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## Objetive

- "Derive optimal spline algorithms for the enlargement or reduction of digital images by arbitrary (non integer) scaling factors" $\Delta$.
- Optimality is managed by the authors in a least square sense.


## Classical Approach: Inteporlation Reconstruction + Resampling

- "Standard approaches fit the original data with a continuous model (image interpolation) and then resample two dimensional function in a new sample grid".

$$
\left[f_{1}\right]_{1} \xrightarrow{\text { Int. Rec. }} f_{1}=\left[f_{1}\right]_{1} * \varphi \xrightarrow{\text { Resamp. freq } \Delta}\left[f_{1}\right]_{\Delta}=\left[\left[f_{1}\right] * \varphi\right]_{\Delta}
$$

- "Simple to implement but they tend to produce suboptimal results because they are not designed to minimize loss information".


## Inteporlation Reconstruction + Resampling
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## Perceptual Results of Inteporlation Reconstruction + Resampling

- "In the case of reduction, the situation is analogous to sampling a signal that has not previously bandlimited, a process that may induce aliasing errors".
- Results in the case of magnification have some distortions but they "tend to disappear when higher order of splines are applied".


## Other common approach for Reduction (M2)

Results of reducing an image using $\mathbf{I R}+\mathbf{R}$ are poor since they do not suppress high frequencies. A traditional approach for reduction that performs better is the following:

$$
f_{\Delta}(k \Delta)=\frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} f_{1}(i) \varphi_{\Delta}(k \Delta-i)
$$


where $\varphi_{\Delta}=\varphi(\bullet / \Delta)$.

## Other common approach for Reduction (M2)

From the previous expression we get:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\Delta}(k \Delta) & =\frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} f_{1}(i) \varphi_{\Delta}(k \Delta-i) \\
& =\frac{1}{\Delta}\left[\left[f_{1}\right] * \varphi_{\Delta}\right]_{\Delta} \\
& =\left[\left[f_{1}\right] *\left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi_{\Delta}\right)\right]_{\Delta}
\end{aligned}
$$

This is quite similar to $\mathbf{I R}+\mathbf{R}$ :

$$
\left[\left[f_{1}\right] * \varphi\right]_{\Delta}
$$

Instead of using $\varphi$ for reconstruction, here we use $\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi_{\Delta}$, a "low pass version" of it.
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## Least Square Approach. Notation

- $\beta^{n}$ : nth order $\beta$-spline.
- $V_{\beta^{n}}=\left\{c * \beta^{n}: c \in I_{2}\right\}$ : Subspace of representable signals for the reconstruction kernel $\beta^{n}$.
- $\beta_{\Delta}^{n}=\beta^{n}(\bullet / \Delta)$ : Kernel scaled to step size $\Delta$.
- $V_{\beta_{\Delta}^{n}}=\left\{c * \Delta \beta_{\Delta}^{n}: c \in I_{2}\right\}$ : Subspace of representable signals for the reconstruction kernel $\beta_{\Delta}^{n}$.


## Least Square Approach. Step-Size
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## Clarification in notation!!



## Least Square Approach. Problem

Definitions:

- $f_{1}^{n}=c_{1} * \beta^{n}$ : Interp. reconstruction for step size 1 .
- $f_{\Delta}^{n}=c_{\Delta} *_{\Delta} \beta_{\Delta}^{n}$ : Reconstruction for step size $\Delta$.

Statement:

- $\left[f_{1}^{n}\right]_{1} \rightarrow$ Given.
- $\left[f_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} \rightarrow$ To Find!.
- $f_{\Delta}^{n} \in V_{\beta_{\Delta}^{n}}$ is the minimum error approximation of $f_{1}^{n} \in V_{\beta^{n}}$.
$\triangleright \Rightarrow f_{\Delta}^{n}=P_{V_{\beta_{\Delta}^{n}}}\left(f_{1}^{n}\right)$.


## Least Square Approach. Problem



## Least Square Approach. Bi-orthogonal Basis

Let $\left\{x_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and $\left\{y_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ be a Bi-orthogonal bases for the space $V$, this is:

$$
<x_{i}, y_{j}>= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } i=j \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Then any $v \in V$ can be expressed as:

$$
v=\sum_{i \in I}<v, y_{i}>x_{i}
$$

Observe one basis is used for projection an the other for reconstruction.

## Least Square Approach. Constructing Bi-orthogonal pairs

Given the basis $B_{\varphi}:\{\varphi(\bullet-k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, let's find it's bi-orthogonal pair in $V_{\varphi}$. Let $B_{p * \varphi}:\{(p * \varphi)(\bullet-k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$.
We must satisfy,

$$
<\varphi(\bullet-i),(p * \varphi)(\bullet-j)>=\delta(i, j)
$$

Equivalently,

$$
\left[\varphi *(p * \varphi)^{\vee}\right]=\delta
$$

This implies,

$$
p=\left[\varphi * \varphi^{\vee}\right]^{-1}
$$

The function $\stackrel{\circ}{\varphi}:=\left[\varphi * \varphi^{\vee}\right]^{-1} * \varphi$ is named the dual. Then $\varphi$ and $\stackrel{\circ}{\varphi}$ induces Bi-orthogonal basis in $V_{\varphi}$.

## Least Square Approach. Multiples representation of the same space: Bases



Basis function




(d) Orthogenal



Fig. 2. Optimal prefilters and basis functions for four equivalent represen-
tation of cubic spline polynomial approximations

## Least Square Approach. Multiples representation of the same space: Change of Coordinates



Fig. 1. Digital filters for the conversion between several equivalent polynomial spline representations of signals.

## Least Square Approach. Orthogonal Projection

- General Sampling Theorem: The orthogonal projection of a function $f \in L_{2}$ on $V_{\varphi}$ is given by:

$$
f_{V_{\varphi}}=\left[f *(\stackrel{\circ}{\varphi})^{\vee}\right] * \varphi
$$

In the article this is implemented as follows:

$$
f_{\Delta}^{n}=P_{V_{\beta_{\Delta}^{n}}}\left(f_{1}^{n}\right)=\left[f_{1}^{n} *\left(\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right)^{\vee}\right]_{\Delta} * \Delta \beta_{\Delta}^{\circ}
$$

Remark: Here the projection is done using the dual as reconstruction basis. In Diego's article is the opposite.

## Least Square Approach. Step 1: Calculating Interpolation Coefficients $c_{1}$

"Determine the $\beta$-spline coefficients of $f_{1}^{n}$ that interpolates the digital signal $\left[f_{1}^{n}\right]_{1}{ }^{\prime \prime}$.

$$
f_{1}^{n}=c_{1} * \beta^{n} \Rightarrow c_{1}=\left[f_{1}^{n}\right]_{1} *\left[\beta^{n}\right]_{1}^{-1}
$$

Remark: $f_{1}^{n}$ can be expressed in terms of the cardinal spline $\beta_{\text {int }}^{n}$ of order $n$ as follows:

$$
f_{1}^{n}=\left[\left[f_{1}^{n}\right]_{1} *\left[\beta^{n}\right]_{1}^{-1}\right]_{1} * \beta^{n}=\left[f_{1}^{n}\right]_{1} *\left(\left[\beta^{n}\right]_{1}^{-1} * \beta^{n}\right)=\left[f_{1}^{n}\right]_{1} * \beta_{i n t}^{n}
$$

Least Square Approach. Step 2: Math Derivation of the Sampling Function $\xi_{\Delta}^{n}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\Delta}^{n} & =\left[f_{1}^{n} *\left(\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right)^{\vee}\right]_{\Delta} *_{\Delta} \beta_{\Delta}^{\circ} \\
& =\left[\left(c_{1} * \beta^{n}\right) *\left(\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right)^{\vee}\right]_{\Delta} *_{\Delta} \beta_{\Delta}^{n} \\
& =\Delta\left[c_{1} *\left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \beta^{n} *\left(\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right)^{\vee}\right)\right]_{\Delta} *_{\Delta} \beta_{\Delta}^{\circ} \\
& =\Delta\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} *_{\Delta} \stackrel{\beta}{\Delta}_{n}^{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

The function $\xi_{\Delta}^{n}=\frac{1}{\Delta} \beta^{n} *\left(\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right)^{\vee}$ is called the Sampling Function. It's important to notice that this function has compact support. Remark: $\xi_{\Delta}^{n}$ corresponds to the cross correlation $\frac{1}{\Delta} a_{\beta^{n}, \beta_{\Delta}^{n}}$.

Least Square Approach. Take care using the notation!
One would be tempted to write

$$
\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta}=c_{1} *\left[\xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta}
$$

but that's a mistake!!. Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} } & =\left\{\left(c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right)(k \Delta)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \\
& =\left\{\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} c_{1}(i) \xi_{\Delta}^{n}(k \Delta-i)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{1} *\left[\xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} & =\left\{\left(c_{1} *\left[\xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta}\right)(k)\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \\
& =\left\{\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} c_{1}(i) \xi_{\Delta}^{n}(\Delta(k-i))\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Least Square Approach. Step 3: Post Filter q

Resample the signal at a step-size $\Delta$ corresponds to find the sequence $\left[f_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta}$.
From the conditions:

$$
\begin{gathered}
f_{\Delta}^{n}=\Delta\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} *_{\Delta} \beta_{\Delta}^{\circ} \\
f_{\Delta}^{n}=\left[f_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} *_{\Delta}\left(\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right)_{i n t}
\end{gathered}
$$

We get,

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[f_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} } & =\Delta\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} *\left[\beta_{\Delta}^{n} *\left(\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right)^{\vee}\right]_{\Delta}^{-1} *\left[\beta_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} \\
& =\Delta\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} *\left(\Delta\left[\beta^{2 n+1}\right]\right)^{-1} *\left[\beta^{n}\right] \\
& =\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} * q
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark: The postfilter $q=\left[\beta^{2 n+1}\right]^{-1} *\left[\beta^{n}\right]$ converts from dual to cardinal spline representation.

## Least Square Approach. Diagram Summary



## Least Square Approach. Diego's article generalization

From the condition $f_{\Delta}^{n}=\Delta\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} * \Delta \beta_{\Delta}^{n}$ we get,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\Delta}^{n} & =\Delta\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} *\left[a_{\beta_{\Delta}^{n}}\right]_{\Delta}^{-1} * \Delta \beta_{\Delta}^{n} \\
& =\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta \Delta} *\left[a_{\beta^{n}}\right]^{-1} * \Delta \beta_{\Delta}^{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{\Delta} & =\left[c_{1} * \xi_{\Delta}^{n}\right]_{\Delta} *\left[a_{\beta^{n}}\right]^{-1} \\
& =\frac{1}{\Delta}\left[c_{1} * a_{\beta^{n}, \beta_{\Delta}^{n}}\right]_{\Delta} *\left[a_{\beta^{n}}\right]^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

This last expression corresponds to (55) of Diego's article:

$$
c_{s}=\frac{1}{s}\left[a_{\varphi}\right]^{-1} *\left[c * a_{\varphi, \varphi_{s}}\right]_{s}
$$

for the particular case $\varphi=\beta^{n}$

## Evaluation of the Sampling Kernels. Degree 0

$$
\xi_{\Delta}^{0}(x)= \begin{cases}b, & 0 \leq|x|<a_{1} \\ b-\frac{b\left(|x|-a_{1}\right)}{a_{2}-a_{1}}, & a_{1} \leq|x|<a_{2} \\ 0, & a_{2} \leq|x|\end{cases}
$$



Fig. 4. Example of trapezoidal sampling function for a zero order spline model ( $\Delta=3 / 2$ ).

## Evaluation of the Sampling Kernels. Degree 1

$\xi_{\Delta}^{1}(x)= \begin{cases}b_{i 0}+b_{i 1}|x|+b_{i 2} x^{2}+b_{i 3}|x|^{3}, & |x| \in\left[a_{i-1}, a_{i}\right) \\ 0, \text { otherwise }\end{cases}$


Fig. 5. Example of a modified sampling function (solid line) for a first order spline model ( $\Delta=3 / 2$ ). This function is a cubic spline with knot points at the positions marked by the small circles. The Gaussian approximation given by (34) is superimposed with a dashed line (relative mean square error $=$ $0.145 \%$ ).

## Evaluation of the Sampling Kernels. General Case

- "As $n$ increases this function converges to a Gaussian as a consequence of the Central Limit Theorem".
- "We use the fact that the global variance of a convolution is equal to the sum of the variance of its individual components".

$$
\xi_{\Delta}^{n}(x) \cong\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \sigma_{n}}} \exp \left\{\frac{-x^{2}}{2 \sigma_{n}^{2}}\right\}, \begin{array}{l}
|x|<\frac{n+1}{2}(1+\Delta) \\
0, \\
\text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

with standard deviation

$$
\sigma_{n}=\sqrt{\frac{n+1}{12}\left(1+\Delta^{2}\right)}
$$

## Article's Results. Box: Resampling vs Least Squares



Fig. 6. Examples of image magnification and reduction using a zeroth-order model: (a) ISC0 with $\Delta=1 / \sqrt{2}$; (b) enlarged detail of (a); (c) LSSC0 with $\Delta=1 / \sqrt{2}$; (d) enlarged detail of (c); (c) ISC0 with $\Delta=\sqrt{2}$; (f) LSSC0 with $\Delta=\sqrt{2}$.

## Article's Results. Hat: Resampling vs Least Squares



Fig. 7. Examples of image magnification and reduction using a first-order model: (a) ISC1 with $\Delta=1 / \sqrt{2}$; (b) enlarged detail of (a); (c) LSSC1 with $\Delta=1 / \sqrt{2}$; (d) enlarged detail of (c); (e) ISC1 with $\Delta=\sqrt{2}$; (f) LSSC1 with $\Delta=\sqrt{2}$.

## Article's Results. Cubic Spline: Resampling vs Least Squares



Fig. 8. Examples of image magnification and reduction using a cubic spline model: (a) ISC3 with $\Delta=1 / \sqrt{2}$; (b) LSSC3 with $\Delta=1 / \sqrt{2}$; (c) ISC3 with $\Delta=\sqrt{2}$; (d) LSSC3 with $\Delta=\sqrt{2}$.

## Comments from the authors

- "Our experimental results demonstrate the superiority of least square scale conversion (LSSC) over interpolative scale conversion in a consistent fashion. This observation is specially true for image reduction".
- "LSSC1 appears to yield images with better visual quality, probably because the oscillation near the borders of the objects are less pronounced than they are for cubic splines".


## Summary of methods discussed

- $\mathbf{I R}+\mathbf{R} \rightarrow\left[\left[f_{1}\right] * \varphi\right]_{\Delta}$
- $\mathbf{M} 2 \rightarrow\left[\left[f_{1}\right] *\left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi_{\Delta}\right)\right]_{\Delta}$
- $\mathbf{L S} \rightarrow\left[\left[\left(\left[f_{1}\right] * \varphi\right) * \varphi_{\Delta}^{\circ}\right]_{\Delta} * \Delta \varphi_{\Delta}\right]_{\Delta}$
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Obrigado!

