Gibbs Random Field-Based Vector Quantization Slawo Wesolkowski Paul Fieguth University of Waterloo Canada	<ul> <li>2 Vector Quantization</li> <li>Mapping Q from R<sup>n</sup> into a finite subset Y of R<sup>n</sup>: Q: R<sup>n</sup> → Y</li> <li>Y = (a<sub>k</sub>: k = 1,, K), the set of prototypes.</li> <li>Applications: speech coding, image compression, image segmentation</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 Dativation</li> <li>A constraints and a stochastic iterative algorithm</li> <li>Type of Annealer and Labeling</li> <li>Deterministic Stochastic</li> <li>No Contextual A.</li> <li>B.</li> <li>Contextual A.</li> <li>C.</li> <li>Contextual C.</li> <li>K-means with local Drobabilistic k-means</li> <li>No Contextual C.</li> <li>K-means with local constraints</li> </ul> 5 B clabs Random Fields provide a natural way of modeling context dependencies between, e.g., image pixels of correlated local features Sign by Correlated local features Algorithm to find the "optimal" solution. In this case, the Gibbs Sampler and Simulated Annealing are used.	4 A Standard VQ Algorithm: K-Means $X=(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}: i = 1,, M, j = 1,, N), M \times N.$ $L = (l_{i,j}: i = 1,, M, j = 1,, N), labels.$ • Choose the number of clusters $K$ . • Set initial cluster prototypes $Y = (\mathbf{a}_k: k = 1,, K)$ . • Compute $d(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}, \mathbf{a}_k)$ for all $i, j$ and $k$ . • Assign $l_{i,j} = k$ if $d(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}, \mathbf{a}_k) < d(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}, \mathbf{a}_k)$ for all $k \neq k'$ . • Update prototypes using $\mathbf{a}^*_k = 1/N_k \cdot (\sum_{i,j} \mathbf{x}_{i,j} \cdot (l_{i,j} = k))$ • If clusters consistent stop, else go to step 3. 6 Objective Function Without Context $\rightarrow$ Algorithms A and B $E[\{l_{i,j}, \mathbf{a}_k\}] = \sum_{i,j} d(\mathbf{a}_{l_{i,j}}, \mathbf{x}_{i,j})$ where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a similarity measure (typically the Euclidean distance), where pixel $(i,j)$ is assigned a label $0 \le l_{i,j} \le N$ corresponding to a cluster/region prototype $\mathbf{a}_{l_{i,j}}$ .
7 Objective Function With Context $\rightarrow$ Algorithms C and D $E[\{l_{i,j}, \mathbf{a}\}] = \sum_{i,j} \{\gamma d(\mathbf{a}_{l_{i,j}}, \mathbf{x}_{i,j}) + \eta[(1 - \delta_{l_{i,j}, l_{i+1,j}}) + (1 - \delta_{l_{i,j}, l_{i,j+1}})]\}$ where $\delta_{l_{i,j}l_{i+1,j}}$ indicates whether pixels $(i, j)$ and $(i+1, j)$ have the same label, $\gamma$ and $\eta$ control region homogeneity and fragmentation	<ul> <li>8</li> <li>Algorithms A and C vs. B and D</li> <li>Algorithms A and C are deterministic: <ul> <li>Label of closest prototype assigned to pixel</li> <li>Region prototype is the vector "mean" of the pixels with the given label</li> </ul> </li> <li>Algorithms B and D are stochastic, use Gibbs Sampling: <ul> <li>Label of closest likely prototype assigned to pixel</li> <li>Most likely pixel from labeled region to be cluster prototype assigned as new cluster prototype</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

