Fourier vs Wavelets -~ Researchlab 4 Presentation Maurice Samulski





Contents

- Introduction
- Discrete Fourier Transform
- Discrete Cosine Transform
- Wavelet Transform
- Comparison between DCT and WT
 Conclusions

2



Fourier analysis

- Joseph Fourier 1807
- Represent functions by superposing sines and cosines with different frequencies and amplitudes
- s(t) = 3 sin (t) 100 sin(4t) 20 sin (200t)



3

Fourier analysis





Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation

4

Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT)

• DFT of image f(x,y) with size m x n $F(u,v) = \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{x=0}^{m-1} \sum_{y=0}^{n-1} f(x,y) \cdot e^{-2\pi i (\frac{ux}{m} + \frac{vy}{n})}$

for
$$u=0,\ldots,m-1$$
 and for $v=0,\ldots,n-1$

$$e^{-2\pi i f} = \cos(2\pi f) + i \cdot \sin(2\pi f)$$

Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation

5



Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT)

- Inverse DFT of F(u,v)
- $f(x,y) = \sum_{u=0}^{m-1} \sum_{v=0}^{n-1} F(u,v) \cdot e^{2\pi i (\frac{ux}{m} + \frac{vy}{n})}$

for $x = 0, \ldots, m-1$ and for $y = 0, \ldots, n-1$



Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



- Image f(x,y) is real
- Fourier transform F(u,v) is complex
- F(u,v) often represented as

$$magnitude(F(u,v)) = \sqrt{R^2(u,v) + I^2(u,v)}$$

$$phase(F(u,v)) = \tan^{-1}\left[\frac{I(u,v)}{R(u,v)}\right]$$



Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation







Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation









Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation









Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT)

- Very similar to the discrete Fourier transform, but
 - Uses only real numbers
 - Decomposes a function into a series of even cosine components only
 - Different ordering of coefficients
- Computationally cheaper than DFT and therefore very commonly used in image processing, eg JPEG and MPEG

۲

Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation

(1) Divide image into 8x8 blocks



Input image

8x8 block



Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



(2a) 2-D DCT basis functions



13

Wednesday, August 24, 2005

Research Lab 4 presentation





AC coefficients (details)

14

Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



(3) Zig-zag ordering DCT blocks

- Why? To group low frequency coefficients in top of vector.
- Maps 8 x 8 to a 1 x 64 vector.







Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



DCT compression

- Because human eye is most sensitive to low frequencies, less sensitive to high frequencies, we can truncate the coefficients which represent these high frequencies
- The lower quality setting, the more coefficients are truncated
- Lesser coefficients mean less detail of the block which leads to the famous blocking artifact





16

Wavelets

- The major advantage of using wavelets is that they can be used for analyzing functions at various scales
- It stores versions of an image at various resolutions, which is very similar how the human eye works.
- As you zoom in at smaller and smaller scales, you can find details that you did not see before.

Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



Haar wavelet example (1D)

Suppose we have a one-dimensional data set containing eight pixels:

[108681582]

• We can represent this image in the Haar basis by computing a wavelet transform, by averaging the pixels together pairwise:

[9735]

• Clearly, some information has been lost in this averaging process, we need to store detail coefficients:

[1-1-21]

Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



Haar wavelet example (1D)

The full decomposition will look like

| Resolution | Averages | Detail Coefficients | | |
|------------|--|---|--|--|
| 8 | $\begin{bmatrix} 10 & 8 & 6 & 8 & 1 & 5 & 6 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$ | | | |
| 4 | [9735] | $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ | | |
| 2 | [8 4] | [1 - 1] | | |
| 1 | [6] | [2] | | |

Table 1: Decomposition of 8-pixel image

- We will store this as follows: [6 2 1 −1 1 −1 −2 1]
- No information has been gained or lost by this process





Haar wavelet example (1D)

The full decomposition will look like

| Resolution | Averages | Detail Coefficients | | |
|------------|----------------------|---|--|--|
| 8 | [10 8 6 8 1 5 6 4] | | | |
| 4 | [9735] | $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ | | |
| 2 | [8 4] | [1 - 1] | | |
| 1 | [6] | [2] | | |

Table 1: Decomposition of 8-pixel image

• This transform will be stored as:

[6 2 1 -1 1 -1 -2 1]

No information has been gained or lost by this process



Haar wavelet

- This may look wonderful and all, but what good is compression that takes eight values and compresses it to eight values?
- Pixel values are similar to their neighbors
- The image can be compressed by removing small coefficients from this transform
- The one-dimensional Haar Transform can be easily extended to two-dimensional
- Input matrix instead of an input vector
 - apply the one-dimensional Haar transform on each row
 - apply the one-dimensional Haar transform on each column



21

Other wavelets

- The Haar wavelet uses simple basis functions (discontinuous) for scaling and determining detail coefficients
- Not suitable for smooth functions





Research Lab 4 presentation

22

JPEG vs JPEG2000

- Generally, there are two visible damages caused by image compression:
 - Blocking artifacts: artificial horizontal and vertical borders between blocks
 - Blur: loss of fine detail and the smearing of edges

23





Test: Image quality

- Test results are subjective
- With 'normal' compression (2+ bits/pixel), quality advantage of JPEG2000 is negligible
- Real quality advantage will only become clear by using very high compression ratios (0.5 or less b/p)
 - At 0.25 b/p, JPEG images begin to look like a mosaic while with JPEG2000 it gets a elegant blur across the image
 - JPEG2000 image files tend to be 20 to 60% smaller than their JPEG counterparts for the same subjective image quality

Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation

24



Test: Image quality (Original)





Lena Original (512x512x24b)

Building Plan (small piece)



Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



Results: Image quality (Lena)





JPEG (0.2 b/p)

JPEG2000 (0.2 b/p)



Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



Results: Image quality (Building plan)



JPEG (0.2 b/p)

JPEG2000 (0.2 b/p)



Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation



Results: Performance

Price to pay: considerable increase in computational complexity and memory usage

| Test image | Uncompressed size | Resolution | Color depth | Quality | JPEG2000 time | JPEG time |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------|---------|---------------|-----------|
| Construction plan | 34 MB | 5000x3477 | 16bit | 0.75bpp | 13.49 sec | 1.98 sec |
| Lena | 786 KB | 512x512 | 24bit | 0.75bpp | 0.94 sec | 0.37 sec |
| Tulips | 1.2 MB | 768x512 | 24bit | 0.75bpp | 0.78 sec | 0.33 sec |
| Monarch | 1.2 MB | 768x512 | 24bit | 0.75bpp | 0.77 sec | 0.36 sec |

Table 2: Performance table JPEG vs JPEG2000





Conclusions

- JPEG2000 works better with sharp spikes in images
- Quality advantages are really visible when compressing with very high compression ratios
- Only to be used with very large datasets like fingerprints, MRI scans, building plans, etc.
 - You can choose between different wavelet basis functions to get the optimal result for a specific application
 - Blur isn't experienced as bad as blocking artifacts
 - Time needed to compress high resolution images takes a lot of time with JPEG2000



Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation

29





Wednesday, August 24, 2005 Research Lab 4 presentation

