International Journal of Linguistics and Computational Applications (IJLCA) ISSN 2394-6385(Print)
Volume 11, Issue 2, April – June 2024 ISSN 2394-6393(Online)

Image Processing-Variability in Image Quality

Yalini. P.D[1], Kaqnimozhi. C[2], Nandhini. S[3]
[1,2]Student, [3]Assistant Professor
K.S.R. College of Arts and Science for Women, India

Abstract — Image quality measures (IQA) presentation a significant function for a types image processing treatment. At purpose for the IQA is to run quality evaluate that apply up for estimate operation image processing procedures. A big work of exertion has been built in latest years to progress objective IQA that associate fit with objective human quality metrics or subjective styles. Furthermost full reference (FR) procedure were resulted built on pixel to pixel error for example peak signal to noise ratio or mean square error, structural similarity index metric etc. Such work offers several procedures performed for IQA.

Keywords — *Quality Assessment; Similarity; Subjective Methods.*

1. Introduction

At image processing and computer vision, image quality valuation has a major and difficult problem including interests thru a type of usages, for example enhancement image property and dynamic monitoring, it is so far an effective field of research. Quality of image is a feature for image which valuation discovered image distortion. The quality valuation is a significant branch of image processing and computer vision. For ration volume of corruption in filtering image, compressed image area, and estate enhancement techniques are a lot used. compression of image decreases the quality of the picture and some criterion to calculate this image corruption is required. The image quality valuation gives computational patterns to scale the quality of an images. IQA may be done subjectively method or objectively way. Objective image optical quality evaluation may be into categories: first category, no-reference (NR); second category, reduced reference (RR); third category full-reference (FR) depend on present of original image. At FR measure, quality of an exam image is metrices by matching it with a reference (original) image. RR approaches have limited information from the original image. However, NR approaches go to evaluation the quality of an image lacking original image. Benefit from objective quality valuation study is been offer quality measures which may be guess image quality mechanically [1].

2. Image Quality Assessment Methods

The estimation of quality can be split into categories; subjective and objective approaches.

2.1 Subjective Approaches

Subjective approaches are depending on human decision. These approaches troublesome, time uncontrollable and without giving mechanization for scheme [2]. Subjective approaches are usable anywhere images, it finally to watch through human; technique of measure visible image quality is during subjective assessment. In Human Vision System (HSV) based measure, variance between the test images and the original images is uniform based to its visibility, as controlled by psychophysics of person perception. Even so lead to some disadvantages, they are difficult simply achieved due to several scenarios, for example; real time applications, works are not possible to be contained within automatic systems, etc. [2].

2.2 Objective Method

Objective technique is a quantifiable method everywhere we are operating two images in that intensity of original and damaged image, they kind are applied to compute a number that show image quality [3]. An objective image quality measure can performance a form of roles in image processing purposes. First, it can be used to dynamically monitor and modify image quality Such as, a network digital video server can be studying the quality of video being conducted for control and assign flowing resources. Second, it can be used to optimize procedures and factor settings of image processing functions. For example, in a visual communication organization, a quality measure can support in the best design of prefiltering and bit give algorithms in encoder and of best reconstruction, error coverup, and postfiltering procedures in decoder. Third, it can be used to standard image processing schemes and procedures [4]. Objective technique is classed into three kinds' no-reference (NR), reduced-reference (RR) and full-reference (FR) depend on the present of the original image that may be guess image quality mechanically [1].

2.2.1 No-Reference Image Quality Assessment (NR-IQA)

It is first class of IQA techniques which evaluate quality for an image without noticing lacking necessities for an original image of the matching scenery [5]. NR-IQA are of essential importance as they can be set in in actual

DOI: 10.30726/ijlca/v11.i2.2024.112002

applications [5]. NR-IQA is an effective subject to study for issues in image processing, this technique the most interesting among approaches of IQA. Thither several methods for NR-IQA. Methods statistical of features that provide acquaintance around the quality of visual images are take-out, they are calculated score of an image quality by these attributes [5].

2.2.2 Reduced-Reference Image Quality Assessment (RR-IQA)

RR-IQA approaches assist as a compare between NR and FR techniques. RR- IQA approaches give a solution for statuses in that the original image is not fully available [6]. These procedures need limited information by original image find at the formula of characteristics.

Some information is transmitted to receiver region over an auxiliary path [7]. Styles of this kind mostly work by extracting a minimal set of factors (parameters) from the original image, factors which are future used with the damaged image to evaluation quality [6], framework for RR- IQA.

2.2.3 Full-Reference Image Quality Assessment (FR-IQA)

At this point, damaged image has been matched with the undistorted image (original) that is usually taken using a high-quality machine. FR-IQA methods offered at most papers can be separated by major sets: First; its dependent the HVS, Second; its dependent arbitrary signal fidelity criteria [9].

2.2.3.1 Human Visual System Based Measures (HVS)

Combination for a basic HVS pattern into objective measures, it is said manages to a best connection with the subjective evaluations. Consign HVS is displayed such as a band pass filter, by an activation function at polar coordinates [10]. Wherever, (ρ = (u2 + v2)1/ 2, u and v) be the spatial frequencies. Both the source and coded images are pre-processed by this filter to mimic the (HVS) result.

The image process of multiplying the (DCT) of the image by the spectral mask above, and reverse (DCT) transforming is indicated by the (U {·}) operator. in (H1-H3). Approximately achievable measures for the multispectral images are offered (H1, H2 and H3). The multiscale model (H4) is also described to be explained but it contains channels, which explanation for perceptual phenomena for instance, orientation selectivity, contrast, color and color- contrast. Starting these channels, extraction of features and afterward an aggregate criterion of similarity using a weighted linear mixture of the feature changes is formed [10].

3. Experiment Design

3.1. Dataset Preparation

To understand which images tend to have larger variations between observers, we analyzed existing databases and found images with the largest standard deviation in the subjective ratings provided by the authors. For our experiment, we chose ten images. The images were chosen to cover a range of image attributes, color volume, and content. The dataset includes busy and homogeneous images, architecture with straight lines, day and night images, high dynamic range images, sky, grass and skin tones, people and animals, simple and more complex images, blurred background, and silhouette or back light. The ten original images will be distorted with various algorithms to simulate natural camera effects during acquisition. To find the distortions with the largest variability between observers, we degraded the images with 21 different distortions.

3.2 Experimental Setup

The visual acuity of each observer was tested with Snellen visual acuity and color blindness Ishihara test. Category judgment approach with 5 categories was used to evaluate the images using the QuickEval platform [11]. Categories were chosen in accordance with CIE and ITU standards, which were: very good, good, fair, bad, very bad. Each observer should decide for her/himself how to use and understand the scale. Instructions included general guidance: “Please rate the quality of the image.” The users had an oppor- tunity to get acquainted with the scale during a brief training session, which included six images of different degradation levels. Images which were shown randomly to observers and included the original images. Observers did not have prior information about applied distortions.

3.3 Experiment Procedure

The experiment consisted of two parts for each observer. The whole dataset of 713 images was split in half and observers had a choice if they want to do both parts together, take a break in between, or finish in different days. In total, each image was evaluated by 22 observers (16 males and 6 females with an average age of 30) with normal color vision. All observers had prior experience with image processing. Average observation time per image was around 3 seconds. The quantitative experiment was followed by a short interview in which they were asked the following questions:

- General comments,
- Which distortions did you find most annoying,
- Which distortions were less annoying for you,

DOI: 10.30726/ijlca/v11.i2.2024.112002

even when you noticed them,

- Which original images did you rate higher or lower and why? The answers were recorded along with observation remarks, noted while the observers carried out the experiment.

4. Results Comparison

Ponomarenko et al. in TID2013 database [12] reported the results of the largest variability between observers utilizing RMSE values. They reported the smallest variability in JPEG2000 and spatially correlated noise. While we did not use exactly spatially correlated noise, the closest distortion to this could be multiplicative noise, which is rated as having an average variability. JPEG2000 was considered one of the distortions with less variability in our study as well. They found contrast increase to be one of the most difficult distortions for observers to judge, which has one of the largest variability in our study as well. It is also interesting to compare our results to the Kadid10K database. The standard deviation results are provided for each image, so we can analyze their data to see the distortions that have the largest variability. As can be seen (Table I), color saturation, contrast change, quantization, color quantization, and white noise have higher standard deviations, which is similar to our results.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we investigated the influence of different distortions on individual observers' judgment of image quality. We conducted a subjective study with 640 distorted images judged by 22 observers. In total, we investigated 21 distortions at three degradation levels each. We conducted a qualitative and quantitative subjective study under controlled lab environ ment and combined the results together. For analysis, we used combinations of distortion type and level, and additionally investigated the results on the image level. Results show that the following distortions have the largest variability in observer ratings: saturation, contrast, quantization, lens dis-tortion, blur/sharpness, and noise. We found a dependency between distortion perception and image content.

In future work, we are planning to use these results to create a larger dataset. This will allow us to create an IQM, able to predict individual observer preferences, and additionally, enhance images according to particular user preferences.

References

[1] Boztoprak, H. (2016), "An Alternative Image Quality Assessment Method for Blurred Images", Balkan Journal of Electrical & Computer Engineering, vol. 4(1), pp. 46_ 50, DOI: 10.17694/bajece.24838.

[2] Sonawane, S. and Deshpande, A. M. (2014), "Image Quality Assessment Techniques: An Overview", International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT), vol. 3(4), pp. 2013-2017.

[3] Patil, S. and Sheelvant, S. (2015), "Survey on Image Quality Assessment Techniques", International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR), vol. 4(7), pp. 1756_ 1759.

[4] Wang, Z. et al. (2004), "Image Quality Assessment: from Error Visibility to Structural Similarity", IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, vol. 13(4), pp. 600_ 612.

[5] DE, K. and V., A. (2018), "No-Reference Image Quality Measure for Images with Multiple Distortions using Multi- Method Fusion", Image Anal Stereol, vol. 37, pp. 105_ 117, DOI: 10.5566/ias.1534.

[6] Chandler, D. and Sheelvant, S. (2013), "Seven Challenges in Image Quality Assessment: Past, Present, and Future Research", Hindawi Publishing Corporation, vol. 2013, pp. 1_ 53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/905685.

[7] Al Madeed, N., Awan, Z. and Al Madeed, S. (2018), "Image Quality Assessment- A Survey of Recent Approaches", Natarajan Meghanathan et al. (Eds): CCSEA, NCOM, AIFU, DKMP, EMSA, SIPRO, SEA - 2018, Computer Science & Information Technology (CS & IT), pp. 143– 156, DOI : 10.5121/csit.2018.80312.

[8] Yogita, H. and Patil, H. (2015), "A Survey on Image Quality Assessment Techniques, Challenges and Databases",IJCA Proceedings on National Conference on Advances in Computing NCAC 2015(7), pp. 34 – 38.

[9] Sheikh, H.R., Bovik, A.C. and Veciana, G. de (2005), "An Information Fidelity Criterion for Image Quality Assessment using Natural Scene Statistics", IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, vol. 14(12), pp. 2117 – 2128, DOI:10.1109/TIP.2005.859389.

[10] Avcıbas, İ., Sankur, B. and Sayood, K. (2002), "Statistical Analysis of Image Quality Measures", Journal of Electronic Imaging, vol. 11(2), pp. 206 – 223.

[11] Van Ngo, K., Dokkeberg, C.A., Farup, I., Pedersen, M., et al.: Quickeval: a web application for psychometric scaling experiments. In: Image Quality and System Performance XII. Volume 9396., International Society for Optics and Photonics (2015) 93960O.

[12] Ponomarenko, N., Jin, L., Ieremeiev, O., Lukin, V., Egiazarian, K., Astola, J., Vozel, B., Chehdi, K., Carli, M., Battisti, F., et al.: Image database tid2013: Peculiarities, results and perspectives. Signal process- ing: Image communication 30 (2015) 57–77.