

Algorithmic Development of Edge-Preserving Filters for Single Image Dehazing



Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
for the Award of Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Sumit Kumar Yadav

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY)
VARANASI, 221005, INDIA

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I, **Sumit Kumar Yadav**, certify that the work embodied in this thesis is my own bona fide work and carried out by me under the supervision of **Dr. Kishor P. Sarawadekar** from **25-07-2017** to **20-07-2023**, at the Department of Electronics Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi. The matter embodied in this thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree/diploma. I declare that I have faithfully acknowledged and given credits to the research workers wherever their works have been cited in my work in this thesis. I further declare that I have not willfully copied any other's work, paragraphs, text, data, results, etc., reported in journals, books, magazines, reports dissertations, theses, etc., or available at websites and have not included them in this thesis and have not cited as my own work.

Date: **20-07-2023**

Place: IIT (BHU), Varanasi

(Sumit Kumar Yadav)

CERTIFICATE BY THE SUPERVISOR

It is certified that the above statement made by the student is correct to the best of my knowledge.

(Dr. Kishor P. Sarawadekar)

Supervisor


(Prof. Manoj Kumar Meshram)

Head of Department

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the work contained in this thesis titled “**Algorithmic Development of Edge-Preserving Filters for Single Image Dehazing**” by **Sumit Kumar Yadav** has been carried out under my supervision and that this work has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree.

It is further certified that the student has fulfilled all the requirements of Comprehensive, Candidacy and SOTA.


(Dr. Kishor P. Sarawadekar)

Supervisor

Department of Electronics Engineering

Indian Institute of Technology (BHU)

Varanasi, India, 221005

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER CERTIFICATE


Title of the Thesis: Algorithmic Development of Edge-Preserving Filters
for Single Image Dehazing
Name of the Student: Sumit Kumar Yadav

Copyright Transfer

The undersigned hereby assigns to the all rights under copyright that may exist in
and for the above thesis submitted for the award of the "Doctor of Philosophy."

Date : 20-07-2023

Place: IIT (BHU), Varanasi


(Sumit Kumar Yadav)

Note: However, the author may reproduce or authorize others to reproduce material
extracted verbatim from the thesis or derivative of the thesis for author's personal
use provided that the source and the Institute's copyright notice are indicated.

Dedicated to My Beloved Family

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I express my deepest gratitude to the divine for granting me the fortitude, wisdom, aptitude, and chance to embark on this research and bring it to a successful conclusion. Devoid of his benedictions, this accomplishment would have remained unattainable. I would like to acknowledge the support and guidance I received throughout my Ph.D. journey. I am deeply grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Kishor P. Sarawadekar, for their continuous support, invaluable feedback, and encouragement. Their expertise and dedication played a pivotal role in shaping my research and thesis. His wisdom, benevolence, forbearance, receptiveness, and foresight have unquestionably bestowed upon me enduring advantages.

I would also like to express my appreciation to my Research Progress Evaluation Committee members-Dr.Naveen Singh Rajput and Prof. Rajeev Srivastava, for their constructive criticism and insightful suggestions. Their expertise and knowledge greatly enhanced the quality of my research. I wish to extend my thanks and profound appreciation to Prof. Anand Mohan for his divine favour and direction in crafting the thesis, I am truly grateful. His perceptive remarks and recommendations have consistently been invaluable and enlightening. I wish to convey my heartfelt gratitude to Prof. Manoj Kr. Meshram, Prof. Satyabrata Jit, Prof. Vishwambhar Nath Mishra, Dr. Amritanshu Pandey, Dr. Priya Ranjan Muduli, and Dr. Somak Bhattacharyya for their direct and indirect support.

I would like to thank my senior, colleagues and friends Dr. Subiman Chatterjee, Dr. Gourav Modanwal, Dr. Himanshu Singh, Mr. Purnendu Mishra, Mr. Saurabh Kr. Shrivastava, Mr. Ankit Kumar, and Mr. Bharat Bhusan Upadhyay for their support and encouragement throughout my Ph.D. journey. Their camaraderie and constructive discussions have been a source of inspiration and motivation. I would like to express my gratitude to the Staff members of the Electronics Department and all those whose direct and indirect assistance facilitated me in finishing my dissertation.

Last but not least, I am profoundly grateful to my family, particularly my parents (Shri Basant Lal and Smt. Kalavati Devi), for their unwavering affection and

unwavering encouragement and support throughout the years. Their sacrifices and belief in me have been my driving force to persevere and complete this Ph.D. journey.

Thank you, everyone, for being a part of my Ph.D. journey and for your support. I am immensely grateful for all the guidance, encouragement, and assistance I have received along the way.

Sumit Kumar Yadav

Contents

List of Figures	xvii
List of Tables	xix
Abbreviations	xxi
Preface	xxiii
Preface	xxiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Haze Imaging Model	2
1.2 Motivation of the Research Work	5
1.3 Challenges in Image Dehazing	7
1.4 Contribution of the Dissertation	9
1.5 Organisation of the Dissertation	11
2 Related Literature And Preliminaries	15
2.1 Related work on Image Dehazing	15
2.1.1 Image Enhancement-Based Dehazing	16
2.1.1.1 Contrast Enhancement-Based Dehazing	17
2.1.1.2 Retinex-Based Image Dehazing	17
2.1.2 Image Restoration-Based Dehazing	18
2.1.2.1 Single Image-Based Dehazing	18
2.1.2.2 Multiple Image-Based Dehazing	20
2.1.3 Image Fusion-Based Dehazing	21
2.1.4 Deep Learning-Based Dehazing	22
2.1.5 Edge-preserving Filtering-Based Dehazing	23
2.1.6 Background on Edge-Preserving Filtering	26
2.1.6.1 Guided Image Filtering (GIF)	26
2.1.6.2 Weighted Guided Image Filtering (WGIF)	27
2.1.6.3 Gradient-Domain Guided Image Filter (GGIF)	28
2.1.6.4 Effective Guided Image Filter (EGIF)	29

2.2	Experimental Set-Up and Image Datasets	30
2.2.1	Dataset	30
2.3	Performance Evaluation Metrics	31
2.3.1	Contrast Enhancement Metric e :	32
2.3.2	Contrast Enhancement Metric \bar{r} :	32
2.3.3	Contrast Enhancement Metric $\bar{\alpha}$:	33
2.3.4	Visual Contrast Measurement (VCM):	33
2.3.5	Fog Aware Density Evaluator (FADE):	33
2.3.6	Colour Natural Index (CNI):	34
2.3.7	Image Quality Index (BIQI):	34
2.3.8	Natural Image Quality Index (NIQE):	34
2.3.9	Contrast Gain C_g :	35
2.3.10	Structural Similarity Index (SSIM):	35
2.3.11	Peak Signal to Noise Ratio (PSNR):	36
2.3.12	Edge-Keeping Index (EKI):	36
2.3.13	CIEDE2000:	36
2.3.14	Universal Image Quality Index (UIQI):	37
2.4	Concluding Remarks	37
3	Efficient Refinement: Edge-Smoothing Weighted Guided Image Filter	39
3.1	Background	39
3.1.1	Major contributions of the work	40
3.2	Effective Scale-Aware Edge-Smoothing Weighting Constraint-Based Weighted Guided Image Filter	41
3.2.1	A New Edge-Smoothing Weighting Constraint	41
3.2.2	The Proposed Filter	42
3.3	Application of The Proposed Filter in Single Image Dehazing	44
3.3.1	Dark Channel Prior (DCP)	45
3.3.2	Transmission Map Refinement	47
3.3.3	Restore Dehaze Image	47
3.4	Experimental Results and Analysis	47
3.4.1	Dataset	48
3.4.2	Qualitative Analysis	48
3.4.3	Quantitative Analysis	50
3.5	Limitations	56
3.6	Concluding Remarks	57
4	Haze Removal: Multi-Scale Edge-Weighting Based-Gradient Guided Filter	59
4.1	Background	59
4.1.1	Major Contributions of the Work	60

4.2	The Proposed Algorithm	61
4.2.1	Dark Channel Prior (DCP)-Based Transmission Map Estimation	62
4.2.2	The Proposed Filter	63
4.2.3	Non-Linear Mapping Function (NLM)	66
4.2.4	Scene Recovery	67
4.3	Experimental Results and Discussion	67
4.3.1	Qualitative Analysis	68
4.3.2	Quantitative Analysis	76
4.4	Limitations	84
4.5	Concluding Remarks	84
5	Haze Removal: Non-Local Haze-line Averaging Based Gradient Guided Image Filter	89
5.1	Background	89
5.1.1	Major Contributions of the Work	90
5.2	The Proposed Algorithm	91
5.2.1	Transmission Map Estimation by Dark Channel Prior (DCP)	91
5.2.2	Non-Local Haze Line Averaging (NL-HLA)	93
5.2.3	Robust Multi-Scale Weighting-Based Edge-Smoothing Filter (RMWEF)	94
5.2.4	A New Edge-Aware Weighting	94
5.2.5	The Proposed RMWEF	96
5.2.6	Transmission map Refinement by RMWEF	100
5.2.7	Restoration of the Haze-Free Image	101
5.3	Experimental Results Discussion	101
5.4	Limitations	110
5.5	Concluding Remarks	110
6	Haze Removal: Structural Patch Decomposition Multi-Exposure Image Fusion	113
6.1	Background	113
6.1.1	Major Contributions of the Work	115
6.2	The Proposed Algorithm	116
6.2.1	Artificial Exposure by Gamma Correction	117
6.2.2	Structural Patch Decomposition-Based Multi-Exposure Image Fusion (SPD-MEF)	120
6.2.3	Effective Edge-Aware Weighting-Based Guided Image Filter (EEAWGIF)	122
6.3	Experimental Results and Analysis	124
6.3.1	Dataset	125
6.3.2	Qualitative Analysis	125
6.3.3	Quantitative Analysis	130

6.3.4 Ablation Experiment	133
6.4 Conclusion	140
7 Conclusions	141
Bibliography	157
List of Publications	171

List of Figures

1.1	Haze imaging model.	4
1.2	Haze removal from input image	5
2.1	Taxonomy of image dehazing methods.	16
3.1	The basic framework of the proposed haze removal method.	44
3.2	Refined transmission maps of different edge-preserving filters.	49
3.3	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	49
3.4	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	50
3.5	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	50
3.6	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	51
3.7	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	51
3.8	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	56
3.9	Dehazed outcomes on dense hazy images.	57
3.10	Dehazed outcomes on night-time hazy images.	57
4.1	The basic block diagram of the proposed method.	61
4.2	Flow chart of the proposed method.	62
4.3	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods. (a) Input hazy image, (b) $\zeta_1 = 5$, (c) $\zeta_1 = 15$, (d) $\zeta_1 = 30$, (e) $\zeta_1 = 60$	69
4.4	Effective weighted base layer (EWBL) by different edge-preserving filters. For all figures, window size $\zeta_1 = 15$ is fixed and regularization parameter ε varies. (a) Input tulip image, (b) $\varepsilon = 0.001^2$, (c) $\varepsilon = 0.01^2$, (d) $\varepsilon = 0.1^2$, (e) $\varepsilon = 1^2$	70
4.5	Effective weighted detail layer (EWDL) by different edge-preserving filters. For all figures, window size $\zeta_1 = 15$ is fixed and regularization parameter ε varies. (a) Input tulip image, (b) $\varepsilon = 0.001^2$, (c) $\varepsilon = 0.01^2$, (d) $\varepsilon = 0.1^2$, (e) $\varepsilon = 1^2$	71
4.6	Refined transmission maps and corresponding dehaze outcomes different edge-preserving filters. For all figures, window size $\zeta_1 = 15$ and the regularization parameter $\varepsilon = 0.1^2$ is fixed. (a) Input hazy image, (b) Refined Transmission maps by different edge-preserving filters, (c) Dehazed output.	72
4.7	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	73

4.8	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	73
4.9	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	74
4.10	Dehazed outcomes of different haze removal methods.	74
4.11	Statistical illustration of different haze removal methods and the proposed method using box plot.	85
4.12	Statistical illustration of different haze removal methods and the proposed method using box plot.	86
5.1	The flow diagram of the proposed method.	91
5.2	Comparison of edge-aware weighting of different haze removal methods. $\zeta_1 = 60$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1^2$ is set for all figures.	95
5.3	1-D illustration between pixel intensity and pixel coordinates in the horizontal directions for tulip image shown in Figure 5.5. For all figures, $\zeta_1 = 60$ set and ε is changed. (a) $\varepsilon = 0.01^2$, (b) $\varepsilon = 0.1^2$, (c) $\varepsilon = 1^2$	98
5.4	1-D illustration between pixel intensity and pixel coordinates in the vertical directions for tulip image shown in Figure 5.5. For all figures, $\zeta_1 = 60$ set and ε is changed. (a) $\varepsilon = 0.01^2$, (b) $\varepsilon = 0.1^2$, (c) $\varepsilon = 1^2$	98
5.5	Visual comparison of the base layer (BL) and detail layer (DL) on tulip image. For all figures, $\zeta_1 = 60$ set and ε is changed. (a) and (b) $\varepsilon = 0.001^2$, (c) and (d) $\varepsilon = 0.01^2$, (e) and (f) $\varepsilon = 0.1^2$, (g) and (h) $\varepsilon = 5^2$	99
5.6	Visual comparison of different dehaze methods for RESIDE dataset .	105
5.7	Visual comparison of different dehaze methods for RESIDE dataset .	106
5.8	Visual comparison of different dehaze methods for RESIDE dataset .	107
6.1	Flow diagram of the proposed method.	116
6.2	Processed exposure outcomes for different Gamma correction values. .	119
6.3	Processed exposure outcomes for different Gamma correction values. .	119
6.4	Processed exposure outcomes for different Gamma correction values. .	120
6.5	Visual comparison of different dehaze methods and the proposed method.	126
6.6	Visual comparison of different dehaze methods and the proposed method.	127
6.7	Visual comparison of different dehaze methods and the proposed method.	128
6.8	Visual comparison of different dehaze methods and the proposed method.	129
6.9	Enlarged Form of Highlighted rectangular portion of the 6.8	130

List of Tables

3.1	Objective evaluation on image shown in Fig. 3.3	53
3.2	Performance comparison on Fattal dataset	54
3.3	Performance comparison on NYU2 dataset	54
3.4	Performance comparison on D-HAZY dataset	54
3.5	Performance comparison on Haze-RD dataset	55
3.6	Performance comparison on O-HAZE	55
3.7	Execution time (in sec.) based Assessment	55
4.1	Objective evaluation metric based assessment on tulip image	76
4.2	Performance comparison on Fattal dataset	76
4.3	Performance comparison on D-Hazy dataset	77
4.4	Performance comparison on Middlebury dataset	77
4.5	Performance comparison on HazeRD dataset	78
4.6	Performance comparison on Image-Net dataset	78
4.7	Performance comparison on NYU2 dataset	79
4.8	Performance comparison on FRIDA dataset	79
4.9	Performance comparison on O-Haze dataset	80
4.10	Average execution time (in seconds) based assessment	80
5.1	Comparison of the average performance metrics and execution time using different dehazing methods for three different ε values ($0.01^2, 0.1^2, 1^2$) and fixed $\zeta_1 = 60$ for RESIDE Dataset.	108
5.2	Comparison of the average performance metrics and execution time using different dehazing methods for three different ε values ($0.01^2, 0.1^2, 1^2$) and fixed $\zeta_1 = 60$ for Fattal, D-HAZY, Middlebury, NYU and FRIDA Dataset.	109
6.1	Average Performance comparison on D-HAZY dataset	133
6.2	Average Performance comparison on NYU2 dataset	134
6.3	Average Performance comparison on HazeRD dataset	134
6.4	Average Performance comparison on O-HAZE dataset	135
6.5	Average Performance comparison on I-HAZE dataset	135
6.6	Average Performance comparison on NH-HAZE dataset	136
6.7	Average Performance comparison on RESIDE-ITS dataset	136

6.8	Average Performance comparison on RESIDE-OTS dataset	137
6.9	Average Performance comparison on RESIDE-HSTS dataset	137
6.10	Average Performance comparison on Fattal dataset	138
6.11	Average Performance comparison on Night time hazy dataset	138
6.12	Average Execution time comparison of state-of-the-art methods . . .	139
6.13	Impact of regularization parameter ε and T on SSIM and FADE . .	139
7.1	The performance comparison of the proposed methods	151
7.2	The performance comparison of the proposed methods	155

Abbreviations

ATSM	A tmospheric S cattering M odel
EWBL	E ffective W eighted B ase L ayer
EWDL	E ffective W eighted D etail L ayer
NLM	N on L inear M apping
DCP	D ark C hannel P rior
GIF	G uided I mage F ilter
WGIF	W eighted G uided I mage F ilter
GGIF	G radient G uided I mage F ilter
HLA	H aze L ine A veraging
RESIDE	R ealistic S ingle I mage D ehazing
ITS	I ndoor T raining S et
OTS	O utdoor T raining S et
VCM	V isual C ontrast M easuremet
FADE	F og A ware D ensity E valuator
BIQI	B lind I mage Q uality I ndex
NIQE	N atural I mage Q uality E valuator
EKI	E dge K eeping I ndex
SID	S ingle I mage D ehazing
SPD	S tructural P atch D ecomposition
MEF	M ulti E xposure I mage F usion