respect to the  $L^1$  convergence
- $\mathcal{J}(A \cup B) + \mathcal{J}(A \cap B) \leq \mathcal{J}(A) + \mathcal{J}(B)$  [**Submodular** Lovasz 82]
- $\mathcal{J}(\emptyset) = \mathcal{J}(\Omega) = 0$

- Idea:  $J$  is a "Total Variation"

Extension to any  $u \in L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow J(u)$

by the **Generalized coarea formula** [Choquet, Lovasz, Visintin]:

$$J(u) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}(\{u > \lambda\}) d\lambda$$

where  $\{u > \lambda\} = \{x \in \Omega \mid u(x) > \lambda\}$  (level sets)

- Proposition (Bouchitté)

$J$  is 1-homogeneous, convex, l.s.c.,  $\forall c J(\cdot + c) = J(\cdot)$

- Conversely:

If  $J$  is a convex, l.s.c., nonnegative functional which satisfies the generalized coarea formula

then  $A \mapsto J(\chi_A)$  is a “generalized perimeter” in our sense.

## A matter of wording

- Same concepts but different words:

- Analysis / Level sets / Coarea formula
- Combinatorics / unary representation / Lovasz extension
- Game Theory/Fuzzy Logic /  $\alpha$ -cut / Choquet Integral

- Similarity with Mathematical Morphology [Guichard Morel], “stack filters”

- $\mathcal{J} \equiv$  monotone filter on sets
- $J \equiv$  monotone filter on functions
- Example:  $J \equiv \|\cdot - v\|_1 + TV(\cdot)$  is morphological [D. 05]

- Proposition (Bouchitté)

$J$  is 1-homogeneous, convex, l.s.c.,  $\forall c J(\cdot + c) = J(\cdot)$

- Conversely:

If  $J$  is a convex, l.s.c., nonnegative functional which satisfies the generalized coarea formula

then  $A \mapsto J(\chi_A)$  is a “generalized perimeter” in our sense.

## A matter of wording

- Same concepts but different words:

- Analysis / Level sets / Coarea formula
- Combinatorics / unary representation / Lovasz extension
- Game Theory/Fuzzy Logic /  $\alpha$ -cut / Choquet Integral

- Similarity with Mathematical Morphology [Guichard Morel], “stack filters”

- $\mathcal{J} \equiv$  monotone filter on sets
- $J \equiv$  monotone filter on functions
- Example:  $J \equiv \|\cdot - v\|_1 + TV(\cdot)$  is morphological [D. 05]

- Total variation/Perimeter:  $P(A, \Omega) = \int_{\Omega} |D\chi_A|$  with

$$\int_{\Omega} |Du| = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u \operatorname{div} \psi : \psi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N), |\psi(x)| \leq 1 \ \forall x \right\}$$

- Nonlocal functionals ( $k$  nonnegative) [Buades et al. 05]:

$$J(u) = \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} k(x, y) |u(x) - u(y)| \, dx dy$$

- Discrete energies of the form (computational point of view)

$$J(u) = \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} |u_i - u_j|$$

- Note that  $\sqrt{u_x^2 + u_y^2}$  is NOT submodular



- We minimize the following energy wrt.  $A$  (with  $v \in L^1(\Omega)$ )

$$\mathcal{E}(A|v) = \mathcal{J}(A) - \int_A v \, dx$$

**Lemma**  $v' < v \Rightarrow A' \subseteq A$

- Several approaches for the proof
  - Stochastically-based [D. Sigelle 04]
  - Variational approach [Chambolle 05] ← the simplest
  - Algorithmically-based [Gallo-Grigoriadis-Tarjan 89]

# ROF Comparison Principle

- Let  $u$  minimize Rudin-Osher-Fatemi (ROF)

$$E(u|v) = J(u) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (u - v)^2 dx.$$

Then: for any  $s$ ,  $\{u > \lambda\}$  and  $\{u \geq \lambda\}$  are the minimal and maximal solution of

$$\min_A \mathcal{E}(A, v - \lambda)$$

- If  $u, u'$  respectively minimize  $E(u|v)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(u'|v')$  then  $v \leq v' \Rightarrow u \leq u'$ .
- Optimization point of view:
  - To minimize  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|v) \rightarrow$  Minimize the associated ROF pb and threshold
  - To minimize ROF  $E(\cdot|v) \rightarrow$  Solve a series  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|\lambda - v)$  and reconstruct  $u$  from its level sets

# ROF Comparison Principle

- Let  $u$  minimize Rudin-Osher-Fatemi (ROF)

$$E(u|v) = J(u) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (u - v)^2 dx.$$

Then: for any  $s$ ,  $\{u > \lambda\}$  and  $\{u \geq \lambda\}$  are the minimal and maximal solution of

$$\min_A \mathcal{E}(A, v - \lambda)$$

- If  $u, u'$  respectively minimize  $E(u|v)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(u'|v')$  then  $v \leq v' \Rightarrow u \leq u'$ .
- Optimization point of view:
  - To minimize  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|v) \rightarrow$  Minimize the associated ROF pb and threshold
  - To minimize ROF  $E(\cdot|v) \rightarrow$  Solve a series a  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|\lambda - v)$  and reconstruct  $u$  from its level sets

# ROF Comparison Principle

- Let  $u$  minimize Rudin-Osher-Fatemi (ROF)

$$E(u|v) = J(u) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (u - v)^2 dx.$$

Then: for any  $s$ ,  $\{u > \lambda\}$  and  $\{u \geq \lambda\}$  are the minimal and maximal solution of

$$\min_A \mathcal{E}(A, v - \lambda)$$

- If  $u, u'$  respectively minimize  $E(u|v)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(u'|v')$  then  $v \leq v' \Rightarrow u \leq u'$ .
- Optimization point of view:
  - To minimize  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|v) \rightarrow$  Minimize the associated ROF pb and threshold
  - To minimize ROF  $E(\cdot|v) \rightarrow$  Solve a series a  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|\lambda - v)$  and reconstruct  $u$  from its level sets

# Minimizing ROF via maximum-flow (1/4)

- **Reduction** of ROF to series a "generalized perimeter" functionals
- **Pairwise interactions** perimeters  $\mathcal{J}(A) = \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} |\theta_i - \theta_j|$

where  $\theta = \mathbb{1}_A$ , i.e.,  $\theta_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in A \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

- Each binary problem to solve has the form

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} |\theta_i - \theta_j| + \sum_i (\lambda - v_i) \theta_i$$

→ Perimeter + data fidelity

⇒ Globally solvable using maximum-flow/minimum-cut

# Minimizing ROF via maximum-flow (2/4)

Strategies of reconstruction, i.e., order for the series of  $\{\lambda_l\}$

- Dyadic (dichotomy/bitonic) search:  
→  $\|\hat{u} - u^*\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  in  $O(\log_2 \epsilon)$  [D. Sigelle 06]
- A much better idea: **Re-use** the maximum-flow result
  - Inclusion property says:
    - the set of nodes connected to the source is increasing (as  $\lambda \nearrow$ )
    - equivalent to capacity arcs "Source  $\rightarrow$  nodes"  $\nearrow$  (**parametric max-flow**)
    - equivalent to convexity of data fidelity of TV problems
  - [Gallo-Grigoriadis-Tarjan 89] showed
    - the comparison principle
    - time complexity of a **parametric** max-flow = time of a **one** max-flow
  - **Algo** Parametric: lowest to greatest
  - **Algo** Parametric: dyadic search [Chambolle D. 06/07] [**Hochbaum 01**]  
→ Solution  $\epsilon = 0$  in *strongly* polynomial time ( $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  becomes  $\log n$ )

DEMO

# Minimizing ROF via maximum-flow (2/4)

Strategies of reconstruction, i.e., order for the series of  $\{\lambda_l\}$

- Dyadic (dichotomy/bitonic) search:  
→  $\|\hat{u} - u^*\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  in  $O(\log_2 \epsilon)$  [D. Sigelle 06]
- A much better idea: **Re-use** the maximum-flow result
  - Inclusion property says:
    - the set of nodes connected to the source is increasing (as  $\lambda \nearrow$ )
    - equivalent to capacity arcs "Source  $\rightarrow$  nodes"  $\nearrow$  (**parametric max-flow**)
    - equivalent to convexity of data fidelity of TV problems
  - [Gallo-Grigoriadis-Tarjan 89] showed
    - the comparison principle
    - time complexity of a **parametric** max-flow = time of a **one** max-flow
  - **Algo** Parametric: lowest to greatest
  - **Algo** Parametric: dyadic search [Chambolle D. 06/07] [**Hochbaum 01**]  
→ Solution  $\epsilon = 0$  in *strongly* polynomial time ( $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  becomes  $\log n$ )

DEMO

# Minimizing ROF via maximum-flow (2/4)

Strategies of reconstruction, i.e., order for the series of  $\{\lambda_l\}$

- Dyadic (dichotomy/bitonic) search:  
→  $\|\hat{u} - u^*\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  in  $O(\log_2 \epsilon)$  [D. Sigelle 06]
- A much better idea: **Re-use** the maximum-flow result
  - Inclusion property says:
    - the set a nodes connected to the source is increasing (as  $\lambda \nearrow$ )
    - equivalent to capacity arcs "Source  $\rightarrow$  nodes"  $\nearrow$  (**parametric max-flow**)
    - equivalent to convexity of data fidelity of TV problems
  - [Gallo-Grigoriadis-Tarjan 89] showed
    - the comparison principle
    - time complexity of a **parametric** max-flow = time of a **one** max-flow
  - **Algo** Parametric: lowest to greastest
  - **Algo** Parametric: dyadic search [Chambolle D. 06/07] [**Hochbaum 01**]  
→ Solution  $\epsilon = 0$  in *strongly* polynomial time ( $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  becomes  $\log n$ )

DEMO



# Minimizing ROF via maximum-flow (2/4)

Strategies of reconstruction, i.e., order for the series of  $\{\lambda_l\}$

- Dyadic (dichotomy/bitonic) search:  
→  $\|\hat{u} - u^*\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  in  $O(\log_2 \epsilon)$  [D. Sigelle 06]
- A much better idea: **Re-use** the maximum-flow result
  - Inclusion property says:
    - the set a nodes connected to the source is increasing (as  $\lambda \nearrow$ )
    - equivalent to capacity arcs "Source  $\rightarrow$  nodes"  $\nearrow$  (**parametric max-flow**)
    - equivalent to convexity of data fidelity of TV problems
  - [Gallo-Grigoriadis-Tarjan 89] showed
    - the comparison principle
    - time complexity of a **parametric** max-flow = time of a **one** max-flow
  - **Algo** Parametric: lowest to greastest
  - **Algo** Parametric: dyadic search [Chambolle D. 06/07] [**Hochbaum 01**]  
→ Solution  $\epsilon = 0$  in *strongly* polynomial time ( $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  becomes  $\log n$ )

DEMO

# Minimizing ROF via maximum-flow Time results (3/4)

$\frac{1}{2\lambda} \|u - v\|_{\ell^2}^2$ , 8-neighbors, 256 gray-levels  
original,  $\lambda = 10$ ,  $\lambda = 20$ ,  $\lambda = 60$



# Minimizing ROF via maximum-flow Time results (4/4)

$\frac{1}{2\lambda} \|u - v\|_{\ell^2}^2$ , 8-neighbors, 256 gray-levels, Intel Core 2 Duo 2.4 Gz

PR: Push/relabel FIFO max-flow algorithm

BK: [Boykov Kolmogorov 04] max-flow algorithm (efficient for sparse graph)

Images (size)	Approach	$\lambda = 10$	$\lambda = 20$	$\lambda = 60$
<i>Girl</i> (256 <sup>2</sup> )	Parametric PR	5.32	9.24	12.67
	Parametric BK	2.97	3.25	4.04
	Dyadic Parametric PR	1.49	2.05	3.42
	Chambolle/Darbon-Sigelle	0.55	0.72	1.08
	Dyadic Parametric BK	0.42	0.55	0.81
<i>Girl</i> (512 <sup>2</sup> )	Parametric PR	41.14	71.39	140.79
	Parametric BK	11.90	13.19	17.08
	Dyadic Parametric PR	10.15	12.92	22.17
	Chambolle/Darbon-Sigelle	2.34	3.05	5.01
	Dyadic Parametric BK	1.86	2.54	4.19

- Goal: Computing anisotropic mean curvature flows
- Almgren-Taylor-Wang's implicit approach [93]:
  - Given a time-step  $h > 0$
  - A current set  $A^{n-1} \approx A((n-1)h)$ , the curve is  $\partial A^{n-1}$
  - Find the new curve evolved by mean curvature by solving

$$\min_A \mathcal{J}(A) + \frac{1}{h} \int_A d_{A^{n-1}}(x) dx$$

where  $\mathcal{J}$  is an isotropic or anisotropic perimeter and  $d_A$  the signed distance to  $\partial A$ .

- Parametric-based approach
  - a) minimize an approximation of  $\min E(u, d_{A^{n-1}})$  (around the level 0)
  - c) find the new set  $A^n = \{u \geq 0\}$ .
- DEMO

# Crystal Growth

Solving Stefan's equation system using [Almgren 93]  
(→solve one step evolution + update temperature)

