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Section 1

Inverse problems in imaging
• Images we observe are nearly always blurred, noisy, projected versions of some “reality”.

• We wish to dispel the fog of acquisition by removing all the artefacts as much as possible to observe the “real” data.

• This is an inverse problem.
Inverse problems in imaging

- Maximum Likelihood
  - We want to estimate some statistical parameter $\theta$ on the basis of some observation $x$. If $f$ is the sampling distribution, $f(x|\theta)$ is the probability of $x$ when the population parameter is $\theta$. The function

  $$\theta \mapsto f(x|\theta)$$

  is the *likelihood*. The Maximum Likelihood estimate is

  $$\hat{\theta}_{ML}(x) = \arg\max_{\theta} f(x|\theta)$$

- E.g., if we have a linear operator $H$ (in matrix form) and Gaussian deviates, then

  $$\arg\max_{x} f(x) = -\|Hx - y\|_2^2 = -x^\top H^\top H x + 2y^\top H x - y^\top y$$

  is a quadratic form with a unique maximum, provided by

  $$\nabla f(x) = -2H^\top H x + 2H^\top y = 0 \rightarrow \theta = (H^\top H)^{-1} H^\top y$$
• When possible, MLE is fast and effective. Many imaging operators have a MLE interpretation:
  • Gaussian smoothing ;
  • Wiener filtering ;
  • Filtered back projection for tomography ;
  • Principal component analysis . . .

• However these require a very descriptive model (with few degrees of freedom) and a lot of data, typically unsuitable for images because we do not have a suitable model for natural images.

• When we do not have all these hypotheses, sometimes the Bayesian Maximum A Posteriori approach can be used instead.
If we assume that we know a prior distribution $g$ over $\theta$, i.e. some a-priori information. Following Bayesian statistics, we can treat $\theta$ as a random variable and compute the posterior distribution of $\theta$:

$$\theta \mapsto f(\theta|x) = \frac{f(x|\theta)g(\theta)}{\int_{\vartheta \in \Theta} f(x|\vartheta)g(\vartheta)d\vartheta}$$

(i.e. the Bayes theorem).

Then the Maximum a Posteriori is the estimate

$$\hat{\theta}_{MAP}(x) = \arg\max_{\theta} f(\theta|x) = \arg\max_{\theta} f(x|\theta)g(\theta)$$

MAP is a regularization of ML.
So far this is statistics theory. What is the link between MAP and imaging? We need an imaging model.

- A Markov Random Field is a model made of a set of “sites” (a.k.a. pixels) $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$, a set of random variables $y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ associated with each pixel, and a set of neighbours $N_{1,\ldots,n}$ at each pixel location.
- $N_p$ describes the neighborhood at pixel $p$.
- Obeys the **Markov condition**, i.e.

\[
\Pr(y_p|y_{S\setminus p}) = \Pr(y_p|N_p)
\]

i.e.: the probability of a pixel $p$ depends only on its immediate neighbours.
Formulating the MAP of an MRF

Now let us express a MAP formulation for an MRF

- Given a set of observables $x = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$,
- We derive a MAP

$$\hat{y} = \arg\max_{y_1\ldots n} \Pr(y_1\ldots n|x)$$

$$= \arg\max_{y_1\ldots n} \prod_{n=1}^{n} \Pr(x_n|y_n) \Pr(y_1\ldots n)$$

$$= \arg\max_{y_1\ldots n} \sum_{n=1}^{n} \log[\Pr(x_n|y_n)] + \log[\Pr(y_1\ldots n)]$$

$$= \arg\min_{y_1\ldots n} \sum_{p=1}^{n} U_p(y_p) + \sum_{u\in N_p} P_{u,p}(y_u, y_p)$$

(Geman & Geman, PAMI 1984).
• This last sum is an energy contains \textit{unary} terms \( U_p(y_p) \) and \textit{pairwise} terms \( P_{u,p}(y_u, y_p) \).

• We now have an optimization problem. Depending on the expression of the probability functions, can solve it by i: statistical means, e.g. EM, ii: physical analogies, e.g. simulated annealing or iii: via linear/convex optimization techniques.

• With some restrictions, \textit{graph cuts} are able to optimize these energies.
For instance, consider the binary \textit{segmentation} problem. With unary weights the above can be written:

\[ \text{argmin} \hat{E}(G) = \sum_{v_i \in V} w_i(V_i) + \lambda \sum_{e_{ij} \in \bar{E}} w_{ij} \delta_{V_i \neq V_j} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

- $V_i$ is 1 if $v_i \in V_s$ and 0 if $v_i \in V_t$, i.e. it is 1 if pixel $i$ belongs to the partition containing $s$ and 0 otherwise.
- $\delta_{V_i \neq V_j}$ is 1 if the corresponding $e_{ij}$ is on the cut, and 0 otherwise.
- The first sum contains the pairwise terms, and sums the cost of the cut in the image plane. The second sum contains the unary terms, and adds the cost of a pixel to belong to either the partition containing $s$ or the partition containing $t$. 
Figure: Segmentation with unary weights. In this case weighted edges link the source and the sink to all the pixels in the image (a). The min-cut is a surface separating \( s \) from \( t \) (b). Some strong edge weights can ensure the surface crosses the pixel plane, enforcing topology constraints.
Figure: Binary segmentation with unary weights and no markers

(Boykov-Jolly segmentation model, ICCV 2001).
Inverse problems in imaging

• GC are able to optimize some MRF energies exactly (globally) in the binary case

• More generally, *submodular* (e.g. discrete-convex) energies can be at least locally optimized using graph cuts

• Using various constructions, e.g. Ishikawa PAMI 2003, it is possible to map restoration (denoising) problems to GC.

• Many GC optimization approaches have been invented to solve the corresponding energies: $\alpha$-expansions, $\alpha - \beta$ moves, convex moves, etc (Veksler 1999). They were essentially known before in other communities (Murota 2003).

• More recent approaches are able to optimize the same kind of energies using different techniques: Belief propagation, Primal-dual Tree-Reweighted, etc (Kolmogorov PAMI 2006).
Graph-based energies

These formulation are very useful but suffer from the purely discrete graph framework

- Formulations and solutions are not isotropic (grid bias)
- Graph based formulation can be resource-intensive (memory and speed)
- They are hard to parallelize
- Hard to incorporate extra constraints and projection/linear operators.
Section 2

Concepts in optimisation
Introduction

• Mathematical optimization is a domain of applied mathematics relevant to many areas including statistics, mechanics, signal and image processing.
• Generalizes many well known techniques such as least squares, linear programming, convex programming, integer programming, combinatorial optimization and others.
• In this talk we will overview both the continuous and discrete formulations.
• We follow the notations of Boyd & Vandeberghe [?].
An optimization problem generally has the following form

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{minimize} & \quad f_0(x) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad f_i(x) \leq b_i, \ i = 1, \ldots, m
\end{align*}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

$x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is a vector of $\mathbb{R}^n$ called the *optimization variable* of the problem; $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the *cost function* functional; the $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the *constraints* and the $b_i$ are the *bounds* (or limits).

A vector $x^*$ is is *optimal*, or is a solution to the problem, if it has the smallest objective value among all vectors that satisfy the constraints.
• The type of the variables, the cost function and the constraints determine the type of problems we are dealing with.

• Optimization problems, in their most general form, are usually unsolvable in practice. NP-complete problems (traveling salesperson, subset-sum, etc) can classically be put in this form and so can many NP-hard problems.

• Some mathematical regularity is necessary to be able to find a solution: for example, linearity or convexity in all the functions.

• Requiring integer solutions usually, but not always, makes things much harder: Diophantine vs linear equations for instance.
The resolution of an optimisation problem depends on its form. In order of complexity, we can solve optimisation problems:

- In closed form solution (some regression problems)
- If convex: by some iterative descent-like method, yielding a global optimum. Note: may work in the non-differentiable case.
- If non-convex, but regular in some other way (differentiable, quasi-convex, ...): iterative descent-like, converging to a local optimum (or a critical point).
- If combinatorial, usually NP-hard, some exceptions: transport problems (graph cuts, transshipment problems).
- If all else fails: brute force, meta-heuristics.
Example closed form: least-squares

Least squares with no constraints

\[
\text{minimize } f_0(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a^T x_i - b_i \tag{7}
\]

The system is quadratic, so convex and differentiable. The solution to (7) is unique and reduces to the linear equation

\[
(A^T A)x = A^T b. \quad \text{(normal equation)} \tag{8}
\]

The analytical solution is \( x = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T b \), however \( A^T A \) should never be calculated, much less the inverse, for numerical reasons.
Even with something as simple as least-squares, if $A$ is ill-conditioned, the solution will be very sensitive to noise, e.g. in the example of deconvolution or tomography. One solution is to use regularization.

### Ill-posed least-squares problems

The simplest regularization strategy is due to Tikhonov [?].

$$\text{minimize } f_0(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \|\Gamma x\|_2^2,$$

(9)

where $\Gamma$ is a well-chosen operator, e.g. $\lambda I$ or $\nabla x$ or a wavelet operator. The solution is given analytically by

$$x = (A^T A + \Gamma^T \Gamma)^{-1} A^T b$$

(10)
Example iterative: linear programming

Linear programming with constraints

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{minimize } & \quad c^T x \\
\text{subject to } & \quad a_i^T x \leq b_i; \quad i = 1, \ldots, n
\end{align*}
\] (11)

• No analytical solution.
• Well established family of algorithms: the Simplexe (Dantzig 1948); interior-point (Karmarkar 1984)
• Not always easy to recognize. Important for compressive sensing.
### Primal / Dual linear programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primal</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>minimize</strong> $c^T x$</td>
<td><strong>maximize</strong> $b^T y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject to $a_i^T x \leq b_i; i = 1, \ldots, n$</td>
<td>subject to $a_i x \geq c_i; i = 1, \ldots, m$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) (13)

- A primal/dual pair of LP problems can be obtained by transposing the constraint matrix and swapping cost function and constraint bounds.
- The primal and dual optima, if they exist, are the same, and can be easily deducted from each other.
Duality in convex optimization

- The same concept of duality applies in convex optimization
- Duality allows one to swap constraints for terms in the objective function
- Two concepts of duality: Lagrange and Fenchel. Both are equivalent.
Lagrange duality

Primal form

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min.} & \quad f_0(x) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad f_i(x) \leq 0, \ i \in [1, m] \\
& \quad h_i(x) = 0, \ i \in [1, p]
\end{align*}
\] (14)

Dual form

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{max.} & \quad g(\lambda, \nu) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} L_{x, \lambda, \nu} = \left( f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i f_i(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \nu_i h_i(x) \right) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad \lambda \geq 0
\end{align*}
\] (15)
• $g(\lambda, \nu)$ is always concave;
• if $p^*$ is an optimal solution for (14), then $\forall \lambda \geq 0, \forall \nu, g(\lambda, \nu) \leq p^*$
• if $d^*$ is the optimal solution for (15), then $d^* \leq p^*$ (weak duality)
• if (14) is convex, then $d^* = p^*$ (strong duality). (Note: this means the $h_i$ are linear). The reverse is not true.
• Various interesting interpretations, in particular saddle-point (min-max) optimisation, leading to efficient algorithms.
• Complementary slackness;
• KKT conditions.
**Definition**

Let \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \), the function \( f^* : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is defined as:

\[
f^*(y) = \inf_{x \in \text{dom}f} y^T x - f(x)
\]

(16)

is the *conjugate* of \( f \). It is always convex.

**Example**

If \( \| \cdot \| \) is a norm on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and its dual norm \( \| \cdot \|^* \), the conjugate of \( f(x) = \| x \| \) is

\[
f^*(y) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \| y \|^* \leq 1 \\
\infty & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

(17)

i.e. \( f^*(y) = \iota \| y \|^* \leq 1 \).
Link between Lagrange duality and Fenchel conjugate

Unconstrained problem

\[
\text{minimize } f_0(Ax + b).
\] (18)

Its Lagrangian dual is the constant \( p^* \), not very interesting or useful.

Related problem

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{minimize } & \quad f_0(y) \\
\text{subject to } & \quad Ax + b = y,
\end{align*}
\] (19)

its dual is

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize } & \quad b^\top \nu - f_0^*(\nu) \\
\text{subject to } & \quad A^\top \nu = 0
\end{align*}
\] (20)
Problem

Minimize the function $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$

- if $f$ has a $\beta$-Lipschitz gradient with $\beta \in ]0, +\infty[$,
  \[
  \forall l \in \mathbb{N}, x_{l+1} = x_l + \gamma_l \nabla f(x_l), \, (\text{Explicit step}) \tag{21}
  \]
  with $0 < \inf_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_l$ and $\sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_l < 2\beta^{-1}$.
- If $f$ is not differentiable, replace the gradient with the subgradient
  \[
  \partial f = \{ t \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, f(y) \geq f(x) + t^T(y - x) \} \tag{22}
  \]
  $t \in \partial f(x) : \text{subgradient at } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \partial f : \mathbb{R}^n \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^n}$. 
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Illustration subgradient

\[ f(y) \]
\[ f(x) + \langle y - x | t \rangle \]
\[ t \in \partial f(x) \]
Subgradient

\[ f(y) \]

\[ f(x) + \langle y - x | t \rangle \]

Illustration subgradient
Illustration subgradient

\[ f(y) = f(x) + \langle y - x | t \rangle \]

\[ t \in \partial f(x) \]
Illustration subgradient

\[ f(y) = f(x) + \langle y - x | t \rangle \]

\[ t \in \partial f(x) \]
Illustration subgradient

\[ f(y) \]
\[ f(x) + \langle y - x | t \rangle \]

\[ t \in \partial f(x) \]
Illustration subgradient

\[ f(y) = f(x) + \langle y - x \rangle_t \]

\( t \in \partial f(x) \)
Illustration subgradient

\[ f(y) = f(x) + \langle y - x | t \rangle \]

\[ t \in \partial f(x) \]
Proximal methods: tools for solving inverse problems on a large scale

Subgradient:

\[ f(y) = f(x) + \langle y - x | t \rangle \]

Illustration subgradient
Examples of subgradients

- if $f$ is differentiable at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $\partial f(x) = \{ \nabla f(x) \}$
- if $f = |.|$, then

\[ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \partial f(x) = \begin{cases} \{ \text{sign}(x) \} & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ [-1, +1] & \text{if } x = 0 \end{cases} \quad (23) \]
Subgradient algorithm [Shor, 1979]

Explicit form

\[
\forall l \in \mathbb{N}, x_{l+1} = x_l - \gamma_lt_l; t_l \in \partial f(x_l),
\]

where \((\forall l \in \mathbb{N}), \gamma_l \in ]0, +\infty[, \sum_{0}^{+\infty} \gamma_l^2 < +\infty\) and \(\sum_{0}^{+\infty} \gamma_l = +\infty\).

Implicit form

\[
\forall l \in \mathbb{N}, x_{l+1} = x_l - \gamma_lt'_l, t'_l \in \partial f(x_{l+1})
\]

\(\Leftrightarrow x_l - x_{l+1} \in \gamma_l \partial f(x_{l+1})\)
**Origins of the proximity operator**

**Property**

Let $\phi \in \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a unique vector $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x - \hat{x} \in \partial \phi(\hat{x})$

- let $\hat{x} = \text{prox}_\phi(x)$
- $\text{prox}_\phi(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$: proximity operator.

**Proximal point algorithm**

\[ \forall l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x_l - x_{l+1} \in \gamma_l \partial f(x_{l+1}) \]
\[ \iff x_{l+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma_l f}(x_l) \quad (26) \]
Alternate definition of the prox

**Property**

Let $f \in \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{prox}_f(x)$ is the only minimizer of

$$y \mapsto f(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

**The definitions are equivalent**

$$\text{prox}_f(x) = \arg\min_y f(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2$$

$$\iff 0 \in \partial\{f(y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2\}$$

$$\iff 0 \in \partial f(y) - x + y$$

$$\iff \exists \hat{x}, x - \hat{x} \in \partial f(\hat{x})$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)
Examples of prox

- If $f(x) = |x|$, $\text{prox}_f(x) = \begin{cases} 
  x + 1 & x \leq -1 \\
  0 & x \in [-1, +1] \\
  x - 1 & x \geq 1 
\end{cases}$

  This is soft-thresholding, very popular in wavelet analysis, also see Lasso algorithm in statistics.

- If $f = \iota(\chi)$, $\chi$ convex set, and $\iota$ the indicator function

  \[ \iota_{\chi}(x) = \begin{cases} 
    0 & \forall x \in \chi, \\
    +\infty & \text{otherwise} 
  \end{cases} \]

  $\text{prox}_f(x) = \text{projection onto convex set } \chi$. 
We seek to minimize the functional $f + g$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, assuming that $g$ has a $\beta$-Lipschitz gradient.

Forward-backward algorithm

$$\forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \ x_{\ell+1} = x_{\ell} - \gamma_\ell(t'_\ell + \nabla g(x_{\ell})), t'_\ell \in \partial f(x_{\ell+1})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow x_{\ell+1} = \text{prox}_{\gamma_\ell f}(x_{\ell} - \gamma_\ell \nabla g(x_{\ell}))$$
Section 3

Formulations in imaging
Continuous image restoration model

- We suppose there exists some unknown image $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$.
- However we do observe some data $y \in \mathbb{R}^Q$ via some linear operator $H$, which is corrupted by some noise:

$$y = H\bar{x} + u, \quad H \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times N}$$
We seek to recover a good approximation $\hat{x}$ of $x$ from $H$ and $y$.

$H$ can be:
- Model for camera, including defocus and motion blur
- MRI, PET,
- X-Ray tomography
- …

$u$ often modeled by Additive White Gaussian Noise, but can be Poisson, Poisson Gauss, Rician, etc.

Simplest case: least squares:

$$\hat{x} = \arg\min_x \|Hx - y\|_2^2$$

analytical, simple, effective, but not robust to outliers.
• We seek to recover a good approximation $\hat{x}$ of $x$ from $H$ and $y$.

• $H$ can be:
  - Model for camera, including defocus and motion blur
  - MRI, PET,
  - X-Ray tomography
  - ...

• $u$ often modeled by Additive White Gaussian Noise, but can be Poisson, Poisson Gauss, Rician, etc.

Tikhonov regularization:

$$\hat{x} = \arg\min_x \|x\|_2^2 + \lambda\|Hx - y\|_2^2$$

reflect the prior assumption that we want to avoid large $x$. Also analytical and more robust but not sparse.
Recovery

- We seek to recover a good approximation $\hat{x}$ of $x$ from $H$ and $y$.
- $H$ can be:
  - Model for camera, including defocus and motion blur
  - MRI, PET,
  - X-Ray tomography
  - ...
- $u$ often modeled by Additive White Gaussian Noise, but can be Poisson, Poisson Gauss, Rician, etc.

Enforced sparsity:

$$\hat{x} = \arg\min_x \|x\|_0 + \lambda \|Hx - y\|_2$$

If we know $x$ to be sparse (many zero elements) in some space (e.g. Wavelets). Highly non-convex.
Recovery

- We seek to recover a good approximation $\hat{x}$ of $x$ from $H$ and $y$.
- $H$ can be:
  - Model for camera, including defocus and motion blur
  - MRI, PET,
  - X-Ray tomography
  - ...
- $u$ often modeled by Additive White Gaussian Noise, but can be Poisson, Poisson Gauss, Rician, etc.

Compressive sensing:

$$\hat{x} = \arg\min_x \|x\|_1 + \lambda\|Hx - y\|_2$$

If we know $x$ to be sparse (many zero elements) in some space (e.g. Wavelets). Smallest convex approximation of the $\ell_0$ pseudo-norm.
Penalized optimization problem

Find

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( F(x) = \Phi(Hx - y) + \lambda R(x) \right),$$

\(\Phi \leftrightarrow\) Fidelity to data term, related to noise

\(R \leftrightarrow\) Regularization term, related to some \textit{a priori} assumptions

\(\lambda \leftrightarrow\) Regularization weight

Here, \(x\) is \textbf{sparse} in a dictionary \(\mathcal{V}\) of analysis vectors in \(\mathbb{R}^N\)

$$F_0(x) = \Phi(Hx - y) + \lambda \ell_0(Vx)$$
Penalized optimization problem

Find

$$
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( F(x) = \Phi(Hx - y) + \lambda R(x) \right),
$$

\(\Phi \rightsquigarrow\) Fidelity to data term, related to noise

\(R \rightsquigarrow\) Regularization term, related to some \textit{a priori} assumptions

\(\lambda \rightsquigarrow\) Regularization weight

Here, \(x\) is \textbf{sparse} in a dictionary \(\mathcal{V}\) of analysis vectors in \(\mathbb{R}^N\)

$$
F_\delta(x) = \Phi(Hx - y) + \lambda \sum_{c=1}^{C} \psi_\delta(V_c^\top x)
$$

where \(\psi_\delta\) is a \textbf{differentiable, non-convex} approximation of the \(\ell_0\) norm.
Benefits and drawbacks of the continuous approach

- **pros**
  - flexible theory (not just denoising; deblurring, tomography, MRI reconstruction, etc)
  - large library of algorithms, many more than in the discrete case
  - isotropic
  - convergence proofs and characterization of solutions.

- **cons**
  - non-explicit discretization
  - non-flexible structure
  - deriving projections operators sometimes inefficient or impossible
  - conditions for convergence.
Both the previous discrete and continuous formulation have a MAP interpretation.

- Total Variation (TV) minimization: good regularization tool
- Weighted TV: penalization of the gradient leading to improved results

Our contribution

- General combinatorial formulation of the dual TV problem: easily suitable to various graphs
- Generic constraint in the dual problem: more flexible penalization of the gradient → sharper results
1. Generalization of TV models
2. Parallel Proximal Algorithm as an efficient solver
3. Results
Section 4

Discrete calculus
Discrete formulation on graphs - notations

Graph of $N$ vertices, $M$ edges

Incidence matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
  e_1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
  e_2 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
  e_3 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\
  e_4 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\
  e_5 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

- $A$ gradient operator
- $A^\top$ divergence operator
- allows general formulation of problems on arbitrary graphs

For more details: L. Grady and J.R. Polimeni,

Minimal surfaces
Motivation

- In the continuum: Minimal cut (surface in 3D) is dual of continuous maximum flow [Strang 1983]
- In the classic discrete case min-cut (="Graph cuts")/ max flow duality but grid bias in the solution
- Recent trend: employ a spatially continuous maximum flow to produce solutions with no grid bias

Max Flow (Graph Cuts)

Continuous Max Flow
[Appleton-Talbot 2006]
Motivation


Our contribution: Combinatorial Continuous Maximum Flow

- a new discrete isotropic formulation
- avoids blockiness artifacts
- is proved to converge, is fast
- generalizes to arbitrary graphs

[In SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, 2011]
Combinatorial Continuous Maximum Flow (CCMF)

- Incidence matrix of a graph noted $A$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Continuous MaxFlow} & \\
\max_{\vec{F}} & \vec{F}_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} & \nabla \cdot \vec{F} = 0, \\
& \|\vec{F}\| \leq g.
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Combinatorial formulation} & \\
\max_{\vec{F}} & \vec{F}_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} & A^T \vec{F} = 0, \\
& |A^T|F^2 \leq g^2
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MaxFlow, GraphCuts} & \\
\max_{\vec{F}} & \vec{F}_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} & A^T \vec{F} = 0, \\
& |\vec{F}| \leq g
\end{align*}
\]

- $g$ defined on nodes

- CCMF: convex problem
- Resolution by an interior point method.
Combinatorial Continuous Maximum Flow (CCMF)

- Incidence matrix of a graph noted $A$

\[
\text{Continuous MaxFlow} \quad \max \quad \vec{F}_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad \nabla \cdot \vec{F} = 0, \\
\quad \|\vec{F}\| \leq g.
\]

\[
\text{Combinatorial formulation} \quad \max \quad F_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad A^T F = 0, \\
\quad |A^T F|^2 \leq g^2.
\]

MaxFlow, GraphCuts

\[
\max_F \quad F_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad A^T F = 0, \\
\quad |F| \leq g
\]

$g$ defined on edges

$g$ defined on nodes

- CCMF : convex problem
- Resolution by an interior point method.
Combinatorial Continuous Maximum Flow (CCMF)

- Incidence matrix of a graph noted $A$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Continuous MaxFlow} & \quad \text{Combinatorial formulation} & \quad \text{MaxFlow, GraphCuts} \\
\max \limits_{\vec{F}} & \quad F_{st} & \max \limits_{\vec{F}} & \quad F_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \nabla \cdot \vec{F} = 0, & \text{s.t.} & \quad A^T \vec{F} = 0, \\
& \quad \|\vec{F}\| \leq g. & \quad |A^T| F^2 \leq g^2 & \quad g \text{ defined on edges}
\end{align*}
\]

- CCMF : convex problem
- Resolution by an interior point method.
**Combinatorial Continuous Maximum Flow (CCMF)**

- Incidence matrix of a graph noted $A$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Continuous MaxFlow} & \quad \text{Combinatorial formulation} \\
\text{MaxFlow, GraphCuts}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\max_{\vec{F}} & \quad F_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \nabla \cdot \vec{F} = 0, \\
& \quad \|\vec{F}\| \leq g.
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\max_{\vec{F}} & \quad F_{st} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad A^T F = 0, \\
& \quad |A^T| F^2 \leq g^2.
\end{align*}
\]

- $g$ defined on nodes

- CCMF : convex problem
- Resolution by an interior point method.
Combinatorial Continuous Maximum Flow (CCMF)

- Incidence matrix of a graph noted $A$

Continuous MaxFlow

$$\max_{\vec{F}} \quad F_{st}$$

s.t. $\nabla \cdot \vec{F} = 0$, $\|\vec{F}\| \leq g$.

MaxFlow, GraphCuts

$$\max_{\vec{F}} \quad F_{st}$$

s.t. $A^T \vec{F} = 0$, $|A^T|F^2 \leq g^2$

$g$ defined on nodes

- CCMF : convex problem
- Resolution by an interior point method.
Graph Cuts vs CCMF

Scale of weight intensity:

1 ... ∞
The dual of the CCMF problem is

\[
\min_{\lambda \geq 0, \nu} \sum_{v_i \in V} \lambda_i g_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{e_{ij} \in E \setminus \{s,t\}} \frac{(\nu_i - \nu_j)^2}{\lambda_i + \lambda_j} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\nu_s - \nu_t - 1)^2}{\lambda_s + \lambda_t}
\]

- weighted cut
- smoothness term
- source-sink enforcement

Image with seeds
\[\lambda\]
Threshold of \(\nu\) at .5
Minimal surfaces

Catenoid test problem:

• source constituted by two full circles
• sink by the remaining boundary of the image, constant metric $g$

analytic minimal surface

CCMF result isosurface of $\nu$

Root Mean Square Error between the surfaces : 0.75
(Appleton-Talbot error : 1.98)
Comparison with Graph cuts

Graph cuts result

CCMF result

GC

CCMF

GC

CCMF

GC

CCMF
Convergence
Genericity of the method

Unseeded segmentation

Classification
Genericity of the method
Total variation regularization

- Given an original image $f$
- Deduce a restored image $u$

Weighted anisotropic TV model [Gilboa and Osher 2007]

$$\min_u \int \left( \int w_{x,y} (u_y - u_x)^2 \, dy \right)^{1/2} \, dx + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int (u_x - f_x)^2 \, dx$$

where
- $\lambda \in ]0, +\infty[$ regularization parameter
Equivalent dual formulation

Weighted anisotropic TV model [Gilboa and Osher 2007]

\[
\min_u \int \left( \int w_{x,y} (u_y - u_x) \, dy \right)^{1/2} \, dx + \Phi(u)
\]

is equivalent [Chan, Golub, Mulet 1999] to the min-max problem

\[
\min_u \max_{||p||_\infty \leq 1} \int \int w_{x,y}^{1/2} (u_y - u_x) p_{x,y} \, dx \, dy + \Phi(u)
\]

with \( p \) a projection vector field.

Main idea

- \( p \) was introduced in practice to compute a faster solution
- constraining \( p \) can promote better results
Segmentation

- Same model as denoising, with a labeled fidelity term
- Same regularisation. This includes very widespread models such as watershed, region growing, minimal curves and surfaces, geodesic active contours, and more.
Deblurring / tomography simply composes a linear term within the fidelity.

Same model for regularization as before

Possible to do very advanced applications: local tomography, angular integration tomography, dual image deblurring, etc.

Also applicable with wavelets, etc. Any linear operator can serve.
Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be the restored image. 
[Bougleux et al. 2007]

$$
\min_u \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{j \in N_i} w_{i,j} (u_j - u_i)^2 \right)^{1/2} + \Phi(u)
$$

where $N_i = \{ j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid e_{i,j} \in E \}$.

We introduce the following combinatorial formulation for the primal dual problem

$$
\min_u \max_{\|p\|_{\infty} \leq 1, \ p \in \mathbb{R}^M} p^\top ((Au) \cdot \sqrt{w}) + \Phi(u)
$$
Constraining the projection vector

- Introducing the projection vector \( F \in \mathbb{R}^M = p \cdot \sqrt{w} \)
- Constraining \( F \) to belong to a convex set \( C \)

\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{F \in C} \left( F^\top (Au) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|u - f\|_2^2 \right)
\]

- \( C = \bigcap_{i=1}^{m-1} C_i \neq \emptyset \) where \( C_1, \ldots, C_{m-1} \) closed convex sets of \( \mathbb{R}^M \).
- Given \( g \in \mathbb{R}^N, \theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^M, \alpha \geq 1, \)
  \( C_i = \{F \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid \|\theta_i \cdot F\|_\alpha \leq g_i\} \).
Dual constrained TV based formulation

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{F \in C} \left( F^\top (Au) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|u - f\|^2_2 \right)$$

- \[ C = \bigcap_{i=1}^{m-1} C_i, \quad C_i = \{ F \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid \|\theta_i \cdot F\|_\alpha \leq g_i \}, \quad \alpha \geq 1. \]

Example adapted to image denoising

- \( g_i \in \mathbb{R}^N \) weight on vertex \( i \), inversely function of the gradient of \( f \) at node \( i \).
- Flat area : weak gradient \( \rightarrow \) strong \( g_i \) \( \rightarrow \) strong \( F_{i,j} \) \( \rightarrow \) weak local variations of \( u \).
- Contours : strong gradient \( \rightarrow \) weak \( g_i \) \( \rightarrow \) weak \( F_{i,j} \) \( \rightarrow \) large local variations of \( u \) allowed.
Illustration of constraining flow.
Sharper results

Noisy image

DCTV

Weighted TV
Extension of our DCTV based formulation

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{F \in \mathcal{C}} \quad F^\top(Au) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|u - f\|_2^2$$

- $f \in \mathbb{R}^Q$, observed image
- $u \in \mathbb{R}^N$, restored image
- $F \in \mathbb{R}^M$, dual solution: projection vector
Extension of our DCTV based formulation

\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{F \in C} F^\top (Au) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|Hu - f\|^2_2
\]

- \(f \in \mathbb{R}^Q\), observed image
- \(u \in \mathbb{R}^N\), restored image
- \(F \in \mathbb{R}^M\), dual solution: projection vector
- \(H \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times N}\), degradation matrix
Extension of our DCTV based formulation

\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{F \in C} \quad F^\top (Au) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|Hu - f\|_2^2 + \frac{\eta}{2} \| Ku \|_2^2
\]

- \(f \in \mathbb{R}^Q\), observed image
- \(u \in \mathbb{R}^N\), restored image
- \(F \in \mathbb{R}^M\), dual solution : projection vector
- \(H \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times N}\), degradation matrix
- \(K \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}\) : projection onto \(\text{Ker} \, H\), \(\eta \geq 0\)
Extension of our DCTV based formulation

\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{F \in \mathcal{C}} F^\top (Au) + \frac{1}{2}(Hu - f)^\top \Lambda^{-1}(Hu - f) + \frac{\eta}{2} \|Ku\|^2
\]

**Regularization**

\[
\begin{align*}
F^\top (Au) + \frac{1}{2}(Hu - f)^\top \Lambda^{-1}(Hu - f) + \frac{\eta}{2} \|Ku\|^2
\end{align*}
\]

**Data Fidelity**

- \( f \in \mathbb{R}^Q \), observed image
- \( u \in \mathbb{R}^N \), restored image
- \( F \in \mathbb{R}^M \), dual solution: projection vector
- \( H \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times N} \), degradation matrix
- \( K \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \), projection onto \( \text{Ker} \, H \), \( \eta \geq 0 \)
- \( \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times Q} \), matrix of weights, positive definite
Primal formulation

\[ \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sigma_C(Au) + \frac{1}{2}(Hu - f)\top \Lambda^{-1}(Hu - f) + \frac{\eta}{2} \|Ku\|^2 \]

- \( C = \bigcap_{i=1}^{m-1} C_i \neq \emptyset \) where \( C_1, \ldots, C_{m-1} \) closed convex sets of \( \mathbb{R}^M \).
- \( \sigma_C \) support function of the convex set \( C \)

\[ \sigma_C : \mathbb{R}^M \to ]-\infty, +\infty] : a \mapsto \sup_{F \in C} F\top a. \]
The problem admits a unique solution $\hat{u}$.

Fenchel-Rockafellar dual problem:

$$\min_{F \in \mathbb{R}^M} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \iota_{C_i}(F) + f_m(F)$$

where $\iota_C$ is the indicator function of the convex $C$ (equal to 0 inside $C$ and $+\infty$ outside),

$$f_m: F \mapsto \frac{1}{2}F^\top A \Gamma A^\top F - F^\top A \Gamma H^\top \Lambda^{-1} f,$$

and $\Gamma = (H^\top \Lambda^{-1} H + \eta K)^{-1}$.

If $\hat{F}$ is a solution to the dual problem,

$$\hat{u} = \Gamma \left( H^\top \Lambda^{-1} f - A^\top \hat{F} \right).$$
Families of algorithms in continuous optimization

- Contour-based algorithms
- Snakes
- Level sets
- Region-based algorithms
- Primal only algorithms
- Primal-dual algorithms
\( \gamma > 0, \nu \in ]0, 2[. \)

Repeat until convergence

For (in parallel) \( r = 1, \ldots, s + 1 \)

\[
\pi_r = \begin{cases} 
P_{C_r}(y_r) & \text{if } r \leq s \\
(\gamma A\Gamma A^\top + I)^{-1}(\gamma A\Gamma H^\top \Lambda^{-1} f + y_{s+1}) & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
z = \frac{2}{s+1}(\pi_1 + \cdots + \pi_{s+1}) - F
\]

For (in parallel) \( r = 1, \ldots, s + 1 \)

\[
y_r = y_r + \nu(z - p_r)
\]

\[
F = F + \frac{\nu}{2}(z - F)
\]
\(\gamma > 0, \nu \in ]0, 2[.\)

Repeat until convergence

For (in parallel) \(r = 1, \ldots, s + 1\)

\[
\pi_r = \begin{cases} 
P_{\mathcal{C}_r}(y_r) & \text{if } r \leq s \\ 
(\gamma A\Gamma A^\top + I)^{-1}(\gamma A\Gamma H^\top \Lambda^{-1}f + y_{s+1}) & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases}
\]

\[z = \frac{2}{s+1}(\pi_1 + \cdots + \pi_{s+1}) - F\]

For (in parallel) \(r = 1, \ldots, s + 1\)

\[
y_r = y_r + \nu(z - p_r)\]

\[F = F + \frac{\nu}{2}(z - F)\]

• Simple projections onto hyperspheres
Parallel ProXimal Algorithm (PPXA) for DCTV [?]

\[ \gamma > 0, \nu \in ]0, 2[. \]

Repeat until convergence

For (in parallel) \( r = 1, \ldots, s + 1 \)

\[
\pi_r = \begin{cases} 
P_{C_r}(y_r) & \text{if } r \leq s \\
(\gamma A\Gamma A^\top + I)^{-1}(\gamma A\Gamma H^\top \Lambda^{-1} f + y_{s+1}) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
z = \frac{2}{s+1}(\pi_1 + \cdots + \pi_{s+1}) - F
\]

For (in parallel) \( r = 1, \ldots, s + 1 \)

\[
y_r = y_r + \nu(z - p_r)
\]

\[
F = F + \frac{\nu}{2}(z - F)
\]

- Linear system resolution
Quantitative performances

- Speed: competitive with the most efficient algorithm for optimizing weighted TV
- Denoising a $512 \times 512$ image
  - with an Alternated Direction of Multiplier Method: 0.4 seconds
  - with the Parallel Proximal Algorithm: 0.7 seconds
- Quantitative denoising experiments on standard images show improvements of SNR (from 0.2 to 0.5 dB) for images corrupted with Gaussian noise of variance $\sigma^2$ from 5 to 25.
Results in image denoising

Original image

Noisy SNR=10.1dB

Weighted TV SNR=13.4dB

DCTV SNR=13.8dB
Results in image denoising

Weighted TV $\text{SNR}=13.4\text{dB}$

DCTV $\text{SNR}=13.8\text{dB}$
Comparison with more standard TV

Figure: Left hand side: Standard deviation of each test image compared with the standard deviation of the denoising results, averaged results with \((\sigma^2 = 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 50)\). Right hand side: mean SNR over the experiments,
Image denoising and deconvolution

Original image

Noisy, blurred image  SNR=12.3dB

DCTV result  SNR=17.2dB
Image fusion

Original image
Noisy SNR=7.2dB
blurry SNR=11.6dB
DCTV SNR=16.3dB
Mesh denoising

Original mesh

Noisy mesh

DCTV regularization on spatial coordinates
Figure: Filtering image data on a biologically sampled image. Noise with variance $\sigma^2 = 10$ was added to the resampled values of the image (c) to produce (d).
Non-local regularization

(a) Nonlocal graph (figure P. Coupé, [?])

**Figure:** Example of Non-Local Graph.

Original image  
Noisy PSNR=28.1dB

Nonlocal DCTV PSNR=35 dB
Section 5

Non-convex optimisation
We wish to minimize the following energy:

\[
\mathcal{MS}(K, u) = \int_{\Omega \setminus K} |u - g|^2 \, dx + \alpha \int_{\Omega \setminus K} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + \lambda \mathcal{H}^1(K \cap \Omega)
\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item \(\Omega\) the image domain
  \item \(g\) a given image (e.g. \(g \in L^\infty(\Omega)\))
  \item \(u\) a simplification of \(g\) (\(u \in H^1(\Omega \setminus K)\))
  \item \(K\) set of contours
\end{itemize}
Relaxation in SBV

\[ \mathcal{M}(u) = \alpha \int_{\Omega} |u - g|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + \lambda \mathcal{H}^1(J_u) \quad (31) \]

Ambrosio-Tortorelli formulation [?]

\[ \text{AT}_\varepsilon(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} \alpha |u - g|^2 + v^2 |\nabla u|^2 + \lambda \varepsilon |\nabla v|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4\varepsilon} |1 - v|^2 \, dx \]

if \( u, v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \) and \( 0 \leq v \leq 1 \).
A bit more Discrete Calculus

Figure: DEC operators
Formulation in DEC

We define $u$ and $g$ on faces and $v$ on vertices and edges. Functions $u$ and $g$ are 2-forms since they represent the gray levels of each pixel.

**U2V0**

\[
\mathcal{AT}^{2,0}_\varepsilon(u, v) = \alpha \langle u - g, u - g \rangle_2 + \langle \mathbf{M}_{01} v, \bar{\star} d_0 \star u \rangle_1^2 + \lambda \varepsilon \langle d_0 v, d_0 v \rangle_1 + \frac{\lambda}{4\varepsilon} \langle 1 - v, 1 - v \rangle_0.
\]

**U0V1**

\[
\mathcal{AT}^{0,1}_\varepsilon(u, v) = \alpha \langle u - g, u - g \rangle_0 + \langle v, d_0 u \rangle_1 \langle v, d_0 u \rangle_1 + \lambda \varepsilon \langle (d_1 + \bar{\star} d_1 \star) v, (d_1 + \bar{\star} d_1 \star) v \rangle_1 + \frac{\lambda}{4\varepsilon} \langle 1 - v, 1 - v \rangle_1.
\]
Restoration
Non-convex optimization

- The current frontier.
- Many interesting applications thought to be very hard to solve: blind deblurring
- Many current methods extend to the Non-Convex case
- Generally only a local minimum is reached, but this might be OK. The minimum might be of high quality: stochastic optimization.
- For instance: see results achieved by deep-learning methods.
We consider the following class of potential functions:

1. $(\forall \delta \in (0, +\infty)) \; \psi_\delta$ is differentiable.
2. $(\forall \delta \in (0, +\infty)) \lim_{t \to \infty} \psi_\delta(t) = 1.$
3. $(\forall \delta \in (0, +\infty)) \; \psi_\delta(t) = \mathcal{O}(t^2)$ for small $t$.

Examples:

- $\psi_\delta(t) = \frac{t^2}{2\delta^2 + t^2}$
- $\psi_\delta(t) = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\delta^2}\right)$
**Objective:** Find $\hat{x} \in \text{Arg min}_x F_\delta(x)$

For all $x'$, let $Q(., x')$ a tangent majorant of $F_\delta$ at $x'$ i.e.,

$$Q(x, x') \geq F_\delta(x), \quad \forall x,$$

$$Q(x', x') = F_\delta(x')$$

**MM algorithm:**

$\forall j \in \{0, \ldots, J\},$

$$x^{j+1} \in \text{Arg min}_x Q(x, x^j)$$
Image reconstruction

Original image $\bar{x}$
128 × 128

Noisy sinogram $y$
SNR=25 dB

- $y = H\bar{x} + u$ with $\begin{cases} H & \text{Radon projection matrix} \\ u & \text{Gaussian noise} \end{cases}$
- $\hat{x} \in \text{Arg min}_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \| Hx - y \|^2 + \lambda \sum_c \psi_\delta(V_c^\top x) \right)$
- Non convex penalty / convex penalty
Results: Non convex penalty

Reconstructed image
SNR = 20.4 dB

MM-MG algorithm:
Convergence in 134 s
Results: Convex penalty

Reconstructed image
SNR = 18.4 dB

MM-MG algorithm:
Convergence in 60 s
Section 6

Conclusion
Conclusion

- Optimization is a very powerful, general methodology
- We’ve drawn a panorama of interesting methodologies in image processing
  - Extension of TV models via dual formulations
  - Many applications in inverse problems including segmentation
  - Proposed algorithm efficiently solves convex and non-convex problems
  - Application to arbitrary graphs
- Generally optimization problems are unsolvable without some regularity assumptions. There exist a trade-off between the generality of a framework and the efficiency of associated algorithms.
- On to new things: hierarchies of partitions.