ℓ_1 Data Fidelity with Concave Regularization: Challenges

Mila Nikolova

CMLA, ENS Cachan, CNRS
61 Av. President Wilson, F-94230 Cachan, France

Joint work with

Michael K. Ng and Chi-Pan Tam — HKBU, Hong Kong

to appear in SIAM J. on Scientific Computing

International Conference on Imaging Science 2012

(In honour of Professor Stanley Osher and his birthday)

December 12-14, 2012, Hong Kong

1. Problem formulation

image $\boldsymbol{u}$ is stored in a vector in $\mathbb{R}^p$ data $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^q$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(u) &= \|Au - v\|_1 + \beta \sum_{j \in J} \varphi(\|\mathrm{G}_j u\|_2) \\
&= \sum_{i \in I} \left| a_i u - v[i] \right| + \beta \sum_{j \in J} \varphi(\|\mathrm{G}_j u\|_2) \ , \quad \beta > 0 \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \cdots, q\} \ , \\
J &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \cdots, r\} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

- A is a matrix of any rank with rows $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p}$
- G_j are matrices or vectors (e.g. discrete gradient operators)
- **φ is concave on $\mathbb{R}_+$**

This family of objective functions has never been considered before

	(f1)	(f2)	(f3)	(f4)
$\varphi(t)$	$\dfrac{\alpha\, t}{\alpha\, t + 1}$ $\alpha > 0$	$1 - \alpha^t$ $0 < \alpha < 1$	$\ln(\alpha t + 1)$ $\alpha > 0$	$(t + \varepsilon)^\alpha$ $0 < \alpha < 1,\ \varepsilon > 0$

Functions $\boldsymbol{\varphi} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$



Plots of the PFs φ. Note that (f1) an (f2) are bounded above, (f3) and (f4) are coercive.

Motivation

$\hat{u}$—(local) minimizer of $\mathcal{F}$

- nonsmooth regularization $\sum_{j \in J} \varphi(\|\mathrm{G}_j u\|_2)$ with $\varphi'(0) > 0$ (e.g. TV)

  $\Rightarrow$ **many j such that $\mathrm{G}_j \hat{u} = 0$** *[Nikolova 2000, 2004]*

- ℓ_1 data fidelity $\|Au - v\|_1 = \sum_{i \in I} \left| a_i u - v[i] \right|$

  $\Rightarrow$ **many i such that $a_i \hat{u} = v[i]$** *[Nikolova 2002, 2004]*

- our $\mathcal{F}$ can be seen as an extension of L1-TV *[Chan, Esedoglu 2005]*

  [Chan, Esedoglu, Nikolova 2006]

2. Peculiar Properties of Minimizers

Illustrations by minimizing $\mathcal{F}(u) = \|u - v\|_1 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \varphi(|u[i+1] - u[i]|)$

$\varphi(t) = \frac{\alpha t}{\alpha t + 1}$ for $\alpha = 4$



$\varphi(t) = \ln(\alpha t + 1)$ for $\alpha = 2$



$\beta \in \{78, \cdots, 156\}$



$\beta \in 0.1 \times \{10, \cdots, 14\}$



$\beta \in \{157, \cdots, 400\}$

$\beta \in 0.1 \times \{16, \cdots, 30\}$

Data samples (ooo), Minimizer samples $\hat{u}[i]$ (+++).



(a) $\varphi(t) = \frac{\alpha\, t}{\alpha\, t+1}$, $\alpha = 4$, $\beta = 3$



(b) $\varphi(t) = 1 - \alpha^t$, $\alpha = 0.1$, $\beta = 2.5$



(c) $\varphi(t) = \ln(\alpha t + 1)$, $\alpha = 2$, $\beta = 1.3$



(d) $\varphi(t) = (t + 0.1)^\alpha$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $\beta = 1.4$

Data samples (ooo) are corrupted with Gaussian noise. Denoising. Minimizer samples $\hat{u}[i]$ (+++). Original (−−−). β—the largest value so that the gate at 71 remains.



Zooms.

Constant pieces—solid black line.

Data points $v[i]$ fitted exactly by the minimizer $\hat{u}$ (♦).



$\varphi(t) = \frac{\alpha\, t}{\alpha\, t+1}$, $\alpha = 4$, $\beta = 3$



$\varphi(t) = t$, $\beta = 0.8$ (TV)

Numerical evidence:

critical values $\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n$ such that

- $\beta \in [\beta_i, \beta_{i+1}) \Rightarrow$ the minimizer remains unchanged
- $\beta \geqslant \beta_{i+1} \quad \Rightarrow$ the minimizer is simplified

Main assumptions

$$\mathrm{G} = [\mathrm{G}_1^T, \cdots, \mathrm{G}_r^T]^T$$

H1 $\ker A \cap \ker G = \{0\}$.

H2 $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ *in* $\mathcal{F}$ *obeys:*

- $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *is* $\mathcal{C}^2$ *on* $\mathbb{R}_+^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ *and* $\varphi(t) > \varphi(0), \ \ \forall t > 0$*;*
- $\varphi'(0^+) > 0$ *and* $\varphi'(t) > 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}_+^*$*.*
- φ'' *is increasing on* $\mathbb{R}_+^*$*,* $\varphi''(t) < 0$*,* $\forall t > 0$ *and*

  $\lim\limits_{t \searrow 0} \varphi''(t) < 0$ *is well defined and finite.*

Example

Given $v \neq 0$, consider the function

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = |u - v| + \beta\varphi(|u|) \quad \text{for} \quad \varphi(u) = \frac{\alpha u}{1 + \alpha u}, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}$$

The necessary conditions for $\mathcal{F}$ to have a (local) minimum at $\hat{u} \neq 0$ and $\hat{u} \neq v$ fail:

$$\hat{u} \notin \{0, v\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \begin{cases} D\mathcal{F}(\hat{u}) = \text{sign}(\hat{u} - v) + \beta\varphi'(|\hat{u}|)\text{sign}(\hat{u}) & = & 0 \\ \\ D^2\mathcal{F}(\hat{u}) = \beta\varphi''(|\hat{u}|) & < & 0 \end{cases}$$

$\mathcal{F}$ does have minimizers $\quad \Rightarrow \quad \boldsymbol{\hat{u} \in \{0, v\}}$.

Main theoretical results

- $\left\{ \hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p \;\mid\; \mathcal{F}(\hat{u}) = \inf_{u \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{F}(u) \right\} \neq \varnothing$
- All (local) minimizers of $\mathcal{F}$ are **strict**
- Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a (local) minimizer of $\mathcal{F}$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}_0 &= \{ i \in \boldsymbol{I} \;:\; \boldsymbol{a}_i \hat{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{v}[i] \} \\ \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}}_0 &= \{ j \in \boldsymbol{J} \;:\; \mathbf{G}_j \hat{\boldsymbol{u}} = \mathbf{0} \} \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow$ $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is the **unique** solution of the liner system

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{a}_i \boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{v}[i] & \forall i \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}_0 \\ \boldsymbol{G}_j \boldsymbol{u} = \mathbf{0} & \forall j \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}}_0 \end{cases}$$

$\Rightarrow$

$(\star)$ the matrix with rows $\left(\boldsymbol{a}_i, \forall i \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}_0 \text{ and } \mathbf{G}_j, \forall j \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}}_0 \right)$ has **full column rank**

$(\star)$ is a necessary condition for a (local) minimizer

$\Rightarrow$ "contrast invariance" of (local) minimizers since $\hat{u}$ is linear in v

Example



The data vector v is of length $\mathbf{80}$.

One checks that the minimizer meets

$$\widehat{I}_0^c = (28\,,\ 29\,,\ 30\,,\ 31\,,\ 69\,,\ 70) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{J}_0^c = (4\,,\ 20\,,\ 44\,,\ 59)\ .$$

The matrix with rows $\left(\boldsymbol{a_i}, \forall \boldsymbol{i} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}_{\mathbf{0}} \text{ and } \mathbf{G}_{\boldsymbol{j}}, \forall \boldsymbol{j} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}}_{\mathbf{0}}\right)$ is of size $\mathbf{149} \times \mathbf{80}$.

Its rank is $\mathbf{80}$.

- Let $\hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a (local) minimizer of $\mathcal{F}$. Then

$$1 \leqslant k \leqslant p \;\Rightarrow \begin{cases} \exists i \text{ obeying } a_i\,\hat{u} = v[i] & \text{such that } a_i[k] \neq 0 \\ & \text{or} \\ \exists j \text{ obeying } \mathrm{G}_j \hat{u} = 0 & \text{such that } \mathrm{G}_j(k) \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

  where $\mathrm{G}_j(k)$ is the k-th column of the linear operator G_j

- $\Rightarrow$ each pixel of a (local) minimizer $\hat{u}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ is involved in (at least) one data equation that is fitted exactly $a_i\hat{u} = v[i]$, or in (at least) one vanishing operator $\|\mathrm{G}_j\hat{u}\|_2 = 0$, or in both types of equations.

- If $A = \mathrm{Id}$ and G_j yield discrete gradients or first-order finite differences between adjacent samples, a (local) minimizer is composed partly of constant patches, partly of pixels that fit data samples exactly, remind the figure.

3. Numerical scheme

Continuation approach

$$\varphi_\varepsilon,\ \varepsilon \in [0,1] \text{ where } \varphi_0(t) = t \text{ and } \varphi_1 = \varphi$$

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = \psi_\varepsilon(t) + \alpha_\varepsilon t \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha_\varepsilon = \varphi'_\varepsilon(0^+).$$

φ_ε for $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ satisfies H2.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(u) &= \|Au - v\|_1 + \beta\alpha_\varepsilon \sum_{j\in J} \|\mathrm{G}_j u\|_2 + \beta\Psi_\varepsilon(u)\ , \\ \text{where} \quad \Psi_\varepsilon(u) &= \sum_{j\in J} \psi_\varepsilon(\|\mathrm{G}_j u\|_2)\ . \end{aligned}$$

For each ε fixed—variable splitting and penalty decomposition techniques:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}(u,w,z) = \gamma\|Au-w\|_2^2+\|w-v\|_1+\beta\Psi_\varepsilon(u)+\gamma\|\mathrm{G}u-z\|_2^2+\beta\alpha_\varepsilon\sum_{j\in J}\|z_j\|_2\ , \quad \text{for } \gamma\to\infty$$

Alternate optimization:
$$\begin{cases} z^{(k)} &= \arg\min_z \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}(u^{(k-1)},w^{(k-1)},z^{(k-1)}) \\ w^{(k)} &= \arg\min_w \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}(u^{(k-1)},w^{(k-1)},z^{(k)}) \\ u^{(k)} &= \arg\min_u \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}(u,w^{(k)},z^{(k)}) \end{cases}$$

Then

$$z_j^{(k)} = \frac{\mathrm{G}_j u^{(k-1)}}{\|\mathrm{G}_j u^{(k-1)}\|_2}\ \max\left\{\|\mathrm{G}_j u^{(k-1)}\|_2 - \frac{\beta\alpha_\varepsilon}{2\gamma},\ 0\right\}, \quad \forall j\in J\ .$$

$$w_i^{(k)} = \frac{Au^{(k-1)}-v}{\|Au^{(k-1)}-v\|_2}\ \max\left\{\|Au^{(k-1)}-v\|_2 - \frac{1}{2\gamma},\ 0\right\}, \quad \forall i\in I\ .$$

$$u^{(k)} \text{ solves } \arg\min_{u\in\mathbb{R}^p}\left\{\gamma\|Au-w^{(k)}\|_2^2+\gamma\|\mathrm{G}u-z^{(k)}\|_2^2+\beta\Psi_\varepsilon(u)\right\}$$

where Quasi Newton method with preconditioning is used

$\Rightarrow$ fast algorithm

MR Image Reconstruction from Highly Undersampled Data



0-filling Fourier



$\|\cdot\|_2^2$+TV

$\|\cdot\|_1$+TV

Our method

restored — original







Reconstructed images from **7% noisy** randomly selected samples in the k-space.

MR Image Reconstruction from Highly Undersampled Data



Zero-filling Fourier recovery

$\|\cdot\|_2^2$+TV

Our method, $\varphi(t) = \frac{\alpha t}{\alpha t+1}$

Reconstructed images from **5% noisy** randomly selected samples in the k-space.

Cartoon

Observed

ℓ_1-TV

Our method, $\varphi(t) = \frac{\alpha t}{\alpha t+1}$

5. Concluding remarks

- The (local) minimizers of the proposed objectives inherit some features of L_1-TV (e.g. "scale-invariance") but in a much sharper way.

- In practice, they neatly outperform L_1-TV.

- All (local) minimizers are strict.

- Bounded above functions (like f1 and f2) yield much better numerical results than coercive functions (like f3 and f4).

  We do not have a theoretical explanation.

- The regularization parameter β is not involved in the computation of a local minimizer.

  Implicitly, β helps the selection of the subsets $\widehat{I}_0$ and $\widehat{J}_0$.

  The ordering of the (local) minimizers $\hat{u}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ according to their value $\mathcal{F}(\hat{u})$ is determined by β.

Thank you for your attention.

Warmest wishes to Stan!

Thanks to Raymond for the invitation.