



Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications

Volume 14

Editor

Haim Brezis

Université Pierre et Marie Curie

Paris

and

Rutgers University

New Brunswick, N.J.

Editorial Board

A. Bahri, Rutgers University, New Brunswick

John Ball, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh

Luis Caffarelli, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Michael Crandall, University of California, Santa Barbara

Mariano Giaquinta, University of Florence

David Kinderlehrer, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh

Robert Kohn, New York University

P. L. Lions, University of Paris IX

Louis Nirenberg, New York University

Lambertus Peletier, University of Leiden

Paul Rabinowitz, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jean-Michel Morel
Sergio Solimini

Variational Methods
in Image Segmentation
with seven image processing experiments

Birkhäuser
Boston • Basel • Berlin

Jean Michel Morel
CEREMADE
Université Paris-Dauphine
Place de Lattre de Tassigny
75775 Paris Cedex 16, France

Sergio Solimini
Università degli Studi di Lecce
Srada provinciale Lecce-Arnesano
73100 Lecce Italy

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Morel, Jean-Michel, 1953-

Variational methods for image segmentation / Jean-Michel Morel,
Sergio Solimini.

p. cm. -- (progress in nonlinear differential equations and
their applications ; v. 14)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8176-3720-6 (acid-free)

1. Image processing--Digital techniques--Mathematics.

2. Geometric measure theory. I. Solimini, Sergio, 1956-

II. Title. III. Series.

TA1637.M67 1994

94-36639

621.3'67--dc20

CIP

Printed on acid-free paper

Birkhäuser ®

© 1995 Birkhäuser Boston

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 1995

Copyright is not claimed for works of U.S. Government employees.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of the copyright owner.

Permission to photocopy for internal or personal use of specific clients is granted by Birkhäuser Boston for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC), provided that the base fee of \$6.00 per copy, plus \$0.20 per page is paid directly to CCC, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, U.S.A. Special requests should be addressed directly to Birkhäuser Boston, 675 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, U.S.A.

ISBN-13: 978-1-4684-0569-9 e-ISBN-13: 978-1-4684-0567-5

DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4684-0567-5

Typeset and reformatted from the author's disk in *AMS-TEX*

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Preface	ix
Introduction	xi

PART I. MODELIZATION

1. Edge detection and segmentation	3
1. Is there a general theory for segmentation?	3
2. Principles of multiscale analysis	7
2. Linear and nonlinear multiscale filtering	8
1. The linear model (Hildreth, Marr, Witkin, Koenderink,...)	8
2. The Perona and Malik theory	11
3. Anisotropic diffusion and “mean curvature motion”	15
4. Image restoration by mean curvature motion	16
3. Region and edge growing methods	21
1. Formalization of region growing methods. (Brince and Fennema, Pavlidis, ...)	21
2. Edge growing methods	25
3. Hybrid methods	28
4. How to translate a heuristic algorithm into a variational theory	29
4. Variational theories of segmentation	35
1. The Nitzberg and Mumford 2.1-D sketch	35
2. The “structural saliency” of Sha’ashua and Ullman	37
3. The “minimum description length” method of Yvon Leclerc	39
4. Algorithms for minimizing the general Mumford and Shah energy	40
5. Affine invariant segmentation	42
5. The piecewise constant Mumford-Shah model: mathematical analysis	46
1. Main theorem	47
2. Definition and elementary properties of segmentations	47
3. Properties of segmentations obtained by merging. Proof of the main theorem	52

4. A pyramidal algorithm computing 2-normal segmentations	58
5. Examples	60

PART II. ELEMENTS OF GEOMETRIC MEASURE THEORY

6. Hausdorff measure	63
1. Hausdorff outer measure	63
2. Outer measures in topological spaces	70
3. Connected sets of finite 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure	75
4. A suggesting example of Hausdorff measurable set with finite length	76
7. Covering lemmas in a metric space	79
1. Elementary properties of generic coverings	79
2. Vitali coverings	82
3. Hausdorff and Lebesgue measure	84
8. Density properties	86
1. Upper and lower density	87
2. Regular sets	90
9. Tangency properties of regular subsets of \mathbb{R}^N	94
1. Reflection lemmas	94
2. Approximate tangent space	99
3. Existence of a tangent space	108
10. Semicontinuity properties of Hausdorff measure	118
1. Hausdorff distance	118
2. Counterexamples to the semicontinuity of the Hausdorff measure for the Hausdorff metric	120
3. Upper semicontinuity in $[0,1]$	121
4. Lower semicontinuity of the Hausdorff measure on uniformly concentrated sets	122
5. Sequences of compact connected 1-sets	125
11. Rectifiable sets	127
1. Rectifiable surfaces and rectifiable sets	127
2. Regularity of rectifiable sets	128
3. Rectifiable curves	133
12. Properties of regular and rectifiable sets	136
1. Geometric lemmas	136
2. Equivalence of the notions of regularity and rectifiability	138

3. Projection properties of irregular sets 142

**PART III. EXISTENCE AND STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES
OF THE MINIMAL SEGMENTATIONS
FOR THE MUMFORD-SHAH MODEL**

**13. Properties of the approximating image
in the Mumford-Shah model 151**

1. Notation and preliminary lemmas 151

2. Green Formulas 155

3. Interior regularity estimates 161

**14. Small oscillation coverings
and the excision method 165**

1. The excision method 165

2. Small oscillation coverings 167

3. The excision lemmas 169

4. The Interpolation Lemma 170

5. Energy jump estimates 174

6. Proof of the excision lemmas 176

**15. Density properties and existence theory
for the Mumford-Shah minimizers 182**

1. The Essentiality Property 183

2. The Uniform Density Property 184

3. The Concentration Property 188

4. The Projection Properties 189

5. Existence theory for the Mumford-Shah minimizers 192

6. Nonuniqueness of the Mumford-Shah minimizers 197

**16. Further properties of the minimizers:
covering the edge set with a single curve 199**

1. The David-Semmes Concentrated Rectifiability Property 199

2. Dual curve lemmas 202

3. Existence of a rectifiable curve containing the edge set 205

4. Existence of a regular curve containing the edge set 206

Bibliographical notes 209

References

References of Part I 215

- I-A) Image segmentation and edge detection, surveys and monographs.
- I-B) Articles proposing algorithms for edge detection and image segmentation.

- I-C) Scale space theory.
- I-D) Mathematical analysis related to scale space theory.
- I-E) Monographs in Image Processing.
- I-F) Articles on texture analysis and segmentation.
- I-G) Wavelets, theory and relation to image processing and scale space.
- I-H) Related topics in psychophysics, neurobiology and gestalt theory.

References of Part II 232

II-A) References on geometric measure theory and rectifiability

II-B) Monographs on mathematics and geometric measure theory.

References of Part III:Mathematical analysis
of the Mumford-Shah model 234

Index 239

Index of segmentation algorithms 243

Notation 244

Preface

This book contains both a synthesis and mathematical analysis of a wide set of algorithms and theories whose aim is the automatic segmentation of digital images as well as the understanding of visual perception. A common formalism for these theories and algorithms is obtained in a variational form. Thank to this formalization, mathematical questions about the soundness of algorithms can be raised and answered.

Perception theory has to deal with the complex interaction between regions and “edges” (or boundaries) in an image: in the variational segmentation energies, “edge” terms compete with “region” terms in a way which is supposed to impose regularity on both regions and boundaries. This fact was an experimental guess in perception phenomenology and computer vision until it was proposed as a mathematical conjecture by Mumford and Shah.

The third part of the book presents a unified presentation of the evidences in favour of the conjecture. It is proved that the competition of one-dimensional and two-dimensional energy terms in a variational formulation cannot create fractal-like behaviour for the edges. The proof of regularity for the edges of a segmentation constantly involves concepts from geometric measure theory, which proves to be central in image processing theory. The second part of the book provides a fast and self-contained presentation of the classical theory of rectifiable sets (the “edges”) and unrectifiable sets (“fractals”). This part contains a discussion of new uniform density properties of rectifiable sets, which prove extremely useful in image processing theory. Several image processing experiments and many figures illustrate algorithmic discussions and mathematical proofs.

This book will be accessible to graduate science students with some mathematical background. It will be of interest to mathematicians concerned with the interaction of analysis and geometry and to vision researchers.

Introduction

Natural, digital and perceptual images.

When one looks directly at scenes from the natural or the human world, or at any image (painting, photograph, drawing,...) representing such scenes, it is impossible to avoid seeing in them structures, which in many cases can be identified with real objects. These objects can be somehow concrete, as in photographs where we see trees, roads, windows, people, etc., or abstract perceptual structures, as the ones which appear in abstract paintings and can only be described in geometrical terms. However, we know that the “visual information” arriving at our retina, far from being structured, is purely local information for which a good model is given by digital images.

From the mathematical (and engineering) viewpoint, digital images simply are functions $g(x)$, where x is a point of the image domain Ω (the plane, a rectangle, ...) and $g(x)$ is a real number representing the “brightness” or “grey level” of the image at point x . This is the unstructured datum with which engineers have to deal in image analysis, robotics, etc.... And it also is somehow the basic datum which arrives at our retina. There is therefore not much in common between what we think we “immediately” see and what the physical information about light reflected by objects is. This striking difference between “images” in the engineering or the biological sense and “images” in the perceptual, artistic, semantic sense is well known, but the question is: How do we pass from the unstructured digital image to the structured perceptual one?

This question has been addressed in a scientific framework by psychologists of the Gestalt school in the twenties (Koehler [Koeh]) and then, with the first computers allowing to display synthetic images, by psychophysicists who did measurements of how much was perceived in the very first milliseconds after the arrival of an image to the retina (Julesz [Ju1, Ju2]). At the end of the sixties, the same problem was addressed in a very practical framework by engineers who wished to extract automatically useful information from digital pictures. The aim of this extraction was to build perception-driven robots and to better understand the human and animal vision. Then arose the *Segmentation Problem*, which is the object of this book.

The segmentation problem and its algorithms.

Segmenting a digital image means finding (by a numerical algorithm) its *homogeneous regions* and its *edges*, or *boundaries*. Of course, the homogeneous regions are supposed to correspond to meaningful parts of objects in the real world, and the edges to their apparent contours. Gestaltists and psychophysicists agree that such a segmentation process is at work at the very first stages of the visual perception process. In addition they proved that these first stages are highly independent of any learning or *a priori* knowledge of the world. In other words, the Vision research assumes that these first stages are accomplished by a *Geometry machine*, and it is also assumed that computer algorithms, working on digital images, should be able to do the same (Marr [Marr3], Koenderink [Koen2]). It is not the aim of this book to directly discuss this thesis, but rather to classify the proposed algorithms and their mathematical properties. More than a thousand algorithms have been proposed for segmenting images or detecting “edges”. It is of course impossible (and unnecessary) to review them all, but the first part of this book (Chapters 1 to 4) is devoted to a classification of these algorithms and their translation from a discrete into a continuous framework (more adapted to the mathematical analysis). The result of this discussion was unexpected to the authors of this book because they became aware that under the very large diversity of numerical tools, **there essentially was only one segmentation (or “edge detection”) model**. Indeed, as we hope these chapters will convince the reader, most segmentation algorithms try to minimize, by several very different procedures, one and the same *Segmentation energy*. This energy measures how smooth the regions are, how faithful the “analyzed image” to the original image and the obtained “edges” to the image discontinuities are.

One can write, and we indeed write in Chapter 4, the “most general” segmentation energy underlying all the analysed computational models. It has six or seven partly redundant terms, however, and therefore does not fit elegant mathematical analysis. If we keep the three more meaningful terms of the functional, we obtain the Mumford-Shah energy. Thus the Mumford-Shah variational model, although initially proposed as one model more, happens to somehow be **the general model** of image segmentation, and all the other ones are variants, or algorithms tending to minimize these variants. The Mumford-Shah model defines the segmentation problem as a joint smoothing/edge detection problem: given an image $g(x)$, one seeks simultaneously a “piecewise smoothed image” $u(x)$ with a set K of abrupt discontinuities, the “edges” of g . Then the “best”

segmentation of a given image is obtained by minimizing the functional

$$E(u, K) = \int_{\Omega \setminus K} (|\nabla u(x)|^2 + (u - g)^2) dx + \text{length}(K).$$

The first term imposes that u is smooth outside the edges, the second that the piecewise smooth image $u(x)$ indeed approximates $g(x)$, and the third that the discontinuity set K has minimal length (and therefore in particular is as smooth as possible). The model is minimal in the sense that removing one of the above three terms would yield a trivial solution. Needless to say, such a simple functional cannot give a good account of the geometric intricacy of most natural images, or of our perception of them. What is expected from algorithms minimizing such a functional is a sketchy, cartoon-like version of the image, and these algorithms will give perceptually good results when the processed images somehow match this *a priori model*: contrasted images with objects presenting piecewise smooth surfaces. We shall see some experimental examples in Chapters 2 to 5.

The Mumford-Shah conjecture.

Two main problems have to be solved once we have fixed a single universal segmentation model. The first one is practical: How can we define algorithms minimizing the Mumford-Shah energy on computers? Now, as we pointed out, the algorithms have in many cases **preexisted** the theory and many of them, though perfectible, yield perceptually reasonable results, as we shall see in Chapters 2 to 5. The second question is simply a mathematical one: Is the model consistent? That is, do segmentations exist which indeed minimize the Mumford-Shah energy, are they unique and are the boundaries thus obtained smooth?

Mumford and Shah [MumS1] conjectured the existence of minimal segmentations made of a finite set of C^1 curves. So far, this conjecture has not been fully proved and only partial but meaningful enough results are at hand. The problem has proved difficult for the present mathematical technique because of the subtle interaction of the two-dimensional term (in u) and the one-dimensional term $\text{length}(K)$. The same difficulty arises when one wishes to define a computer program minimizing the energy and we hope that the mathematical analysis will somehow clarify the numerical debate.

Edge sets and rectifiable sets.

As a matter of fact, the first mathematical task is to correctly define the functional $E(u, K)$. Indeed, we cannot *a priori* impose that an edge set K minimizing E is made of a finite set of curves. This is precisely what

has to be proved, and if we imposed this condition to all “candidates” to be minimizers, we would have, for the time being, no existence theorem at all.

This kind of situation is classical in mathematical analysis and is dealt with by enlarging the Search Space, that is, in our case, by looking for a solution in a wider class of sets with finite length than just finite sets of curves. This is done by defining the “length” of K as its one-dimensional Hausdorff measure, which is the most natural way of extending the concept of length to non-smooth sets (Carathéodory, 1915 [Cara], Hausdorff, 1919 [Haus]). So we shall have to work in the main part of this book with “1-sets”, i.e., sets with finite, positive, one-dimensional Hausdorff measure. The theory of these sets was developed by Besicovitch between 1928 and 1944 [Bes1, 2, 3], and was completed by Federer (1947, [Fed1]), Marstrand (1961 [Marst]), Mattila (1975 [Matt]) and Preiss (1987 [Prei]). As the dates indicate, it has not been a straightforward theory.

Now, it is a extremely suggestive theory for image processing. Besicovitch conjectured a remarkable structural classification of sets with finite m -dimensional Hausdorff measure. This conjecture was proved by himself and the above-mentioned authors. We shall now explain the results of the theory in the case $m = 1$, which is particularly significant for image processing, but they are identical in any dimension.

Besicovitch calls *rectifiable* any 1-set which is essentially contained in a countable family of curves with finite length. Clearly, the “edge sets” sought for in image processing belong to this class. A 1-set is called *fully unrectifiable* if it has no rectifiable part. Of course, any 1-set can be divided into its rectifiable and its unrectifiable part, but the question arises: How can we separate them? Here comes the remarkable Besicovitch discovery: Besicovitch conjectured and thereafter proved that there is a simple *local density criterion* to decide whether a point x of K belongs to the rectifiable part of K or not. This criterion is, from the computational viewpoint, clear cut: If x is in the rectifiable part, then the length of $K \cap B(x, r)$ is equivalent to $2r$ when r tends to zero. Otherwise, one can find balls $B(x, r)$ with arbitrarily small radii such that the length of $K \cap B(x, r)$ is less than $\frac{3}{4}2r$. This is the *density criterion*. Another geometric criterion is the following. If x is in the rectifiable part, then K admits a tangent line at x , and if x is in the unrectifiable part, every cone with vertex x and arbitrarily small diameter contains parts of K with positive length. Here again, strong *local criteria* give an account of the (nonlocal) rectifiability property. Last but not least, the unrectifiable part has a “fractal” structure which, among other properties, implies that its projection on almost every line has zero length.

When a computer scientist has applied some *edge detector* to an image,

he can see on the screen a set of points, and most edge detection or *segmentation devices* deal with so-called *connectivity algorithms*. What do these algorithms aim at? Clearly, a separation of the *rectifiable* part from the unrectifiable one. Indeed, “edges” are always assumed to be contained in curves or in finite unions of curves because they are assumed to correspond to the apparent contours of physical objects. Even if these objects may have “fractal” boundaries, like trees or clouds, the perception and the computer programs tend to define their boundary as a set of smooth lines. *The Besicovitch theory is a first answer as to the theoretical possibility of separating by local criteria the rectifiable part of a set from its unrectifiable part.* To our knowledge, no one of the Besicovitch criteria has been tried for “cleaning” edge sets from their spurious, unrectifiable part. The reason may be that the situation, in the numerical framework, is less contrasted: what really is aimed at is *a separation from a more rectifiable part from a less rectifiable part.*

We shall see that variational algorithms in image processing implicitly do this task, since minima of the Mumford-Shah functional are *uniformly rectifiable* in a sense which will be developed in the third part of this book. In any case, the second part of this book is devoted to a complete exposition of the Besicovitch theory. Our presentation does not follow the original Besicovitch presentation, which only works for dimension 1. (An excellent such presentation is done in Falconer [Fal1]). We tried to take into account all the new information about the geometric structure of rectifiable and unrectifiable sets given by the above mentioned Marstrand and Mattila contributions, as well as several new compactness results about sequences of m -sets. All of these results are proved because they are used in the third part of this book: We wished the exposition to be as complete and self-contained as possible.

What will be proved about the Mumford-Shah functional.

Although the Mumford and Shah conjecture is not yet proved, adequately weakened versions have been, and we shall list a series of questions which have been and will in this book be positively answered.

- Do minimal segmentations exist, and are they unique for each image? The answer is yes for existence and no for uniqueness, which matches the experimental intuition.
- Is the set of minimal segmentations small? Somehow, yes, because it is compact.

We now are concerned with the **structure** of the edge set.

- Are the edge sets obtained by the Mumford-Shah theory *rectifiable* in the Besicovitch sense? The answer is yes, and this is a first confirmation that the variational method is sound.

- Is the “edge set” made of a finite set of (not necessarily smooth) curves? The answer is unknown, but we shall see that the edge set is almost equal to a finite set of curves and can even be enclosed in a single curve with finite length, which is a remarkable result!

At this stage of the theory, one can deduce that the Mumford-Shah energy and conjecture are sound and that all the segmentation algorithms discussed in the first part of the book find, beyond their own experimental justification, a mathematical label of correctness.

To summarize, this book is divided in three parts:

- Modelization (Chapters 1 to 5),
- Geometric measure theory and the structure of sets with finite Hausdorff measure (Chapters 6 to 12), and
- Existence and structural properties of the minimal segmentations for the Mumford-Shah model (Chapters 13 to 16).

We tried to make this book as self-contained as possible. The first part only asks that the reader have some familiarity with the formalism of partial differential operators; no further mathematical knowledge is required. The second part is fully self-contained. It will, however, seem easier to readers having some knowledge of the Lebesgue measure and integration theory. The last part asks the reader to know the elementary distribution theory, but not more than the mere definitions of derivatives in the distributional sense. The few results about elliptic equations and variational problems used therein are either proved or explicitly admitted. The authors wish to thank Haim Brezis who had the idea that the present book could be written, and Ennio de Giorgi and Yves Meyer, who were a steady source of good suggestions and encouragement. The remarkable applications of the segmentation algorithm discussed in Chapter 5, developed at Cognitec-Inc by Lenny Rudin and Stanley Osher, brought surprise and excitement. We thank Isabeau Birindelli and Guy David for many useful comments. The first author thanks heartily his collaborators Luis Alvarez, Coloma Ballester, Vicent Caselles, Antonin Chambolle, Francine Catté, Tomeu Coll, Françoise Dibos, Manolo Gonzalez, Georges Koepfler, Frédéric Guichard and Christian Lopez, who kindly put to his disposition experimental results. Every successful image processing experiment condenses a lot of mathematical and algorithmic skill.