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Images compression with wavelets
Signal analysis

- Signal analysis: similitude to “atoms” $\phi_n[k]$
- Similitude: scalar product
  \[ c[k] = \sum_n x[n] \phi_n[k] \]
- Projection over a set of signals
- Basis change
- Linear Transform
Signal analysis

\[ \phi_n[k] = \delta[n - k] \]
Signal analysis

\[ \phi_n[k] = e^{-j2\pi \frac{k}{N} n} \]
Signal analysis

\[ \phi_{n,t}[k] = e^{-j2\pi \frac{k}{N} n} w_t[k] \]

Short Time Fourier Transform
Signal analysis

\[ \phi_{n,a}[k] = \phi(2^{-a}k - n) \]
Wavelets and images: Motivations

- Image model: trends + anomalies
Wavelets and images: Motivations

- Image model: *trends* + *anomalies*
Wavelets and images: Motivations

- Image model: *trends + anomalies*
Wavelets and images: Motivations

- **Anomalies**:  
  - Abrupt variations of the signal  
  - High frequency contributions  
  - Objects’ contours  
  - Good spatial resolution  
  - Rough frequency resolution

- **Trends**:  
  - Slow variations of the signal  
  - Low frequency contributions  
  - Objects’ texture  
  - Rough spatial resolution  
  - Good frequency resolution
Wavelets and images: Motivations

Signal model: an image row
Wavelets and images: Motivations

Signal model: an image row
Wavelets and images: Motivations

Signal model: an image row
Introduction
DWT and MRA
Images compression with wavelets

Wavelets and Multiple resolution analysis

- Approximation: low resolution version
- “Details”: zeros when the signal is polynomial

![Approximation and Details graphs]
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1D filter banks

Decomposition

\[ x[k] \xrightarrow{h} \hat{c}[k] \quad \xrightarrow{\downarrow 2} \quad c[k] \]
\[ x[k] \xrightarrow{g} \hat{d}[k] \quad \xrightarrow{\downarrow 2} \quad d[k] \]

Analysis filter bank

\[ 2 \downarrow : \text{decimation} : c[k] = \hat{c}[2k] \]
Reconstruction

\[ \hat{c}[k] = \begin{cases} c[k/2] & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \end{cases} \]

2 ↑: interpolation operator, doubles the sample number

Synthesis filter bank
Filter properties

- Perfect reconstruction (PR)
- FIR
- Orthogonality
- Vanishing moments
- Symmetry
Perfect reconstruction conditions

We want PR after synthesis and analysis filter banks:
\[ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \]
\[ \tilde{x}_k = x_{k+\ell} \iff \tilde{X}(z) = z^{-\ell}X(z) \]
Z-domain relationships

\[
\hat{\mathcal{C}}(z) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{c}_n z^{-n} = H(z) X(z)
\]

decimation

\[
\hat{C}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \hat{\mathcal{C}} \left( z^{1/2} \right) + \hat{\mathcal{C}} \left( -z^{1/2} \right) \right]
\]

interpolation

\[
\hat{\mathcal{C}}(z) = C \left( z^2 \right)
\]

output

\[
\tilde{X}(z) = \tilde{H}(z) C \left( z^2 \right) + \tilde{G}(z) D \left( z^2 \right)
\]

\[
\tilde{X}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{H}(z) H(z) + \tilde{G}(z) G(z) \right] X(z)
+ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{H}(z) H(-z) + \tilde{G}(z) G(-z) \right] X(-z)
\]
PR conditions in $\mathbb{Z}$

\[ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \tilde{x}_k = x_{k+\ell} \iff \tilde{X}(z) = z^{-\ell}X(z) \]

\[ \tilde{H}(z)H(z) + \tilde{G}(z)G(z) = 2z^{-\ell} \quad \text{Non distortion} \]

\[ \tilde{H}(z)H(-z) + \tilde{G}(z)G(-z) = 0 \quad \text{Non aliasing} \]
Matrix form

For simplicity, we ignore the delay, $\ell = 0$

If the analysis filter bank is given, the synthesis one is determined by:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H(z) & G(z) \\
H(-z) & G(-z)
\end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{H}(z) \\
\tilde{G}(z)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]

We assume that the modulation matrix is invertible.
Perfect reconstruction conditions

Synthesis filter bank

Modulation matrix determinant:

\[ \Delta(z) = H(z) G(-z) - G(z) H(-z) \]

\[ \tilde{H}(z) = \frac{2}{\Delta(z)} G(-z) \]

\[ \tilde{G}(z) = -\frac{2}{\Delta(z)} H(-z) \]
Perfect reconstruction with FIR filters

Finite impulse response filters:
It can be shown that in this case the PR condition is equivalent to the alternating signs condition. Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
    h(k) &= \begin{bmatrix} a & b & c \end{bmatrix} &\tilde{h}(k) &= \begin{bmatrix} p & -q & r & -s & t \end{bmatrix} \\
    g(k) &= \begin{bmatrix} p & q & r & s & t \end{bmatrix} &\tilde{g}(k) &= \begin{bmatrix} -a & b & -c \end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]
Orthogonality assures energy conservation:

\[
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (x_k)^2 = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (c_k)^2 + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (d_k)^2
\]

\[\Rightarrow\] reconstruction error = quantization error on DWT coefficients
For non orthogonal filters, the reconstruction errors is a weighted sum of the quantization errors on the DWT subbands, with suitable weights \( \omega_i \)
Vanishing moments

- Vanishing moments (VM) represent filter ability to reproduce polynomials: a filter with $p$ VM can represent polynomials with degree $< p$
- The High-pass filter will not respond to a polynomial input with degree $< p$
- In this case all the signal information is preserved in the approximation signal (half the samples)
- A filter with $p$ VM has at least $2p$ taps
Borders problem

- Filterbank properties such as we saw, are valid for infinite-size signals
- We are interested in finite support signals
- How to interpret the previous results for finite support signals?
Borders problem

- Filterbank properties such as we saw, are valid for infinite-size signals
- We are interested in finite support signals
- How to interpret the previous results for finite support signals?
- Zero padding would introduce a coefficient expansion
- Filtering an $N$-size signal with an $M$-size produces a signal with size $N + M - 1$
Borders problem

- Filterbank properties such as we saw, are valid for infinite-size signals
- We are interested in finite support signals
- How to interpret the previous results for finite support signals?
- Zero padding would introduce a coefficient expansion
- Filtering an $N$-size signal with an $M$-size produces a signal with size $N + M - 1$
- Periodization?
- Symmetrization?
Borders problem: Coefficient expansion

\[ y = h \ast x \]
Borders problem: Periodization

- A signal $x$ of support $N$ is considered as a periodic signal $\tilde{x}$ of period $N$
- Filtering $\tilde{x}$ with $h$ results into a periodic output $\tilde{y}$
- $\tilde{y}$ has the same period $N$ as $\tilde{x}$
- So we need to compute just $N$ samples of $\tilde{y}$
- However, periodization introduces “jumps” in a regular signal
Borders problem: Periodization

\[ \tilde{x} \]

\[ \tilde{y} \]
Borders problem: Symmetry

- Symmetrization before periodization reduces the impact on signal regularity
- But it doubles the number of coefficients...
**Borders problem: Symmetry**

- Symmetrization before periodization reduces the impact on signal regularity
- But it doubles the number of coefficients...
- Unless the filters are symmetric, too
  - We use $x$ as half-period of $\tilde{x}_s$
  - $\tilde{x}_s$ has a period of $2N$ samples
  - Filtering $\tilde{x}_s$ with $h$, produces $\tilde{y}_s$
  - If $h$ is symmetric, $\tilde{y}_s$ is periodic and symmetric, with period $2N$: we only need to compute $N$ samples
Borders problem: Symmetry

\[ \tilde{x}_s \]

\[ \tilde{y}_s \]
Haar filter

\[ h(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \tilde{h}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ g(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \tilde{g}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \]

- Symmetric
- Orthogonal
- \( \text{VM} = 1 \)
- Only capable to represent piecewise constant signals
Summary: perfect reconstruction and borders

- Convolution involves coefficient expansion
- Solution: circular convolution
  - Circular convolution allows to reconstruct an $N$-samples signal with $N$ wavelet coefficients
  - The periodization generates borders discontinuities, i.e. spurious high frequencies coefficients that demand a lot of coding resources
- Solution: Symmetric periodization
  - No discontinuities
  - Does it double the coefficient number?
  - No, if the filter is symmetric!

Bad news: the only orthogonal symmetric FIR filter is Haar!
Cohen-Daubechies-Fauveau filters

With biorthogonal (i.e. PR) filters, if $h$ has $p$ VM and $\tilde{h}$ has $\tilde{p}$ VM, the filter has at least $p + \tilde{p} - 1$ taps.

The CDF filters have the following properties:

- They are symmetric (linear phase)
- They maximize the VM for a given filter length
- They are close to orthogonality (weights $\omega_i$ are close to one)

They are by far the most popular in image compression
**9/7 biorthogonal filters**

Filter coefficients:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>$\pm 1$</th>
<th>$\pm 2$</th>
<th>$\pm 3$</th>
<th>$\pm 4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h[l]$</td>
<td>0.852699</td>
<td>0.377403</td>
<td>−0.110624</td>
<td>−0.023849</td>
<td>0.037828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{h}[l]$</td>
<td>0.788486</td>
<td>0.418092</td>
<td>−0.040689</td>
<td>−0.064539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impulse response of low-pass filters

For high pass filters, we have (alternating sign condition):

$$g[l] = (-1)^{l+1} \tilde{h}[l - 1] \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}[l] = (-1)^{l-1} h[l + 1].$$
1D Multiresolution analysis

Decomposition

$$c_0[k] \rightarrow g \rightarrow 2 \downarrow \rightarrow d_1[k]$$

$$c_0[k] \rightarrow h \rightarrow 2 \downarrow \rightarrow c_1[k]$$

$$c_1[k] \rightarrow h \rightarrow 2 \downarrow \rightarrow c_2[k]$$

$$c_2[k] \rightarrow h \rightarrow 2 \downarrow \rightarrow c_3[k]$$

$$c_2[k] \rightarrow g \rightarrow 2 \downarrow \rightarrow d_2[k]$$

$$d_2[k] \rightarrow g \rightarrow 2 \downarrow \rightarrow d_3[k]$$

Three level wavelet decomposition structure
Multiresolution Analysis 1D

\[ x[k] = c_0[k] \]

\[ c_1[k] \quad d_1[k] \]

\[ c_2[k] \quad d_2[k] \quad d_1[k] \]

\[ c_3[k] \quad d_3[k] \quad d_2[k] \quad d_1[k] \]
Reconstruction from wavelet coefficients
2D AMR

2D Filter banks for separable transform

One decomposition level

\[ a_j[n, m] \]

\[ h[k] \] \( \downarrow (2, 1) \)

\[ g[k] \] \( \downarrow (2, 1) \)

\[ h[\ell] \]

\[ g[\ell] \]

\( \downarrow (1, 2) \)

\[ a_{j+1}[n, m] \]

\( d_{j+1}^H[n, m] \)

\( d_{j+1}^V[n, m] \)

\( d_{j+1}^D[n, m] \)
2D-DWT subbands: orientations

(A), (H), (V) and (D) respectively correspond to approximation coefficients, horizontal, vertical and diagonal detail coefficients.
2D AMR: multiple levels

Three levels of separable 2D-AMR.
2D-DWT subbands: orientations

\[ f_{ver} \quad f_{hor} \]

\[(A) \quad (V3) \quad (V2) \quad (V1) \]

\[(H3) \quad (D3) \quad (H2) \quad (D2) \]

\[(H1) \quad (D1) \]
Example
Example
Example
Example
Example

Wavelet-based image compression
Example
Example
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Compresssion with DWT

Methods based on inter-scale dependencies:

- EZW (Embedded Zerotrees of Wavelet coefficients),
- SPIHT (Set Partitioning in Hierarchical Trees)
- Tree-based representation of dependencies
- Advantages: good exploitation of inter-scale dependencies, low complexity
- Disadvantage: no resolution scalability

Methods not based on inter-scale dependencies

- Explicit bit-rate allocation among subbands
- Entropy coding of coefficients
- Advantages: Good exploitation of intra-scale dependencies, random access, resolution scalability
- Disadvantage: no exploitation of inter-scale dependencies
Main characteristics

- Quality scalability (i.e. progressive representation)
- Lossy-to-lossless coding
- Small complexity
- Rate-distortion performance much better than JPEG above all at small rates
Progressive representation of DWT coefficients

- Each new coding bit must convey the maximum of information

- Each new coding bit must reduce as much as possible distortion

- We first send the largest coefficients

- Problem: localization overhead
Example: an image and its wavelet coefficients

DWT and MRA

Images compression with wavelets

EZW

JPEG 2000

Introduction

Wavelet-based image compression
Progressive representation: subband order

- Image compression with wavelets
- Introduction
- DWT and MRA
- EZW
- JPEG 2000

Wavelet-based image compression

- Institut Mines-Telecom
EZW Algorithm

- The subband scan order alone is not enough to assure that largest coefficients are sent first
- We need to localize the largest coefficients
- Without having to send explicit localization information
- Idea: to exploit the inter-band correlation to predict the position of non-significant coefficients
- If the prediction is correct we save many coding bits (for all the predicted coefficients)
Zero-tree of wavelet coefficients
EZW idea

- **Auto-similarity**: When a coefficient is small (below a threshold) it is probable that its descendants are small as well.

- In this case we use a single coding symbol to represent the coefficient and all its descendants. If \( c \) and all its descendants are smaller than the threshold, \( c \) is called a zero-tree root.

- With just one symbol, \((ZT)\) we code \( (1 + 4 + 4^2 + \ldots + 4^{N-n}) \) coefficients.

- The localization information is implicit in the significance information.
1. $k = 0$

2. $n = \lfloor \log_2 (|c|_{\text{max}}) \rfloor$

3. $T_k = 2^n$

4. while (rate < available rate)
   - Dominant pass
   - Refining pass
   - $T_{k+1} \leftarrow T_k / 2$
   - $k \leftarrow k + 1$

5. end while
Dominant pass

- For each coefficient $c$ (in the scan order)
- If $|c| \geq T_n$, the coefficient is significant
  - If $c > 0$ we encode SP (Significant Positive)
  - If $c < 0$ we encode SN (Significant Negative)
- If $|c| < T_n$, we compare all its descendants with the threshold
  - If no descendant is significant, $c$ is coded as a zero-tree root (ZT)
  - Otherwise the coefficient is coded as Isolated Zero (IZ)
Refining pass

- We encode a further bit for all significant coefficients
- This is equivalent to halve the quantization step
Iteration and termination

- The $k$-th dominant pass allows to encode the $k$-th bit-plane
- A significant coefficient $c$ is such that $2^k \leq |c| < 2^{k+1}$
- For the next step we halve the threshold: it is equivalent to pass to the next bitplane
- Algorithm stops when
  - the bit budget is exhausted; or when
  - all the bitplanes have been coded
**EZW Algorithm: summary**

- **Bitplane coding:** at the $k$-th pass, we encode the bitplane $\log_2 T_k$
- **Progressive coding:** each new bitplane allows refining the coefficients quantization
- **Lossless coding of significance symbols**
- **Lossless-to-lossy coding:** When an integer transform is used, and all the bitplanes are coded, the original image can be restored with zero distortion
EZW Algorithm: Example

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
26 & 6 & 13 & 10 \\
-7 & 7 & 6 & 4 \\
4 & -4 & 4 & -3 \\
2 & -2 & -2 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
T_0 = 2^{\lfloor \log_2 26 \rfloor} = 16
\]
EZW Algorithm: Example

\[
T_0 = 2^{\left\lfloor \log_2 26 \right\rfloor} = 16
\]

Bitstream:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>ZR</th>
<th>ZR</th>
<th>ZR</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>ZR</td>
<td>ZR</td>
<td>ZR</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>IZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JPEG2000 aims at challenges unresolved by previous standards:

- Low bit-rate coding: JPEG has low quality for $R < 0.25$ bpp
- Synthetic images compression
- Random access to image parts
- Quality and resolution scalability
New functionalities

- Region-of-interest (ROI) coding
- Quality and resolution scalability
- Tiling
- Exact coding rate
- Lossy-to-lossless coding
JPEG2000 is made up of two tiers

- First tier
  - DWT and quantization
  - Lossless coding of codeblocks

- Second tier
  - EBCOT: embedded block coding with optimized truncation
  - Scalability (quality, resolution) and ROI management
Quantization in JPEG2000

- DWT coefficients are encoded with a very fine quantization step
- For the lossless coding case, DWT coefficients are integers, and they are not quantified
- In summary, it is not in the quantization step that the really lossy operations are performed
- The lossy coding is performed by the bitstream truncation of Tier 2
Embedded Block Coding with Optimized Truncation

- Each subband is split in equally sized blocks of coefficients, called codeblocks.
- The codeblocks are losslessly and independently coded with an arithmetic coder.
- We generate as much bitstreams as codeblocks in the image.
Bitplane coding

Most significant bitplane

[Image showing wavelet coefficients for LL2, HL2, LH2, HH2, HL1, LH1, HH1]
Bitplane coding

Second bitplane

- LL2
- HL2
- LH2
- HH2
- HL1
- LH1
- HH1
Introduction
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Bitplane coding

Third bitplane

LL2  HL2  HL1
LH2  HH2  HH1
LH1  LL1  HH1
Bitplane coding

Fourth bitplane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LL2</th>
<th>HH2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL2</td>
<td>LH2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL1</td>
<td>HH1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bitplane coding

Fifth bitplane
Example of bitstreams associated to codeblocks
EBCOT

Optimization

▶ If we keep all the bitstreams of all the codeblocks, we end up with a huge bitrate
▶ We have to truncate the bitstream to attain the target bit-rate
▶ Problem: how to truncate the bitstreams with a minimum resulting distortion?

\[
\min \sum_i D_i \quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_i R_i \leq R_{\text{tot}}
\]

▶ Solution: Lagrange multiplier

\[
J = \sum_i D_i + \lambda \left( \sum_i R_i - R \right)
\]
Introduction
DWT and MRA
Images compression with wavelets

EZW
JPEG 2000

EBCOT
Rate-distortion curve per each codeblock

Institut Mines-Telecom
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EBCOT

Rate-distortion curve per each codeblock
Embedded block coding with optimized truncation

- Optimal truncation point:

\[
\frac{\partial D_i}{\partial R_i} = -\lambda
\]

- The value of the Lagrange multiplier can be found by an iterative algorithm.
- We can have several truncations for several target rates (quality scalability)
Example of bit-rate allocation with EBCOT

Allocation for maximal quality and minimal resolution
Example of bit-rate allocation with EBCOT

Allocation for maximal quality and medium resolution
Example of bit-rate allocation with EBCOT

Allocation for maximal quality and maximal resolution

Wavelet-based image compression
Example of bit-rate allocation with EBCOT

Allocation for perceptual quality and maximal resolution
Example of bit-rate allocation with EBCOT

Allocation for a given bit-rate, maximal quality and resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BP1</th>
<th>BP2</th>
<th>BP3</th>
<th>BP4</th>
<th>BP5</th>
<th>BP6</th>
<th>BP7</th>
<th>BP8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LL2</td>
<td>LH2</td>
<td>HL2</td>
<td>HH2</td>
<td>LH1</td>
<td>HL1</td>
<td>HH1</td>
<td>LH1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82/95 21.11.18
Example of bit-rate allocation with EBCOT

Allocation pour plusieurs couches et résolution maximale

BP1
BP2
BP3
BP4
BP5
BP6
BP7
BP8
LL2 LH2 HL2 HH2 LH1 HL1 HH1
JPEG

Comparison JPEG / JPEG2000

Image Originale, 24 bpp
Comparison JPEG / JPEG2000

Rate: 1bpp
Comparison JPEG / JPEG2000

Rate: 0.75bpp
Comparison JPEG / JPEG2000

Rate: 0.5bpp
Comparison JPEG / JPEG2000

Rate: 0.3bpp
Comparison JPEG / JPEG2000

Rate: 0.2bpp
Comparison JPEG / JPEG2000

Rate: 0.2bpp pour JPEG, 0.1 pour JPEG2000
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EZW
JPEG 2000

Error effect: JPEG

JPEG, $p_E = 10^{-4}$

JPEG, $p_E = 10^{-4}$
Error effect: JPEG and JPEG 2000

JPEG, $p_E = 10^{-4}$

JPEG 2000, $p_E = 10^{-4}$
Error effect: JPEG and JPEG 2000

JPEG, $p_E = 10^{-3}$

JPEG 2000, $p_E = 10^{-3}$
Image coding and robustness

- Markers insertion
- Markers period
- Marker emulation prevention
- Trade-off between robustness and rate
Error robustness in JPEG2000

- Data prioritization is possible
- No dependency among codeblocks
  - No error propagation
- No block-based transform
  - No *blocking* artifacts