

On the Logic Elements Associated with Round-Off Errors and Gaussian Blur in Image Registration: A Simple Case of Commingling

Serap A. Savari

Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3128, USA

February 18, 2025

Abstract

Discrete image registration can be a strategy to reconstruct signals from samples corrupted by blur and noise. We examine superresolution and discrete image registration for one-dimensional spatially-limited piecewise constant functions which are subject to blur which is Gaussian or a mixture of Gaussians as well as to round-off errors. Previous approaches address the signal recovery problem as an optimization problem. We focus on a regime with low blur and suggest that the operations of blur, sampling, and quantization are not unlike the operation of a computer program and have an abstraction that can be studied with a type of logic. When the minimum distance between discontinuity points is between 1.5 and 2 times the sampling interval, we can encounter the simplest form of a type of interference between discontinuity points that we call “commingling.” We describe a way to reason about two sets of samples of the same signal that will often result in the correct recovery of signal amplitudes. We also discuss ways to estimate bounds on the distances between discontinuity points.

1 Introduction and Motivating Example

One of the foundational topics in the study of image data is the recovery of signals from samples distorted by blur and noise. This problem has resulted in numerous contributions pertaining to the computational superresolution of data from instruments or sensors with limited resolution (see, e.g., [1], [2], [3], [4] and the references therein). It is also related to a large literature in image registration, which combines information from two or more images

of the same signal [5], [1], [6, §2.5]. Digital images are quantized [6, §2.4], but previous studies do not treat that feature as fundamental to the understanding of blur and instead typically focus on optimization ([2], [3], [4], [6, §5.9]). Digital images are also sampled [6, §2.4]. Given the importance of the applications that involve image data, it is worth asking if disciplines that primarily consider the processing of discrete data have the potential to advance image analysis, and we will use a simple special case of the problem to suggest that they do. For example, signal recovery algorithms must be implemented in hardware and/or software to be applied. There is a significant body of work on the logic underlying computer programs and circuits (see, e.g., [7], [8], [9], [10]). In this work we begin to incorporate the philosophy of sequential and concurrent processing to the understanding of the signal recovery problem; we focus in this paper exclusively on the effects of blur, sampling, and round-off errors on one-dimensional piecewise constant functions under simple conditions, and we only briefly comment on stochastic noise.

We motivate our investigations with an example. Suppose our uniform sampling interval is T and our signal is

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq t < 1.51T, 3.02T \leq t < 4.53T \\ -1, & 1.51T \leq t < 3.02T, 4.53T \leq t < 6.04T \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Our focus throughout will be on blur which is Gaussian or a mixture of Gaussians [6, §5.6]. For our example we will consider pure Gaussian blur of the form

$$h(t) = \frac{e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}}, \quad -\infty < t < \infty.$$

Then $\tilde{g}(t) = g(t) * h(t)$ is a blurred version of $g(t)$ without round-off errors. We observe eleven samples of this blurred version which are each rounded to the nearest integer multiples of $\frac{1}{256}$. For our first set of samples, suppose $\sigma = \frac{T}{8}$ and we begin sampling at $-1.8T$. Then our first set of observations is

$$\gamma_0 = \left(0, 0, \frac{242}{256}, \frac{253}{256}, -1, \frac{218}{256}, \frac{254}{256}, -1, -\frac{26}{256}, 0, 0 \right)$$

Notice that we cannot recover $g(t)$ from γ_0 . For example, we again obtain

γ_0 after rounding if we apply Gaussian blur with $\sigma = \frac{T}{7.7}$ to the function

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{129}{128}, & 0 \leq t < 1.508T, \\ -1, & 1.508T \leq t < 3.014T, \quad 4.527T \leq t < 6.035T \\ \frac{257}{256}, & 3.014T \leq t < 4.527T \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The application of imag registration [1] suggests that a second set of samples may be helpful. Suppose the blur is now $\sigma = \frac{T}{7}$ and we begin sampling at $-1.3T$. Our second set of observations is

$$\gamma_1 = \left(0, \frac{5}{256}, 1, -\frac{209}{256}, -\frac{250}{256}, 1, -\frac{196}{256}, -\frac{254}{256}, 0, 0, 0 \right).$$

The question is how to combine γ_0 and γ_1 . If we either directly average them [6, p. 70] or average them after applying the maximum of cross-correlation template matching [6, p. 1061], then it is not apparent how to infer much about $g(t)$. However, we will show that there is a way to reason about γ_0 and γ_1 to recover the amplitudes of $g(t)$.

A spatially limited piecewise constant function with a minimum distance between discontinuity points can be viewed in terms of a sequence of events consisting of actions to modify the amplitude of the signal at certain (continuous) times. These events are input to the combined, blur, sampling, and quantization operation which outputs partial information about the events of interest. Therefore, the difference between successive samples provides a useful representation of the output. For this difference representation and the blur regime we study, there are three behavioral primitives. In our earlier work [11]-[14], any difference value could be affected by at most one discontinuity point. However, a difference value could be affected by more than one discontinuity point, and we call that phenomenon *commingling*. In this paper we consider the simplest form of commingling where there is exactly one way for a difference value to be impacted by two discontinuity points; the new behavior is a type of fusion between two primitive behaviors.

The plan for the rest of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we review a measurement and a difference matrix from [14]. In Section 3 we describe the three primitive behaviors and add a fourth. We will also revisit our motivating example there. In Section 4, we give an overview of the syntax of our model. In Section 5, we describe an approach to parse our data and make inferences about signal amplitudes. In Section 6 we offer simple bounds on the relative locations of discontinuity points. In Section 7, we conclude.

2 Preliminaries

As in [11]-[13], our underlying spatially limited piecewise constant function with m regions in its support by

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} g_j, & D_{j-1} \leq t < D_j, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $D_0 = 0$, $g_1 \neq 0$, $g_m \neq 0$, $g_j \neq g_{j+1}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, and $g_0 = g_{m+1} = 0$. As in [14], suppose that g_j is an integer multiple of $\frac{1}{256}$ with bounded magnitude for all j .

We consider uniform sampling with a sampling interval of length T and assume it is impossible to sample at a discontinuity point. Further suppose that no two discontinuity points have a distance which is an integer multiple of T .

Let $h(t)$ be a pure Gaussian blur

$$h(t) = \frac{e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}}, \quad -\infty < t < \infty$$

and $\Phi(z) = \int_{-\infty}^z \frac{e^{-t^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dt.$

Let $\tilde{g}(t) = g(t) * h(t)$ be a blurred version of $g(t)$ without round-off errors. As we discussed in [14]

$$\tilde{g}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^m (g_{j+1} - g_j) \Phi\left(\frac{t - D_j}{\sigma}\right).$$

As in [14], we observe N samples of $\tilde{g}(t)$ beginning at $t_0 < 0$ and ending at $t_0 + (N-1)T > D_m$. To first characterize the unrounded samples, we follow [14] and let \tilde{M} be the $N \times (m+1)$ deformation matrix given by

$$\tilde{M}_{i,j} = \Phi\left(\frac{t_0 + iT - D_j}{\sigma}\right), \quad i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}, \quad j \in \{0, \dots, m\},$$

g_D be the *difference vector*

$$g_D = (g_1 - g_0, g_2 - g_1, \dots, g_m - g_{m-1}, g_{m+1} - g_m)^T,$$

$\tilde{g}[i]$ be the unrounded sample $\tilde{g}[i] = \tilde{g}(t_0 + iT)$, $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, and

$$\tilde{g} = (\tilde{g}[0], \tilde{g}[1], \dots, \tilde{g}[N-1])^T.$$

Then

$$\tilde{g} = \tilde{M}g_D.$$

In the absence of statistical noise, our observation of quantized samples is

$$\gamma = (\gamma[0], \gamma[1], \dots, \gamma[N-1])^T,$$

where $\gamma[i]$ is the closest integer multiple of $\frac{1}{256}$ to $\tilde{g}[i]$. Then

$$\gamma = Mg_D,$$

where the signal-dependent *measurement matrix* M is a corrupted version of \tilde{M} . Moreover, it is straightforward to generalize the discussion to a mixture of Gaussian blurs. In [14] we briefly discuss the cases of pure Gaussian blur with σ extremely large or extremely small; in the former case each element of M is 0.5 and in the latter case each element of M is either 0 or 1. The main focus of [14] and this paper is in a regime of small but apparent blur where each column of the measurement matrix may have at most one element strictly between zero and one; these elements of the measurement matrix *critical values*. The measurement matrix depends on the value ν_j , $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$, for which

$$\Phi(\nu_j) = 1 - \frac{1}{512|g_{j+1} - g_j|}. \quad (1)$$

For pure Gaussian blur, if

$$\frac{t_0 + iT - D_j}{\sigma} > \nu_j, \text{ then } M_{i,j} = 1,$$

and if

$$\frac{t_0 + iT - D_j}{\sigma} < -\nu_j, \text{ then } M_{i,j} = 0.$$

For a weighted average of pure Gaussian blurs of the form we study, let σ_{\max} be the largest σ that contributes to the round-off errors associated with the blur. Then [14, Proposition 1] is

Proposition 1: For pure Gaussian blur or a mixture of Gaussian blurs, if

$$\sigma_{\max} < \frac{0.5T}{\max_j \nu_j} \quad (2)$$

then each column of the measurement matrix has at most one critical value.

The measurement matrix also depends on the number of samples taken in the various regions of $\tilde{g}(t)$. Assume η_0 samples of $\tilde{g}(t)$ are taken for $t < 0$,

η_j samples are taken in the region $D_{j-1} < t < D_j$, $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and η_{m+1} samples are taken for $t > D_m$. η_0 and η_{m+1} are each at least one, and the constraints on η_1, \dots, η_m are discussed in [11]. For $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$, let

$$\iota(j) = \sum_{k=0}^j \eta_k.$$

Then $\gamma[\iota(j)]$ is the first sample following D_j , and index $\iota(j)$ is called a *segmentation point*.

In [13] and [14] we work with a *difference matrix* M_D to address the possible variations in η_j , $j \in \{0, \dots, m+1\}$. M_D has the same first row as M and defines row i for $i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ as row i of M minus row $i-1$ of M . Then [14, Corollary 2] is

Corollary 2: Given a pure Gaussian blur or a mixture of Gaussian blurs with $\sigma_{\max} < 0.5T/\max_j \nu_j$ for all k , there are three possible forms for column j of the measurement matrix:

- $M_{i,j} = 0$ for $i \leq \iota(j) - 1$, and $M_{i,j} = 1$ for $i \geq \iota(j)$
- $M_{i,j} = 0$ for $i \leq \iota(j) - 1$, $0.5 < M_{\iota(j),j} < 1$, and $M_{i,j} = 1$ for $i \geq \iota(j) + 1$
- $M_{i,j} = 0$ for $i \leq \iota(j) - 2$, $0 < M_{\iota(j)-1,j} < 0.5$, and $M_{i,j} = 1$ for $i \geq \iota(j)$.

Therefore, the three possible forms for column j of the difference matrix are:

- $M_{D[\iota(j),j]} = 1$, $M_{D[i,j]} = 0$ for $i \neq \iota(j)$
- $M_{D[\iota(j),j]} = M_{\iota(j),j} \in (0.5, 1)$, $M_{D[\iota(j)+1,j]} = 1 - M_{\iota(j),j}$,
and $M_{D[i,j]} = 0$ for $i \notin \{\iota(j), \iota(j) + 1\}$.
- $M_{D[\iota(j)-1,j]} = M_{\iota(j)-1,j} \in (0, 0.5)$, $M_{D[\iota(j),j]} = 1 - M_{\iota(j)-1,j}$,
and $M_{D[i,j]} = 0$ for $i \notin \{\iota(j) - 1, \iota(j)\}$.

The samples and differences between consecutive samples depend on the rows of the measurement matrix. The following result is [14, Proposition 3]:

Proposition 3: For a pure Gaussian blur or a mixture of Gaussian blurs with $\sigma_{\max} < 0.5T/\max_j \nu_j$, no row of the measurement matrix contains more than one component which is a critical value. Moreover, if the minimum distance between discontinuity points exceeds $2T$, then any row of M_D has at most one nonzero component.

The algorithms we propose for image registration in [13] and [14] are based on $M_D g_D$. In [13] we see that when the blur is negligible compared to quantization errors, then any component of g_D appears in one element

of $M_D g_D$ assuming a minimum distance of at least T between discontinuity points. Proposition 3 indicates that in this regime of larger blur, any component of g_D can either appear in one element of $M_D g_D$ or be divided between two consecutive components of $M_D g_D$ without the commingling of different elements of g_D as long as the minimum distance between discontinuity points of $g(t)$ is at least $2T$. However, when the minimum distance between discontinuity points falls below $2T$, then the commingling of different element of g_D within $M_D g_D$ is possible. Therefore, it is next of interest to consider a situation where there is a single form of commingling that may occur.

2.1 On Segmentation Points and Minimum Distance $1.5T$

The reason why a minimum distance of $2T$ has a special property in this blur model can be viewed as a consequence of Corollary 2 and the following more general result. We defer all proofs to a longer version of the paper.

Proposition 4: For any positive integer l , if the minimum distance between discontinuity points exceeds $\frac{(l+1)T}{l}$, then there is no collection of $l+1$ consecutive segmentation points.

Just as the case $l = 1$ has a special property, the case $l = 2$ is the only one where there is exactly one type of commingling of elements of g_D that can occur in $M_D g_D$ under this blur model. Our first step in the study of commingling is to extend Proposition 3. We have

Proposition 5: For a pure Gaussian blur or a mixture of Gaussian blurs with $\sigma_{\max} < 0.5T/\max_j \nu_j$, no row of the difference matrix more than two nonzero components. Moreover, if a row of the difference matrix contains two nonzero values, then they will be consecutive components and at least one of them will be strictly between 0 and 1. Furthermore, if the minimum distance between discontinuity points exceeds $1.5T$, then for a row of M_D with two nonzero entries, both of them will have values strictly between 0 and 0.5.

We also have

Proposition 6: For a pure Gaussian blur or a mixture of Gaussian blurs with $\sigma_{\max} < 0.5T/\max_j \nu_j$ and assuming the minimum distance between discontinuity points exceeds $1.5T$, if rows i_1 and $i_2 > i_1$ of the difference matrix each contain two nonzero components, then $i_2 \geq i_1 + 3$.

We will also use the terminology and notation of *difference sequence* for $\delta = M_D g_D$.

3 Modeling and Our Motivating Example

By Corollary 2, since there are three possible forms for column j of the difference matrix it follows that there are three primitive behaviors available in an observation. In [14, Section 5] we summarize these with tokens that we will expand upon here. First we ignore commingling.

- $M_{D[\iota(j),j]} = 1$, $M_{D[i,j]} = 0$ for $i \neq \iota(j)$. Here we denote $\iota(j)$ with the token A and $\delta(\iota(j)) = g_{j+1} - g_j$.
- $M_{D[\iota(j),j]} = M_{\iota(j),j} \in (0.5, 1)$, $M_{D[\iota(j)+1,j]} = 1 - M_{\iota(j),j}$, and $M_{D[i,j]} = 0$ for $i \notin \{\iota(j), \iota(j) + 1\}$. Here we label the pair $(\iota(j), \iota(j) + 1)$ with the tokens (F_1, F_2) and $\delta(\iota(j)) + \delta(\iota(j) + 1) = g_{j+1} - g_j$.
- $M_{D[\iota(j)-1,j]} = M_{\iota(j)-1,j} \in (0, 0.5)$, $M_{D[\iota(j),j]} = 1 - M_{\iota(j)-1,j}$, and $M_{D[i,j]} = 0$ for $i \notin \{\iota(j) - 1, \iota(j)\}$. Here we label the pair $(\iota(j) - 1, \iota(j))$ with the tokens (S_1, S_2) and $\delta(\iota(j) - 1) + \delta(\iota(j)) = g_{j+1} - g_j$.

In the case of commingling in our setting, we merge an (F_1, F_2) with an (S_1, S_2) to occur in three positions to which we assign the tokens (P_1, P_2, P_3) . We can use properties of the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal probability density function to prove

Theorem 7: For a pure Gaussian blur or a mixture of Gaussian blurs with $\sigma_{\max} < 0.5T / \max_j \nu_j$, if $\iota(j+1) = \iota(j) + 2$ and $0 < M_{\iota(j)+1,j+1} < 0.5$, then $|\delta(\iota(j))| > |\delta(\iota(j) + 1)|$ and $|\delta(\iota(j)) + 2| > |\delta(\iota(j) + 1)|$.

We can now continue our motivating example.

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &= \left(0, 0, \frac{242}{256}, \frac{253}{256}, -1, \frac{218}{256}, \frac{254}{256}, -1, -\frac{26}{256}, 0, 0 \right) \\ \gamma_1 &= \left(0, \frac{5}{256}, 1, -\frac{209}{256}, -\frac{250}{256}, 1, -\frac{196}{256}, -\frac{254}{256}, 0, 0, 0 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_0 &= \left(0, 0, \frac{242}{256}, \frac{11}{256}, -\frac{509}{256}, \frac{474}{256}, \frac{36}{256}, -\frac{510}{256}, \frac{230}{256}, \frac{26}{256}, 0 \right) \\ \gamma_1 &= \left(0, \frac{5}{256}, \frac{251}{256}, -\frac{465}{256}, -\frac{41}{256}, \frac{506}{256}, -\frac{452}{256}, -\frac{58}{256}, \frac{254}{256}, 0, 0 \right) \end{aligned}$$

In cell-library binding in circuit synthesis one also worries about labeling elements that affect future labels [10, 15]; in that setting it has proven helpful

to consider all possible labels. In our setting we use information from both sequences to work on the joint parsing/labeling of each to make inferences about signal amplitude values. We begin by seeking the smallest nonzero elements in each difference sequence.

We have $\delta_0[2] = \frac{242}{256}$ and $\delta_1[1] = \frac{5}{256}$. Since $\delta_1[2]$ has the same sign as $\delta_1[1]$ and larger amplitude, in δ_1 component 1 corresponds to S_1 or A . However, it cannot correspond to A because it is smaller than $\delta_0[2]$. Therefore, in δ_1 components 1 and 2 are parsed as (S_1, S_2) ; therefore, $g_1 - g_0 = \delta_1[1] + \delta_1[2] = 1$. Let us return to δ_0 . Since $\delta_0[2]$ has the same sign and larger magnitude than $\delta_0[3]$, the possible labels for component 2 of δ_0 are A, F_1 or P_1 . However, we already know that $g_1 - g_0 = 1$, so we can infer that in δ_0 components 2, 3, and 4 are parsed as P_1, P_2, P_3 . Since $\delta_0[2] + \delta_0[3] + \delta_0[4] = -1 = g_2 - g_0$, we can infer that $g_2 - g_1 = -2$. We next return to δ_1 to process the first unparsed component, etc. With this process of going back and forth between δ_1 and δ_0 , we will parse the components of δ_0 as

$$(0, 0, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_1, P_2, P_3, F_1, F_2, 0)$$

and the components of δ_1 as

$$(0 S_1, S_2, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_1, P_2, P_3, 0, 0),$$

infer that $g_3 - g_2 = 2, g_4 - g_3 = -2, g_5 - g_4 = 1$, and use our knowledge that $g_0 = 0$ to correctly recover the amplitudes of $g(t)$. We next work towards generalizing this approach.

4 Counting Arguments for Dataflow

In [11] we used a counting argument to describe the number of samples taken between successive discontinuity points, and in [13] we extended this to the number of samples taken between an arbitrary pair of discontinuity points. These papers focus on the case with no blur, and in the language of the previous section the parsing of the symbols between two successive discontinuity points would be A followed by some (and possibly no) zeroes. In the blur regime we currently study, there are many more possible behaviors. The main idea is as follows. A sample taken between D_j and $D_j + \nu_j \sigma_{\max}$ has in the difference sequence the label F_1 or P_1 depending on other entries in the difference sequence. A sample taken between $D_j - \nu_j \sigma_{\max}$ and D_j has in the difference sequence the label S_1 or P_2 depending on other entries in the difference sequence. The remaining labels F_2, S_2, P_3, A for nonzero

entries in a difference sequence depend on the context. Suppose

$$D_j - D_{j-1} = (n_j - f_j)T,$$

where n_j is an integer that is at least two and $0 < f_j < 1$. For $n_j \geq 3$ there are ten broad categories of parsing possibilities for the segment of the difference sequence between D_{j-1} and D_j which depend on $\nu_{j-1}\sigma_{\max}$, $\nu_j\sigma_{\max}$, and f_jT . Suppose that the first sample after D_{j-1} occurs at $D_{j-1} + \Delta_j$ for some $0 < \Delta_j < T$. Then within each category there are five possible parsings depending on Δ_j . We can also loosely extend that result to a partial description of the beginnings and endings of the parsing for a segment of the difference sequence between discontinuity points that are not successive. For $n_j = 2$ and $0 < f_j < 0.5$, the five broad categories of parsing possibilities correspond to

- $0 < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < (1 - f_j)T < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$
- $0 < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < (1 - f_j)T < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$
- $0 < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < (1 - f_j)T$
- $0 < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < (1 - f_j)T$
- $0 < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j <$

Among these categories, only the first and the third will permit possible parsings of P_1 , P_2 . To describe how the parsings associated with the two cases depends on Δ_j , we will divide each case into two.

Case 1.1: $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < f_jT$, $\sigma_{\max}\nu_j < f_jT$, $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j > (1 - f_j)T$:

- $0 < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j$: Parse F_1F_2 . The parsing of the next segment begins A .
- $(1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < \Delta_j < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$: Parse P_1P_2 . The parsing of the next segment begins P_3 .
- $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T$: Parse AS_1 . The parsing of the next segment begins S_2 .
- $(1 - f_j)T < \Delta_j < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$: Parse A . The parsing of the next segment begins F_1 or P_1 .
- $T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j$: Parse S_2 or P_3 . The parsing of the next segment begins F_1 or P_1 .

- $(1 - f_j)T + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < \Delta_j < T$: Parse S_2 or P_3 . The parsing of the next segment begins A .

Case 1.2: $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < f_jT < \sigma_{\max}\nu_j$, $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j > (1 - f_j)T$:

- $0 < \Delta_j < \sigma_{\max}\nu_j - f_jT$: Parse F_1F_2 . The parsing of the next segment begins F_1 or P_1 .
- $\sigma_{\max}\nu_j - f_jT < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j$: Parse F_1F_2 . The parsing of the next segment begins A .
- $(1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < \Delta_j < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$: Follow Case 1.1.
- $T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < \Delta_j < T$: Parse S_2 or P_3 . The parsing of the next segment begins F_1 or P_1 .

Case 3.1: $\sigma_{\max}\nu_j < f_jT < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$, $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j > (1 - f_j)T$:

- $0 < \Delta_j < \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$: Follow Case 1.1
- $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < \Delta_j < T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1}$: Parse AS_1 . The parsing of the next segment begins S_2 .
- $T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T$: Parse S_2S_1 or P_3S_1 . The parsing of next segment begins S_2
- $(1 - f_j)T < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j$ Parse S_2 or P_3 . The parsing of the next segment begins F_1 or P_1 .
- $(1 - f_j)T + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < \Delta_j < T$: Parse S_2 or P_3 . The parsing of the next segment begins A .

Case 3.2: $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} > f_jT$, $\sigma_{\max}\nu_j > f_jT$, $\sigma_{\max}\nu_{j-1} + \sigma_{\max}\nu_j > (1 - f_j)T$:

- $0 < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j$: Follow Case 1.2.
- $(1 - f_j)T - \sigma_{\max}\nu_j < \Delta_j < (1 - f_j)T$: Follow Case 3.1.
- $(1 - f_j)T < \Delta_j < T$: Parse S_2 or P_3 . The parsing of the next segment begins F_1 or P_1 .

5 On Collaborative Parsing and Amplitude Recovery

From [11, Lemma 2] we know that the offsets are related by $\Delta_j = (\Delta_{j-1} + f_{j-1}T)$ modulo T , and [11] and [13] imply that a refinement of Δ_j occurs for each j as more observations about the difference sequence are processed.

In the following discussion we assume that we do not consider identical copies of the same difference sequence.

The sum of the entries of any difference sequence are zero, and either $g_{j+1} - g_j$ is the value of a single component of the difference sequence, $g_{j+1} - g_j$ is the sum of the values of a pair of consecutive components of the difference sequence with the same sign, or $g_{j+2} - g_j$ is the sum of the values of three consecutive components of the difference sequence. The nonzero components of a difference sequence are partitioned so that each component contributes to one of these three cases for exactly one value of j .

Our scheme mainly seeks the smallest cluster of components in the unprocessed portion of the difference sequence that have a matching sum. When we find terms that are identical or have a matching sum, we have processed those portions of the difference sequences, we reset the algorithm to start searching at the beginning of the unprocessed portions of the difference sequences. If we cannot find a match then we will be in a situation like our motivating example, and in that case there will be collaborative parsing until there is a match in the sums. Those cases are left to the end of the search. We initialize by starting at the first nonzero difference value in each sequence and we list the searches in order:

1. Do the first elements of the unprocessed portions of the difference sequences match?
2. Does the first element of the unprocessed portion of the difference sequence match the sum of the first two components of the unprocessed portion of the other difference sequence which must be of the same sign?
3. Is the sum of the first two elements of the unprocessed portions of each of the two difference sequences equal?
4. Is the unprocessed portion of one difference sequence matching a commingling pattern, and are there four consecutive symbols in the unprocessed portion of the other which provide a matching sum?

5. Is the sum of the first three elements of the unprocessed portions of each of the difference sequences equal? This case has multiple parts:
 - (a) If the magnitudes of the component values of one of the sequences are in decreasing order, then parse that string as A, F_1, F_2 .
 - (b) If the magnitudes of the component values of one of the sequences are in increasing order, then parse that string as S_1, S_2, A .
 - (c) If in one of the sequences the second unprocessed component has the largest magnitude, then there are again subcases: If the first and third unprocessed components of that sequence have differing signs, then the determination of parsing that string as A, F_1, F_2 or as S_1, S_2, A is determined by the sign of the second component; i.e., the A is matched to the one component of a different sign from the other two. Otherwise, if the magnitude of the first component is larger than the magnitude of the first component of the other sequence, then parse as A, F_1, F_2 and if not, parse as S_1, S_2, A .
 - (d) For the remaining subcase, the true parsing of the unprocessed portion of one sequence begins as P_1, P_2, P_3 and for the other sequence it is either P_1, P_2, P_3 or F_1, F_2, A or A, S_1, S_2 . As in the previous subcase if the first and third unprocessed components of that sequence have differing signs, then the sign of the second unprocessed component will eliminate a possible parsing. If all three of the first unprocessed components of each sequence have the same sign, then as in the previous subcase an argument about magnitudes will eliminate a possible parsing. For this subcase we know $g_{j+2} - g_j$ for the corresponding value of j , but we can only bound $g_{j+1} - g_j$ and $g_{j+2} - g_{j+1}$. Once again, the bounds will depend on whether the first and third unprocessed components have the same sign or opposite signs. To resolve this case either more information must be gleaned about the values of Δ_k or by using constraints on the relative values of ν_j and ν_k , which lead to constraints on the corresponding relative values of the magnitudes of the corresponding components of g_D .
6. The remaining cases extend our motivating example and again are divided into subcases. Note that in the previous section we saw that if one sequence is parsed P_1, P_2, P_3 then the other cannot be parsed as A, A or as F_1, F_2, S_1, S_2 .

- (a) If the unprocessed portion of the beginning of one sequence has the parsing A, P_1, P_2, P_3 , then the third component of that segment has smaller magnitude than its second or fourth, and its first component has larger magnitude than the first unprocessed component of the other sequence.
- (b) If the unprocessed portion of the beginning of one sequence has the parsing S_1, S_2, P_1, P_2 , then the third component of that segment has larger magnitude than its fourth, and its first component has smaller magnitude than its second.
- (c) If the unprocessed portion of the beginning of one sequence has the parsing F_1, F_2, P_1, P_2 , then the third component of that segment has larger magnitude than its fourth, and its first two components have the same sign. If that sign is the opposite of the sign of the third component, then the sum of the magnitudes of the first two components of that segment is larger than the corresponding sum of the other segment. Otherwise the sum of the first three components of this segment is smaller than the corresponding sum of the other segment.

As a brief comment on stochastic noise, we need enumerative techniques or good heuristics to optimize the amplitude recovery problem in the presence of underlying logical constraints.

6 Bounds on Discontinuity Point Distances

Assume that the first sample is taken at t . We have the following:

- If the segmentation point associated with D_j has the label P_1 or F_1 , then

$$t + \iota(j)T - \nu_j \sigma_{\max} < D_j < t + \iota(j)T.$$

- If the segmentation point associated with D_j has the label S_2 or P_3 , then

$$t + [\iota(j) - 1]T < D_j < t + [\iota(j) - 1]T + \nu_j \sigma_{\max}.$$

Therefore, these bounds can be combined to bound $D_{j+k} - D_j$ given the labeling of a difference sequence. Suppose the labels (x, y) are associated with the segmentation points (D_j, D_{j+k}) .

- If $(x, y) = (A, A)$, then $[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) - 1]T + (\nu_j + \nu_{j+k})\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) + 1]T - (\nu_j + \nu_{j+k})\sigma_{\max}$.

- If $(x, y) = (A, F_1)$ or if $(x, y) = (A, P_1)$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T - \nu_{j+k}\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) + 1]T - \nu_j\sigma_{\max}.$$
- If $(x, y) = (A, S_2)$ or if $(x, y) = (A, P_3)$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) - 1]T + \nu_j\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T + (\nu_{j-k} - \nu_j)\sigma_{\max}.$$
- If $x \in \{F_1, P_1\}$ and $y = A$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) - 1]T + \nu_{j+k}\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T + (\nu_j - \nu_{j+k})\sigma_{\max}.$$
- If $x, y \in \{F_1, P_1\}$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T - \nu_{j+k}\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T + \nu_j\sigma_{\max}.$$
- If $x \in \{F_1, P_1\}$ and $y \in \{S_2, P_3\}$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) - 1]T < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) - 1]T + (\nu_j + \nu_{j+k})\sigma_{\max}.$$
- If $x \in \{S_2, P_3\}$ and $y = A$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T + (\nu_{j+k} + \nu_j)\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) + 1]T - \nu_{j+k}\sigma_{\max}.$$
- If $x \in \{S_2, P_3\}$ and $y \in \{F_1, P_1\}$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) + 1]T - (\nu_j + \nu_{j+k})\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j) + 1]T.$$
- If $x, y \in \{S_2, P_3\}$, then

$$[\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T - \nu_j\sigma_{\max} < D_{j+k} - D_j < [\iota(j+k) - \iota(j)]T + \nu_{j+k}\sigma_{\max}.$$

The minimum distance of $1.5T$ often provides tighter lower bounds than the ones specified here, but some of the upper bounds constrain the relationship between parsing and amplitude recovery.

7 Conclusions

In *À la recherche du temps perdu*, Marcel Proust suggests that the real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new lands, but seeing with new eyes. Regarding image data, image registration and multiple image analysis offer opportunities that single image analysis do not.

References

- [1] X. Tong, Z. Ye, Y. Xu, S. Gao, H. Xie, Q. Du, S. Liu, X. Xu, S. Liu, K. Luan, and U. Stilla, “Image registration with Fourier-based image correlation: a comprehensive review of developments and applications,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* **12**(10), 4062-4081, Oct. 2019.
- [2] E. J. Candès and C. Fernandez-Granda, “Towards a mathematical theory of super-resolution,” *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, **67**, 906-956, 2014.
- [3] M. Jacob, M. P. Mani, and J. C. Ye, “Structured low-rank algorithms,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* **37**(1), 54-68, 2020.
- [4] Q. Denoyelle, V. Duval, G. Peyré, and E. Soubies, “The sliding Frank-Wolfe algorithm and its application to super-resolution microscopy,” *Inverse Problems* **36** 014001, 2020.
- [5] M. H. Cheng, K. Flores De Jesus, S. D. Cronin, K. A. Sierros, and E. Bakhoun, “A versatile spatial resolution enhancement method for data acquisition,” *Meas. Sci. Technol.* **26**, 045901, 2015.
- [6] R. C. Gonzalez and R. E. Woods, *Digital Image Processing*, Fourth Edition, Pearson, New York, NY, 2018.
- [7] A. Aho, R. Sethi, and J. Ullman, *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1988.
- [8] C. A. R. Hoare, *Communicating Sequential Processes*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1985.
- [9] R. Milner, *Communication and Concurrency*, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1989.
- [10] G. De Micheli, *Synthesis and Optimization of Digital Circuits*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1994.
- [11] S. A. Savari, “On image registration and subpixel estimation,” arXiv.org preprint, arXiv:2405.12927, May 2024.
- [12] S. A. Savari, “A counterexample in image registration,” arXiv.org preprint, arXiv:2410.10725, October 2024.

- [13] S. A. Savari, “A counterexample in cross-correlation template matching,” arXiv.org preprint, arXiv:2410.19085, October 2024.
- [14] S. A. Savari, “On Round-Off Errors and Gaussian Blur in Superresolution and in Image Registration,” arXiv.org preprint, arXiv:2412.09741, December 2024.
- [15] R. Rudell, “Logic synthesis for VLSI design,” Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1989.