94-26

Neural, Morphological, and Stochastic Methods in Image and Signal Processing

Edward R. Dougherty
Françoise Prêteux
Sylvia S. Shen
Chairs/Editors

New results on optimality and consistency of morphological openings and closings

N.D. Sidiropoulos, J.S. Baras

Institute for Systems Research, and Dept. of Electrical Engineering
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

C.A. Berenstein

Institute for Systems Research, and Dept. of Mathematics
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

ABSTRACT

It has been recently shown that morphological openings and closings can be viewed as consistent MAP estimators of morphologically smooth signals in i.i.d. noise. We revisit this viewpoint under a different set of assumptions, which allows the explicit incorporation of geometric and morphological constraints into the noise model, i.e., the noise may now exhibit *geometric structure*; surprisingly, it turns out that this affects neither the optimality nor the consistency of these filters.

Keywords: Opening, Closing, MAP Optimality, Consistency of MAP Estimator

1 INTRODUCTION

In two recent papers[24,25] Sidiropoulos et al. have obtained statistical proofs of MAP optimality and strong consistency of morphological openings and closings. These results were made possible by casting the filtering problem within a general framework of Uniformly Bounded Discrete Random Set (or, Discrete Random Set (DRS), for short) theory.[23,21]

A DRS X is simply defined as a measurable mapping from some probability space to a measurable space $(\Sigma(B), \Sigma(\Sigma(B)))$, where $\Sigma(B)$ is a complete lattice with a finite least upper bound (usually, the power set of some finite $B \subset \mathbf{Z}^2$), and $\Sigma(\Sigma(B))$ is a σ-field over $\Sigma(B)$ (usually, the power set of the power set of B). A DRS X induces an associated probability structure $P_X(\cdot)$ on $\Sigma(\Sigma(B))$.

The optimality results of[24,25] critically depend on the assumption that B is *finite*; they further assume that the noise process is i.i.d., both within a given observation (pixel-wise), and across a sequence of observations (sequence-wide). As it turns out, the pixel-wise i.i.d. assumption, as well as the sequence-wide assumption of

identical distribution can both be removed, as long as the sequence-wide independence assumption is maintained, and a uniformity condition (to be specified) is imposed. The net result is that we end up with a new set of optimality conditions, which neither implies, nor is implied by the previous set. The most interesting feature of this new set of conditions is that it allows the explicit incorporation of geometric and morphological constraints into the noise model, thus enabling one to model colored noise, and establishing optimality in a more flexible and interesting environment.

1.1 Preliminaries

The theory of Mathematical Morphology has been developed mainly by Matheron,[12,13] Serra,[19,6] and their collaborators during the 70's and early 80's. Morphological filtering is one of the most popular and successful branches of this theory (cf.[20] for a recent survey of the status of morphological filtering). One good reason for the widespread use of morphological filters is their excellent shape-preservation (syntactic) properties. Important characterizations (e.g., root signal structure, relations to other filter classes) are well developed and understood.[26,10,11,14] Another aspect of filter behavior is revealed through statistical analysis. We are mostly interested in optimizing filter behavior with respect to some statistical measure of goodness.[24,25,23,21] Dougherty et al.,[1,8,5,2,4,3] Schonfeld et al.,[18,16,17] and Goutsias[7] have worked on several related problems, using different measures of optimality and/or families of filters. We concentrate on MAP optimality and strong consistency.

We do not reproduce the definitions of basic morphological operators $\oplus, \ominus, \circ, \bullet$ (Minkowski addition and subtraction, and morphological opening and closing, respectively) here; we follow the conventions of.[19] In morphological image analysis, structural and geometric image constraints are often expressed in terms of domains of invariance under certain morphological lattice operators. A digital image $I \in \Sigma(B)$ is said to be *smooth* with respect to a given operator (filter) f *iff* it is invariant under that operator, i.e., $f(I) = I$. For example, an image I is smooth with respect to morphological opening by a structural element W *iff* $I \circ W = I$. It has been shown[13] that this latter condition is satisfied *iff* I is a union of replicas of the structural element W, i.e., iff I is spanned by translates of W. We shall use $O_W(B)$ to denote the domain of invariance of opening by W, i.e., the collection of all images (subsets of B) which are spanned by translates of W. Note that $\emptyset \in O_W(B)$, $\forall W$. Similarly, we shall use $C_W(B)$ to denote the domain of invariance of closing by W. We can also fit more complicated image structure by allowing composite constraints, e.g., consider the class of all images which are invariant under a union of openings with respect to a family of structural elements.

2 RESULTS

We have the following results. Proofs can be found in.[22]

THEOREM 2.1. *(MAP Optimality) Assume we observe* $\mathbf{Y}^{(M)} = [Y_1, \cdots, Y_M]$, *where* $Y_i = X \cup N_i$, $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^M$ *is an* independent but not necessarily identically distributed *sequence of noise DRS's, which is independent of X, and each N_i is uniformly distributed over* some arbitrary collection, $\Psi_i(B) \subseteq \Sigma(B)$, *of subsets of the observation lattice B. Let us further assume that X is uniformly distributed over a collection, $\Phi(B) \subseteq \Sigma(B)$, of all subsets K of B which are spanned by unions of translates of a family of structural elements, W_l, $l = 1, \cdots, L$, i.e., those $K \subseteq B$ which can be written as $K = \cup_{l=1}^L K_l$, $K_l \in O_{W_l}(B)$, $l = 1, \cdots, L$. Then $\widehat{X}_{MAP}(\mathbf{Y}^{(M)}) = \bigcup_{l=1}^L \left((\cap_{i=1}^M Y_i) \circ W_l \right)$ is a MAP estimator of X on the basis of $\mathbf{Y}^{(M)}$.*

THEOREM 2.2. *(Strong Consistency) In addition, if $\emptyset \in \Psi_i(B)$, $\forall i \geq 1$, then, under the foregoing assumptions, $\widehat{X}_{MAP}(\mathbf{Y}^{(M)}) \longrightarrow X$, a.s. as $M \to \infty$, i.e., this MAP estimator is strongly consistent.*

What does a uniform distribution model? We may think of it as modeling an "unbiased" or "fair" adversary.

If the noise is "biased", then, depending on the particular type of probabilistic noise structure, and assuming we can uncover this structure, we might well be able to construct better estimators, or, we might not even be able to guarantee consistency.

We now present two more theorems. They can both be established by appealing to duality (note that closing is the dual of opening with respect to lattice complementation). Observe that here we deal with intersection noise, which can be interpreted as a formal mechanism to consider random sampling of DRS's.

THEOREM 2.3. *(MAP Optimality for the* dual *problem) Assume we observe* $\mathbf{Y}^{(M)} = [Y_1, \cdots, Y_M]$, *where* $Y_i = X \cap N_i$, $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^M$ *is an independent but not necessarily identically distributed sequence of noise DRS's, which is independent of X, and each N_i is uniformly distributed over some arbitrary collection,* $\Psi_i(B) \subseteq \Sigma(B)$, *of subsets of the observation lattice B. Let us further assume that X is uniformly distributed over a collection,* $\Phi(B) \subseteq \Sigma(B)$, *of all subsets K of B which can be written as* $K = \cap_{l=1}^L K_l$, $K_l \in C_{W_l}(B)$, $l = 1, \cdots, L$, *where* $C_{W_l}(B)$ *denotes the set of all W_l-closed subsets of B. Then* $\widehat{X}_{MAP}(\mathbf{Y}^{(M)}) = \cap_{l=1}^L \left((\cup_{i=1}^M Y_i) \bullet W_l \right)$ *is a MAP estimator of X on the basis of* $\mathbf{Y}^{(M)}$.

THEOREM 2.4. *(Strong Consistency for the* dual *problem) In addition, if $B \in \Psi_i(B)$, $\forall i \geq 1$, then, under the foregoing assumptions* $\widehat{X}_{MAP}(\mathbf{Y}^{(M)}) \longrightarrow X$, *a.s. as $M \to \infty$, i.e., this MAP estimator is strongly consistent.*

3   DISCUSSION

A little reflection on the above results is in order. The discussion will focus on Theorems 2.1,2.2, but the remarks are equally applicable to the case of Theorems 2.3,2.4.

The first remark is that both theorems crucially depend on B being finite (obviously, the size of B can be made as large as one wishes, as long as it is finite). We view this as further evidence of the utility of this restriction. The second observation is that the results are fairly general: apart from the mild condition $\emptyset \in \Psi_i(B)$, $\forall i \geq 1$, which is needed for consistency, we have imposed absolutely no other restrictions on the sequence of range spaces $\{\Psi_j(B)\}$ of the noise DRS's $\{N_j\}$;

In general, we cannot derive analytical formulas for some standard measures of estimator performance, such as bias and variance, without specifying the sequence of range spaces $\{\Psi_j(B)\}$ of the noise DRS's $\{N_j\}$; this is obvious, since these measures strongly depend on the structure of this sequence. Based on our experience in,[25] our feeling is that these derivations are going to be nasty, except in some limited cases. However, it should be noted that the MAP principle leads to optimal estimators in a particular Bayesian sense: it minimizes the total probability of error, P_e.[15] In other words, even though the MAP estimator may not be unbiased and/or minimize the error variance (as a MMSE estimator typically does) it is optimal in the sense that for each and every M, it minimizes the total probability of error. This is just an alternative concept of optimality.

Let us now consider two special cases.

- $\Psi_j(B) = \Sigma(B)$, $\forall j \geq 1$: The noise DRS's are identically distributed, each noise DRS is uniformly distributed over the power set of B. This is in fact the only nontrivial noise distribution compatible both with our earlier results in,[25] and with our results herein. This corresponds to the case of an i.i.d. sequence of i.i.d. DRS's, each being a Bernoulli lattice process of constant intensity $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$. In addition to MAP optimality and strong consistency, compatibility with[25] buys *uniqueness* of the functional form of the MAP estimator, and a handle on the bias.

- $\Psi_j(B) = \Psi(B)$, $\forall j \geq 1$, where $\Psi(B) \subseteq \Sigma(B)$, is a collection of all subsets K of B which are spanned by

unions of translates of a family of structural elements, V_l, $l = 1, \cdots, \Lambda$ i.e., those $K \subseteq B$ which can be written as $K = \cup_{l=1}^{\Lambda} K_l$, $K_l \in O_{V_l}(B)$, $l = 1, \cdots \Lambda$ The noise is now a system of overlapping particles of several different types, i.e., constrained to be smooth with respect to a union of openings by an appropriately chosen family of structural elements. Noise particles overlap with signal particles. Regardless of the degree of overlap and the particular types of signal and noise particles, we can claim optimality and strong consistency. However, small sample behavior will be governed by the interplay between the two families of structural elements which span the signal and noise DRS's ($\{W_l\}, \{V_l\}$, respectively). For example, if $|V_l| < |W_m|$, $\forall m = 1, \cdots, L$ then application of the $M = 1$ MAP filter will eliminate all isolated instances of V_l noise patterns. This may well be the case in applications, where the signal is usually associated with the more prominent image structures.

4 CONCLUSIONS

We have revisited the problem of estimating realizations of random sets immersed in random clutter, or suffering from random dropouts, under a new, and, in a sense, more appealing set of assumptions, which allows the explicit incorporation of geometric and morphological constraints into the noise model, i.e., the noise may now exhibit *geometric structure*; Surprisingly, it turns out that this affects neither the optimality nor the consistency of these filters.

5 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

6 REFERENCES

[1] E. Dougherty. Optimal Mean Square N-Observation Digital Morphological Filters - I. Optimal Binary Filters. *Computer Vision, Graphics, and Image Processing: Image Understanding*, 55(1):36–54, January 1992.

[2] E. R. Dougherty, editor. *Mathematical Morphology in Image Processing*. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1993.

[3] E. R. Dougherty, J. Newell, and J. Pelz. Morphological texture-based maximum-likelihood pixel classification based on local granulometric moments. *Pattern Recognition*, 25:1181–1198, 1992.

[4] E.R. Dougherty. Optimal mean-absolute-error filtering of gray-scale signals by the morphological hit-or-miss transform. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 4:255–271, 1994.

[5] E.R. Dougherty, A. Mathew, and V. Swarnakar. A conditional-expectation-based implementation of the optimal mean-square binary morphological filter. In *Proc. SPIE Vol. 1451, San Jose, California*. Society for Optical Engineering, February 1991.

[6] J. Serra Ed. *Image Analysis and Mathematical Morphology, vol. 2, Theoretical Advances*. Academic, San Diego, 1988.

[7] J. Goutsias. Morphological Analysis of Discrete Random Shapes. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 2:193–215, 1992.

[8] R.M. Haralick, E.R. Dougherty, and P.L. Katz. Model-based morphology. In *Proc. SPIE Vol. 1472, Orlando, Florida*. Society for Optical Engineering, April 1991.

[9] R.M. Haralick, X. Zhuang, C. Lin, and J.S.J. Lee. The Digital Morphological Sampling Theorem. *IEEE Trans. Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 37(12):2067–2089, 1989.

[10] P. Maragos and R. W. Schafer. Morphological filters - part I : Their set-theoretic analysis and relations to linear shift-invariant filters. *IEEE Trans. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Proc.*, ASSP-35(8):1153–1169, Aug. 1987.

[11] P. Maragos and R. W. Schafer. Morphological filters - part II : Their relations to median, order-statistic, and stack filters. *IEEE Trans. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Proc.*, ASSP-35(8):1170–1184, Aug. 1987.

[12] G. Matheron. *Elements pour une theorie des Milieux Poreux*. Masson, 1967.

[13] G. Matheron. *Random Sets and Integral Geometry*. Wiley, New York, 1975.

[14] I. Pitas and A. N. Venetsanopoulos. *Nonlinear Digital Filters: Principles and Applications*. Kluwer, Boston, 1990.

[15] H. V. Poor. *An introduction to Signal Detection and Estimation*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.

[16] D. Schonfeld. Optimal Structuring Elements for the Morphological Pattern Restoration of Binary Images. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 16(6):589–601, June 1994.

[17] D. Schonfeld and J. Goutsias. On the morphological representation of binary images in a noisy environment. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, 2(1):17–30, March 1991.

[18] D. Schonfeld and J. Goutsias. Optimal morphological pattern restoration from noisy binary images. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 13(1):14–29, Jan. 1991.

[19] J. Serra. *Image Analysis and Mathematical Morphology*. Academic, New York, 1982.

[20] J. Serra and L. Vincent. An Overview of Morphological Filtering. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, 11(1):47–108, January 1992.

[21] N.D. Sidiropoulos. *Statistical Inference, Filtering, and Modeling of Discrete Random Sets*. PhD thesis, University of Maryland, June 1992.

[22] N.D. Sidiropoulos, J.S. Baras, and C.A. Berenstein. Further results on MAP Optimality and Strong Consistency of certain classes of Morphological Filters. Submitted for publication, IEEE Trans. Image Processing. Also available as Institute for Systems Research ISR TR 94-84.

[23] N.D. Sidiropoulos, J.S. Baras, and C.A. Berenstein. An Algebraic Analysis of the Generating Functional for Discrete Random Sets, and Statistical Inference for Intensity in the Discrete Boolean Random Set Model. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 4:273–290, 1994.

[24] N.D. Sidiropoulos, J.S. Baras, and C.A. Berenstein. Optimal Filtering of Digital Binary Images Corrupted by Union/Intersection Noise. *IEEE Trans. Image Processing*, 3(4):382–403, 1994.

[25] N.D. Sidiropoulos, D. Meleas, and T. Stragas. MAP Signal Estimation in Noisy Sequences of Morphologically Smooth Images. Submitted for publication, IEEE Trans. Image Processing. Also available as Institute for Systems Research ISR TR 94-83.

[26] J. Song and E.J. Delp. A Study of the Generalized Morphological Filter. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, 11(1):229–252, January 1992.