

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: The estimation of σ_n^2 has been derived from the background of the magnitude MRI Rician distribution data where signal is not present [29]. 11

Figure 2-2: Example of sub-optimal de-noising: (a) Ground truth MRI data, (b) noisy data with variance of 10, and (c) recursive LMMSE based filtering (for 50 numbers of iterations and window size of [7, 7]) 13

Figure 2-3: Example of sub-optimal tissue contrast enhancement leads to artifacts and noise: (a) real T2 weighted MRI data, (b) contrast enhancement using classical adaptive histogram equalization..... 15

Figure 2-4: Generalized schematic of proposed optimized DSR based image enhancement. 23

Figure 2-5: Generalized schematic of previously proposed DSR based image enhancement 25

Figure 3-1: The comparison of classical recursive LMMSE (shown in black line) and proposed MOPSO-LMMSE (shown in red line) algorithms in terms of (a) noise vs. PSNR, (b) noise vs. Anisotropy, (c) noise vs. IQLV, and (d) noise vs. SSIM 40

Figure 3-2: Qualitative comparison of the recursive LMMSE filter and proposed MOPSO-LMMSE filter (a) ground truth image, (b) ground truth image affected by noise with $\sigma_n = 15$, (c) standard LMMSE filtered image and (d) proposed MOPSO-LMMSE filter. The second row (e-h) shows the zoomed section of respective first row images. 40

Figure 3-3: Comparison of standard non-iterative Kalman filter vs. non-iterative MOPSO-NL-Kalman and non-iterative LMMSE (shown in black line) vs. non-iterative MOPSO-LMMSE (shown in red line) in terms of (a, e) PSNR, (b, f) AQI, (c, g) IQLV and (d, h) SSIM 41

Figure 3-4: Comparison of classical non-iterative filters and MOPSO based noise estimation followed by non-iterative filters, (a) ground truth data, (b) ground truth data affected by noise with $\sigma_n = 15$, filtered data processed with (c) standard LMMSE filter, (d) proposed MOPSO-LMMSE filter, (e) standard Kalman filter and (f) proposed MOPSO-NL-Kalman filter. 42

Figure 3-5: (a) T2 sequence of MRI (having resolution: 512×448, echo time: 97, repetition time: 4500, field of view=195×230), and (b) FLAIR sequence of MRI (having resolution: 512×448, echo time: 89, repetition time: 7200, inversion time: 2250, field of view=320×272) suspicious of white matter lesion. (c,d) Resultant data obtained from the proposed MOPSO-LMMSE filter, and (e,f) resultant data obtained from the proposed MOPSO-NL-Kalman filter..... 43

Figure 3-6: Comparison of de-noising and de-nosing followed by EnFCM segmentation for 80th slice of T1 dataset image, (a) ground truth data corrupted by noise with $\sigma_n = 12.5$, (b) ground truth data, (c) ground truth segmentation. The de-noised data, zoomed section and segmented data for (d-f) wavelet-based filter, (g-i) Wiener filter, (j-l) NLM filter, (m-o)

Kalman filter, (p-r) LMMSE filter, (s-u) proposed MOPSO-LMMSE filter and (v-x) proposed MOPSO-NL-Kalman filter..... 45

Figure 3-7: Comparison of de-noising results for real DCE-MRI data (having resolution: 384×384, echo time: 10, repetition time: 497). (a) Input MRI data, results obtained after applying (b) wavelet filter, (c) Wiener filter, (d) NLM filter, (e) Kalman filter, (f) LMMSE filter, (g) proposed MOPSO-LMMSE filter and (h) proposed MOPSO-NL-Kalman filter. The segmentation results obtained from de-nosing algorithms followed by EnFCM, the pituitary microadenoma has cropped from segmented brain MRI and its enlarged view has shown at bottom of each filtered image. 46

Figure 4-1: Potential function curves for (a) unmodulated potential neuron model for $\lambda = 2.2$, (b) modulated potential neuron model for $\lambda = 2.2$, $t = 0$ and $n_a = 0.5$ (c) unmodulated quartic bistable system for $a = 2, b = 0.3$ and (d) modulated quartic bistable system for $a = 2, b = 0.3, t = 0$ and $n = 0.5$ 57

Figure 4-2: Pareto front surface of F and MOS for (a) Test 1 and (b) Test 2 images obtained using MO-PSO..... 67

Figure 4-3: Original images (first row) and pseudocolor images (second row) of abnormal and healthy subjects (a) input isotropic DW image ($b = 1000$ sec/mm²; repetition time (msec)/echo time (msec) = 3,000/89; matrix, 192 × 192; field of view = 250 × 250 mm, section thickness = 5 mm) (c) input isotropic T2 weighted image ($b = 0$ sec/mm²; repetition time (msec)/echo time (msec) = 3,000/89; matrix, 192 × 192; field of view = 229 × 229 mm, section thickness = 5 mm), and (b, d) proposed algorithm..... 68

Figure 4-4: Comparative enhancement results of Test 3 (a) input isotropic T2 image ($b = 0$ sec/mm²; repetition time (msec)/echo time (msec) = 3,000/89; matrix, 192 × 192; field of view = 229 × 229 mm, section thickness = 5 mm), image processed using (b) SSR, (c) HE, (d) CLAHE, (e) Gamma (1.2), (f) Gamma (0.9), (g) Photoshop, and (h) proposed algorithm 70

Figure 4-5: Comparative enhancement results of Test 4 (a) Input isotropic DW image ($b = 1,000$ sec/mm²; repetition time (msec)/echo time (msec) = 3,000/89; matrix, 192 × 192; field of view = 229 × 229 mm, section thickness = 5 mm), image processed using (b) SSR, (c) HE, (d) CLAHE, (e) Gamma (1.2), (f) Gamma (0.9), (g) Photoshop, and (h) proposed algorithm 71

Figure 4-6: Comparative enhancement results of Test 5 (a) Input isotropic DW image ($b = 1,000$ sec/mm²; repetition time msec/echo time msec = 3,000/89; matrix, 192 × 192; field of view = 229 × 229 mm, section thickness = 5 mm), image processed using (b) SSR, (c) HE, (d) CLAHE, (e) Gamma (1.2), (f) Gamma (0.9), (g) Photoshop, (h) proposed algorithm 72

Figure 4-7 Different MRI sequences of abnormal and healthy subjects (a) T1 weighted (Test image 1), (c) DWI ($b=1000$) (Test image 2), (e) FLAIR (Test image 3), (g) T2 weighted

(Test image 4) and (b, d, f and h) respective MOBA optimization based SR processed image 75

Figure 4-8: Test image 5 (left column) and MO-BA optimized SR processed (right column) axial FLAIR images in a case of right-sided cortical dysplasia showing hyper-intense (bright) signal of the right side parieto-temporal cortex (encircled areas). The gray-white matter differentiation is weak in this region with increased signal intensity due to reduced myelin and organization of cortical architecture apart from the thickened cortex. These changes are seen best in FLAIR images and may be contrasted from the corresponding normal anatomy on left (white circles). Enhancement of these diagnostic features in processed images (gray circle) assists significantly in pick-up during the routine clinical reading of the images. Note the overall change in color hue (red as opposed to yellow) of the cortex in the processed pseudo-colored image has led to a much better gray-white differentiation, in addition, a brighter red hue seen in the pathological area (gray circle) may offer an added advantage for clearly demarcating such areas of disorganized cortical architecture..... 77

Figure 4-9: Test image 6 (left column) and MO-BA optimized SR processed (right column) coronal FLAIR images in a case of left-sided mesial temporal sclerosis (MTS) showing hyper-intense (bright) signal of the left side hippocampal formation (straight arrow) in comparison to that on the right (open arrow). Such intensity elevation forms the basis of diagnosis in MTS but remains difficult to pick-up by an eye-balling technique in routine clinical practice. The corresponding pseudo-colored image may offer some advantage as is seen in the lower panel, by showing a brighter hue of blue and white on the left side as compared to darker blue only on the right. The signal intensity and color hue difference between the pathological (double straight arrow) and the normal (double open arrow) sides in the processed images is much more convincing. Further, the thickness of the structure in this section (and hence the volume overall) is also reduced on the pathological side, appreciated with increased confidence in processed imaging..... 78

Figure 4-10: Original (a) Test image 7, (b) image filtering using LMMSE method, (c) processed image using CLAHE method (d) processed using LMMSE followed by CLAHE (hybrid), (e) processed image using proposed algorithm and (f-j) respective pseudocolor images 80

Figure 4-11: Original (a) Test image 8, (b) image filtering using LMMSE Estimator, (c) processed image using CLAHE method (d) processed using LMMSE followed by CLAHE (hybrid), (e) processed image using proposed algorithm and (f-j) respective pseudo color images 81

Figure 4-12: Variation of CEF and UIQ index with respect to the number of DSR iterations for (a, b) 80th slice (corrupted with 3% noise) of T1 weighted simulated MRI dataset image, (c, d) 110th slice (corrupted with 3% noise) of T2 weighted simulated MRI dataset image . 84

Figure 4-13: Pareto front surface for the 60th slice of simulated T1 weighted MRI dataset image corrupted with 3% noise. Original input image (above) and processed output image (below) corresponding to the solution shown in the red box..... 85

Figure 4-14: (a) Input T1 weighted MRI (Test 1), (b) optimized enhanced image corresponding to Test 1 (DSR parameters $a=0.0608$, $b=5.47 \times 10^{-9}$, $n_q=23$, $n_n=15$, $\lambda=2.11$). (c) Input DWI (Test 2), (d) optimized enhanced image corresponding to Test 2 (DSR parameters: $a=0.0466$, $b=5.62 \times 10^{-9}$, $n_q=24$, $n_n=20$, $\lambda=2.15$). (e) Input FLAIR (Test 3) images, (f) optimized enhanced image corresponding to Test 3 (DSR parameters: $a=0.1987$, $b=6.343 \times 10^{-9}$, $n_q=24$, $n_n=24$, $\lambda=2$). 87

Figure 4-15: (a) Simulated T1 weighted MRI, (b) Simulated T2 weighted MRI, (b,g) processed with CLAHE, (c,h) processed with BPFDE based algorithm, (d,i) processed with quartic bistable model based DSR, (e,j) processed with proposed MO-PSO based cascaded DSR..... 89

Figure 5-1: Flowchart of DSR based correction of shading artifact..... 97

Figure 5-2: (a) T1 weighted image (40% inhomogeneity and 3% noise), (e) T2 weighted image (40% inhomogeneity and 3% noise), (b, f) obtained curve for number of generation against the objective function for image (a, e) respectively, (c, g) are the SR processed images, (d, h) are the segmented images 101

Figure 5-3: (a) Simulated input T1 weighted image with 20% inhomogeneity and 3% noise, (k) simulated input T2 weighted image with 40% inhomogeneity and 3% noise, images (f) and (p) are respective segmented images, image obtained using (b, l) Gaussian HmF, (c, m) LEMS method, (d, n) MICO method, (e, o) proposed method, (g, q), (h, r), (I, s) and (j, t) are respective segmented images..... 103

Figure 5-4: Quantitative comparison of LEMS, MICO, HmF and proposed SR based method in terms of global consistency error for (a) segmented T1 weighted image and (b) segmented T2 weighted image..... 105

Figure 5-5: Quantitative comparison of LEMS, MICO, HmF and proposed SR based method with ground truth images in terms of JS 106

Figure 5-6: Comparison among the correction methods for real DWI Test image 1, Test image 2, Test image 3 and Test image 4. Original input images are shown in [(a), (f), (k)]; images processed using homomorphic filtering are shown in [(b), (g), (i)]; images using LEMS correction are shown in [(c), (h), (m)]; images using MICO method are shown in [(d), (i), (n)] and the corrected images using the proposed method are shown in [(e), (j), (o)].... 107

Figure 6-1: Multi-stable potential function in (a) mono-stable state corresponding to $a=15$, $b=4.5$, $c=1$, (b) bi-stable state corresponding to $a=28$, $b=4.5$, $c=-1$, and (c) tri-stable state corresponding to $a=28$, $b=4.5$, $c=1$ 118

Figure 6-2: Overview of material and methods for proposed algorithm 124

Figure 6-3: Qualitative and quantitative evaluation of proposed MOALO based MSSR algorithm on simulated T1, T2 weighted images of dataset, (a, g) input T1W image with 80th slice and 90th slice (T1 80 and T1 90), respective processed images in (b, h) bistable mode,

(c, i) in tri-stable mode, (d, j) input T2W image with 80th slice and 90th slice (T2 80 and T2 90), respective processed images in (b, h) bistable mode, (c, i) in tri-stable mode, (m, n) comparison of CEF and PSNR of MSSR in bi-stable and tri-stable mode..... 128

Figure 6-4: Pareto front surfaces of two objective functions PSNR and CEF for T1 60, T1 70, T1 90, T1 100, T2 60, T2 70, T2 90 and T2 110 simulated MR images 129

Figure 6-5: DCE MR images of case 1 suspicion of pituitary microadenoma, (a-g) all seven sections of coronal planes from the anterior clinoid to the dorsum sellae, the enlarged view of pituitary gland are shown in below to respective images, (h-n) processed images using proposed MOALO based MSSR algorithm respective to images shown in (a-g), (o-t) six phases (second to seventh phase) of plane 4, (u-z) processed images using proposed MOALO based MSSR algorithm respective to images shown in (o-t)..... 131

Figure 6-6: DCE MR images of case 2 suspicion of pituitary microadenoma, (a-g) all seven sections of coronal planes from the anterior clinoid to the dorsum sellae, the enlarged view of pituitary gland are shown in below to respective images, (h-n) processed images using proposed MOALO based MSSR algorithm respective to images shown in (a-g), (o-t) six phases (second to seventh phase) of plane 4, (u-z) processed images using proposed MOALO based MSSR algorithm respective to images shown in (o-t)..... 132

Figure 6-7: Case 1 suspicion of pituitary microadenoma (a, d) enlarged pituitary of algorithm processed images showing placement of ROIs for microadenoma (blue circle) and normal region (red circle), (b, c) cropped input, (e, f) cropped output fourth and fifth phases of section 4, (g) mean intensity curves for original input DCE MR images and (h) obtained by proposed algorithm for section 4 and section 5. 133

Figure 6-8: Case 2 suspicion of pituitary microadenoma (a, d) enlarged pituitary of algorithm processed images showing placement of ROIs for microadenoma (blue circle) and normal region (red circle), (b, c) cropped input, (e, f) cropped output fourth and fifth phases of section 4, (g) mean intensity curves for original input DCE MR images and (h) obtained by proposed algorithm for section 4 and section 5 134

Figure 6-9: Comparison between classical SR and MSSR technique using pareto front surfaces of two objective functions PSNR and CEF for T1 60, T1 70, T1 80, T2 70, T2 80 and T2 90 simulated MR images 136

Figure 6-10: (a, d) Input T1 and T2 weighted simulated MR images, (b, e) MOALO based classical quartic bistable processed images, (c, f) MOALO based MSSR processed images respective to first column images 136

Figure 6-11: Normalized Pareto fronts for the maximization of objectives (Fitness 1: CEF, Fitness 2: PSNR) on 60th slice of T1 weighted image obtained from BrainWeb 138

Figure 7-1: Segmentation results for synthetic image having five clusters and corrupted by Gaussian noise (0.05 variance), (a) ground truth image, (b) input image, segmented images

obtained using (c) FCM, (d) FCM_S1, (e) FCM_S2, (f) EnFCM, (g) FCM_TPF and (f) proposed algorithm 155

Figure 7-2: Segmentation results for synthetic image having six clusters and corrupted by Speckle noise (0.02 variance), (a) ground truth image, (b) input image, segmented images obtained using (c) FCM, (d) FCM_S1, (e) FCM_S2, (f) EnFCM, (g) FCM_TPF and (f) proposed algorithm 156

Figure 7-3: Segmentation results for 90th slice simulated MRI image corrupted by 9% noise. (a) First column images from up to below shows segmented ground truth image, its WM, GM and CSF respectively. (b) Second column images shows segmentation results for noisy input image, WM, GM and CSF obtained using FCM, (c) FCM_S1, (d) FCM_S2, (e) EnFCM, (f) FCM_TPF and (g) proposed algorithm..... 157

Figure 7-4: Comparison of proposed CNV index with Xie-Beni, Partition entropy coefficient and Fuzzy Hyper Volume for different cases. (a) Synthetic image has three clusters and suffered from speckle noise (0.05 variance), (b) synthetic image have four clusters without noise, (c) synthetic image has five clusters and suffered from Gaussian noise (0.03 variance) (d) synthetic image has five clusters and suffered from speckle noise (0.02 variance), (e) 92nd slice of simulated MRI image has four clusters and corrupted by 9% noise with 20% inhomogeneity..... 160