

# Properties of the Discrete Pulse Transform for Multi-Dimensional Arrays

Roumen Anguelov and Inger Fabris-Rotelli  
Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics  
University of Pretoria  
roumen.anguelov@up.ac.za  
inger.fabris-rotelli@up.ac.za

ISBN: 978-1-86854-785-2

Technical Report

2010/01

arXiv:1003.0776v1 [cs.CV] 3 Mar 2010

# 1 Introduction

This report presents properties of the Discrete Pulse Transform on multi-dimensional arrays introduced earlier in [1]. The main result given here in Lemma 2.1 is also formulated in [4, Lemma 21]. However, the proof, being too technical, was omitted there and hence it appears in full in this publication.

## 2 The Lemma

The lemma which follows deals with two technical aspects of the Discrete Pulse Transform of a function  $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  (where  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  denotes a vector lattice). The first is that the Discrete Pulse representation of a function  $f$ , given by

$$f = \sum_{n=1}^N D_n(f),$$

can be written as the sum of individual pulses of each resolution layer  $D_n(f)$ . The second result in the lemma below indicates a form of linearity for the nonlinear LULU operators.

### Lemma 2.1

Let  $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ ,  $\text{supp}(f) < \infty$ , be such that  $f$  does not have local minimum sets or local maximum sets of size smaller than  $n$ , for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then we have the following two results.

a)

$$(id - P_n)f = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} \phi_{ni} + \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma^+(n)} \varphi_{nj}, \quad (1)$$

where  $V_{ni} = \text{supp}(\phi_{ni})$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \gamma^-(n)$ , are local minimum sets of  $f$  of size  $n$ ,  $W_{nj} = \text{supp}(\varphi_{nj})$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, \gamma^+(n)$ , are local maximum sets of  $f$  of size  $n$ ,  $\phi_{ni}$  and  $\varphi_{nj}$  are negative and positive discrete pulses respectively, and we also have that

$$\bullet V_{ni} \cap V_{nj} = \emptyset \text{ and } \text{adj}(V_{ni}) \cap V_{nj} = \emptyset, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n), \quad i \neq j, \quad (2)$$

$$\bullet W_{ni} \cap W_{nj} = \emptyset \text{ and } \text{adj}(W_{ni}) \cap W_{nj} = \emptyset, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, \gamma^+(n), \quad i \neq j, \quad (3)$$

$$\bullet V_{ni} \cap W_{nj} = \emptyset \quad i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n), \quad j = 1, \dots, \gamma^+(n). \quad (4)$$

b) For every fully trend preserving operator  $A$

$$U_n(id - AU_n) = U_n - AU_n,$$

$$L_n(id - AL_n) = L_n - AL_n.$$

**Proof.**

a) Let  $V_{n1}, V_{n2}, \dots, V_{n\gamma^-(n)}$  be all local minimum sets of size  $n$  of the function  $f$ . Since  $f$  does not have local minimum sets of size smaller than  $n$ , then  $f$  is a constant on each of these sets, by [4, Theorem 14]. Hence, the sets are disjoint, that is  $V_{ni} \cap V_{nj} = \emptyset$ ,  $i \neq j$ . Moreover, we also have

$$\text{adj}(V_{ni}) \cap V_{nj} = \emptyset, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n). \quad (5)$$

Indeed, let  $x \in \text{adj}(V_{ni}) \cap V_{nj}$ . Then there exists  $y \in V_{ni}$  such that  $(x, y) \in r$ . Hence  $y \in V_{ni} \cap \text{adj}(V_{nj})$ . From the local minimality of the sets  $V_{ni}$  and  $V_{nj}$  we obtain respectively  $f(y) < f(x)$  and  $f(x) < f(y)$ , which is clearly a contradiction. For every  $i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n)$  denote by  $y_{ni}$  the point in  $\text{adj}(V_{ni})$  such that

$$f(y_{ni}) = \min_{y \in \text{adj}(V_{ni})} f(y). \quad (6)$$

Then we have

$$U_n f(x) = \begin{cases} f(y_{ni}) & \text{if } x \in V_{ni}, i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n) \\ f(x) & \text{otherwise (by [4, Theorem 9])} \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$(id - U_n)f = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} \phi_{ni} \quad (7)$$

where  $\phi_{ni}$  is a discrete pulse with support  $V_{ni}$  and negative value (down pulse).

Let  $W_{n1}, W_{n2}, \dots, W_{n\gamma^+(n)}$  be all local maximum sets of size  $n$  of the function  $U_n f$ . By [4, Theorem 12(b)] every local maximum set of  $U_n f$  contains a local maximum set of  $f$ . Since  $f$  does not have local maximum sets of size smaller than  $n$ , this means that the sets  $W_{nj}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, \gamma^+(n)$ , are all local maximum sets of  $f$  and  $f$  is constant on each of them. Similarly to the local minimum sets of  $f$  considered above we have  $W_{ni} \cap W_{nj} = \emptyset$ ,  $i \neq j$ , and  $\text{adj}(W_{ni}) \cap W_{nj} = \emptyset$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, \gamma^+(n)$ . Moreover, since  $U_n(f)$  is constant on any of the sets  $V_{ni} \cup \{y_{ni}\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n)$ , see [4, Theorem 14], we also have

$$(V_{ni} \cup \{y_{ni}\}) \cap W_{nj} = \emptyset, \quad i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n), \quad j = 1, \dots, \gamma^+(n), \quad (8)$$

which implies (4).

Further we have

$$L_n U_n f(x) = \begin{cases} U_n f(z_{nj}) & \text{if } x \in W_{nj}, j = 1, \dots, \gamma^+(n) \\ U_n f(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $z_{nj} \in \text{adj}(W_{nj})$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, \gamma^+(n)$ , are such that  $U_n f(z_{nj}) = \max_{z \in \text{adj}(W_{nj})} U_n f(z)$ .

Hence

$$(id - L_n)U_n f = \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma^+(n)} \varphi_{nj} \quad (9)$$

where  $\varphi_{nj}$  is a discrete pulse with support  $W_{nj}$  and positive value (up pulse). Thus we have shown that

$$(id - P_n)f = (id - U_n)f + (id - L_n)U_nf = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} \phi_{ni} + \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma^+(n)} \varphi_{nj}.$$

b) Let the function  $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  be such that it does not have any local minimum or local maximum sets of size less than  $n$ . Denote  $g = (id - AU_n)(f)$ . We have

$$g = (id - AU_n)(f) = (id - U_n)(f) + ((id - A)U_n)(f). \quad (10)$$

As in a) we have that (7) holds, that is we have

$$(id - U_n)(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} \phi_{ni}, \quad (11)$$

where the sets  $V_{ni} = \text{supp}(\phi_{ni})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n)$ , are all the local minimum sets of  $f$  of size  $n$  and satisfy (2). Therefore

$$g = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} \phi_{ni} + ((id - A)U_n)(f). \quad (12)$$

Furthermore,

$$U_n(f)(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} V_{ni} \\ v_i & \text{if } x \in V_{ni} \cup \{y_{ni}\}, i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n), \end{cases}$$

where  $v_i = f(y_{ni}) = \min_{y \in \text{adj}(V_{ni})} f(y)$ . Using that  $A$  is fully trend preserving, for every  $i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n)$  there exists  $w_i$  such that  $((id - A)U_n)(f)(x) = w_i$ ,  $x \in V_{ni} \cup \{y_{ni}\}$ . Moreover, using that every adjacent point has a neighbor in  $V_{ni}$  we have that  $\min_{y \in \text{adj}(V_{ni})} ((id - A)U_n)(f)(y) = w_i$ . Considering that the value of the pulse  $\phi_{ni}$  is negative, we obtain through the representation (12) that  $V_{ni}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n)$ , are local minimum sets of  $g$ .

Next we show that  $g$  does not have any other local minimum sets of size  $n$  or less. Indeed, assume that  $V_0$  is a local minimum set of  $g$  such that  $\text{card}(V_0) \leq n$ . Since

$V_0 \cup \text{adj}(V_0) \subset \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} V_{ni}$  it follows from (12) that  $V_0$  is a local minimum set of  $((id - A)U_n)(f)$ . Then using that  $(id - A)$  is neighbor trend preserving and using [4, Theorem 17] we obtain that there exists a local minimum set  $W_0$  of  $U_n(f)$  such that  $W_0 \subseteq V_0$ . Then applying again [4, Theorem 17] or [4, Theorem 12] we obtain that there exists a local minimum set  $\tilde{W}_0$  of  $f$  such that  $\tilde{W}_0 \subseteq W_0 \subseteq V_0$ . This inclusion implies that  $\text{card}(\tilde{W}_0) \leq n$ . Given that  $f$  does not have local minimum sets of size

less than  $n$  we have  $\text{card}(\tilde{W}_0) = n$ , that is  $\tilde{W}_0$  is one of the sets  $V_{ni}$  - a contradiction. Therefore,  $V_{ni}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \gamma^-(n)$ , are all the local minimum sets of  $g$  of size  $n$  or less. Then using again (7) we have

$$(id - U_n)(g) = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma^-(n)} \phi_{ni} \quad (13)$$

Using (11) and (13) we obtain

$$(id - U_n)(g) = (id - U_n)(f)$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (U_n(id - AU_n))(f) &= U_n(g) = g - (id - U_n)(f) \\ &= (id - AU_n)(f) - (id - U_n)(f) \\ &= (U_n - AU_n)(f). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first identity. The second one is proved in a similar manner. ■

## References

- [1] R Anguelov and I N Plaskitt (now Fabris-Rotelli), A Class of LULU Operators on Multidimensional arrays, University of Pretoria, Tech. Rep. UPWT2007/22, 2008, URL=<http://arxiv.org/abs/0712.2923>.
- [2] R Anguelov and I N Fabris-Rotelli, Discrete Pulse Transform of Images, Proceedings of ICISP 2008: International Conference on Image and Signal Processing, Cherbourg-Octeville, Normandy, France, 1-3 July 2008, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, **5099** (2008) 1-9.
- [3] I Fabris-Rotelli and S J van der Walt, The Discrete Pulse Transform in Two Dimensions, Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Symposium of the Pattern Recognition Association of South Africa, 30 November - 1 December 2009 Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- [4] R Anguelov and I N Fabris-Rotelli, LULU Operators and Discrete Pulse Transform for Multi-dimensional Arrays, IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, to appear, 2010.