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## Image decomposition

- So far, we have studied pixel classification, a problem whose feasible solutions define decisions at the pixels of an image
- Next, we will study image decomposition, a problem whose feasible solutions decide whether pairs of pixels are assigned to the same or distinct components of the image
- Image decomposition has applications where components of the image are indistinguishable by appearance (see next slide)


Volume Image (32 nm/voxel)
(Denk and Horstmann, 2004)


Decomposition (Andres et al., 2012)






Decomposition of a graph $G=(V, E)$

- A mathematical abstraction of a decomposition of an image is a decomposition of the pixel grid graph.
- A decomposition of a graph is a partition of the node set into connected subsets (one example is depicted above in gray).


Decomposition of a graph $G=(V, E)$

- A decomposition of a graph is characterized by the set of edges that straddle distinct components (depicted above as dotted lines)
- Those subsets of edges are called multicuts of the graph
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Multicut of a graph $G=(V, E)$
multicuts $(G):=\{M \subseteq E|\forall C \in \operatorname{cycles}(G):|M \cap C| \neq 1\}$
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Multicut of a graph $G=(V, E)$

- The characteristic function $y: E \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ of a multicut $y^{-1}(1)$ can be used to encode the decomposition induced by the multicut in an $|E|$-dimensional 01-vector
- For any $e \in E, y_{e}=1$ indicates that an edge is cut, straddling distinct components


Multicut of a graph $G=(V, E)$

- The set of the characteristic functions of all multicuts of $G$ :

$$
Y_{G}:=\left\{y: E \rightarrow\{0,1\} \mid \forall C \in \operatorname{cycles}(G) \forall e \in C: y_{e} \leq \sum_{f \in C \backslash\{e\}} y_{f}\right\}
$$



Graph $G=(V, E)$

- An instance of the image decomposition problem is given by a graph $G=(V, E)$ and, for every edge $e=\{v, w\} \in E$, a (positive or negative) $\operatorname{cost} c_{e} \in \mathbb{R}$ that is payed iff the incident pixels $v$ and $w$ are put in distinct components
- Such costs are often estimated from examples using machine learning technqiues


Graph $G=(V, E)$. Edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

- An instance of the image decomposition problem is given by a graph $G=(V, E)$ and, for every edge $e=\{v, w\} \in E$, a (positive or negative) $\operatorname{cost} c_{e} \in \mathbb{R}$ that is payed iff the incident pixels $v$ and $w$ are put in distinct components
- Such costs are often estimated from examples using machine learning technqiues
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- Image decomposition problem:

$$
\min _{y \in Y_{G}} \sum_{e \in E} c_{e} y_{e}
$$

- The optimal solution is shown in the next slide


Graph $G=(V, E)$. Edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$


- One technique for finding feasible solutions to an image decomposition problem is local search.
- Starting from the finest decomposition into singleton components (depicted above), we greedily join neighboring components as long as this improves the cost (see next slide).
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