HIGH-DYNAMIC RANGE COMPRESSION USING A FAST MULTISCALE OPTIMIZATION
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ABSTRACT

High-dynamic-range medical images take intensity values which cannot be visualized on current low-dynamic-range displays. In this paper, we introduce a fast range compression method which avoids common artifacts such as loss of contrast, haloes and gradient inversions. The proposed method first compresses the intensity range using a global transfer function. It then extracts and enhances weak structures using multiscale decomposition and artifact correction. We show that artifact correction can be formulated as a linear-programming problem, for which we proposed an efficient approximate solution. Experiments on real data demonstrate the effectiveness and speed of the proposed algorithm.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Medical imaging devices are able to generate data whose High-Dynamic Range (HDR) far exceeds the display capabilities of current low-dynamic-range monitors. It is therefore necessary to compress their range before visualizing them. The challenge here is to design techniques which reduce the intensity range but preserve the structural content, so that as much information as possible be available for diagnostics.

Range-compression methods fall into two categories [1]: tone-reproduction curves and tone-reproduction operators. Tone-reproduction curves only consider intensity values and apply the same global transfer function to all pixels. They are usually faster than tone-reproduction operators. However, they are also less flexible, which limits the quality of the compressed images. Such methods include simple transfer functions like logarithm, power, or linear functions. Improved results are obtained by defining the transfer function based on intensity histograms [2] or by relying on more complex transfer functions [3]. Tone-reproduction operators take both intensity values and spatial neighborhoods into account. Such methods include direct intensity processing [4], two-band decompositions [5], multi-band decompositions [6], and gradient-domain processing [7].

Range-compression methods suffer from severe artifacts, such as loss of contrast [7], haloes around edges [6], or gradient reversals in slowly varying regions [8]. All of these artifacts make diagnostics more difficult: reduced contrasts remove weak but meaningful structures, while haloes and gradient reversals actually add distracting structures to the images. Moreover, the most successful methods tend to be computationally demanding [7], which hinders their implementation in medical devices.
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In this paper, we present a novel algorithm which aims at compressing HDR images while preserving their structural content. The algorithm first compresses the intensity range using a global transfer function. Since it reduces the image contrast, an enhancement procedure follows which amplifies the weak structures to keep them visible. Here, we rely on a Laplacian pyramid [9] to extract and enhance these structures. We present a novel theoretical analysis of the enhancement artifacts, which leads to a linear-programming problem [10]. Since the size of the images makes linear-programming solvers too complex to be practical, we propose an efficient method which provides an approximate solution. The proposed algorithm is able to quickly process the large images found in typical medical scenarios, which makes it suitable for medical devices. Experiments on real data show the effectiveness and speed of this algorithm.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. First, Section 2 provides a theoretical analysis of the enhancement problem and its artifacts. It leads to a linear-programming formulation, for which Section 3 presents an approximate but efficient solution. Finally, Section 4 describes our experimental results.

2. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

We now turn to the theoretical study of HDR compression and its artifacts. The goal of HDR compression is to transform an input image \( s \) into an output image \( \tilde{s} \) with a reduced intensity range but a similar structural content.

In the following, the grayscale input images is assumed to be a 2D signal made of non-negative integer values \( s_{ij} \), sampled at the integer locations \((i, j)\) of a rectangular lattice. For readability, we shall omit the subscripts when obvious. The output signal \( \tilde{s} \) is defined in a similar fashion.

An intermediate compressed signal \( \tilde{s} \) is first generated by applying a global transfer function to the image, that is

\[ \tilde{s} = f(s) \]  

where \( f(\cdot) \) is a logarithmic function.

The compressed signal is decomposed into a Gaussian pyramid. Let us denote by \( l \) and \( 2l \) respectively the upsampling and downsampling operators, along with their associated low-pass filters. The bands of the Gaussian pyramid are related by \( \tilde{s}_{(l+1)} = 2\tilde{s}_l \), where \( 0 \leq l < L \) is the pyramid level. At the finest level \( \tilde{s}_0 = \tilde{s} \).

These bands are upsampled to compute the high-pass bands of a Laplacian pyramid. Denoting \( \tilde{e}_l \) the coarse signals obtained by upsampling, that is \( \tilde{e}_l = 2\tilde{s}_{l+1} \), the high-pass bands are given by the analysis equation

\[ \tilde{d}_l = \tilde{s}_l - \tilde{e}_l, \]

where \( \tilde{d}_l \) is a logarithmic function.
Enhancing the weak structures amounts to modulating the high-pass bands by gain functions \( g^{(l)}(\cdot) \), that is
\[
\tilde{d}^{(l)} = g^{(l)}(\tilde{d}^{(l-1)}),
\]
and correcting artifacts. The gain functions \( g^{(l)}(\cdot) \) can be any functions whose values are greater or equal to one.

The enhanced signals then follow from the synthesis equation
\[
\hat{s}^{(l)} = \hat{d}^{(l)} + \hat{s}^{(l)}
\]
where \( \hat{d}^{(l)} \) denotes the coarse enhanced signal obtained by upsampling the enhanced signal \( \hat{s}^{(l-1)} \) at the previous levels, that is \( \hat{d}^{(l)} = \lceil \hat{s}^{(l-1)} \rceil \). This top-down process is initialized by \( \hat{s}^{(L-1)} = \hat{s}^{(L-1)} \) at the coarsest level.

The weak-structure enhancement and the artifact correction are computed jointly by solving a series of independent optimization problems, one at each level. For clarity, in the following we drop the exponent \( l \).

The goal is to obtain an enhancement signal \( \hat{d} \) which is:
- as close as possible to the one given by the gain equation (3),
- does not exceed it,
- has the same signs as \( \tilde{d} \),
- does not create artifacts such as overflows, overshoots, and gradient inversions in the enhanced signal \( \hat{s} \) (see Figure 1).

The first three conditions can be expressed by the optimization problem
\[
\max_{\hat{d}} \sum_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{ij}|
\]
such that
\[
0 \leq \chi(\hat{d}_{ij}) \hat{d}_{ij} \leq g(\hat{d}_{ij}) |\hat{d}_{ij}|, \, \forall (i,j),
\]
where \( \chi(\cdot) \) denotes a sign operator which takes the value 1 when its input is non-negative, and \(-1\) otherwise.

The last condition is enforced by introducing two additional sets of constraints in the optimization (5). The first set of constraints prevents positive and negative overflows. It is expressed as
\[
0 \leq \hat{s} \leq s_{\text{max}}
\]
where \( s_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum output value, e.g. 255 in the case of an 8-bit display. From (4) it follows that
\[
-\hat{c} \leq \hat{d} \leq s_{\text{max}} - \hat{c}.
\]

The second set of constraints test the partial derivatives of the signal to prevent gradient inversions and overshoots, both positive and negative. Let us denote the partial derivatives along the axes \( i \) and \( j \) by respectively \( \partial/\partial i \) and \( \partial/\partial j \), which are approximated by the finite difference kernel \([-1 \, 1]\). For the time being, we only consider the partial derivatives along the axis \( i \).

Overshoots are reduced by limiting the increase of the partial-derivative magnitude,
\[
\left| \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right| \leq \beta_{\text{max}} \left| \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right|
\]
where \( \beta_{\text{max}} \) is a constant factor greater than one.

Gradient inversions are prevented by enforcing that the partial derivatives of \( \hat{s} \) and \( \hat{d} \) have the same sign. Here, we actually rely on a stronger version of this constraint, which also prevents the enhancement signal from completely flattening out the signal,
\[
\chi \left( \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right) \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \geq \beta_{\text{min}} \left| \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right|
\]
where \( \beta_{\text{min}} \) is a constant factor smaller than one.

Since (9) enforces that \( \hat{s} \) and \( \hat{d} \) have partial derivatives with the same sign, we have
\[
\frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} = \chi \left( \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right) \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} = \chi \left( \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right) \frac{\partial \hat{d}}{\partial i}.
\]

Therefore, (8) and (9) can be merged into a unique set of constraints. From (4) it follows that
\[
\beta_{\text{min}} \left| \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right| - \varepsilon \leq \chi \left( \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \hat{d}}{\partial i} + \frac{\partial \hat{c}}{\partial i} \right) \leq \beta_{\text{max}} \left| \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right| + \varepsilon,
\]
where the small constant \( \varepsilon \) has been added to cope with noisy signals. The same constraint holds for the partial derivatives along the \( j \) axis.

Putting equations (5), (7) and (11) together, we obtain the following optimization problem,
\[
\max_{\hat{d}} \sum_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{ij}|
\]
such that
\[
\frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \geq \beta_{\text{min}} \left| \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial i} \right| - \varepsilon, \quad \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial j} \geq \beta_{\text{min}} \left| \frac{\partial \hat{s}}{\partial j} \right| - \varepsilon,
\]
where the small constant \( \varepsilon \) has been added to cope with noisy signals. The same constraint holds for the partial derivatives along the \( j \) axis.
As is, this optimization is non-linear and non-derivable due to the sum of absolute values in the objective function. However, it can be transformed into a linear-programming problem [10] by splitting the negative and positive parts of the enhancement signal. Let \( d_+ \) and \( d_- \) be respectively the positive and negative parts, defined by

\[
\begin{align*}
    d &= d_+ - d_- , \\
    0 &\leq d_- \leq s_{\text{max}}, \\
    0 &\leq d_+ \leq s_{\text{max}}.
\end{align*}
\]

The maximization term in (12) is equivalent to

\[
\max_{d_+,d_-} \sum_{i,j} \left( d_{ij}^+ + d_{ij}^- \right)
\]

such that \( V(i,j) \),

\[
\begin{align*}
    d_{ij} &= d_{ij}^+ - d_{ij}^-, \\
    0 &\leq d_{ij}^- \leq s_{\text{max}}, \\
    0 &\leq d_{ij}^+ \leq s_{\text{max}},
\end{align*}
\]

which is linear.

Linear programming problems are particularly interesting. First, there is no risk of falling into a poor local optimum since all local optima are also global optima [10]. Second, these problems have been extensively studied and several methods exist to solve them [10]. In our case, however, the size of the images, and therefore the number of variables and constraints in the optimization, precludes these methods. Instead, we propose an efficient algorithm which provides an approximate solution.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

As mentioned in the previous section, the proposed algorithm first reduces the image range using a global transfer function and then enhances the weak structures by finding an approximate solution to the optimization problem (12). Figure 2 gives an overview of the enhancement process.

For efficiency, range compression (1) is performed using a look-up table. Moreover, the separable binomial filter [1 4 6 4 1]/16 is used as low-pass filter in the upsampling and downsampling operators of the Laplacian pyramid. It is implemented by multiplication-less lifting steps [11]. Like the Gaussian filter it approximates, the binomial filter does not suffer from ringing artifacts, which means that upsampling and downsampling do not create artifacts such as overflows, overshoots and gradient inversions. On the down side, the binomial filter has a large transition band, which may lead to some aliasing.

3.1. Weak-Structure Amplification

The enhancement begins by setting the enhanced signal \( \hat{d} \) to the values given by the gain equation (3). This implements the objective function and the second constraint of the optimization problem (12).

Here we rely on the following gain function

\[
g(\hat{d}_{ij}) = \min_{(k,l) \in N_{3x3}(i,j)} \left( 1 + \alpha e^{-\frac{\hat{d}_{kl}}{\sigma^2}} \right)
\]

where \( N_{3x3}(i,j) \) is the 3 \( \times \) 3 block of pixels centered at \((i,j)\), \( \alpha \) is a parameter controlling the enhancement, and \( \sigma^2 \) is a parameter controlling the bias toward weak structures. Both parameters can take different values at each level to enhance specific structures of interest.

For efficiency, the gain equation (3) is implemented using a look-up table and is skipped when \( \alpha = 0 \). In order to save memory, the 3 \( \times \) 3 local minimum is implemented using a 3-row round-robin array.

3.2. First Correction

The first correction pass reduces the enhancement signal \( \hat{d} \) to avoid overflow artifacts. This implements the first constraint of the optimization problem (12). The values of the enhancement signal \( \hat{d} \) are updated using the equation

\[
\hat{d}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
\min \left( \hat{d}_{ij}, -\hat{c}_{ij} + s_{\text{max}} \right) & \text{if } \hat{d}_{ij} \geq 0, \\
\max \left( \hat{d}_{ij}, -\hat{c}_{ij} \right) & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

3.3. Second Correction

The second correction pass reduces the enhancement signal \( \hat{d} \) to avoid artifacts such as overshoots and gradient inversions. This implements the third and fourth constraints of the optimization problem (12). The pixels are updated in a sequential order via two raster scans, one forward (left-to-right and top-to-bottom) and one backward. Approximating the partial derivatives by the finite difference kernel \([-1 1]\), and fixing the values of the pixel neighbors in (12) leads to the update equation

\[
\hat{d}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
\min \left( \hat{d}_{ij}, -\hat{c}_{ij} + s_{\text{max}} \right) & \text{if } \hat{d}_{ij} \geq 0, \\
\max \left( \hat{d}_{ij}, -\hat{c}_{ij} \right) & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

If \( \hat{d}_{ij} \geq 0 \),

\[
\tau = \min_{(k,l) \in N_{4}(i,j)} \left( \Delta_{kl}^+ \left( \beta_{\text{max}} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{kl}^+ \geq 0} + \beta_{\text{min}} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{kl}^+ < 0} \right) \right) + \hat{c}_{kl} - \hat{d}_{ij} + \hat{d}_{kl},
\]

and

\[
\hat{d}_{ij} = \max(0, \min(\tau, \hat{d}_{ij})),
\]

otherwise,

\[
\tau = \max_{(k,l) \in N_{4}(i,j)} \left( \Delta_{kl}^- \left( \beta_{\text{min}} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{kl}^- \geq 0} + \beta_{\text{max}} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{kl}^- < 0} \right) \right) - \hat{c}_{kl} - \hat{d}_{ij} + \hat{d}_{kl},
\]

\[
\hat{d}_{ij} = \min(0, \max(\tau, \hat{d}_{ij})).
\]
where $\Delta_{i,j} = \bar{s}_{ij} - \bar{s}_{ijkl}$, $N_4(i, j)$ is the 4-neighborhood around pixel $(i, j)$, and $1_{1_{ij}}$ is the zero-one function which takes value 1 when its subscript is true and 0 otherwise.

4. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We present experimental results on two real images (spine and skull) over which synthetic patterns have been added to help study artifacts. The images are 3114 by 3115 in size, for a total of about 9.7Mpx.

The software implementation reduces the image range by a factor of four, from $14b$ ($\max s = 16383$) to $12b$ ($\max s = 4095$). The experiments have been run with a 6-level pyramid. The gains $\alpha$ have been set to 0 at the finest level to reduce the noise amplification and make the algorithm run faster, and to 3 at the other levels. The bias $\sigma$ has been set to $10^{-1}s_{\max}$, and the tolerance parameters $\varepsilon$, $\beta_{\min}$, and $\beta_{\max}$ have been set respectively to $10^{-5}s_{\max}$, 3/4 and 5.

Figure 3 shows a crop of the skull image after applying the global transfer function, and after applying weak-structure enhancement. It confirms the ability of the proposed algorithm to preserve the contrast of both weak and strong image structures.

Figure 4 shows a crop of the spine image and 1D intensity profiles along a horizontal line at the vertical center of the image. The top row shows the image enhanced without artifact correction (classical Laplacian enhancement), while the bottom row shows the image enhanced with the proposed method. Unlike classical Laplacian enhancement, the proposed method does not generate haloes or gradient inversion in regions surrounding large intensity variations, like those around the synthetic squares for instance.

The experiments have been run on a Pentium 4 at 2.8GHz with 1GB of RAM. In spite of the large size of the images, it takes only 1.95s to process each image.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have introduced a fast compression method based on the Laplacian pyramid, which avoids common artifacts such as loss of contrast, haloes and gradient inversions. We have shown that the artifact correction can be formulated as a linear-programming problem, for which we have proposed an efficient approximate solution. The effectiveness and speed of the proposed algorithm have been demonstrated on real medical images. Future work shall aim at generalizing the proposed method to image sequences.
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