



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Motivation

The Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) as a typical deep learning technique has been widely used in many image processing applications and achieved remarkable success. The benefit of preprocessing is natural in traditional image processing, but it is questionable in deep learning. For instance, the Histogram Equalization (HE) is a global operation to images but convolutional operations in CNN are localized, and thus we hypothesize that a CNN may inherently be unable to perform HE on images. This study aims to examine this hypothesis.

CNN Architecture

We built a CNN having several layers and its input and output are same size images.

- Input: image x
- > Output: supervised by **HE(x)**



Evaluation Method

Since HE is a operation on histogram, we evaluate the differences between two histograms (Hists) via the <u>Wasserstein distance (</u>W-dist).

$W_1(p,q) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(p,q)} \iint \gamma(x,y) d(x,y) dxdy = \int |P - Q||$

 \succ For two 1-D distributions and d(x,y) = |x-y|> P, Q are the respective <u>CDFs</u> of histogram p and q

0.8 0.6 -0.4 0.2 —— Hist CDF of **x** Hist CDF of HE(x) Gray-value

The W-dist of this example is 34.92 (the gray area). The max-value for *W-dist is 255.*

Can a Convolutional Neural Network implement histogram equalization in image analysis? Shuyue Guan and Murray Loew **Department of Biomedical Engineering, George Washington University**





different to HE(x). But for Test 2, when x is not IR image, CNN(x) looks similar to HE(x). These results are also reflected on W-dist values (smaller is better).



We randomly selected images from the two databases to build 3 tests. For each test, 1,000 images were used to train the CNN and 1,000 images were for validation. After every epoch of training, average W-dists between histograms of **CNN(x)** and **HE(x)** for training and validation images were computed. In this experiment, we had much more images to train the CNN to obtain reliable results. And since the W-dist were verified as an effective method to measure the similarity of two images in experiment 1, we evaluate outcomes by the W-dists instead of comparing images by looking. Although training process is conducted by MSE, we only show the W-dists.

st 1	Average W-dist	Test 2	Average W-dist
ner Categories	109.73	lenna	49.28
me patient IR	6.86	Same patient IR	9.14
ner patient IR 1	31.75	Other patient IR 1	35.05
ner patient IR 2	52.58	Other patient IR 2	48.51
ner patient IR 3	39.88	Other patient IR 3	38.10
	Experi	iment 2	

We used two open-source image databases (CIFAR-10 and USPtex1.0) to examine our hypothesis by more images. The CIFAR-10 has 60,000 images of animals and transporters and USPtex1.0 has 2,292 texture images. Their

USPtex1.0



st	Data for training	Validation
	1000 from CIFAR	1000 from CIFAR
2	1000 from CIFAR	1000 from USPtex
8	1000 from USPtex	1000 from CIFAR







Results of Experiment 2							
			Test 1			Average difference for last 100 epochs ~~ 0.8775	
	100	200	300 Epoch	400	500	600	
la a	Mulandas			Mole population		ain al ► 8.3324	
	100	200	300 Epoch Test 3	400	500	eoo	
≈ 5.0670							
	100	200	300 Epoch	400	500	600	



• Such results demonstrate CNN does not well HE image style somewhat but transformation to a certain category. Otherwise, the W-dist difference between two categories would be zero. Because once HE is learned, it should be implemented as needed for any kind of images.

 CNN performs better in Test 3 because USPtex1.0 contains more similar and simpler images than CIFAR-10. CNN might learn the key transformation easier.

 Such results imply that image pre-processing such as HE might be needed to apply in CNN applications to improve their performance CNN cannot implement then because automatically.