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Abstract—The geometry-texture decomposition of images produced by X-Ray Computed Tomography (CT) is a challenging inverse problem which is usually performed in two steps: reconstruction and decomposition. Decomposition can be used for instance to produce an approximate segmentation of the image, but this one can be compromised by artifacts and noise arising from the acquisition and reconstruction processes. We propose a geometry-texture decomposition based on a TV-Laplacian model, well-suited for segmentation and edge detection. The corresponding joint reconstruction and decomposition task from CT data is then formulated as a convex constrained minimization problem. We use our recently introduced proximal interior point method to solve this inverse problem in a reliable manner. Numerical experiments on realistic images of material samples illustrate the practical efficiency of the proposed approach. Our algorithm indeed compares favorably with a state-of-the-art method.

Index Terms—Geometry-texture decomposition, interior point method, proximal algorithm, computed tomography

I. INTRODUCTION

Decomposing a natural image $x^{t+g}$ into two components, namely a texture $x^t$ and a geometry $x^g$ such that $x^{t+g} = x^t + x^g$, provides solutions to various tasks in image processing such as denoising [1], clustering and classification [2] [3], texture segmentation [4], or digital inpainting [5]. Traditionally, the geometry represents a piecewise smooth version of the image, enabling large object detection, in contrast with the textural component which depicts details and local components with higher spatial frequencies. For instance, in the context of noise removal, the texture represents the noise contribution and consequently shares the same statistical properties, while the geometry can be extracted using the total variation semi-norm [1] [6]. The textural component can also capture meaningful features of an image, corresponding for example to periodic elements, edges, or blobs. A large number of models can be found in the literature regarding the texture extraction using variational approaches, based on $\ell_1$ or $\ell_2$ regularizations, wavelet decomposition or the Hölder exponent to name only a few [7]–[10]. In this paper, we focus on the use of the Laplacian detector, which has been known for a long time to be useful for texture element extraction, more precisely for edge and blob detection [11]–[13].

In the specific case of material image analysis, the geometry-texture decomposition aims at classifying material components. However, this task can be compromised by the very nature of the samples which can exhibit erosion or microporosity, blurring the border between the different elements. Another issue is the X-Ray Computed Tomography (CT) acquisition procedure used for this type of images. The latter provides a fast non-destructive scanning technique [14]. It consists in measuring the absorption of an object along a sampled grid of size $L$ for $N_0$ angular positions. This acquisition process can be modelled by a sparse projection operator $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where $n$ is the number of pixels of the absorption image and $m = L \times N_0$. Reconstructing the image from the measured data $y = H x^{t+g}$ (or a noisy version of it), called sinogram, is a challenging inverse problem [15] which involves ringing artifacts, contrast issues due to beam hardening, and noise caused by sensor motion [16]. These artifacts can be partially removed by improving scanning techniques or by increasing the number of measurements but this comes at a price and lots of applications can benefit from a faster subsampled CT acquisition. Reconstructing the image from the acquired data is a heavy processing step which can introduce a bias in the subsequent segmentation task [17]. Hence, there is a need for a reliable technique that can allow performing both reconstruction and segmentation on CT data in a reasonable time.

Joint geometry-texture decomposition and tomographic reconstruction can be formulated as a large-scale convex optimization problem under constraints. Interior point approaches have proven to be very useful and efficient to solve constrained optimization problems [18] [19]. The main idea behind these methods is to replace the constrained problem by an unconstrained minimization problem where the objective function is augmented with a so-called barrier term which goes to infinity as the variable approaches the border of the feasible domain. One advantage of interior point algorithms is that they guarantee feasibility of every iterate, which can boost convergence. However, most of interior point approaches rely on second-order methods [20]–[22] and thus require the objective function to be differentiable. In particular this framework excludes the use of total variation, which is at the core of segmentation variational models.

In this article, we introduce a TV-Laplacian geometry-texture model and propose a compact formulation to perform joint reconstruction and decomposition from tomographic data under some bounded measurement error. The corresponding constrained convex optimization problem is solved using a
recently introduced proximal interior point method that can handle non-differentiable terms in the objective function. The proposed optimization method leads to conclusive results for images of materials. This article is organized as follows: Section II details the geometry-texture decomposition model and the corresponding inverse problem; the optimization method is described in Section III; Section IV presents numerical experiments carried out on real data and comparison to a state-of-the-art algorithm; a short conclusion is drawn in Section V.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Notation and definitions

Let \( I_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \), \( 0_n \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and \( 1_n \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be the identity matrix, the zero vector, and the one vector, respectively. We denote by \( S_{++}^n \) the set of positive definite matrices in \( \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \). Let \( \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^n) \) denote the set of functions which are proper, convex, lower semi-continuous on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and take values in \( \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \).

The proximity operator [23] is defined as follows: for every \( A \in S_{++}^n \), \( f \in \Gamma_0(\mathbb{R}^n) \), and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \),

\[
\text{prox}_A^f(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|y - x\|^2 + f(y) \right\}. 
\]

B. Problem formulation

We propose to decompose an image into two parts: a geometry and a texture. The geometry is represented by a piecewise constant image which can be viewed as an approximation to the segmented map. Conversely, the texture represents the spatiotemporally varying components, namely the edges and textural components of the natural image, the residual noise, and artifacts from the tomography measurement. Assuming that the input data \( y \in \mathbb{R}^m \) is a CT sinogram with a measure uncertainty bounded by \( \chi > 0 \), the following formulation is proposed for the geometry-texture decomposition:

\[
P_0 : \min_{(x^t,x^g) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|Fx^t\|^2 + \lambda TV(x^g) \quad \text{subject to } \quad x^t + x^g \in [0,1]^n, \quad \|H(x^t + x^g) - y\|_\infty \leq \chi. 
\]

where \( F \) is the texture and \( x^g \) is the geometry, \( \lambda > 0 \) is the regularization parameter, \( TV \) is the isotropic total variation semi-norm [1], \( H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) is the discrete Radon projection operator, \( F = I_n - \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is the Laplacian associated with the 2D kernel:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & -4 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

padded with circulant assumption. The first term in the criterion enforces edge detection in the texture while the geometry is made smooth thanks to the total variation regularization. The first set of constraints corresponds to the bounds on the pixel values of the natural image \( x^t + x^g = x^t + x^g \), while the second constraint is the data-fitting term which can be decomposed into \( 2 \times m \) linear inequalities. We introduce the notation \( x = [(x^t)^T (x^g)^T]^T \), and since the constraints are linear, we can define \( C \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+m) \times 2n} \) and \( c \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+m)} \) such that \( x \) satisfies the constraints if and only if \( Cx + c \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+m)} \) where

\[
C = \begin{pmatrix} -I_n & -I_n \\ I_n & I_n \\ -H & -H \\ H & H \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad c = \begin{pmatrix} 0_n \\ -1_n \\ -\chi_1 m + y \\ -\chi_1 m - y \end{pmatrix}.
\]

III. OPTIMIZATION METHOD

We propose to solve the constrained problem \( P_0 \) via a sequence \( (P_{\mu,j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) of unconstrained subproblems parametrized by the barrier coefficient \( \mu_j \) and defined as follows:

\[
P_{\mu,j} : \min_{(x^t,x^g) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|Fx^t\|^2 + \lambda TV(x^g) + \mu_j b(Cx + c),
\]

where \( b \) is the logarithmic barrier: \( \forall z = (z_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2(n+m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+m)} \), \( b(z) = -\sum_{i=1}^{2(n+m)} \ln(\|z_i\|) \) if \( z \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+m)} \), \( +\infty \) otherwise.

As the subproblems \( (P_{\mu,j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) do not have an explicit solution, we solve them approximately using proximal gradient iterations, leading to the generic Proximal Interior Point Algorithm (PIPA) introduced in [24], the specific implementation of which is detailed below.

Algorithm 1: Proximal Interior Point Algorithm (PIPA)

Let \( \{(\epsilon_{i,j})_{j \in \{1,2,3\}} \} \) be strictly positive sequences converging to 0 such that \( (\forall i \in \{1,2,3\}) \lim_{j \to \infty} \epsilon_{i,j}/\mu_j = 0 \);

Take \( \delta \in [0,1], \theta \in [0,1] \) and \( \gamma > 0 \);

Initialize \( x_0,0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \) such that \( Cx_0,0 + c \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+m)}, \)

for \( j = 0,1, \ldots \) do

Choose \( A_{j,k} \) according to Condition 3.1;

for \( l = 0,1, \ldots \) do

\[
\begin{aligned}
\bar{x}_{j+1,k} &= \text{prox}_{\gamma \theta l \lambda TV} \left( x_{j,k} - \gamma \theta l A_{j,k}^{-1} \left[ \begin{array}{c} F^T Fx_{j,k} \\ 0_n \end{array} \right] \right) \\
&\quad - \mu_j C \text{Diag}(Cx_{j,k} + c) \left[ (1)^{1-1 \hat{1}_{2(n+m)}} \right] ;
\end{aligned}
\]

Stop if (6) is satisfied;

\[
x_{j,k+1} = \bar{x}_{j+1,k} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{j,k} = \gamma \theta l ;
\]

Stop if (7)-(9) are satisfied;

end

end

Given a fixed barrier parameter \( \mu_j > 0 \), \( P_{\mu,j} \) is solved approximately via several forward-backward iterations [25] [26] which include a gradient step on the barrier and on the texture regularization, and a proximal step on the total variation term. In order to accelerate the convergence rate, the proximity operator is associated to a preconditioning matrix \( A_{j,k} \) which should satisfy Condition 3.1 below. The choice for this matrix is detailed in Section III-B.

Condition 3.1: For every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), \( A_{j,k} \in S_{++}^n \) and \( \bar{\nu}_j I_n \preceq A_{j,k} \preceq \bar{\nu}_j I_n \).
Since the barrier is not Lipschitz differentiable, a linesearch is performed to find an appropriate stepsize $\gamma_{j,k}$ [27] [28]. The backtracking is based on the stopping criterion given by

$$
\frac{1}{2} \| F(x_{j,k} + \gamma_{j,k} c) - F(x_{j,k}) \|^2 + \mu_j \langle C x_{j,k} + c, b(C x_{j,k} + c) \rangle
$$

$$+
\mu_j \sum_{i=1}^{2(m+n)} \left( \frac{(C_{j,k} x_{j,k} - x_{j,k})_i}{(C x_{j,k} + c)_i} \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{\gamma_{j,k}} \| x_{j,k} - x_{j,k} \|_{A_{j,k}}^2.
$$

(6)

The barrier parameter $\mu_j$ is decreased as soon as the following accuracy conditions are met:

$$
\| x_{j,k} - x_{j,k+1} \| \leq \epsilon_{1,j}
$$

(7)

$$
\frac{1}{\gamma_{j,k}} \| A_{j,k} (x_{j,k} - x_{j,k+1}) \| \leq \epsilon_{2,j}
$$

(8)

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{2(n+m)} \left( \frac{(C x_{j,k+1} + c)_i}{(C x_{j,k} + c)_i} \right) - 1 \leq \epsilon_{3,j}.
$$

(9)

As stated in [24], the sequence $(x_{j,0}) \in \mathbb{N}$ produced by PIPA is bounded and every cluster point of it is a solution to $\mathcal{P}_0$.

A. Initialization

The proposed interior point method must be initialized in the strict interior of the feasible domain. To this aim, we initialize $x^0$ with the zero vector and follow the method of [29, Chap. 11.4] for $x^g$. We consider the minimization of the maximal infeasibility:

$$
\mathcal{P}_1 : \begin{array}{ll}
\text{minimize} & s \\
\text{subject to} & s \geq 0, x^g \in [0,1]^n \\
& \| H x^g - y \|_\infty \leq \chi + s \\
& \end{array}
$$

(10)

which is solved using a standard primal-dual interior point algorithm. This iterative process is stopped once the constraints in $\mathcal{P}_0$ are strictly satisfied or when $s$ is sufficiently small. In all the numerical experiments we performed, we were able to initialize our method using this procedure in a reasonable time.

B. Diagonal preconditioning matrix

For the traditional forward-backward algorithm, a suitable preconditioning matrix $A_{j,k}$ can be chosen as an approximation of the Hessian of the differentiable term in (5) at the current iterate $[30]$, which, in our case, is of the form

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
F^T F + G(x_{j,k}) & F(x_{j,k}) \\
G(x_{j,k}) & G(x_{j,k})
\end{pmatrix}
$$

(11)

where

$$
G(x_{j,k}) = \mu_j D_1(x_{j,k}) + \mu_j H^T D_2(x_{j,k}) H
$$

(12)

$$
D_1(x_{j,k}) = \text{Diag}(x_{j,k}^{t+q} - 2 + \text{Diag}(1_{n} - x_{j,k}^{t+q} - 2)
$$

(13)

$$
D_2(x_{j,k}) = \text{Diag}(H x_{j,k}^{t+q} + \chi_{1m} - y)^2 + \text{Diag}(-H x_{j,k}^{t+q} + \chi_{1m} + y)^2.
$$

(14)

Given the huge size and ill-conditioning of $H$, the inverse of $H^T D_2(x_{j,k}) H$ is hardly computable. Hence, instead of using the full Hessian we propose to rely on the diagonal approximation proposed in [31] for $G(x_{j,k})$, so that:

$$
A_{j,k} = \begin{pmatrix}
F^T F + D(x_{j,k}) & D(x_{j,k}) \\
D(x_{j,k}) & D(x_{j,k})
\end{pmatrix}
$$

(15)

where

$$
D(x_{j,k}) = \mu_j D_1(x_{j,k}) + \mu_j \text{Diag}(P^T d_2(x_{j,k}))
$$

(16)

and $d_2(x_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the diagonal of $D_2(x_{j,k})$, $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\langle v(i, \ell) \rangle |P|_{i,\ell} = |H|_{i,\ell} \sum_{q=1}^n |H|_{i,q}$. The operator $A_{j,k}$ is easily invertible since $D(x_{j,k})$ is diagonal.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The efficiency of the proposed approach is illustrated through the reconstruction and decomposition of three natural images from material samples, depicted in Figure 1. These images of size $n = 128 \times 128$ present various textural elements and artifacts. The discrete Radon operator $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ corresponds to projections along $N_\theta = 180$ angular positions on a grid of size $L = 128$, so that $m = 180 \times 128$. To mimic measurement uncertainty, the sinograms are corrupted with a uniform noise of amplitude $\chi = 1$. The regularization parameter $\lambda$ is chosen for each image, such that it leads to satisfactory geometry estimates: it is fixed to 0.6 for the glass sample, 0.1 for the AlCu data, and to 0.1 for the basalt image. Note that the correlation criterion defined in [7] could also have been used to assess the decomposition. The proposed algorithm PIPA is compared to the standard Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) [32]. Since the latter does not need to be initialized in the feasible domain, we run it with two different initializations, namely the one that we use for PIPA (labeled ADMM1) and the zero vector (labeled ADMM2).

The methods are implemented on Matlab R2016b and the simulations are performed on a desktop computer with an Intel Xeon 3.2 GHz processor and 16 GB of RAM.

A. Results

The performance of the different optimization algorithms is evaluated in terms of the normalized distance from the current iterate $x_{j,k}$ to the final point $x_\infty$, where $x_\infty$ is obtained after running the algorithms for 20 000 s. The corresponding plots

Figure 1. Natural images. (left and middle) Phase-separated barium borosilicate glass and AlCu sample, resp., imaged at the ESRF synchrotron (courtesy of David Bouttes). (right) Colorado Plateau basalt with bubbles (courtesy of Alexander Proussevitch [33]).
d iterates to the constraints for ADMM1 and ADMM2 where
Moreover, Figure 2 (right) represents the distance from the
can be found on Figure 2 (left) and Figure 3. Note that the
time needed to solve $P_I$ for initializing PIPA and ADMM1 is
included into these graphs, which corresponds to a duration
of about 115 seconds for all three tests.

Figure 2 (right) represents the distance from the current iterate to the final
distance to the constraints with time.

can be found on Figure 2 (left) and Figure 3. Note that the
time needed to solve $P_I$ for initializing PIPA and ADMM1 is
included into these graphs, which corresponds to a duration
of about 115 seconds for all three tests.

B. Discussion

In terms of optimization speed, as one can see on Figures 2
(left) and 3, the proposed algorithm converges faster to its
limit point. In addition, both PIPA and ADMM1 perform better
than ADMM2, which shows that initializing the algorithms
with the solution obtained by solving $P_I$ is significantly
beneficial. It should also be noted that PIPA and ADMM
do not follow the same path: as opposed to the proposed
interior point algorithm, ADMM does not produce feasible
iterates (even if they converge to one). This is confirmed by
Figure 2 (right). Regarding Figure 4, the proposed decomposi-
tion scheme provides visually satisfactory results. For the glass
sample, the geometry, which is free of the noisy background
and of the textural elements on the borders between the two
materials, approximates well the expected segmentation, while
the texture captures the edges between the different areas of
the sample. The AlCu data is characterized by ringing artifacts
which are almost removed from the geometry. One may expect
that the analysis of this sample content would be improved by
combining information from the geometry and the texture
which highlights significantly the edges between the different
blobs. The basalt image is affected by vertical artifacts along
with blur. As expected, these vertical lines can be found in the
resulting texture, leaving the geometry smooth and relevant for
a two-phase classification step.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we proposed a TV-Laplacian geometry-texture
model for image reconstruction from tomographic measure-
ments. We formulated the joint decomposition and tomo-
graphic reconstruction task as a constrained optimization prob-
lem. A novel proximal interior point algorithm was proposed
to solve this problem, that compares favorably with ADMM in
terms of convergence speed. In addition, it allows meaningful
decomposition results to be obtained when tested on realistic
test images of materials. One possible improvement of our
approach could be to consider more sophisticated non-linear
constraints and to employ a data-fitting term better adapted to
the noise statistics encountered in given acquisition processes.
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