NOVATEUR PUBLICATIONS
International Journal Of Research Publications In Engineering And Technology [IJRPET]
ISSN: 2454-7875
VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3, Mar. -2017

IMAGE DENOISING METHODOLOGIES USING DIFFERENT ALGORITHMS

ASHWINI R. VIDAP
E&TC Department, B.I.G.C.E. Solapur, India, ashu.vidap@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

The look for proficient image denoising methods still is a substantial task, at the intersection of practical analysis and measurements. Disregarding the refinement of the as of late proposed methods, most algorithms have not yet achieved an alluring level of relevance. All demonstrate an exceptional performance when the image model relates to the algorithm presumptions, however unable to do as a general and make ancient rarities or evacuate image fine structures. The principle center of this paper is, to start with, to characterize a general mathematical and test methodology to think about and arrange established image denoising algorithms, second, to propose an algorithm (Non Local Means) tending to the safeguarding of structure in a digital image. The mathematical analysis depends on the analysis of the "method noise", characterized as the contrast between a digital image and its denoised form. The NL-implies algorithm is turned out to be asymptotically ideal under a non specific factual image model. The denoising execution of every considered method are looked at in four ways; mathematical: asymptotic requirement of the method noise under consistency presumptions; perceptual-mathematical: the algorithms curios and their clarification as an infringement of the image model; quantitative trial: by tables of L2 separation of the denoised variants to the first image.

KEYWORDS: Image denoising, local variational method, patch-based method, differential geometry. Frequency domain filters.

DIGITAL IMAGES AND NOISE

The requirement for proficient image rebuilding methods has developed with the huge creation of digital images and motion pictures of assorted types, frequently taken in poor conditions. Regardless of how great cameras are, an image change is constantly alluring to expand their scope of activity. A digital image is by and large encoded as a matrix of grey level or color values. On account of a motion picture, this matrix has three measurements, the third one relating to time. Each pair (i, u(i)) where u(i) is the incentive at i is called pixel, for "picture component". On account of grey level images, i is a point on a 2D matrix and u(i) is a genuine esteem. On account of established color images, u(i) is a triplet of qualities for the red, green and blue parts. All of what we should state applies indistinguishably to motion pictures, 3D images and color or multi-spectral images. For a purpose of effortlessness in notation and show of examinations, we might here be placated with rectangular 2D grey level images. The two primary constraints in image precision are sorted as blur and noise. Blur is natural for image securing systems, as digital images have a limited number of tests and should fulfill the Shannon-Nyquist examining conditions [32]. The second fundamental image bother is noise.

Every one of the pixel values u(i) is the consequence of a light intensity estimation, normally made by a CCD matrix combined with a light focusing system. Every captor of the CCD is about a square in which the quantity of approaching photons is being measured a settled period relating to the obturation time. At the point when the light source is consistent, the quantity of photons got by every pixel changes around its normal number as far as central limit theorem. In different terms one can expect changes of request $\sqrt{n}$ for n approaching photons. Furthermore, every captor, if not enough cooled, gets warm spurious photons. The subsequent bother is typically called "obscurity noise". In a first rough practice one can compose v(i) = u(i) + n(i), where $i \in I$, v(i) is the watched esteem, u(i) would be the "genuine" esteem at pixel i, to be specific the one which would be seen by averaging the photon relying on a drawn out stretch of time, and n(i) is the noise annoyance. As demonstrated, the measure of noise is signal-subordinate, that is n(i) is bigger when u(i) is bigger. In noise models, the standardized estimations of n(i) and n(j) at various pixels are thought to be autonomous arbitrary factors and one discusses "white noise".

SIGNAL AND NOISE RATIOS.

A best quality photo (for visual assessment) has around 256 grey level qualities, where 0 speaks to black and 255 speaks to white. Measuring the measure of noise by its standard deviation, σ(n), one can characterize the signal noise ratio (SNR) as

$$SNR = \frac{\sigma(u)}{\sigma(n)},$$

where σ(u) denotes the empirical standard deviation of u,

$$\sigma(u) = \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{i \in I} (u(i) - \overline{u})^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$\overline{u} = \frac{1}{|I|}\sum_{i\in I} u(i)$ and is the normal grey level value. The standard deviation of the noise can likewise be gotten as an exact estimation or formally processed when the noise model and parameters are known. A decent quality image has a standard deviation of around 60. The most ideal approach to test the impact of noise on a standard digital image is to include a gaussian white noise, in which case n(i) are i.i.d. gaussian real factors. Whenever σ(n) = 3, no visible alteration is typically watched. Accordingly, a 60/3 ≃ 20 signal to noise ratio is almost imperceptible. Shockingly enough, one can add white noise up to a 2 1 ratio and still observe everything in a photo ! This reality is represented in Figure 1.1 and constitutes a noteworthy riddle of human vision. It legitimizes the many endeavors to characterize persuading denoising algorithms. As we should see, the outcomes have been somewhat beguiling. Denoising algorithms see no contrast between little subtle elements and noise, and in this manner evacuate them. By and large, they make new twists and the scientists are such a great amount of used to them as to have made a scientific categorization of denoising curios: "ringing", "blur", "staircase impact", "checkerboard impact", "wavelet outliers", and so forth. This reality is not exactly astonishment. Without a doubt, to the best of our insight, all denoising algorithms depend on • a noise model • a non specific image smoothness model, neighborhood or worldwide.

THE "METHOD NOISE":

All denoising methods rely on upon a filtering parameter h. This parameter measures the level of separating connected to the image. For most methods, the parameter h relies on upon an estimation of the noise difference σ 2. One can characterize the consequence of a denoising method Dh as a deterioration of any image v as

$$v = D_h v + n(D_h, v),$$

where 1. Dhv is more smooth than v 2. n(Dh,v) is the noise speculated by the method. Presently, it is insufficient to smooth v to guarantee that n(Dh,v) will resemble a noise. The later methods are really not placated with a smoothing, but rather attempt to recoup lost data in n(Dh,v) . So the emphasis is on n(Dh,v). Let u a chance to be a (not really noisy) image and Dh a denoising administrator relying upon h. At that point we characterize the method noise of u as the image contrast

$$n(D_h, u) = u - D_h(u).$$

This method noise ought to be as like a white noise as could be expected under the circumstances. Moreover, since we might want the first image u not to be modified by denoising methods, the method noise ought to be as little as feasible for the capacities with the correct normality. As indicated by the former talk, four criteria can and will be considered in the examination of denoising methods:

1) A show of common antiquities in denoised images:- a formal calculation of the method noise on smooth images, assessing how little it is as per image neighborhood smoothness.

2) A comparative show of the method noise of every method on genuine images with σ = 2.5 We said that a noise standard deviation littler than 3 is subliminal and it is normal that most digitization methods permit themselves this sort of noise.

3) An established correlation receipt view of noise creation: it comprises of taking a decent quality image, include Gaussian white noise with known σ and afterward process the best image recouped from the loud one by every method. A table of L 2 separations from the restablished to the first can be built up. The L 2 separate does not give a decent quality appraisal. Be that as it may, it reflects well the relative exhibitions of algorithms. On top of this, in two cases, a proof of asymptotic recovery of the image can be gotten by measurable contentions.

SPINOR FOURIER TRANSFORM [3]:

It presents another spinor Fourier transforms for both gray-level and color image preparing. Our approach depends on the three after considerations: mathematically, characterizing a Fourier transform requires to manage amass activities; vectors of the obtaining space can be considered as summed up numbers when implanted in a Clifford variable based math; the tangent space of the image surface seems, by all accounts, to be a characteristic parameter of the transform we characterize by methods for purported turn characters. The subsequent spinor Fourier transform might be utilized to perform frequency filtering that considers the Riemannian geometry of the image. We give cases of low-pass filtering deciphered as dispersion process. At the point when connected to color images, the whole color data is included in a truly non negligible process. The development includes bunch activities by means of turn characters, these ones being parameterized by bi-vectors of the Clifford polynomial math. A characteristic decision for the bi-vectors is the one comparing to the tangent planes of the image surface. In any case, different bi-vectors can be considered. This paper presents a new way to deal with orthonormal wavelet image denoising. Rather than hypothesizing a factual model for the wavelet coefficients, we straightforwardly parameterize the denoising procedure as an entirety of rudimentary nonlinear procedures with obscure weights. We then limit a gauge of the mean square blunder between the perfect image and the denoised one. The key point is that we have available to us an exceptionally precise, measurably fair, MSE gauge—Stein's fair-minded hazard assess that relies on upon the uproarious image alone, not on the perfect one. Like the MSE, this gauge is quadratic in the obscure weights, and its minimization adds up to illuminating a straight system of conditions. The presence of this a need appraise makes it pointless to devise a particular measurable model for the wavelet coefficients. Rather, and in spite of the custom in the writing, these coefficients are not viewed as irregular any longer. We portray an inter scale orthonormal wavelet thresholding algorithm in light of this new approach and demonstrate its close ideal execution—both in regards to quality and CPU prerequisite—by contrasting it and the aftereffects of three cutting edge non redundant denoising algorithms on a vast arrangement of test images. A fascinating aftermath of this review is the advancement of another gathering delay-based, parent–child expectation in a wavelet dyadic tree.

A NON-LOCAL ALGORITHM [7]:

In this review they propose another measure, the method noise, to assess and look at the execution of digital image denoising methods. We first process and dissect this method noise for a wide class of denoising algorithms, to be specific the nearby smoothing filters. Second, we propose another algorithm, the non-nearby means (NL-implies), in light of a non neighborhood averaging of all pixels in the image. Show a few examinations looking at the NL-implies algorithm and the neighborhood smoothing filters. A few methods have been proposed to expel the noise and recover the genuine image despite the fact that they might be altogether different in tools it must be underscored that a wide class have a similar fundamental comment: denoising is accomplished by averaging. This averaging might be performed locally: the Gaussian smoothing model the anisotropic filtering and the area filtering by the analytics of varieties: the Total Variation minimization or in the frequency space: the exact Wiener filters and wavelet thresholding methods.

A NEW SURE APPROACH TO IMAGE DENOISING [4]:

This paper acquaints another approach with orthonormal wavelet image denoising. Rather than proposing a factual model for the wavelet coefficients, we specifically parameterize the denoising procedure as a total of rudimentary nonlinear procedures with obscure weights. We then limit a gauge of the mean square blunder between the perfect image and the denoised one. The key point is that we have available to us an exceptionally precise, factually fair-minded, MSE gauge—Stein's unbiased risk evaluation that relies on upon the boisterous image alone, not on the spotless one. Like the MSE, this evaluation is quadratic in the obscure weights, and its minimization adds up to unraveling a direct system of conditions. The presence of this from the priori evaluation makes it superfluous to devise a particular factual model for the wavelet coefficients. Rather, and in spite of the custom in the writing, these coefficients are not viewed as irregular any longer. We portray an inter scale orthonormal wavelet thresholding algorithm in light of this new approach and demonstrate its close ideal execution—both in regards to quality and CPU necessity—by contrasting it and the consequences of three cutting edge non redundant denoising algorithms on a huge set of test images. A fascinating aftermath of this review is the improvement of another group delay-based, parent–child expectation in a wavelet dyadic tree.

GAUSSIAN SMOOTHING [12]:

By Riesz hypothesis, image isotropic straight filtering comes down to a convolution of the image by a direct radial kernel. The smoothing necessity is generally communicated by the energy of the kernel. A comparable outcome is really legitimate for any positive radial kernel with limited fluctuation, so one can keep the gaussian case without loss of all inclusive statement. The former estimate is substantial if h is sufficiently enough. Then again, the noise decrease properties rely on the way that the area required in the smoothing is sufficiently expansive, so that the noise gets diminished by averaging. So in the accompanying we accept that $h = k\varepsilon$, where k remains for the quantity of tests of the function u and noise n in an interim of length h. The spatial ratio k must be significantly bigger than 1 to guarantee a noise decrease. The impact of a Gaussian smoothing on the noise can be assessed at a reference pixel $i = 0$.

ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENT ALGORITHMS [11]:

We needed to make a determination of the denoising methods we wished to think about. Here a trouble emerges, as most unique methods have brought on a bottomless writing proposing numerous enhancements. So we attempted to get the best accessible variant, however keeping the basic and bona fide character of the first method no hybrid method.

NOVATEUR PUBLICATIONS
International Journal Of Research Publications In Engineering And Technology [IJRPET]
ISSN: 2454-7875
VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3, Mar. -2017

SO WE MIGHT DISSECT:

1. The Gaussian smoothing model (Gabor [10]), where the smoothness of u is measured by the Dirichlet integral.
2. The anisotropic filtering model (Perona-Malik [11], Alvarez et al. [1]);
3. the Rudin-Osher-Fatemi [31] add up to variety model and two as of late proposed iterated total variety refinements [36, 25];
4. The Yaroslavsky ([42], [40]) neighborhood filters and an exquisite variation, the SUSAN filter (Smith and Brady) [34];
5. The Wiener neighborhood empirical filter as executed by Yaroslavsky [40];
6. The interpretation invariant wavelet thresholding [8], a straightforward and performing variation of the wavelet thresholding [10];
7. Man, the discrete all inclusive denoiser [24] and the UINTA, Unsupervised Information-Theoretic, Adaptive Filtering [3], two exceptionally recent new methodologies;
8. The non nearby means (NL-implies) algorithm, which we present here. This last algorithm is given [illegible] a straightforward closed formula.

In this work, we utilize partial [illegible]tial equation methods to expel noise from digital images[illegible] evacuation is done in two stages. We first utilize a[illegible] aggregate variety filter to smooth the [illegible]mal vectors of the level bends of a noise image. A[illegible] attempt to locate a surface to fit the smo[illegible]hed norma[illegible]ctors. For each of these two phases [illegible]ue is dim[illegible]shed to a nonlinear partial differ[illegible]ntial eq[illegible]n. Lin[illegible]trast plans are utilized [illegible] explain t[illegible] equations. [illegible] expansive scope [illegible] [illegible]erical cases [illegible] given in the paper. In this paper, th[illegible]ttempted to [illegible]ess three dimensiona[illegible] surfaces. The [illegible]mental thou[illegible]was to control [illegible] normal vectors fo[illegible]iven 3-D s[illegible]face and after that [illegible]te another surfa[illegible] that matches the handled norm[illegible]ectors appropriate[illegible] In this work, we are extending to [illegible]mage noise [illegible]sion. Promote, we might want to say t[illegible]ormal ha[illegible]ling has additionally been utilized as a [illegible] of shape from shading reproduction and in work[illegible]vancement Non-Local Patch Regression

a. ROBUST PATCH REGRESSION:

It is notable that ℓ1 minimization is more strong to outliers than ℓ2 minimization. A basic contention is that the un squared residuals kP−Pjk in (5) are better made preparations for the distorted information guides thought about toward the squared residuals kP − Pjk2. The previous tends to better stifle the huge residuals that may come about because of outliers. This fundamental standard of hearty insights can be followed back to the works of von Neumann, Tukey and Huber and lies at the heart of a few late work on the outline of strong estimators; and the references in that. A characteristic question is the thing that happens on the off chance that we supplant the ℓ1 relapse in (5) by ℓ(p<1) relapse. As a rule, one could consider the accompanying class of issues:

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}_i = \arg\min_{\mathbf{P}} \sum_{j \in S(i)} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_j\|^p. \quad \text{... (5)}$$

The natural thou[illegible] is that, by taking littler estimations of p, we [illegible]n better stifle the residuals kP−Pjk instigated by [illegible]tliers. This ought to make the relapse conside[illegible]bly m[illegible]trong to outliers, contrasted with what we [illegible]t with p = [illegible]e take note of that a flip side of se[illegible]ing p [illegible]1 is that (6) [illegible]ever again be convex (this i[illegible] basi[illegible]lly in light of the [illegible] that t 7→ |t|p is co[illegible]ex if and just if p ≥ 1), and it [illegible] rule hard to [illegible]cate the w[illegible]ldwide minimizer [illegible] a non-convex [illegible]tional. In a[illegible]se, we do have a decent possibility of fin[illegible] the [illegible]orldwide idea[illegible] on the off chance that we can instat[illegible]e solver near [illegible]e worldwide ideal. The motivati[illegible]hind this n[illegible]e is to numerically show that, [illegible]r all adeq[illegible] sub[illegible]antial σ, the ˆu got by fathoming [illegible]5) (and letting [illegible]o be the middle pixel in ˆP i) brings about a more po[illegible]erful estimate of f as p → 0, than what is acquired utilizing NLM. Hereafter, we will allude to (6) as Non-Local Patch Regression (NLPR), where p is for the most part permitted to take values in the range (0, 2].

[illegible]ERATIVE SOLVER:

The usefulness of the above thought really comes from the way that there exists a basic iterative solver for (6). Truth be told, the thought was affected by the notable association amongst "sparsity" and 'robustness', especially the utilization of l(p<1) minimization for best-premise choice and correct meager recovery. We were especially spurred by the iteratively reweighted least squares (IRLS) approach of Daubechies et al and a regularized variant of IRLS created by Chartrand for no convex improvement. We will adjust the regularized IRLS algorithm in [19], [20] for solving (6). The correct working of this iterative solver is as per the following. We utilize the NLM estimate to introduce the algorithm, that is, we set

$$\mathbf{P}^{(0)} = \frac{\sum_{j \in S(i)} w_{ij} \mathbf{P}_j}{\sum_{j \in S(i)} w_{ij}}. \quad \text{... (7)}$$

Then, at every iteration k ≥ 1, we write $\|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_j\|^p = \|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_j\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_j\|^{p-2}$ in (6), and use the current estimate to approximate this by

$\|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{P}_j\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{P}^{(k-1)}-\mathbf{P}_j\|^{p-2}$. This gives us the surrogate least-squares 3 Problem

$$\mathbf{P}^{(k)} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{P}} \sum_{j\in S(i)} w_{ij} \frac{\|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{P}_j\|^2}{\left(\|\mathbf{P}^{(k-1)}-\mathbf{P}_j\|^2+\varepsilon^{(k)}\right)^{1-p/2}}. \quad \text{... (8)}$$

Here ε(k) >0 is used as a guard against division by zero, and is gradually shrunk to zero as the iteration progresses. We refer the reader to [19] for details. The solution of (8) is explicitly given by

$$\mathbf{P}^{(k)} = \frac{\sum_{j\in S(i)} w_{ij}\mu_j^{(k)}\mathbf{P}_j}{\sum_{j\in S(i)} w_{ij}\mu_j^{(k)}}, \quad \text{... (9)}$$

where

$$\mu_j^{(k)} = (\|\mathbf{P}^{(k-1)}-\mathbf{P}_j\|^2+\varepsilon^{(k)})^{p/2-1}. \quad \text{... (10)}$$

The minimize of (6) is taken to be the point of confinement of the repeats, accepting that it exists. While we can't give any ensure on neighborhood convergence now, we take note of that (9) can be communicated as a gradient descent venture (with suitable stride size) [illegible] smooth surrogate of (6). This understanding prompts to the outstanding Weiszfeld algorithm (for the u[illegible] case p = 1), which is known to join straightly [26], [2[illegible]] [illegible] the other hand, one could adjust more complex IR[illegible] algorithms (e.g., the one in [21]), which accompany demonstrated assurances on neigh[illegible]nvergence, to the case p < 1. The general computational complexity of NLPR is O(k2S2I) per p[illegible] where I is the normal number of iterations. For N[illegible] the complexity is O(k2S2) per pixel. For given conv[illegible] prec[illegible] have seen that I in[illegible]ts as p redu[illegible]s. Specifically, an expansive number [illegible]rations are [illegible]ired in the non-arched administration [illegible]p < 0.4. For th[illegible]tion, we end th[illegible] calculation after [illegible]dequately s[illegible]stantial numb[illegible]ations.

Algorithm 1 No[illegible]al Patch Regressi[illegible]n (NLPR)

Input: Noisy image u = [illegible] and parameters h, S, k, p.

Return: Denoised image ˆ[illegible] = (ˆui).

(1) Extract fix Pi of size k × k at each pixel i.

(2) For each pixel i, do

(a) Set wij = exp(−kPi − Pjk2/h2) for each j ∈ S(i).

(b) Sort wij , j ∈ S(i), in non-expanding request.

(c) Let j1, j2, . . . , jS2 be the re-indexing of j ∈ S(i) according to the above request.

(d) Find fix P that limits P[S2/2] t=1 wijtkP − Pjkp.

(e) Set ˆui to be the inside pixel in P.

ROBUSTNESS USING K-NEAREST NEIGHBORS:

We saw that a basic heuristic regularly gives an amazing change in the execution of NLM. In (2), one considers all patches P[illegible], j ∈ S(i), drawn from the geometric neighborhood of pixel i. In any case, see that when a fix is nea[illegible]ge, then generally 50% of its neighboring patches are [illegible]ne side (the right side) of the edge. Taki[illegible] after this [illegible]ption, we consider just the main half of the neighbor[illegible]atches that have the bigge[illegible] weights. That is, the chose[illegible]tches compare to the [illegible]r/2]-closest neighbors of Pi in th[illegible] space, where r [illegible] |S(i)|. While this has a tendency to repress the [illegible]mination [illegible] noise levels (in smooth areas), it was [illegible]n [13] that it can essentially enhance the hearti[illegible] of NLM and N[illegible]M everywhere σ. We will likewise [illegible] this heuristic in NLPR. The general plan [illegible] abridged [illegible]orithm 1. We utilize S(i) to signify a window of size [illegible] focused at pixel i in the algorithm.

8. CONCLUSION:

In this paper we have clarified distinctive systems of Image Denoising. We have seen distinctive [illegible]rithms which are utilized for Image denoising like Wavelet Transform, Curvelet Transform, Fourier Transform and so forth. This processes formally the method noise for the best rudimentary nearby smoothing methods, in particular gaussian smoothing, anisotropic smoothing (mean ebb and flow movement), add up to variety minimization and the area filters. For every one of them we demonstrate or review the asymptotic extension of the filter at smooth purposes of the image and along these lines get a formal articulation of the method noise. This expression grants to describe places where the filter performs well and where it comes up short. We treat the Wiener-like methods, which continue by a soft or hard threshold on frequency or space-frequency coefficients. We look at thusly the Wiener-Fourier filter, the Yaroslavsky neighborhood versatile DCT based filters and the wavelet threshold method. Obviously the gaussian smoothing has a place with both classes of filters. We additionally depict the universal denoiser DUDE, yet we can't draw it into the examination as its immediate application to gray level images is eccentric up until now (we talk about its practicality). At long last, we look at the UINTA algorithms whose standards stand near the NL-implies

NOVATEUR PUBLICATIONS
International Journal Of Research Publications In Engineering And Technology [IJRPET]
ISSN: 2454-7875
VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3, Mar. -2017

algorithm. We present the Non Local means (NL-implies) filter. This method is not effectively ordered in the previous wording, since it can work adaptively in a neighborhood or non nearby way. We first give a proof that this algorithm is asymptotically predictable (it gives back the restrictive desire of every pixel esteem given a watched neighborhood) under the presumption that the image is a genuinely broad stationary irregular process. The works of Efros and Leung [13] and Levina [15] have demonstrated that this presumption is sound for images having enough specimens in every surface fix. In area 6, we look at all algorithms from a few perspectives, do an execution arrangement and clarify why the NL-implies algorithm shares the consistency properties of a large portion of the previously mentioned algorithms.

REFERENCES

1) Gabriela Ghimpe¸teanu, Thomas Batard, Marcelo Bertalmío, and Stacey Levine, "*A Decomposition Framework for Image Denoising Algorithms*," in Proc.IEEE Transactions on image processing, vol. 25, no. 1, january 2016
2) S. P. Awate and R. T. Whitaker, "*Higher-order ima[illegible] statistics for unsupervised, information-the[illegible]tic, adaptive, image filtering,*" in Proc. IEEE C[illegible]pute. Soc. Conf. Compute. Vis. Pattern Recog[illegible] 2. Jun. 2005, pp. 44–51.
3) T. Batard and M. Berthier, "*Spinor Fourier transfo[illegible] for image processing*," IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process., vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 605–[illegible]2013.
4) Florian Luisier, Thierry Bl[illegible] and Mi[illegible] Unser, "*A New SURE Approach to [illegible]age Denoisi[illegible] Interscale Orthonormal Wavelet [illegible]olding,*" in [illegible]EEE Trans. *Image Process.*, vol. 15, n[illegible] pp. 6[illegible] Mar. 2006.
5) P. Blomgren [illegible] T. F. Chan, "[illegible]lor TV: Total variation method[illegible] restoration [illegible]ctor-valued images," IEEE Trans. [illegible]ge Process, v[illegible] no. 3, pp. 304–[illegible]09, Mar. 1998.
6) **[6]** [illegible]resson and T. F. C[illegible] "Image De[illegible]oising Via Spar[illegible]nd Redundant [illegible]esentations Over Learned [illegible]tionaries" Inverse [illegible]blems Imag., vol. 2, no. 4, pp[illegible]–484, 2008.
7) A. Buades, B[illegible]ll, and J[illegible] Morel, "*A non-local algorithm for [illegible] denoising,*" in Proc. IEEE Comput. Soc. Con[illegible]ut. Vis. Pattern Recognit., vol. 2. Jun. 2005, pp. [illegible]–65.
8) M. Lysaker, S. Osh[illegible], and X.-C. Tai, "*Noise removal using smoothed normals and surface fitting,*" *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 1345–1357, Oct 2004
9) K. Dabov, A. Foi, V. Katkovnik, and K. Egiazarian, "*Image denoising by sparse 3D transform-domain collaborative filtering,*" IEEE Trans. Image Process., vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 2080–2095, Aug. 2007.
10) F. Malgouyres , " *A noise selection approach of image restoration",* Applications in signal and image processing IX, 4478 (2001), pp. 34–41.
11) S. Mallat, "*A wavelet tour of signal processing*", Academic Press, 1997.
12) B. Merriman, J. Bence, and S. Osher, "*Diffusion generated motion by mean curvature*", in Proceedings of the Geometry Center Workshop, 1992.
13) Y. Meyer, "*Oscillating Patterns in Image Processing and Nonlinear Evolution Equations*", vol. 22, AMS University Lecture Series, 2002.
14) E.A. Nadaraya, on estimating regression, "*Theory of Probability and its A[illegible]plications"*, 10 (1964), pp. 186–190.