# Nonlinear Image Representation with Cascaded Local Gain Control

Eero Simoncelli Center for Neural Science, and Courant Inst. of Mathematical Sciences, New York University



- How do populations of neurons extract/represent visual information?
- In what ways is this matched to, or optimized for, our visual environment?
- How do these representations enable/limit perception?
- What new principles may be gleaned from these representations, and applied to engineered imaging or vision systems?



[figure: Hubel '95]





### Canonical functional models for sensory neurons



response

• Evolving...



# Temporally adaptive gain control



[Mante et. al. 2005]

# Local **spatial** gain control



[Bonin, et al 2005]

# V1: Surround suppression





[Cavanaugh etal 02]

## V1: Cross-orientation suppression



[Carandini etal 1997]

## V1 Normalization Model

The linear model of simple cells



The normalization model of simple cells



[Carandini, Heeger, and Movshon, 1996; Carandini & Heeger, 2012]

## Example: Area MT



[Simoncelli & Heeger, 1998]

## Sparse marginal statistics



## Independent Components Analysis (ICA)



# For linearly-transformed-factorial sources: guaranteed independence

(with some minor caveats)

[Cardoso 89; Jutten & Herault 91; Comon 94; Bell & Sejnowski 96; etc]

## ICA on image blocks



[Bell/Sejnowski '97; see also Olshausen/Field '96]

## Linearly-transformed factorial model



# Marginal Gaussianization



[Chen & Gopinath 01]

## Indications that the model is weak...



#### Sample from model



#### Image, ICA-transformed and marginally Gaussianized

Subbands are *heteroskedastic* (they have variable variance):



# We can model this behavior using a Gaussian scale mixture (GSM):

[Wainwright & Simoncelli 2000]



# GSM model

Model generalized coefficient neighborhood as a Gaussian scale mixture (GSM) [Andrews&Mallows '74]:

$$\vec{x} = \sqrt{z}\vec{u}$$

- $\vec{u}$  is Gaussian, z > 0
- z and  $\vec{u}$  are independent
- $\vec{x}$  is elliptically symmetric, with covariance  $zC_u$
- marginals of  $\vec{x}$  are leptokurtotic



## Joint statistics





joint histogram of natural image band-pass filter responses with separation of 2 samples



### Joint statistics - sound



# non-Gaussian elliptical models of natural images:



- Simoncelli, 1997;
- Zetzsche & Krieger, 1999;
- Huang & Mumford, 1999;
- Wainwright & Simoncelli, 2000;
- Hyvärinen and Hoyer, 2000;
- Parra et al., 2001;
- Srivastava et al., 2002;
- Sendur & Selesnick, 2002;
- Teh et al., 2003;
- Gehler and Welling, 2006
- Lyu & Simoncelli, 2008
- etc.



- Density is elliptical, but not Gaussian
- Whitening makes spherical, but not independent!

## radial Gaussianization (RG)



Gaussianize the *radial component* of the density

Approximate version: estimate local L2 norm, and divide (i.e., local gain control)



... all paths lead to a spherical/factorial Gaussian

## Densities and their factorizations



# RG vs. ICA on coefficient pairs



RG eliminates most dependency for *nearby* coeffs ICA offers minimal advantage over PCA Similar behaviors for coefficient blocks

## Joint densities



- Nearby: densities are approximately circular/elliptical
- Distant: densities are approximately factorial

[Simoncelli, '97; Wainwright&Simoncelli, '99]

How do we build a global model that captures the full range of observed statistical behaviors?

1) Random Field of Gaussian Scale Mixtures [Lyu & Simoncelli, 2008]

2) Build an implicit model, using local gain control. I'll show three recent examples...

# Example 1: Density estimation [Ballé, Laparra, Simoncelli, ICLR-16]

#### Density estimation (parametric density)



#### Density estimation (parametric transformation)



#### Parameter estimation

$$\mathbf{x} \longrightarrow g(x; \theta) \longrightarrow \mathbf{y}$$
$$-\log p_x(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial g(x; \theta)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial g(x; \theta)}{\partial x} (x; \theta)}{\partial x} (x; \theta) = \frac{\partial g(x; \theta)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial g(x; \theta)}{\partial x} (x; \theta)}{\partial x} (x; \theta) = \frac{\partial g(x; \theta)}{\partial x} (x; \theta) =$$

minimize wrt.  $\theta$  using stochastic gradient descent

#### Marginal distribution of linear filter responses



Burt & Adelson, 1981 Field, 1987 Mallat, 1989





$$y_{0} = \frac{x_{0} \quad x_{0}}{(\beta_{0} + \gamma_{0} | x_{0} | \phi \phi)^{\epsilon_{0}} + \gamma_{00} | x_{0} | \alpha_{00})^{\epsilon_{0}}}$$

$$y_{1} = \frac{x_{1} \quad x_{1}}{(\beta_{1} + \gamma_{1} \phi | x_{0} | \phi \phi)^{\epsilon_{1}} + \gamma_{11} | x_{1} | \alpha_{11})^{\epsilon_{1}}}$$

#### Contour lines, linear filter responses





#### Generalized divisive normalization (GDN)



#### Special cases/related models:

- Independent Component Analysis, Cardoso, 2003
- Independent Subspace Analysis, Hyvärinen & Hoyer, 2000
- Weighted normalization model, Schwartz & Simoncelli, 2001
- Topographic ICA, Hyvärinen et al., 2001
- Radial Gaussianization, Lyu & Simoncelli, 2009
- *L<sub>p</sub>*-nested symmetric distributions, Sinz & Bethge, 2010
- "Two-layer model", Köster & Hyvärinen, 2010

#### Parameter estimation (multiple layers)

$$\mathbf{x} \longrightarrow g_0(\mathbf{x}_0; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad g_1(\mathbf{x}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{y}$$

$$-\log p_{x}(x) = -\log \left| \frac{\partial g(x; \theta)}{\partial x} \right| - \frac{1}{2} \left\| g(x; \theta) \right\|_{2}^{2} + C$$

$$\overbrace{-\log \left| \frac{\partial g_{0}(x_{0}; \theta)}{\partial x_{0}} \right| - \log \left| \frac{\partial g_{1}(x_{1}; \theta)}{\partial x_{1}} \right| - \dots}$$

minimize wrt.  $\theta$  using stochastic gradient descent

#### One layer of joint GDN > many layers of marginal GDN



# Example 2: Perceptually-optimized rendering [Laparra, Ballé, Berardino & Simoncelli, in preparation]

#### Perceptual error is not consistent with Mean Squared Error



#### Equal MSE:



# Why does MSE fail?

Human visual system constructs a nonlinear visual representation, and is sensitive to distortions in this space







#### Multiscale version: Normalized Laplacian Pyramid (NLP)



[Laparra, et. al. 2016]

## NLP Distortion metric



[Laparra, et. al. 2016]

#### TID2008 database [Ponomarenko et al., 2009]

#### 30 0.2 0.3 1-(MS-SSIM) MSE in retinal model 0.7 0.8 0.9 0.1 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.3 0.4 V1 model response space explains $\rho_1$ : 0.6, $\rho_2$ : 0.62, RMSE:10.57 $\rho_1$ : 0.86, $\rho_2$ : 0.87, RMSE:6.71 100 100 perceptual data 90 90 80 80 70 70 DMOS DMOS 60 0.02 0.03 0.04 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 Normalized Laplacian model 0.01 0.05

Additive Gaussian noise

Spatially correlated noise

High frequency noise

Quantization noise

JPEG compression

JPEG2000 compression

JPEG transmission errors

Mean shift (intensity shift)

JPEG2000 transmission errors Non eccentricity pattern noise

Masked noise

Impulse noise

Gaussian blur

Image denoising

Contrast change

X

×

×

0

Ō

000

100

90

80

70

DMOS

Additive noise (more intensive in color components)

Local block-wise distortions of different intensity

 $\rho_1$ : 0.81,  $\rho_2$ : 0.82, RMSE:7.78

Laplacian model

[Laparra et al, 2016]



 $\rho_1$ : 0.79,  $\rho_2$ : 0.84, RMSE:7.27

0

0.5

0

0

0.6

100

90

80

DMOS

## The image rendering problem





#### Automatic high dynamic range image rendering



original

Paris et. al., 2015

Laparra et. al. (in preparation)

#### Perceptuallyoptimized image rendering



original



Paris et. al., 2015



Lmax = 10^3

 $Lmax = 10^{4}$ 

 $Lmax = 10^{5}$ 

#### Dithering (binary rendering)



standard (Floyd-Steinberg 1976) Laparra et. al. (in preparation)

original (grayscale)

# Example 3: Compression [Ballé, Laparra & Simoncelli, PCS-16+]

### End-to-end rate-distortion optimization



objective:  $L[g_a, g_s] = H[P_q] + \lambda \mathbb{E} \| \boldsymbol{z} - \hat{\boldsymbol{z}} \|$ 

#### relaxation to differential entropy:



$$p_{\hat{y}_i}(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} P_{q_i}(n) \,\delta(t-n),$$

 $P_{q_i}(n) = (p_{y_i} * \mathcal{U}(0, 1))(n), \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z},$ 

[Balle et al., PCS-16]

### 3-stage GDN cascade

 $g_a$ 



IGDN	upsample $2 \times 2$	$conv \mid 5 \times 5 \mid 128 \times 128$	add const	IGDN	upsample $2 \times 2$	$conv \mid 5 \times 5 \mid 128 \times 128$	add const	IGDN	upsample $4 \times 4$	$conv \mid 9 \times 9 \mid 1 \times 128$	add const	

 $g_s$ 

GDN:

$$y_{i} = \frac{x_{i}}{(\beta_{i} + \sum_{j} \gamma_{ij} x_{j}^{2})^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$
  
$$\gamma_{ij} \text{ symmetric}$$

IGDN (approximate):  $x_i = y_i \cdot (\beta_i + \sum_j \gamma_{ij} y_j^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ 

(one step of fixed-point inverse)

[Balle et al., in preparation]

#### original (cropped)



jpeg2000: 8362 bytes, RMSE: 11.264



jpeg: 9094 bytes, RMSE: 12.032



3-stage GDN: 8360 bytes, RMSE: 8.16



[Balle et al., in preparation]

original (cropped)



jpeg2000: 8127 bytes, RMSE: 18.37



jpeg: 9851 bytes, RMSE: 18.84



3-stage GDN: 8115 bytes, RMSE: 15.95



[Balle et al., in preparation]



[Balle et al., in preparation]

# Local gain control...

- is found throughout biological sensory systems
- can be implemented as an invertible nonlinear transform
- can Gaussianize natural signals, eliminating dependencies
- can mimic human perception of visual distortions
- can be used, cascaded, for image compression
- but we need a more complete characterization/ design toolbox!

## Thanks

Johannes Ballé

Valero Laparra

Alex Berardino

Siwei Lyu

