

Math 285J, L. Vese. **Assignment 1:** Due on Wednesday, November 6

[1] Consider in two dimensions the functional minimization problem

$$\inf_u F(u) = F_1(u) + \lambda F_2(u_0 - Ku),$$

where  $u_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a given degraded version of a true (unknown) image  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , and  $K$  is a linear and continuous operator on  $L^2(\Omega)$ . Here,  $F_1$  represents the regularization term while  $F_2$  represents the data fidelity term. Recall that  $|\nabla u| = \sqrt{(u_x)^2 + (u_y)^2}$ .

Assume  $u_0, u \in L^2(\Omega)$ ,  $F_1(u) = \int_{\Omega} \phi_1(|\nabla u|) dx dy$ ,  $F_2(u_0 - Ku) = \int_{\Omega} \phi_2(u_0 - Ku) dx dy$ , where  $\nabla u = (u_x, u_y)$  is the spatial gradient operator,  $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are functions of class  $C^1$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), and that  $\phi_2'(u_0 - Ku) \in L^2(\Omega)$ , as long as  $u_0 - Ku \in L^2(\Omega)$ .

(i) For  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ , obtain the Euler-Lagrange equation associated with the minimization problem in  $u$ , in the stationary and time-dependent cases, together with the appropriate boundary conditions in  $u$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . For the time-dependent case, show that the energy  $E(t) = F(u(x, y, t))$  is decreasing in time. <sup>1</sup>

(ii) Show that, if  $\phi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are both convex, and  $\phi_1$  is in addition non-decreasing from  $[0, \infty)$  to  $[0, \infty)$ , then the functional  $F(u)$  is convex.

[2] Consider in two dimensions  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ , and  $u(\cdot, \lambda)$  the minimizer of

$$F(u) = \lambda \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u| dx dy + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (u - f)^2 dx dy,$$

with  $\lambda > 0$ . Recall that  $|\nabla u| = \sqrt{(u_x)^2 + (u_y)^2}$  can be made differentiable substituting it by  $\sqrt{\epsilon^2 + (u_x)^2 + (u_y)^2}$ .

(i) Using the result from the previous problem, give the associated Euler-Lagrange equation with the corresponding boundary conditions for a minimizer  $u = u(\cdot, \lambda) \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ .

(ii) Show that the  $L^2$ -norm of  $u(\cdot, \lambda)$ , given by  $\sqrt{\int_{\Omega} (u(x, y, \lambda))^2 dx dy}$  is bounded by a constant independent of  $\lambda$ .

(iii) Show (e.g. using the obtained stationary E.-L. equation and associated boundary condition), that

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x, y, \lambda) dx dy = \int_{\Omega} f(x, y) dx dy.$$

(iv) Show that  $u(\cdot, \lambda)$  converges in the  $L^1(\Omega)$  – *strong* topology to the average of the initial data. In other words, show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \left| u(x, y, \lambda) - \frac{\int_{\Omega} f(x, y) dx dy}{|\Omega|} \right| dx dy = 0.$$

---

<sup>1</sup>We may need to formally assume, in addition, that  $(Ku)_t = K(u_t)$ ; this is natural for a linear and continuous operator  $K$  that does not depend on  $t$ , for instance if  $Ku = k * u$  and  $k = k(x, y)$  does not depend on  $t$ .

[3] Discretize and implement the stationary or the non-stationary E.-L. equation from [2] by the method of your choice using finite differences, for the denoising case. More details will be discussed in class. Choose an original true image  $\hat{u}$ , and define a noisy version  $f = \hat{u} + noise$  (see matlab sample codes on the class web-page, or in matlab you can add noise of zero mean to an image using “imnoise”). Give the optimal  $\lambda$  (may be different in each case) and the RMSE between the original clean image  $\hat{u}$  and the reconstructed image  $u$ :

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1, j=1}^{i=M, j=N} (\hat{u}(i, j) - u(i, j))^2}{MN}}.$$

Plot the energy versus iterations.

*Optional:* You can make additional tests by substituting the data fidelity term  $\|f - u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$  above by  $\|f - u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  or by  $\|f - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ , and compare the results. Each method may require different  $\lambda$  for the same image.  $\lambda$  can also be automatically selected if we know the noise variance in the form  $\|f - u\|^2 = \sigma^2$ . Using a norm, instead of the norm square for the data fidelity term avoids the intensity loss drawback of the ROF model.