

Using Wavelet Decomposition to Determine the Dimension of Structures from Projected Images

Svitlana Mayboroda

ETH Zurich, Department of Mathematics, Rämistrasse 101 8092, Zürich, Switzerland

David N Spergel

Flatiron Institute, 162 Fifth Avenue NY NY 10011 USA

(*dspergel@flatironinstitute.org)

(Dated: April 1, 2025)

Mesoscale structures can often be described as fractional dimensional across a wide range of scales. We consider a γ dimensional measure embedded in an N dimensional space and discuss how to determine its dimension, both in N dimensions and projected into D dimensions.

It is a highly non-trivial problem to decode the original geometry from lower dimensional projection of a high-dimensional measure. The projections are space-filling, the popular box-counting techniques do not apply, and the Fourier methods are contaminated by aliasing effects. In the present paper we demonstrate that under the "Copernican hypothesis" that we are not observing objects from a special direction, projection in a wavelet basis is remarkably simple: the wavelet power spectrum of a projected γ dimensional measure is $P_j \propto 2^{-j\gamma}$. This holds regardless of the embedded dimension, N , and the projected dimension, D . This approach could have potentially broad applications in data sciences where a typically sparse matrix encodes lower dimensional information embedded in an extremely high dimensional field and often measured in projection to a low dimensional space.

Here, we apply this method to JWST and Chandra observations of the nearby supernova Cas A. We find that the emissions can be represented by projections of mesoscale substructures with fractal dimensions varying from $\gamma = 1.7$ for the warm CO layer observed by JWST, up to $\gamma = 2.5$ for the hot X-ray emitting gas layer in the supernova remnant. The resulting power law indicates that the emission is coming from a fractal dimensional mesoscale structure likely produced by magneto-hydrodynamical instabilities in the expanding supernova shell.

1. INTRODUCTION

Observations of nebulae, molecular clouds, and other astronomical objects reveal intricate structures. While astronomers display these images in beautiful multi-color images, they rarely extract the full information contained in the data. In this paper, we discuss how to infer the fractal dimension of a structure in three-dimensional space from projected images. While this work has been motivated by examples from astronomy, our methods are applicable to a broad range of fields.

Many objects show scaling behavior over many orders of magnitude, often generated by hydrodynamical or magneto-hydrodynamical turbulence. If we could accurately measure the dimension of these structures in 3D, then we could obtain new insights into the underlying physics. The dimension of a level set of a passive scalar in a turbulent flow appears to depend on the Damkohler number [1]: flames develop a $7/3$ fractal if the chemical reaction time (or equivalently the cooling time) is short compared to the Eddy turnover time of the smallest eddies and $8/3$ if the Eddy turnover time scale is comparable to the chemical reaction time. Simulations [2] suggest that the Kelvin-Helmholtz instability generates a thermal emission layer with dimension $5/2$ while simulations [3] of molecular clouds show an index that varies with Alfvén Mach number. If we could infer the dimension of a structure in three dimensions, we would have important insights into the physics that determines the observed mesoscale structures.

When astronomers observe the surface brightness of an image at frequency, ν , $\Sigma_\nu(x, y)$, they are measuring the projec-

tion of the emissivity, ϵ_ν :

$$\Sigma_\nu(x, y) = \int dz \epsilon_\nu(x, y, z), \quad (1)$$

where we assume that the emission at frequency ν is optically thin. If the emission at frequency ν is coming from a thin layer corresponding to a peak in the cooling function, then our underlying physical model is that we are observing emission from a surface that can be described as a γ -dimensional surface on its mesoscale, $r_{min} < r < r_{max}$. Here, r_{min} is the thickness of the emission layer and r_{max} is the outer scale of the instability that creates the mesoscale phenomenon. Note that equation (1) implies that we are interesting in measures and their projections, not sets. Indeed, when $\gamma > 2$, the projection of a set would be typically space-filling, that is, two-dimensional, as well, rendering no information about the initial structure. In this paper, we will generalize from the projection from 3 to 2 dimensions to N to D dimensions.

What is the most effective way of describing the fractal dimension of a measure on the mesoscale? Even with the access to the full structure, not just its projection, this is a very intricate question, and the traditional toolbox is surprisingly misleading. The fundamental problem is that numerical methods developed for "classical" fractals do not accurately capture the mesoscale phenomena in highly disconnected sets under consideration. While the box counting methods are widely used to describe sets in fields ranging from engineering [4] to plant science [5] to ophthalmology [6], we argue that this approach fails even for the famous problem of determining the properties of a coastline. This method counts the number of boxes, K , in \mathbb{R}^N that contain μ as a function of scale, L and then

defines the box-counting dimension as $d \log K / d \log L$. This definition is problematic [7], particularly if μ is not a continuous surface. An important caveat is that in many applications μ is fragmented into bubbles. While it may be tempting to introduce a "filling factor" to count the boxes containing μ , this is an ill-defined concept: in the limit, the points in μ are a set of measure zero in \mathbb{R}^N and the filling factor, the volume of the box filled by μ , is zero. One could say that a bubble is not a point, but when viewed on the mesoscale, a bubble or tidal pool appears as "dust" and box counting breaks down in the presence of "dust". As an illustration of its failure, consider the rational numbers $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$: box counting yields a dimension 1 for \mathbb{Q} and dimension N for \mathbb{Q}^N . The rational numbers are a set of measure zero. If you are a marine biologist who wants to determine the surface area of the tidal zone, you do not want to exclude tidal pools. Similarly, isolated bubbles are not properly counted in analyses of molecular clouds or measurements of the area of a flame front in studies of combustion. In §2, we show that wavelets are a sparse and effective description of a measure that provides a more robust approach than box counting on sets.

An even bigger problem, central to the present paper, is that in astronomy one often only has access to projected images. If one is projecting to \mathbb{R}^d a set of dimension larger than 2, the result is typically two-dimensional, space-filling, and box counting fails for much more trivial reasons than above: it blindly yields projected dimension 2. The Fourier methods, if attempted, would be contaminated by aliasing. Moreover, we only observe one projection at a time, as opposed to the view from all angles. Thus, the methods of reconstructing the data from projections at all angles used, e.g., in CT, do not apply. This problem is the focus of §3, where the main contributions of the paper are described. We develop a new method to infer fractal dimension of a mesoscale structure in \mathbb{R}^N from observations of projected images in \mathbb{R}^D , under appropriate physical assumptions.

In §4, we apply this method to an image of the emission from warm CO derived from JWST image of Cas A at F356W and F444W [8, 9] and to X-ray images of Cas A [10].

2. MEASURING FRACTAL DIMENSION

This section focuses on methods for describing the dimension of a measure with either wavelets or Fourier methods. We refer the reader to classical texts, e.g., [7], for rigorous definitions and analysis of some of the mathematical concepts use below.

We consider a set in \mathbb{R}^N with a fractional dimension. We will refer to it as a fractal, although we do not assume self-similarity, simply that it exhibits the same dimension across a range of scales. We denote by μ the Hausdorff measure. The Hausdorff dimension, γ , of μ , is the supremum of s so that the Riesz potential,

$$I_s(\mu) = \int \frac{d\mu_x d\mu_y}{|x-y|^s}, \quad (2)$$

is finite.

Wavelets provide an effective language for describing the dimension of a measure. We pick a wavelet basis and let $\phi_{jm} = 2^{jN/2} \phi((x-x_{jm})/2^{-j})$ denote the wavelets concentrated on a cube centered at $x_{jm} \in 2^{-j}\mathbb{Z}^N$ of the side length 2^{-j} . We make sure that wavelets are L^2 normalized, that is, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi_{jm}|^2 = 1$, and denote the amplitude of a wavelet coefficient at scale 2^{-j} centered at position x_{jm} by

$$a_{jm} = \int \phi_{jm} d\mu. \quad (3)$$

Because fractal dimensional surfaces are sparse and typically not space-filling, wavelets are a sparse representation. In this language, most of the wavelet coefficients (concentrated on boxes that do not intersect the support of μ) are close to zero. When, on the other hand, the box corresponding to ϕ_{jm} has an ample intersection with $\text{supp } \mu$, generally the amplitude of the corresponding coefficient a_{jm} scales as $2^{-j\gamma} 2^{jN/2}$ (see, e.g., [11], for an analogous computation). Given that μ is γ -dimensional in \mathbb{R}^N , the proportion of boxes with a non-trivial contribution at every scale is $2^{j(\gamma-N)}$. Working at mesoscales $r_{min} < r < r_{max}$ corresponds to considering wavelets with $-j_{max} < j < -j_{min}$. On these scales, the wavelet power spectrum has a power-law behavior:

$$P_j = \frac{1}{2^{jN}} \sum_m |a_{jm}|^2 \propto 2^{j(\gamma-N)} 2^{j(N-2\gamma)} \propto 2^{-j\gamma}. \quad (4)$$

Alternatively, we can describe the measure in a Fourier basis:

$$\hat{\mu}(k) = \int \exp(ikx) d\mu(x), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (5)$$

Now, the Riesz potential becomes:

$$I_s(\mu) = \int |k|^{s-N} |\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 dk.$$

Hence, bringing us back to the power spectrum, if we assume the power behavior of $|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2$, the dimension can be viewed as $\inf\{\tau : |\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 \leq C|k|^{-\tau}\}$, or more informally, γ is the mesoscopic dimension if $|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2 \approx |k|^{-\gamma}$ for $\frac{1}{r_{max}} < |k| < \frac{1}{r_{min}}$. The description of the measure in Fourier modes is, however, a less sparse representation as the information is spread through Fourier space.

3. MEASURING FRACTAL DIMENSION FROM PROJECTED IMAGES

How do we deduce the dimension of the original set, γ , looking at its projection on \mathbb{R}^D ? When $\gamma < D$, it almost surely projects into a set of dimension γ again, according to Marstrand's 1950 theorem. When $\gamma > D$, which is a typical situation discussed in the present paper, the situation is much more delicate. The projection of a set itself would typically

be simply D -dimensional, space-filling, giving us no information. However, we have more information than that. We actually project a *measure* not a set, in the sense that we retain the information of the number of intersections with the set when projecting, but then the challenge is how to take advantage of this information.

Part of the problem is that projection always loses information. Physical systems can have preferred directions determined by either large-scale gravitational fields (e.g., the Earth for oceanographers or atmospheric physicists) or large-scale magnetic fields. If the properties of the set depend on direction, a projection parallel or perpendicular to the symmetry direction yields very different projected images. Luckily, we can apply ‘‘Copernican principle’’ to an astronomical observation and assume that we are not seeing an object from a preferred directions which eliminates this problem, but yet, to the best of our knowledge, the methodology for establishing the dimension of a measure from its projection has been unknown.

Projecting the \mathbb{R}^N wavelet decomposition $\sum_{jm} a_{jm} \phi_{jm}$ to \mathbb{R}^D , we use the property that ‘‘horizontally oriented’’ 3D wavelets ϕ_{jm} , $m \in 2^{-j}\mathbb{Z}^N$, project identically onto 2D wavelets modulo a renormalization: $\mathbb{P}\phi_{jm} = 2^{-j\frac{N-D}{2}} \phi_{jm^\sharp}$, $m^\sharp \in 2^{-j}\mathbb{Z}^D$. The ‘‘vertically oriented’’ wavelets project to zero. This would be a problem if horizontal or vertical were a preferred direction, but since we assume that there is none, the information contained in all coefficients a_{jm} is the same. Hence, we obtain a decomposition of the projected measure,

$$\sum_{jm^\sharp} a_{jm^\sharp} \phi_{jm^\sharp}, \quad (6)$$

where a_{jm^\sharp} is the sum of the coefficients a_{jm} for m above m^\sharp times $2^{-j\frac{N-D}{2}}$. For the astronomical images described in the introduction, equation (6) is essentially an expansion of $\Sigma(x, y)$.

In N dimensional space on scale j , there are 2^{jN} wavelets in a box of size 1. For a γ dimensional set, a fraction of roughly $2^{-j(N-\gamma)}$ of the a_{jm} ’s are non-zero. These $2^{j\gamma}$ non-zero wavelets project into 2^{jD} wavelets in the projected image. Thus, each a_{jm^\sharp} is a sum of typical M amplitudes

$$M(j) = 2^{j(\gamma-D)} = \left(\frac{1}{r}\right)^{(\gamma-D)}, \quad (7)$$

where r is the wavelet scale associated with the j -th wavelets. If the coefficients of the modes sum incoherently [12], then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{jm^\sharp} &\propto M^{1/2} 2^{-j\gamma} 2^{jN/2} 2^{-j(N-D)/2} \propto 2^{j(\gamma-D)/2} 2^{-j\gamma} 2^{jD/2} \\ &\propto 2^{-j\gamma/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Thus, the dimension of the initial image can be deduced from its D -dimensional wavelet decomposition (equation (6)) by using the scaling law (equation (8)).

Many astronomical objects are ‘‘limb brightened’’. Consider a supernova remnant of radius R_0 with a shell of thickness r_{max} . Because, we are viewing a spherical shell in projection, its projected thickness varies so that the number of

projected wavelets varies across the image and depends on the path length, R_{m^\sharp} at the position of the wavelet center:

$$M(j, m^\sharp) = \left(\frac{R_{m^\sharp}}{r}\right)^{\gamma-D}, \quad (9)$$

At the center of the image, $R_{m^\sharp} \sim 2r_{max}$ and closer to the edge, the shell thickness can reach $\sim 2\sqrt{2R_0 r_{max}}$.

Averaging the image over wavelet centers at fixed j yields an averaged shell thickness, R_{eff} :

$$\overline{M}_{projected}(j) = \frac{1}{2^{jD}} \sum_{m^\sharp} \left(\frac{R_{m^\sharp}}{r}\right)^{\gamma-D} \propto \left(\frac{R_{eff}}{r}\right)^{(\gamma-D)} \propto 2^{j(\gamma-D)}. \quad (10)$$

Note that R_{eff} can be defined independently of j (only depending on γ , D , and the shape of the shell). Then again the computation yields the scaling of the wavelet power spectrum:

$$P_j^{wavelet} = \frac{1}{2^{jD}} \sum_{m^\sharp} a_{jm^\sharp}^2 \propto 2^{-j\gamma}. \quad (11)$$

Note that the shape of a shell ultimately plays no role in (9)–(11). The wavelets mod out the global structure effortlessly. This makes it clear why the proposed method is superior to the Fourier decomposition.

Indeed, for a homogeneous uniform slab in (6)–(8), the analysis could be done in Fourier space. Projection in physical space is a slice (restriction) in Fourier space. If we apply the ‘‘Copernican principle’’ and assume that we are not seeing an object from a preferred directions, then the power spectrum of the image in D dimensions is just a slice through the N dimensional power spectrum. For a projected measure,

$$|\widehat{\mu}^\sharp(k_D)|^2 = Ck_D^{-\gamma} \quad (12)$$

where k_D is a vector in D dimensional space whenever for the original measure $|\widehat{\mu}(k_N)|^2 = Ck_N^{-\gamma}$.

However, an analog of (6)–(8) would suffer from the dominating aliasing effects (see §4): one would need to know what is the shape of the initial shell and painfully extract delicate dimension information from an analogue of (11), much less explicit in the Fourier representation. Thus while projection is conceptually simplest in Fourier space, Fourier analysis is poorly suited as even isotropic processes can be inhomogeneous in projection due to ‘‘limb brightening’’ effects.

4. APPLICATION: CAS A

In this section, we apply these methods to a mosaiced NIR-CAM JWST image of Cas A [8] and to Chandra image at 0.5-1.5, 1.5-3.0, and 4.0-6.0 keV [10]. Cas A is a nearby and young (~ 350 yr) core-collapse supernova remnant. Emission at F444W is dominated by warm CO and synchrotron emission, while emission at F365W is dominated by synchrotron [9]. In this section, we analyze an image shown in Figure (1) that is derived by subtracting the F365W observations from

F444W to remove the synchrotron emission [9]. The CO emission in the image is tracing the distribution of warm gas ($\sim 1000\text{K}$) in a reverse shock in the remnant [13]. This reverse shock is unstable to Rayleigh-Taylor instabilities and is expected to develop a multi-scale fractal-like structure [14]. The X-ray images are tracing the hot gas behind the forward shock.

Figure (2) shows the power spectrum of the Fourier transform of the image shown in Figure (1). The power spectrum is dominated by the large-scale structure of the image. As discussed in the previous section, projection effects alias power across scales making it more difficult to extract information about the structure of the emission layer.

Figure (3) shows the wavelet power spectrum, P_j , as a function of scale. The wavelet transform of the image shows remarkable power law behavior across a wide range of scales with a spectral index depending on the wavelength. This power law scaling suggests that the description of the image as the projection of fractal emitting layer is consistent with the data. For the CO gas, the slope of the wavelet power spectrum is 1.7: this suggests that instabilities fragment the reverse shock into filaments that do not fill the shell. For the X-ray emitting gas, the slope of the power spectrum peaks near 2.5, consistent with simulations of instabilities of a thermal radiative mixing layer [2]. It will be interesting to compare numerical studies of the development of instabilities in young supernova remnants [15] to these measurements from the observations.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we establish a new method for analyzing images and determining the dimension of projected mesoscale measure, set up in the framework of the wavelet-based analysis. Traditional box-counting methods fail not only in projection but in the original dimension for disconnected sets. Fourier methods are also ineffective as the Fourier power spectrum is dominated by the large-scale structure of the remnant. Here, we demonstrate the technique on observations of Cas A and find that the dimension of the measure depends on the temperature contour. We speculate that the inferred fractal dimensions are due to the various instabilities in the supernova's forward and reverse shocks.

We believe this approach is quite general and can be used not only to extract additional information about the underlying physics for a wide range of astrophysical objects, but more generally to analyze data in projection across a variety of fields.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Tea Temim for providing the Cas A image, Guy David for helpful insights on measuring level sets with

wavelets in the presence of randomness, and Drummond Fielding and Vikramaditya Giri for many discussions.

-
- [1] O. Chatakonda, E.-R. Hawkes, A.-J. Aspden, A.-R. Kerstein, H. Kolla, and J.-H. Chen, On the fractal characteristics of low Damköhler number flames, *Combustion and Flame* **160**, 2422 (2020).
 - [2] D. B. Fielding, E. C. Ostriker, G. L. Bryan, and A. S. Jermyn, Multiphase Gas and the Fractal Nature of Radiative Turbulent Mixing Layers, *Ap.J. (Letters)* **894**, L24 (2020), arXiv:2003.08390 [astro-ph.GA].
 - [3] J. R. Beattie, C. Federrath, and R. S. Klessen, The relation between the true and observed fractal dimensions of turbulent clouds, *MNRAS* **487**, 2070 (2019), arXiv:1905.04979 [astro-ph.GA].
 - [4] J. Wu, J. Jin, S. Mi, and J. Tang, An effective method to compute the box-counting dimension based on the mathematical definition and intervals, *Results in Engineering* **6**, 1001006 (2020).
 - [5] M. Bouda, J. Caplan, and J. Saiers, "box-counting dimension revisited: Presenting an efficient method of minimizing quantization error and an assessment of the self-similarity of structural root systems", *Front. Plant Sci.* **7**, 00149 (2016).
 - [6] L. Liebovitch and T. Toth, A fast algorithm to determine fractal dimensions by box counting, *Physics Letters A* **141**, 386 (1989).
 - [7] K. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 1990).
 - [8] D. Milisavljevic, T. Temim, I. De Looze, D. Dickinson, J. M. Laming, R. Fesen, J. C. Raymond, R. G. Arendt, J. Vink, B. Posselt, G. G. Pavlov, O. D. Fox, E. Pinarski, B. Subrayan, J. Schmidt, W. P. Blair, A. Rest, D. Patnaude, B.-C. Koo, J. Rho, S. Orlando, H.-T. Janka, M. Andrews, M. J. Barlow, A. Burrows, R. Chevalier, G. Clayton, C. Fransson, C. Fryer, H. L. Gomez, F. Kirchschrager, J.-J. Lee, M. Matsuura, M. Niculescu-Duvaz, J. D. R. Pierel, P. P. Plucinsky, F. D. Priestley, A. P. Ravi, N. S. Sartorio, F. Schmidt, M. Shahbandeh, P. Slane, N. Smith, N. Sravan, K. Weil, R. Wesson, and J. C. Wheeler, A jwst survey of the supernova remnant cassiopeia a, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* **965**, L27 (2024).
 - [9] J. Rho, S. H. Park, R. Arendt, M. Matsuura, D. Milisavljevic, T. Temim, I. D. Looze, W. P. Blair, A. Rest, O. Fox, A. P. Ravi, B. C. Koo, M. Barlow, A. Burrows, R. Chevalier, G. Clayton, R. Fesen, C. Fransson, C. Fryer, H. L. Gomez, H. T. Janka, F. Kirchschrager, J. M. Laming, S. Orlando, D. Patnaude, G. Pavlov, P. Plucinsky, B. Posselt, F. Priestley, J. Raymond, N. Sartorio, F. Schmidt, P. Slane, N. Smith, N. Sravan, J. Vink, K. Weil, J. Wheeler, and S. C. Yoon, Shockingly bright warm carbon monoxide molecular features in the supernova remnant cassiopeia a revealed by jwst (2024), arXiv:2406.03685 [astro-ph.GA].
 - [10] D. J. Patnaude and R. A. Fesen, Proper Motions and Brightness Variations of Nonthermal X-ray Filaments in the Cassiopeia A Supernova Remnant, *Astrophys. J.* **697**, 535 (2009), arXiv:0808.0692 [astro-ph].
 - [11] M. Hazewinkel, Wavelets understand fractals, in *Wavelets: An Elementary Treatment of Theory and Applications* (World Scientific, 1993) pp. 209–219.
 - [12] We thank Guy David for suggesting this $M^{1/2}$ scaling.

- [13] I. Biscaro and B. Cherchneff, Molecules and dust in cassiopeia i. synthesis in the supernova phase and processing by the reverse shock in the clumpy remnant, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **564**, A24 (2014).
- [14] J. M. Blondin and D. C. Ellison, Rayleigh-Taylor Instabilities in Young Supernova Remnants Undergoing Efficient Particle Acceleration, *Astrophys. J.* **560**, 244 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0104024 [astro-ph].
- [15] S. Mandal, P. C. Duffell, A. Polin, and D. Milisavljevic, A 3D Numerical Study of Anisotropies in Supernova Remnants, *Astrophys. J.* **956**, 130 (2023), arXiv:2305.17324 [astro-ph.HE].




FIG. 1. Image of CO emission in Cas A. This image is derived [9] by subtracting the F365W JWST NIRCAM image from F444W JWST NIRCAM image to remove the synchrotron emission. We display the image provided by Tea Temim from the JWST Cas A survey team. The other three images are Chandra X-ray images at 0.5-1.5 keV, 1.5-3.0 keV, and 4.0-6.0 keV. JWST has better angular resolution so there are more pixels across Cas A in the upper left figure.




FIG. 2. Fourier Power Spectrum of the CO image of Cas A. Because of aliasing effects, it is difficult to infer the geometry of the projected layer.




FIG. 3. Wavelet Power Spectrum of 2D Image of Cas A for gas at different frequencies. Here, we use Ricker wavelets in the analysis. The upper left is for CO emission. The upper right is for 0.5-1.5 keV X-ray emission. The lower left is for 1.5-3.0 keV X-ray emission and the lower right is for 4.0-6.0 keV. The break from the power law at the largest scales is due to the fractal description of the emitting surface failing at scales comparable to the radius of Cas A. Because of JWST's better angular resolution, the upper left spectrum has a larger dynamic range.